
From: Sasha Turnbull [REDACTED]
Sent: 04 December 2022 00:12
To: Planning Planning
Subject: 2022/4513/L - 91a Belsize Lane objection

[REDACTED]

Dear Sir/Madame

The huge scale of the proposal to extend the lower half of my building has been brought to my attention, albeit late.

I occupy the upstairs maisonette, 91, which we ourselves restored to its historic original about 10 years ago and now live with our child. The planning officers were extremely strict at the time, even to the point of turning down our first choice of wrought iron railings on the roof terrace as being too fancy!

I'm so disturbed by what's proposed by the new owners. A two storey extension infill that brings a new roof line right up to beneath our kitchen window. Thus destroying our green outlook, potentially affecting light and definitely the enjoyment from our one and only main living space. It also means our one and only outdoor living space (the terrace) will also be compromised. Especially given the proposed eyesores of industrial looking solar panels at our feet and just out our window.

It beggars belief that the proposal identifies number 91 as "the most original" building left on the terrace - and then details how it will destroy that. All in the name - and I quote - "to add VALUE and enjoyment" to their home, definitely not taking into account that it would take away those things from ours.

The statements also show other infills and extensions along the terrace and on other buildings - however, completely failing to identify all those buildings are sole occupancy NOT maisonettes, whereby there's others directly effected in the same building. We own half the building so surely are entitled to enjoy it as equally, without such a major alteration which compromises only us?

I'm also saddened by the huge amount of unnecessary detail and numerous documents the architects have provided, a tactic to blind and bamboozle and dare I say, intimidate the planning officers and the public. My partner has previously lodged an objection, but was unaware and now overwhelmed by all these documents.

It's difficult to read and is also inaccurate - not showing our roof terrace as a living space. It does however, illustrate how boxed in our rear window would be with the proposed two storey extension coming right up the side and to the base of our window. Surely this can't be right? Surely a one storey extension is more appropriate and fairer given the dual occupancy?

I hope you can see my concerns, which have led me writing this at midnight unable to sleep.

But emotions aside, the proposal would destroy the final remaining intact house on the terrace, as it removes much of the rear material (let's not forget we are in a conservation area, and we moved here for a reason - to not be surrounded by glass boxes and many of these other extensions were done before listed status); while given the maisonette nature and it not being a single occupancy house, the high, blocking two-storey extension with solar panels on top is inappropriate and interfering, reducing outlook and quality of life.

Many thanks for reading.

Kind regards

Sasha Turnbull
91 Belsize Lane