

---

**From:** darian leader [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 04 July 2023 09:32  
**To:** Planning Planning  
**Subject:** 2023/2549/A

[REDACTED]

Dear Camden,

I am writing regarding the recent application by Vakrat re 40 Rosslyn Hill, posted on 30/6/23. It is of concern that the owners installed signage on a listed heritage property without planning permission, only applying retrospectively. They are fully aware of the regulations here, as they note in their original application for works to this important building, yet installed the signage nonetheless.

Re the applications for the new illuminated sign and the flag, displaying the owner's name, these are really inappropriate in this historic building. The current signage - installed without permission - is at least not too obtrusive, and it allows the building to retain its historic character and original features, which make it important to the area. The previous owners, Lloyds, had a small sign up for a bit and it was not illuminated. They did not use the flagpole, and other flagpoles in the local area are not used. It would be detrimental to the heritage aspect of the building as well as unightly to install an illuminated sign, and putting up a flag would also go against the heritage and historic character of the building and be wildly inappropriate for the area. It is a beauty salon which is perfectly visible with current signage, and adding an illuminated sign and a flag might inflate the owner's ego but are totally unnecessary and counter to the spirit and ethos of the area, where both the Council and residents have endeavoured to respect historic features.

Many thanks for registering this objection.

Kind regards  
Prof. D Leader  
1 Pilgrim's Lane  
London NW3 1SJ