An error has been made regarding the Council's statement to the balcony plans in 2003 It should read 'It is NOT a good idea'

REAR EXTENSION/BALCONY

in my previous comments I have already referred to the fact that the turf roof of the proposed rear extension and the upper ground floor windows that reach very low, just above the floor, will, in practice, create a balcony.

I would like to convey to you the effect it will have on us if that structure is allowed to be used as a balcony.

The absence of a balcony on that floor will not stop the flat from being rented, all that it can possibly mean for the developers is that with a balcony they will get more rent.

A bit more rent for them but at what cost for us in terms of privacy. For the 19 years we have lived here we enjoyed and valued the privacy that we now have.

If that structure were allowed to be used as a balcony we would have people just a few yards away looking down on us, breathing down our necks as it were. They would even be able to hear our conversations.

When in 2003 our then neighbours applied for permission to build a balcony there, Camden Council turned it down because of the infringement on our privacy.

At that time a Camden official knocked on our door and asked permission to see where the proposed balcony would be from our side. His comments were 'It is a good idea'.

Later on we heard that Camden Council had turned down the proposal, the infringement on our privacy was so obvious that they did not even feel the need to ask us for our opinion in the decision making process.

For 19 years we have lived in harmony with our neighbours, the long term ones and also the short term passing ones.

We do not want the unpleasantness of having to deal the tenants who will think that they have the right to be on the balcony and that we are the bad neighbours trying to deprive them of using it.

WE WOULD LIKE TO ASK THE COUNCIL TO DETERMINE AT THIS STAGE THAT THE ROOF OF THE REAR EXTENSION SHOULD BE BUILT SO THAT IT CANNOT BE USED AS A BALCONY.

All that we are asking the Council is that they continue with the same policy created by the precedent of a a few years ago.

1

SUBSIDENCE

We already referred to the problem of subsidence and a bulging wall at No 26 and, because this house is attached to ours, it is of great concern that such major works should not be done without addressing those problems28th May until the first.

We understand that it is a legitimate aim of a business to maximise profits and we wish the developers the best in achieving this.

However, achieving maximum revenue should not involve neglecting the structural integrity of the building.

Living next door we know the history of the subsidence problem, we have seen the cracks, we have heard about it from the previous owners.

There will be no better time to correct these problems than now, when the other major works are undertaken.

WE URGE CAMDEN COUNCIL TO CONSIDER THE ABOVE AND TO PLEASE INSPECT THE PROPERTY.

I have asked to be at the Committee Meeting. However, there are some days that I would not be able to attend.

