

From: CASTLEGATE ASBC
Sent: 12 March 2025 13:45
To: Planning
Subject: 2025/0384/P

To whom it may concern,

Re: 2025/0384/P (OBJECTION)

I write in relation to the proposed development above, as I believe that should it go ahead as designed, it would increase the sense of enclosure both to my property and the properties neighbours immediately adjacent. Furthermore, it would if approved in its current form, have a substantial and negative impact on the appearance of the south terrace to the detriment of the terrace as a whole. Not only are there currently no developments of this nature on the south side of our mews, but by comparison were it to go ahead, it would represent the largest roof level development (pro rata) that has ever been undertaken in this mews. By direct comparison, having completed my own roof development, in the not too distant past, and notwithstanding the fact that the properties on the north terrace are generally around fifty percent larger than the application property. The roof level developments that have been undertaken on the north terrace have been significantly set back, so as to reduce their impact on the character of the mews, and as a result have been markedly smaller than that of the proposed development, both in their overall volume and by way of the additional floor area created as a percentage of the original footprint of those properties prior to development.

It would also appear that the inferences drawn on the impact of the proposed development, on the rest of the mews, as suggested in some of the supporting documentation, are disproportionately conservative. To illustrate this point I have included a number of historic images all of which are freely and readily available. These images portray the reality of the impact on daylight that the existing properties on the south terrace have on the properties of the north terrace at different times of the day, and at different

times of the year. It is evident from these images that should the current application be approved the completed development would result in a loss of amenity both to me and my aforementioned neighbours.

Ms Rosalind Eisen 3 Belsize Park Mews, London NW3 5BL



SOUTH TERRACE

CONTRARY TO THE DAYLIGHT ANALYSIS ATTACHED TO THE APPLICATION, HISTORIC IMAGES SHOW THAT THE IN THE EARLY MONTHS OF THE YEAR, THE SHADOW CAST BY THE PROPERTIES ON THE SOUTH TERRACE CLEARLY EXCEED THE HEIGHT OF THE VEHICLES PARKED ON THE NORTH TERRACE. AND THEREFORE, THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT WOULD FURTHER IMPEDE THE AVAILABLE DAYLIGHT TO THE GROUND FLOOR OF THOSE NEARBY PROPERTIES OPPOSITE

(JANUARY 2021 SOURCE GOOGLE MAPS)



THERE ARE NUMEROUS IMAGES AVAILABLE ON ARCHIVE WHICH DEMONSTRATE THAT THERE HAVE BEEN NO PREVIOUS ROOF LEVEL DEVELOPMENTS TO THE TERRACE OF PROPERTIES TO THE SOUTH SIDE OF BELSIZE PARK MEWS AND THUS THE PROPOSED APPLICATION WOULD DETRIMENTALLY IMPACT THE HISTORIC NATURE OF THE SAME.

(JULY 2017 SOURCE GOOGLE MAPS)



SOUTH TERRACE

DURING HIGH SUMMER IT IS EVIDENT THAT THE SHADOW CAST BY THE APPLICATION PROPERTY WOULD EXTEND WELL BEYOND THE LINE OF THE FLANK WALL TO 74 BELSIZE LANE, WHICH WOULD QUESTION THE ACCURACY OF THE PROJECTIONS OF THE DAYLIGHT ANALYSIS ATTACHED TO THE APPLICATION.

(JULY 2014 SOURCE GOOGLE MAPS)



HEIGHT OF REAR DORMER TO EXISTING PITCHED ROOF OF N67 BPM DOES NOT EXCEED THAT OF ORIGINAL PARAPET

APPLICATION PROPERTY

ORIGINAL FOOT PRINT OF N63 BPM APPX 70.9M² FOOT PRINT OF ROOF LEVEL DEVELOPMENT APPX 29.75M² EQUATING TO 41% OF ORIGINAL (SET BACK APPX 4.3M)

LIGHT WELL TO ROOF OF N62 BPM SET WITHIN ORIGINAL SLOPE (SET BACK APPX 4.3M)

NOTE: NO ROOF LEVEL DEVELOPMENTS TO SOUTH TERRACE



APPLICATION PROPERTY

IT IS NOTED THAT NO ROOF LEVEL DEVELOPMENT IS CURRENTLY FULLY VISIBLE WITHIN THE STREETScape OF THE EXISTING TERRACES WHEN VIEWED FROM GROUND LEVEL. THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT WOULD DRASTICALLY ALTER THIS FACT. IT WOULD RESULT IN A DIRECT AND MATERIAL LOSS OF LIGHT TO Nos. 2, 3 AND 4 AND BPM. FURTHERMORE, IT WOULD IRREVERSIBLY DAMAGE THE BALANCE AND AESTHETIC OF THE MEWS AS IT CURRENTLY EXISTS.