

Dear Laura and John,

On the points raised by the chartered surveyor's letter, please see comments below;

1 and 2. This is not a standard single storey extension at no 18 - the extension including terrace is raised significantly. The garden of no 16 is on a slope. There are obvious elements of an overbearing structure that affects no 16. I can confirm that as a family and as the persons directly affected by this extension, we and visitors find this an overbearing structure.

3. This statement is inaccurate. From the unauthorised extension and raised terrace of no 18, most of the garden and private amenity space of no 16 can be overlooked. As the occupants on no 16, we require a permanent solution to this unauthorised invasion of privacy. Films on windows are not sufficient or permanent. The overlooking from the raised terrace has also not been addressed and requires a screen. This terrace also directly overlooks onto our private space which has an established stoned patio seating / dining area with electrical plug points and a children's play structure in close proximity. We are not in agreement with any overlooking from this extension onto our private amenity space. Overlooking raises a number of well being issues.

4. If the argument of fairness is being raised by no 18, this is not valid for a number of reasons. When we wanted to extend at no 16, we followed process and policy, worked collaboratively with planners, builders and neighbouring properties. Before commencing, we obtained planning permission. The obscured glazing that we inserted actually replaced existing large clear glass windows on our property that already overlooked the neighbouring property. Therefore, our extension reduced significantly the overlooking of our property onto neighbouring property.

The occupants of no 18 have themselves, at least twice, vehemently opposed the planning permission of a dwelling on the level land on the north side of their property to prevent, amongst other concerns, their property being overlooked. They have gone door to door to have petitions signed to prevent primarily their garden and property being overlooked. The planning application has been denied both times no 18 objected thereby preventing overlooking and the loss of privacy of their space.

In no way has no 18 been "fair" in this process as evidenced by the denial of no 18 of the need to apply for planning permission when asked, the repeated breach of noise disturbance whilst building this structure and the experiences associated with the loss of privacy for no 16.