

Strongest possible objection to the loss of retail unit to residential.

1.1 Camden's formally adopted Primrose Hill conservation area statement states at PH2 'The Council will seek to retain uses which form part of the established character of the conservation area'. This retail premises is a key part of the character of the conservation area also because of its location at a central crossroads in the CA, where local shops and a pub were originally located.

1.2 The loss of retail use is not justified. The local shops and businesses in the adjoining parade are now doing well. We understand that the shop at 38 has been marketed at an annual rent some three times that paid by businesses in the adjoining group: that is not an appropriate test. The proposal is directly contrary to Camden's Core Strategy at CS7g. Local shops and local employment are highly valued by the community, their loss fails to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.

2.0 We note the applicant's comment (at 1.4.5) that the tiles to the shop elevations may be removed and reinstated. We strongly object. We note the technical reasons which make it highly unlikely that such tiles can be removed and reinstated. Alternatives are possible. We draw your attention to the Planning Inspector's decision on 1 Edis Street which dismissed an appeal against refusal to allow the removal of the tiles to that property: such tiles are a key element in the character of the conservation area. The appeal was decided on 3 January 2014 with ref APP/X5210/A/13/2203853. In that case the walls were repaired without removing the tiles, which were also repaired, where necessary, in situ.

3.0 We would very much regret the loss of the internal fittings of the shop, which could be retained if retail were kept or an appropriate employment use were approved.