

## Comment on a planning application

### Application Details

**Application:** 24/1640/LBC

**Address:** 8 Montpelier Row Twickenham TW1 2NQ

**Proposal:** Proposed replacement of existing roof, repairs to the existing roof structure, repointing and repairs to the existing roof parapet, roof dormer and chimney.

### Comments Made By

**Name:** Mr. Kevin Flanagan

**Address:** 7 Montpelier Row Twickenham TW1 2NQ

### Comments

**Type of comment:** Make a general observation

**Comment:** Broadly we support this application as improvements to the fabric of the building are welcomed. However we have 6 observations to make which give us grounds for concern and wish to be taken into account when considering this application.

1. The history of little or no maintenance and then botched intervention due to little or no supervision by the owner's agents due to the owner being an overseas Liberian registered company gives rise to considerable concerns about the proposed works. Competent and fully costed supervision in particular must be a condition of granting planning permission. In addition we would insist that the council be involved in the detailed execution to avoid the "bodge it and run" approach we have experienced as neighbours in the last 10 years.

2. In the supplied documents the solution to the deterioration that has been allowed due to point 1 above is principally a pair of steel beams bearing on the party walls under the valley. In none of the documents has any account been taken of the condition of the brickworks which are to be the load bearing elements. Our concern is that particularly on the nos 8-9 party wall which has been exposed to many years of water penetration and resulting weathering and presumable deterioration as a result of the same weathering and water damage. This may have compromised the integrity of the load bearing walls. It must also be observed that these are low quality bricks in initial poor condition compared to the facing bricks. This is compounded by the regular observation by the structural engineers that they have been unable to observe everything they would like because of the dangerous condition of the building in their documents. While the party wall between nos 8-7 is in a less parlous state again no calculations have been supplied. We would like to see these assessments and calculations presented to the 2 direct neighbours and the council's building control function before work is commenced.

3. A further concern is a lack of commentary about the structural integrity of the overall building given that the rear wall has separated from the chimney breast between nos 7-8 and the crack has widened to several centimetres allowing rain ingress and weathering. There is no mention of bracing or any other mitigating safety precautions in the planning and given the history of sub-standard or even dangerous work done on the building this is a major concern.

4. Repair of the damage and dangerous consequences of the botched earlier works this year should also be a precondition of the granting of planning permission. We are referring to the dislodging of at least 1 chimney pot at the rear from the wrap around weatherproofing in one of the storms earlier this year. This pot is now loose and may fall in subsequent storms.

5. There is a gap in the very front roof space between no 7 and 8. We must insist from a fire safety aspect to have this gap sealed with lightweight blocks as part of the works and to prevent the risk of fire spreading during the proposed works and the further ingress of water whilst the repairs are being done across the autumn and winter.

6. Lastly as these works are structural and notifiable under Party Wall legislation we must observe that no notification has yet been given to either neighbour and must insist that it is made a condition of granting planning permission.