

## **THE LONDON BOROUGH OF CAMDEN**

At a meeting of the **PLANNING COMMITTEE** held on **THURSDAY, 27TH FEBRUARY, 2025** at 7.00 pm in Council Chamber, Town Hall, Judd Street, London WC1H 9JE

### **MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE PRESENT**

Councillors Edmund Frondigoun (Vice-Chair, in the Chair), Nasrine Djemai, Tommy Gale, Eddie Hanson, Liam Martin-Lane, Adam Harrison, Tom Simon and Robert Thompson

### **MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ABSENT**

Councillors Heather Johnson, Lotis Bautista, Andrew Parkinson and Sue Vincent

### **ALSO PRESENT**

Councillors Nanouche Umeadi and Stephen Stark

**The minutes should be read in conjunction with the agenda for the meeting. They are subject to approval and signature at the next meeting of the Planning Committee and any corrections approved at that meeting will be recorded in those minutes.**

## **MINUTES**

### **1. APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Heather Johnson (Chair), Lotis Bautista, and Sue Vincent.

### **2. DECLARATIONS BY MEMBERS OF STATUTORY DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS, COMPULSORY REGISTERABLE NON-PECUNIARY INTERESTS AND VOLUNTARY REGISTERABLE NON-PECUNIARY INTERESTS IN MATTERS ON THIS AGENDA**

#### **Agenda Items 7(1&2) and 7(3&4)**

Councillor Frondigoun declared for transparency that held a position with Citizens Advice as an Expert Advisor for Heat and Heat Networks. He had discussed this with the Borough Solicitor and had determined that it did not preclude him from taking part in discussion on the item.

Councillor Hanson was speaking against the applications and would, therefore, step down from the Committee for these items.

**Agenda Items 7(5)**

Councillor Harrison declared for transparency that he took a Single Member Decision on one of the schemes mentioned in the report, and following advice from the Legal Advisor determined that it did not preclude him from taking part in discussion on the item.

**Agenda Items 7(8)**

Councillor Simon had commented on the application, was speaking against the application and would therefore step down from the Committee for this item.

**3. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**Webcasting**

The Chair announced that the meeting was being broadcast live to the internet and would be capable of repeated viewing and copies of the recording could be made available to those that requested them. Those seated in the Chamber were deemed to be consenting to being filmed. Anyone wishing to avoid appearing on the webcast should move to one of the galleries.

**4. REPRESENTATIONS TO THE COMMITTEE**

**RESOLVED –**

THAT the written submissions and deputation requests contained in the supplementary agenda be accepted.

**5. NOTIFICATION OF ANY ITEMS OF BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIR DECIDES TO TAKE AS URGENT**

There was no such business.

**6. MINUTES**

Consideration was given to the Minutes of the previous meeting.

**RESOLVED –**

THAT the Minutes of the meeting held on 12 December 2024 be agreed and signed as an accurate record of the meeting.

## **7. PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

Consideration was given to the report of the Executive Director Supporting Communities.

### **7(1) ALEXANDRA ROAD ESTATE, ROWLEY WAY, LONDON NW8 0SN &**

### **7(2) RELATED APPLICATION &**

### **7(3) RELATED APPLICATION &**

### **7(4) RELATED APPLICATION**

Consideration was also given to the information, written submissions and deputation requests contained within the supplementary agenda.

Councillor Eddie Hanson stepped down from the Committee to address the Committee as Ward Councillor. Councillor Nanouche Umeadi also addressed the Committee as Ward Councillor.

The Planning Officer introduced the applications.

Responding to questions, Planning Officers provided the following information:

- Consultation on the planning applications and listed building consents followed the statutory process and the Council's Statement of Community Involvement. These processes do not require letters to be sent to individual households, therefore all statutory obligations had been met.
- Consultation on the Capital Works Programme, followed a separate governance process and was not a consideration that could be taken into account by the Committee when making a decision on the applications.
- However, it was noted that details on this consultation were included in the officer report for information.
- The Planning Committee could only consider the applications that were before it, and not potential future phases, therefore a desire for additional works to be included in an application was not a valid reason to refuse them.
- Furthermore, making a decision on the current applications would not preclude or predetermine the outcome of future applications for further works.
- The proposed works were deemed to cause less harm to the listed buildings compared to some of the alternative retrofit options available.
- Listed buildings were legally protected, and harm must be mitigated as far as possible and then carefully weighed against public benefits.
- The National Planning Policy Framework requires balancing heritage harm against public benefits, and case law had identified environmental and sustainability improvements as a public benefit.

- The Council's policy (CC1) encouraged sensitive energy efficiency improvements to historic buildings.
- A condition was included in the application requiring further details of the glazing to be submitted before installation commenced.
- Therefore, the recommendation was based on significant weight being given to heritage protection and also the need for energy efficiency improvements.
- Furthermore, Historic England had been consulted and had not raised objections to the proposals.
- For applications that altered windows on listed buildings, factors such as reflectivity and transparency were assessed and their impact on the building carefully considered.
- The proposed changes involved replacing every dwelling's window in a uniform manner to ensure consistency across the estate.
- The works would primarily be undertaken from the exterior of the building with minimal internal access, which would hopefully minimise potential disruption.
- Officers acknowledged there would be low-level harm due to minor visual differences, such as small dots in the vacuum glass. Although they deemed this harm minimal it was still given considerable importance and weight.
- Alternative options, such as using conventional double glazing, would require thicker beading and profiles, which was considered to be a greater visual impact as it would change the frames.
- Officers stated that on balance, the proposed vacuum glass was preferable due to its minimal effect on the building's appearance.
- Visual comparisons were provided, demonstrating that the replacement windows would closely match the originals, with other minor changes such as the addition of louvred ventilation panels.
- Vacuum glass was superior to standard double glazing and comparable to triple glazing, despite being much thinner. Historic England and conservation officers had supported the use of vacuum glass as it minimised harm while improving energy efficiency.

The applicant responded to questions by setting out their views as follows:

- Phase 1 would involve extensive distribution pipework across the estate, with work inside homes only occurring in the latter part of the estimated two to three-year programme.
- Two different contractors would be involved in the works, with one for mechanical and electrical work and another for the glazing works.
- Funding and grant opportunities were being pursued to reduce costs, including government grants that could cover the pipework.
- Further funding sources were being explored for Phase 2, including grants for heat source pumps and insulation measures.
- The applicant confirmed that while plans for Phase 2 were not yet fully developed, the Council remained committed to engaging with residents on future retrofit options.
- The applicant acknowledged that the glass specification was made five years ago and agreed to review newer products as the specification continued to be developed.

- The applicant stated that passive ventilation was already incorporated into the building's design, with ventilation panels alongside windows. These panels would be refurbished to improve insulation while maintaining airflow.
- The applicant confirmed that some flats had ventilation designed into the structure, particularly outside Block A.
- Phase 1 of the works aimed to replace the failing distribution pipework to address issues such as leaks and outages. The new system would be more reliable and efficient.
- Another problem with the current system was the failure of heating coils embedded in the walls of some properties, leaving around 40 residents reliant on immersion heaters.
- The estate had a full-time engineer assigned, and additional funds were allocated to ensure the boilers remained in good condition.
- A ventilation strategy had been developed and was continuing to be refined before issuing tender documents to contractors and the scheme included background ventilation and proposals to introduce mechanical ventilation in kitchens and bathrooms.
- However, confirmation would need to be sought on whether modelling of this new system had taken place.

The deputies responded to questions by setting out their views as follows:

- The proposed works should be classified as a "refit" rather than a "retrofit," as they did not involve a full heating system upgrade.
- Concern was raised about the future proposals for air-source heat pumps, as these systems required significant electricity, and it was not known whether that the current power network would support future demands.
- Leaseholders were not consulted about replacing the boilers, despite their previous financial contributions.
- The current system had lasted 50 years and was failing due to a lack of maintenance rather than age.
- Residents expressed fears that ongoing works could last up to seven years, only for the boilers to fail, leading to further costly interventions.
- The applicant's claim that the new glazing would be thinner and lighter was challenged with deputies stating that existing glass was 4mm thick while the proposed vacuum-sealed glass was 8mm, which would doubling the weight.
- Residents had got in contact with suppliers of the proposed laminated glazing and had been advised it was 16mm thick and it was believed that this would be incompatible with the historic window frames.
- Furthermore, it was reported that in pilot flats, windows had to be screwed shut as the existing ironmongery could not support the heavier glass.

Members of the Committee made the following comments on the application:

- Delaying any improvement proposals until a time where the estate could be fully retrofitted did not make sense and was not a valid reason for refusal.
- Officers had been clear about the exterior aspects of the proposals and that the visual impacts seemed minimal as the proposals within the application were well-designed and chosen with respect to the building's aesthetics.

- The ventilation system must be designed and implemented to the highest possible standards, if the application was agreed, as there would be serious consequences for both residents and the Council if the ventilation was inadequate.

The Committee voted on the applications set out in Agenda Items 7(1&2) of the agenda.

On being put to the vote, with 4 in favour of the officer recommendation, 1 against and 1 abstention, it was

**RESOLVED –**

- i) THAT Planning Permission be granted subject to conditions and Section 106 obligations, as set out in the agenda; and
- ii) THAT listed building consent be granted.

**ACTION BY: Director of Economy, Regeneration & Investment  
Borough Solicitor**

The Committee then voted on the applications set out in Agenda Items 7(3&4) of the agenda.

On being put to the vote, with 4 in favour of the officer recommendation, 1 against and 1 abstention, it was

**RESOLVED –**

- i) THAT Planning Permission be granted subject to conditions and a shadow Section 106 legal agreement, as set out in the agenda; and
- ii) THAT listed building consent be granted.

**ACTION BY: Director of Economy, Regeneration & Investment  
Borough Solicitor**

**7(5) ROYAL FREE HOSPITAL, POND STREET, LONDON NW3 2QG**

Consideration was also given to the information, written submissions and deputation requests contained within the supplementary agenda.

Councillor Stark made a statement as Ward Councillor.

Responding to questions Planning Officers provided the following information:

- In terms of traffic concerns, the main consideration was whether the new building extension would materially worsen traffic congestion or parking stress. A transport statement had been submitted with the application, which concluded that additional car movements would be low and could be accommodated. Council Transport officers had reviewed the assessment.
- The scheme before the committee could not be used to resolve pre-existing transport issues, nor could conditions be imposed to require mitigation for existing problems.
- Traffic congestion and parking stress were known challenges in the area and discussions were already taking place between transport officers, the Royal Free Hospital, and residents regarding possible solutions.
- Committee Member's concerns would be minuted and an informative could be added to the decision, encouraging continued collaboration on traffic issues.
- An informative could be drafted which would serve as a formal note to the applicant and would record concerns regarding the traffic issues and would encourage engagement but would not impose legal obligations.
- Furthermore, as the meeting was webcast and minutes, there was a public record of these concerns.

Transport Officers made the following comments in response to questions:

- It was known that there were long-standing traffic congestion issues on Pond Street.
- As a potential solution, Transport for London had been consulted on adjusting traffic signals at the junction with Rosslyn Hill but unfortunately found no capacity for improvement.
- Officers, including the transport design team manager, attended quarterly meetings with the Royal Free Hospital and residents to address transport concerns.
- The hospital had an action plan to improve car park operations, including new electronic signage displaying real-time parking availability.
- The planning process included a travel plan and five years of monitoring, allowing for regular reviews.
- Officers would continue working with the hospital to identify possible improvements.
- An Auto Tracking Analysis Diagram (also known as a Swept Path Analysis) had been provided, which demonstrated that narrowing the access road into the car park, which was necessary to support the proposed structure, would not impact vehicles, including the ambulances, accessing, entering, and exiting the car park.
- Therefore, transport officers were satisfied that that the proposals in the application would not result in any material impact on ambulances accessing the hospital.

Responding to a question, the applicant's representative confirmed that the hospital would continue to collaborate and work with the Council and community to come up with solutions to mitigate against traffic issues and there was a meeting to discuss traffic concerns due to take place the following day.

The depute responded to questions by setting out their views as follows:

- Traffic concerns had been discussed with the Director of Property Services at the hospital and the hospital had commissioned traffic consultants to undertake a report, which had recommended that cars could queue in the road leading the entrance to the car park, however, this solution was deemed to be impractical if the proposed construction works were to take place.
- Whilst regular meetings were held to discuss concerns, the disruption arising as a result of the proposals would halt any progress that had been made.
- The hospital needed to come up with a plan that worked for them and all the other road users in the area.
- The depute was agreeable to continue discussions with the hospital about the traffic concerns.

The Head of Development Management confirmed that an informative would be drafted and included in the decision notice, as follows:

“It became evident during our consideration of this application that there are existing issues to do with car parking and traffic congestion in the surrounding area as a result of the Hospital. Whilst it was accepted by officers and members that this application would not exacerbate those issues, the Planning Committee were concerned to hear about the impact that existing issues were having on the local community. The Planning Committee were reassured to hear that there had already been discussions between the Council, the Hospital and local residents which sought to address these. The Royal Free London NHS Foundation Trust should continue to liaise with the Council’s Transport Strategy Team and local residents to consider further action to alleviate traffic congestion and parking issues in the surrounding area. The Trust should also explore improving on-site traffic management to avoid tailbacks onto Pond Street.”

On being put to the vote, with all Committee Members in favour of the officer recommendation, it was unanimously

**RESOLVED –**

THAT Planning Permission be granted subject to conditions and Section 106 obligations, as set out in the agenda.

**ACTION BY: Director of Economy, Regeneration & Investment  
Borough Solicitor**

**7(6) 151 SHAFTESBURY AVENUE, LONDON WC2H 8AL**

Consideration was also given to the information contained within the tabled paper.

The Planning Officer introduced the application.



On being put to the vote, with all Committee Members in favour of the officer recommendation, it was unanimously

**RESOLVED –**

THAT Planning Permission be granted subject to conditions and Section 106 obligations, as set out in the agenda.

**ACTION BY: Director of Economy, Regeneration & Investment  
Borough Solicitor**

**7(7) THE COURTYARD 1-7 ALFRED PLACE, 22 STORE STREET AND 220-226  
TOTTENHAM COURT ROAD, LONDON WC1E 7EB**

Consideration was also given to the information, written submissions and deputation requests contained within the supplementary agenda.

On being put to the vote, with all Committee Members in favour of the officer recommendation, it was unanimously

**RESOLVED –**

THAT Planning Permission be granted subject to conditions and Section 106 obligations, as set out in the agenda.

**ACTION BY: Director of Economy, Regeneration & Investment  
Borough Solicitor**

**7(8) 147-151 HAVERSTOCK HILL, LONDON NW3 4RU**

Councillor Tom Simon stepped down from the Committee for this item to address the Committee as Ward Councillor.

Some Members of the Committee commented on the design of the advert and noted that it was very bright and possibly not suitable for a conservation area and questioned whether the design could be made more appropriate for the area.

In response, the Planning Officer clarified that advertisement control was limited to public safety and amenity, including visual impact and heritage concerns, and the actual content of adverts could not be controlled.

Responding to a follow up question, the Planning Officer explained that the signage only required express consent due to the external illumination, which was not covered by deemed consent. It was also noted that the size of the adverts had already been reduced following negotiation.

The Planning Officer advised that a decision on the application could not be based on subjective judgments about colour or style and even if the applicant agreed to modify the current signage to accommodate taste preferences, future occupants could change the adverts as long as they complied with the permitted display conditions and the manner of the display.

On being put to the vote, with in 6 favour of the officer recommendation and 1 against, it was

**RESOLVED –**

THAT advertisement consent be granted.

**ACTION BY: Director of Economy, Regeneration & Investment  
Borough Solicitor**

**8. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIR CONSIDERS URGENT**

There was none.

The meeting ended at 9.54 pm.

**CHAIR**

**Contact Officer: Rebecca Taylor**

**Telephone No: 020 7974 6884 / 0207 974 8177**

**E-Mail: [planningcommittee@camden.gov.uk](mailto:planningcommittee@camden.gov.uk)**

**MINUTES END**