

I wish to comment on both the above applications.

Re 2024/4733/P, I consider the hours of 7am opening are not appropriate for this property set as it is in the middle of residential streets in the CA. It is too early and may well remove from residents their reasonable expectation of quiet and peaceful enjoyment of their property and its surrounding area.

In addition, this property is to become Gail's Bakery and if, at some time in the future, they bake on the premises they might wish to stay open all night in order to perform this function. The early opening hours of 7am might help them achieve this. None of the other businesses in the area, and there are at least two other food shops nearby, open at 7am but they might feel pressured to do so if Gail's can open at 7am. We wish to avoid this rush of early opening competition.

Re 2024/4734/A, I do not object to the proposed non-illuminated projecting sign on the left (facing the building) but object strongly to the proposed centrally fixed 3D illuminated letters on the roof of the right part of the property (facing the building).

It is difficult to see exactly what the applicant proposes with this signage as the description reads:

PROPOSED CENTRALLY FIXED 3D
ILLUMINATED LETTERS APPLIED INDIVIDUALLY ON TO ALUMINIUM BASE WHERE
DRIVER AND CABLES TO BE HIDDEN. THE BASE IS SECURED BY VBH TAPE FIXED ON
GLASS TOP.

But this seems to propose to put a sort of 3d illuminated graphic sculpture on top of the glass roof externally of a height not specifically disclosed, but likely to be in excess of 435 x 1850mm. This will cause light pollution and the illumination is to be avoided as well as the size of the signage and its position externally on the roof. The applicant should only be permitted to put signage within this part of the building, under the ceiling, and behind the window.

If any other shop in the CA proposed to put this decorative display on top of their shopfront, it would certainly not be described as an advertisement and would need to be a full planning application with full consultation process and it would almost certainly not be granted.

This is in direct contravention of PH45 in the Primrose Hill CA Statement and I urge you to refuse this application.

Alex Murray
47 Princess Road
London NW1 8JS