



I object to the above application and attach the reasons for this.

Please let me know if you want any further information.

Janet Langdon



PLANNING APPLICATION 2013/3833/P – 2 MARSTON CLOSE

I oppose the above planning application as, if it went ahead, I would have a loss of privacy and the proposed project overlooks my property. The terrace is only about 1.75 metres from the back of my garden. The length of my back garden is only about 10 metres. Hence anyone looking out of the door from the proposed extension or being on the terrace would look straight in to my garden and into all the rooms at the back of my house.

Some years ago, the current owners of 2 Marston Close put in a planning application to build a conservatory – I did not object to this, as, although I can see the top of the conservatory, people in the conservatory do not overlook my house or the garden.

There is no terrace at the moment – there is only a flat roof over a garage (this is no longer a garage but has been incorporated into the house) with a low parapet and from a safety point of view, it is not suitable for people to be on it. However, on the 'proposed drawing document', it says 'New terrace has been in place for 15 years'. I have lived at [REDACTED] 1973 (before the current owners of 2 Marston Close moved in) and have never been consulted by Camden Council except on the conservatory. Hence is it possible that the door from the house on to the terrace, and the terrace, were installed without planning permission?

The application says that the extension is similar to those of 1 and 12 Marston Close – this is not the case as neither of these extensions have windows overlooking other properties. Only No. 12 has a terrace, which is very small, and it does not overlook other people's properties.

In researching Camden planning applications, I found an application for 2 Marston Close (ref. 7006) dated 3 July 1969 for the erection of first floor addition over double garage and the formation of a door at 2nd floor level in the side elevation. The application was refused for the following reasons:

- 1) The proposal does not comply with the Council's daylighting standards along the side boundary of the site and will be detrimental to the amenities enjoyed by adjoining owners
- 2) The proposal will further reduce the amenities enjoyed by the adjoining owners, by reason of overlooking.

The same is as true in 2013, as it was in 1969.

