

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/2542/L	M Horlock	21/07/2023 13:06:37	OBJ	<p>I am writing with regard to the renewed application by Vakrat re 40 Rosslyn Hill. I note the owner installed signage on a listed heritage property without planning permission, and is now applying retrospectively. They were aware of the regulations, having referenced them before, yet have shown to flout them when suits. It is an unfortunate precedent and demonstration of bad faith if residents and business owners find it acceptable to go ahead and break heritage and planning regulations and seek permission retrospectively. That said, at least these signs are in keeping with what existed before.</p> <p>As regards the further addition of a flag and a new illuminated projecting sign, I'd consider both serious impairment of the original historic building, and completely out of keeping with its design and character. In photographs of the building in its previous incarnation there is no flag on the flag pole and the one now proposed would look wildly out-of-place and really inappropriate.</p> <p>Furthermore, the addition of an illuminated sign is completely out of keeping with the wider area as well as a gross imposition on what is a prized historic facade of great heritage value.</p> <p>This building has its own grandeur, with large, arched windows and a fine interior space now clearly visible from the outside. There are signs on the side and a sign on the pavement that pedestrians see instantly. There is no need for these further garish impositions which seem determined only to ruin what should be a prized bit of Hampstead's history.</p> <p>It's not just detrimental to the character and heritage of this site, but to the wider area, and the ethos and spirit of Hampstead High Street.</p> <p>I strongly oppose the application.</p>
2023/2542/L	Darian Leader	20/07/2023 12:32:52	COMMENT	<p>The installation of a projecting sign is not in keeping with the historic character of this important building. Lloyds had a very small sign which they only kept up for a limited time. The current signage - installed without consent - and the A board outside make it perfectly clear that it is a salon, and adding a further sign is not necessary and distracts from the heritage aspect of the building.</p> <p>The same goes for the grandiose idea of hanging a sign from the flagpole. This is entirely unnecessary, and Lloyds never did this, nor hung a flag. Other local properties with flagpoles do not do this, and it would set a poor precedent, to use period features purely as pegs for commercial pursuits, as well as being out of character with the building itself. The Lloyds building is one of the most important and beautiful landmarks in the area and I hope we can all try to maintain its dignity and period features.</p>
2023/2542/L	M Milos	20/07/2023 13:23:43	OBJ	<p>From memory I believe this is the second time in the past 12mths that this same request is being logged with planning. As the owner of the Flat right above the proposed signage, I sincerely hope the concerns of residents in the same block will be taken into account and this proposal rejected. Having advertising signed run underneath our bedroom windows let alone the proposed hanging sign on the flagpole, will cause unnecessary attention to our residential premises let alone impact our own privacy. I appreciate our flat is above a business premises, but there must be more subtle ways their advertising can be done. I hope therefore the respective planning officer will take into account the concerns of all private residence in the vicinity of this planning application and how that may affect their day to day lives. Thank you</p>