|               |                        |                   |                     |         |   | Printed on:   | 12/05/2025                                    | 09:10:04 |
|---------------|------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|---------|---|---|---|----------|
| Application N | <b>Consultees Name</b> | Recipient Address | Received            | Comment | Response  |   |   |          |
| 2025/1782/A   | The Belsize<br>Society | 38 Howitt Road    | 09/05/2025 11:51:48 | OBJ     | The Belsize Society objects to this application for retention of advertising material which was already refused in a previous application 2024/3704/A. These non-consented signs are subject to enforcement and should have been removed after 7th March with leeway given until 21st March before legal action was to start.   |   |   |          |
|               |                        |                   |                     |         | The original scheme 2024/2771/A was withdrawn on 23/7/24 in view of opposition, supported by a ward councillor.   | of considerat   | ole local                                     |          |
|               |                        |                   |                     |         | Following discussion with the planning team, a revised scheme 20124/2.9.24. Following advice, the applicant further modified the plans and c signs either side of the main door and replaced the panel above the do to the transom glazing. All advertisements covering the windows had b drawings were produced on 11.11.24.   | omitted the i<br>oor with a vii                               | lluminated<br>nyl film applied                |          |
|               |                        |                   |                     |         | The signage was installed prior to consent being granted. The actual s the two illuminated signs either side of the front door signs and the viny the windows and five trough-illuminated fascia signs. This application v 7.3.25. Consent was given for the revised scheme which included sign not those either side of the doors, nor the advertisements covering the   | nyl covering o<br>was finally d<br>ns above the               | of 5 out of 6 of<br>lecided on                |          |
|               |                        |                   |                     |         | The council indicated enforcement action would follow and allowed a 1 those particular signs from 7th March, ie by 21st March. This has been  | •   | removal of                                    |          |
|               |                        |                   |                     |         | The comments justifying the rejection were: "intrusive visual clutter, ha appearance of the host building, streetscene and wider Belsize Conser Council will authorise the Borough Solicitor to secure removal of these prosecution proceedings in the Magistrates Court if necessary." "Pleas display of such advertisements without the benefit of advertisement counder Section 224 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as am | ervation Area<br>e advertisem<br>se be aware<br>onsent is a c | a. As such, the<br>ents and start<br>that the |          |
|               |                        |                   |                     |         | This new application for the explicitly unacceptable signs would appear prolong unconsented advertising material and impede enforcement act appearance of the conservation area.  |   | -   |          |
|               |                        |                   |                     |         | Indeed, the new application even worsens the illegally retained scheme of the Belsize Grove window from the upper half only to total obliteration   |   | sing coverage                                 |          |
|               |                        |                   |                     |         | There were 52 objections recorded from local residents, citing the bras the illumination, the poor-quality materials and the obliteration of the will advertisements. Nothing in the present application changes those objections.  | vindows by v  |   |          |
|               |                        |                   |                     |         | We consider the existing unconsented signs in this application excession context of this conservation area. The whole facade has become one bout of keeping with the rest of the shopping arcade and excessive to the place and purpose of this shop.   | brash adver   | tising hoarding                               |          |

Printed on:

12/05/2025 09:10:04

Application N Consultees Name Recipient Address Received Comment

We consider this application to retain the illegally signs is in contravention to the following:

- Local Plan Policy D1 (Design), the application specifically detracts from this prominent corner of the conservation area which leads into the quietly designed and elegant residential street (Belsize Grove), clumsily and brashly spoiling this corner of an otherwise restrained arcade. The neighbouring shops fronts are generally restrained in comparison and the large frontage of this particular shop, across, effectively three frontages, allows sufficient and proportionate advertising in the existing consented scheme which had been modified by reasonable agreement. The bright and unnatural colour represented on a large proportion of the corner frontage is a visual intrusion in the local street-scene. The large side panels do not respect the proportions of the art deco style door mouldings and the fenestration of the residential properties above and cause a visual imbalance and confusion.
- Local Plan Policy D2 (Heritage) these advertisements in this application do not preserve or enhance the character of this part of the conservation area (whereas the previous consented scheme had been carefully modified to comply).
- Local Plan D4 (Advertisements) these excessive and unnecessary advertisements contribute to an unsightly proliferation of signage in the area and contribute to light pollution to nearby residential properties. In relation to light pollution, the application covering letter erroneously states 'The only signs which are illuminated are those either side of the entrance door' clearly ignoring the existing five trough-illuminated lights. The total illumination around this shop must be considered.
- Camden Planning Guidance (CPG Advertisements) these advertisements in this
  conservation area, harm the character and appearance of this building and obscures and
  damages specific architectural features of the building, notably the proportions of the corner
  entrance and by obliterating the windows. The existing consented scheme applied an acceptable
  design basis of matching the signs to the architectural form, proportions and features of the host
  building. The present application distorts and unbalances this.
- Camden Planning Guidance (Design) which states in Paragraph 6.13 that 'Any signage or lettering should be uncluttered and respect the character and design of the building'. This application is obviously the opposite of this policy.

We therefore request:

Response

- 1) that this application be rejected
- 2) and that the previously agreed enforcement action by completed.

AS for The Belsize Society

|               |                        |   |                     |         | Printed on: 12/05/2025 09:10:04   |
|---------------|------------------------|---|---------------------|---------|---|
| Application N | <b>Consultees Name</b> | Recipient Address                                 | Received            | Comment | Response  |
| 2025/1782/A   | Celia Scott            | 3 Mall Studios<br>Tasker Road<br>London<br>NW32YS | 12/05/2025 08:10:00 | OBJ     | The shop front consists of three bays and dominates this part of the street.  |
|               |                        |   |                     |         | The windows below the fascia have been filled with vinyl signs, contravening the Parkhill + Upper Park Conservation Area Appraisal + Management Strategy which says: "Fascia signage should be restricted to the traditional fascia zone, delineated by the console brackets and should not project above the cornice or encroach below into the traditional glazed portion of the shopfront."  |
|               |                        |   |                     |         | The revisions to the original planning submission required by Camden have not been carried out.<br>Enforcement action should already have started.  |
| 2025/1782/A   | David                  | Belsize Grove<br>Belsize Park                     | 11/05/2025 19:39:19 | NOBJ    | I would like to extend my support for Leyland in Belsize Park as a local resident and against the local campaign to remove them.  |
|               |                        |   |                     |         | Leyland is operating in a building that was derelict for many years and had squatters move in. They have renovated the building and provide good services to the community. We need to support local shops in Belsize Park NOT drive businesses away just because somebody wants to put up an advertising panel. We need to ask this local campaign would they rather have vibrant shops in Belsize Park or rows of empty shops and (sadly) homeless people move in and more rubbish on our streets. Thank you. |