

, I write to object to the revised plans for 52 Bacon lane and wish to make the following points.

The objections we made in relation to the privacy issues [REDACTED] of the previous plan still stand for the reasons given in that objection.

We welcome the revised height and shape of the garage extension and acknowledge the difference this will make to the light and visual presence of the proposed building.

We also note on revised drawing F the inclusion of obscure glass to mitigate the view from the rear of the garage extension, first floor, [REDACTED] and the first floor side windows on the opposite side of 52 Bacon lane.

There is no such change however in the plans for any of the first floor side windows [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

So further to our previous objections regarding loss of privacy, should the revised plan be passed with these new changes, then it could amount to [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

As the use of obscured glass in side windows has a long standing precedent [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] clear glass, would as stated in our previous objection, definitely remove our right to privacy.

I ask the question what is the long window for?

If necessary for light for the use of the stairs then obscured glass, as stated in our previous objection, would provide this [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

The window gives uninterrupted views of [REDACTED] it
[REDACTED]

In addition to this, [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] will have uninterrupted views into [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

In short, almost total removal of the privacy we have previously enjoyed.

The developer has indicated the use of obscured glass in this new version of the plans and so is obviously open to its use to mitigate their neighbours objections [REDACTED]

I respectfully ask that the planning department uphold our right to privacy [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

It should also be remembered that this development began without any planning permission and that the long window was created without consent. The fact that it is now there does not diminish the fact that it wasn't.

We feel that we are offering mitigation for the window to remain by suggesting the glass be replaced by level 5 obscured glass and not objecting to the actual window itself, which obviously would have been our position if the appropriate planning process had been followed from the outset.

[REDACTED]

Regards

[REDACTED]