

## **COUNCIL – 19<sup>th</sup> JANUARY 2026**

### **BUSINESS FROM THE ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING ON 17<sup>th</sup> NOVEMBER 2025**

#### **Report of the Borough Solicitor**

This report relates to the unconsidered motions and the responses to written Council questions from the Council meeting held on 17<sup>th</sup> November 2025.

#### **1. Background**

The Constitution advises that where motions have not been dealt with at the conclusion of the meeting of the Council, they fall without discussion and are passed onto the relevant Cabinet Member or Committee Chair whose response is then to be provided to the next meeting of the Council. Also, the responses to written questions that were provided for last ordinary Council meeting are to be circulated as part of the next meeting's agenda for information. These responses are then noted at that next meeting without debate.

#### **2. Responses to motions**

At the meeting of the Council held on 17<sup>th</sup> November 2025, there was one motion that was not considered due to lack of time. As the Constitution requires, this motion was passed to the relevant Cabinet Member or Committee Chair, who is required to report back to the next meeting of the Council. A copy of the motion and the response is attached at Appendix A to this report.

#### **3. Responses to written questions from Councillors**

The written questions from Councillors and the responses from Cabinet Members linked to the Council meeting on 17<sup>th</sup> November 2025 are attached as Appendix B.

#### **4. Recommendation**

That the report be noted.

## UNCONSIDERED MOTION

## Appendix A

- 1. To consider the following motion, notice of which was given by Councillor Steve Adams and which was seconded by Councillor Stephen Stark.**

This Council notes that,

As well as being the responsible local authority it is by far the largest freeholder of the land to the south of Hampstead Heath and as such has the duty and power to control development so as not to negatively impact the Heath itself and views toward London, from the Heath. The 1871 Act of Parliament, enabling the Metropolitan Board of Works to purchase the land of the Heath for the people, included the essential aim that it should not be enclosed.

The current understandable pressures to provide more housing in the country and specifically Camden's response to them, must be considered with due respect of the need to protect irreplaceable heritage.

At present, there are various sites which are either in, or approaching, the process of redevelopment and which form a perimeter around this critical aspect. These comprise directly owned Camden land such as the Wendling, West Kentish Town or Bacton Estates, land in which Camden is effectively a co-developer such as the Yoo Capital Regis Road site and the Murphy's Yard site, where Camden's planning guidance is paramount in influence. This would form a high degree of visual enclosure.

This Council recognises this heavy responsibility and so resolves to instruct Officers to bring a report to Council outlining how it might be possible to create a policy limiting the height of any new building within this arc to below 8 storeys (or 24 metres) tall and that this should not be a blanket level of development but rather an articulated and faceted horizon leaving the un-enclosed feel of the Heath intact, while producing the much needed new housing accommodation.

## RESPONSE BY CABINET MEMBER FOR PLANNING AND A SUSTAINABLE CAMDEN

The concerns raised in this motion are about the height, scale, and density of development in areas to the north of the borough and the potential impact that might have on the view from the Heath and its openness.

The local planning authority takes the Local Plan, plans prepared by Neighbourhood Forums, and the London Plan into consideration when making planning decisions. The Mayor of London's London Views Management Framework (LVMF), which forms part of the London Plan (2021), sets out guidance for strategic views including those from the Heath. The London Plan is clear that development proposals should avoid causing harm to Strategic Views and their key landmark elements, and should make a positive contribution where possible.

Alongside these overarching planning guidelines, the Heath is designated in the London Plan as Metropolitan Open Land, which has the same level of protection as greenbelt in planning terms from inappropriate development. The draft Local Plan sets out an approach to tall buildings that conforms to the London Plan and identifies potentially appropriate height ranges for relevant sites, reflecting the findings of the Camden Building Heights Study.

Building new homes is a key focus of the draft Local Plan. This includes site allocations for all the sites referred to in the motion which are supported by the Camden Building Heights Study. As with the existing Local Plan, a policy is included saying the council will “preserve and enhance Hampstead Heath through...taking into account the impact on the Heath when considering relevant planning applications, including any impacts on views to and from the Heath”. All schemes which are over 30m in height must be referred to the Greater London Authority (GLA) alongside the local planning authority. Therefore there is a comprehensive framework across the Local Plan, London Plan, Neighbourhood Plans and Planning Frameworks, meaning additional policy is not required.

In any case, the Council cannot make blanket decisions to restrict the nature of development in an area in an ad hoc fashion which takes no account of other policy priorities without altering the Camden Local Plan. The approach would need to be aligned to the London Plan and suitably evidenced—therefore it is not possible to set an arbitrary height limit.

**ENDS**

## **APPENDIX B**

### **RESPONSES TO WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS**

#### **QUESTION 1**

**TO THE: CABINET MEMBER FOR NEW HOMES AND COMMUNITY INVESTMENT**

**BY: COUNCILLOR JANET GRAUBERG**

What assessment has been made of the Government's October announcement on housebuilding?

What will be the impact of reducing the GLA's affordable housing requirement from 35% to 20% in:

- schemes approved but not started, e.g. 100 Avenue Road
- phased schemes, e.g. The O2 Centre & car park
- schemes in development, e.g. The Regis Road regeneration project?

What will be the impact of reducing by 50% CIL contributions requirement, including the £10m contributing to a lift at West Hampstead tube station agreed as part of the outline planning permission for the O2 centre and car park redevelopment?

#### **REPLY**

Despite the housing delivery challenges across London, in Camden we have been able to keep delivering. Over 1,000 homes were completed in 2024/25 through a combination of CIP schemes and privately led developments. This sustained progress is strongly supported by the Labour Government's renewed national investment in housebuilding, which is helping councils like ours to continue delivering the much-needed homes for our communities during a challenging period for the construction sector.

It is important to clarify that these measures are subject to consultation, which is expected to begin for six weeks later this month. We look forward to greater clarity on the proposals, including how they affect the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

These measures will not affect the Community Investment Programme. The Council is in control of these developments, which will continue to deliver new council homes and intermediate rent homes through Camden Living, designed to help keyworkers remain in the borough.

Private sector developments in Camden will be affected by these changes, and we will be holding developers to account to ensure they comply with the adjusted requirements, including the time limits imposed upon them. We will continue to push for the maximum amount of genuinely affordable housing and wider community benefit.

The 100 Avenue Road development has started and therefore would not qualify for the proposed CIL relief. The recent permission increasing the affordable housing offer has been issued, and the developer is now focused on completing the development as consented.

The O2 development has planning consent, and a revised application was submitted earlier in the year making changes to Phase 1. Landsec are currently reviewing the implications of the draft measures for their scheme.

For schemes such as this, the draft guidance makes clear that the first step must be to explore with the GLA the use of grant to maintain the consented level of affordable housing. Only if this is not possible can developers seek to benefit from the 20 per cent fast track. Where a developer applies for the 20 per cent fast track, they can qualify for 50 per cent CIL relief, with increased relief possible where a scheme delivers above 20 per cent.

These are temporary measures and, on a phased development, would likely apply only to the first phase given the deadlines for planning consent, start on site, and construction progress. Under the 20 per cent fast track the Council loses less than 50 per cent of the original CIL because if affordable housing reduces from 35 per cent to 20 per cent, the amount of CIL liable floorspace increases by the same amount and the 50 per cent relief applies only to this. In any event, the £10m contribution to the West Hampstead step free scheme comes from S106, which remains unaffected. Since these measures aim to kick start developments such as the O2, they may help speed up delivery and therefore bring forward the associated S106 payments.

The Camden film quarter includes a mixture of public and private land. Under the new measures, the 20 per cent fast track applies to public land and 35 per cent to private land, alongside the existing 35 per cent and 50 per cent fast tracks.

Irrespective of the revised framework, we are assured that Yoo Capital and Places for People remain committed to delivering 50 per cent affordable housing in their planning application.

## **QUESTION 2**

**TO THE: CABINET MEMBER FOR PLANNING AND A SUSTAINABLE CAMDEN**

**BY: COUNCILLOR STEVE ADAMS**

Many serious problems arise from increased use of e-bikes in Camden, including cyclists regularly riding on pavements, through red lights and putting others at risk. The situation is so bad that traffic lights are now seen by many as either optional or inapplicable. Over 58% of lime bike users admit to jumping lights, even though they recognise this is dangerous.

One measure that should be introduced, following Haringey's lead, is the introduction of a borough wide public spaces protection order giving Camden power to issue £100, on the spot fines.

Will the Council commit to introducing this in Camden?

## **REPLY**

Camden recognises the concerns raised around unsafe cycling behaviour, including the misuse of e-bikes, cycling on pavements, and failure to observe traffic signals. We take these issues seriously and are committed to promoting safe and responsible cycling for all road users and pedestrians.

Good cycling behaviour and road awareness are integral parts of the free cycle training Camden offers to residents, students, and workers. Since April 2025, 779 children across 21 schools have received training, alongside 310 adult cycling sessions. This training reinforces respect for other road users, adherence to traffic signals, and responsible cycling conduct.

We continue to work closely with Lime, including through recent discussions focused on promoting their current 'Respect the Red' campaign, which encourages riders to comply with red lights and highway rules. Camden also maintains ongoing dialogue with local cycling campaign groups, including Camden Cyclists, to develop further ways of reaching new cyclists with clear messages about road safety and respectful cycling.

The Council has also seized over 500 bikes from the various dockless bike providers since March 2025 associated to inappropriate parking of cycles. Fines to the companies associated have so far totalled £95k.

In the longer term, Camden will explore how it can collaborate with the Metropolitan Police to strengthen visibility and enforcement of safe cycling behaviour, alongside the promotion and education measures already in place.

With regard to the suggestion of a Public Spaces Protection Order (PSPO), these powers, available under the *Anti-social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014*, can be used to address a range of anti-social behaviours in public spaces. Any PSPO must be supported by evidence, subject to public consultation, and undergo a thorough equalities impact assessment.

Camden currently operates a borough-wide PSPO on responsible dog ownership, and Cabinet will shortly consider proposals to consult on a further PSPO relating to responsible drinking. Further PSPO consultations are being planned for 2026. The Council will continue to assess the evidence on e-bike use and cycling behaviour to determine whether this approach would be appropriate or effective in Camden.

### **QUESTION 3**

**TO THE: CABINET MEMBER FOR BETTER HOMES**

**BY: COUNCILLOR MATT COOPER**

With Awaab's Law now in place, setting clear time limits for social landlords to investigate and resolve reports of damp and mould, can the cabinet member outline how Camden Council is meeting these new legal duties? In particular, what steps are being taken to ensure that residents are supported to report issues quickly and confidently?

### **REPLY**

Camden Council has put in place a range of measures to make sure it can comply with the new statutory duties introduced under Awaab's Law, part of the Social Housing (Regulation) Act 2023, which sets clear, enforceable time limits for landlords to investigate and remedy health and safety hazards, including, but not limited to, damp and mould.

Delivering on these duties is integral to the We Make Camden mission: ensuring that everyone has a place to call home that is safe, secure, and supports good health and wellbeing.

The Council's approach to complying with Awaab's Law therefore sits alongside its Housing Investment Strategy which will see £670m invested in the Council's stock and substantial work to comply with the Building Safety Act 2022.

Under Awaab's Law, all hazard reports can be submitted through various channels and logged in our repairs system "ROCC". Channels and reporting processes have been communicated Council wide.

Each case is assessed by the repairs service and, when a potential Category 1 hazard is identified under the Housing Health and Safety Rating System (HHSRS), an HHSRS-qualified operative conducts an on-site inspection. These operatives are authorised to take appropriate action such as emergency decants or repair work.

This dedicated Rapid Response Team (RRT) has been operational since 1 October 2025, consisting of 11 HHSRS-trained operatives, two diary managers, and two team managers, supported by shared disrepair surveyors. The team provides 24-hour coverage, responding immediately to potential Category 1 hazards.

Out-of-hours (OOH) services are delivered through the Emergency Technical Services (ETS) team, which includes an RRT-trained operative for technical escalation. OOH attendance is prioritised for significant risks to life or property.

Performance is tracked and assured through ROCC, enabling real-time monitoring and management reporting. Cases are subject to structured 1-, 3-, 6-, and 12-month follow-ups, with damp and mould sensors installed where recurring issues are

detected. This system supports early identification of risk, compliance with statutory timescales, and sustained improvement in property condition.

Residents are supported through automated text confirmations, followed by AI-generated progress reports within three days, providing clear communication, transparency, and confidence in the process. Resident feedback is actively reviewed to inform service improvements.

Governance and assurance is provided through a newly established Repairs Board, the existing Housing Regulatory Board, with performance indicators aligned to Tenant Satisfaction Measures (TSMs) and monitoring tools used by the Regulator of Social Housing.

Through these changes to services and systems the Council is making sure it can comply with Awaab's Law and monitor its progress.

#### **QUESTION 4**

**TO THE: CABINET MEMBER FOR PLANNING AND A SUSTAINABLE CAMDEN**

**BY: COUNCILLOR SYLVIA McNAMARA**

Camden's tree planting strategy aims to increase canopy cover from 22.9% to 26.6% by 2045. Can the cabinet member report on progress so far towards this goal?

#### **REPLY**

A tree canopy cover survey conducted revealed that canopy cover across the borough increased from 22.9% in 2016 to 24.6% in 2023. This represents a 1.7% points increase, equivalent to approximately 34 football pitches of additional canopy cover created through the Council's tree planting programme, community tree planting, and maintaining a healthy tree population.

The Council's tree planting strategy 2020-2025 has planted 2,971 trees, of which 55% are in new locations. The investment in tree planting, along with maintaining a healthy tree population supported by our tree policy, has seen a return in the form of benefits provided to residents by our urban forest.

Measurement	2017	2023
Number of Trees	25,890	28,461
Amenity Valuation (CAVAT)	Not measured	£1.2 billion
Total Carbon Storage	10,800 tonnes	13,600 tonnes
Annual Carbon Sequestration	207 tonnes/yr	231 tonnes/yr
Annual Pollution Removal	5 tonnes/yr	1.3 tonnes/yr

The table above provides a comparison of ecosystem services provided by Council-maintained trees between 2017 and 2023. Please note, we are waiting to hear back from Treeconomics, who were contracted to calculate the values, on the difference in replacement costs between the two years. We do know the reason for the reduction in annual pollution removal is because the calculation in 2017 included a wide range of pollutants, which has been reduced to NO<sub>2</sub>, SO<sub>2</sub>, and PM<sub>10</sub>, as these are the only pollutants with UK social cost damage values.

## QUESTION 5

**TO THE: CABINET MEMBER FOR PLANNING AND A SUSTAINABLE CAMDEN**

**BY: COUNCILLOR NINA DE AYALA PARKER**

Camden is working its way towards World Health Organisation air quality standards, which are more ambitious than those legislated for in the UK and the EU. Please update the Council on progress towards WHO levels and how feasible it would be for these goals to become universally adopted.

## REPLY

Camden has adopted the World Health Organisation (WHO) annual mean air quality guideline limits as local air quality targets for nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>), coarse particulate matter (PM<sub>10</sub>) and fine particulate matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>), and has committed to meeting these borough-wide by 2034 (2030 for PM<sub>10</sub>) with interim targets for 2026 and 2030.

The 2026 interim target for NO<sub>2</sub> was met at three of four automatic monitoring sites with only Euston Road exceeding the target. The 2026 interim target was met in 2024 at 131 out of 152 (86%) diffusion tube monitoring sites. In contrast, in 2019 none of the automatic monitoring sites and only 29 out of the 152 (19%) diffusion tube sites met the 2026 target.

The 20 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  2026 interim target for PM<sub>10</sub> was met at all four automatic monitoring sites, and the 15 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  WHO target was met at two of these (Bloomsbury and Coopers Lane). In 2019, three out of four monitoring sites met the 20 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  interim target and one of these also met the 15 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  WHO target.

The 10 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  2030 interim target for PM<sub>2.5</sub> was met at all four automatic monitoring sites, but all sites exceeded the 5 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  WHO target. All automatic monitoring sites exceeded the 10 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  2030 interim target in 2019.

Camden has made good progress towards its WHO targets due to the impact of the Council's clean air, climate and transport strategies, the Mayor of London's Ultra Low Emission Zone, and technological advances for vehicles and construction. Further reduction in NO<sub>2</sub> pollution will depend on the success of decarbonising building heating in Camden and London - gas heating is now the largest source of NO<sub>2</sub> emissions in central London.

PM air pollution in Camden is strongly influenced by national and international policy because it can be transported large distances from source. To achieve Camden's WHO targets for PM it will be necessary to reduce local emissions (especially from commercial kitchens, domestic wood-burning and garden fires, construction and road transport) whilst also advocating for stricter air quality standards and improved regulation nationally.

Camden's next Clean Air Action Plan 2027-2030 will set out the pathway to cleaner air, including more focus on commercial emissions, indoor air quality, and preparedness for climate-related air quality incidents, which are predicted to increase.

## **QUESTION 6**

**TO THE: CABINET MEMBER FOR PLANNING AND A SUSTAINABLE CAMDEN**

**BY: COUNCILLOR JAMES SLATER**

Residents of Brecknock Road have complained about potholes and the state of the road. What conversations have Camden had with Islington and/or Transport for London about repairing the road and eventually resurfacing it?

## **REPLY**

Brecknock Road forms part of the boundary between Camden and Islington, but the full responsibility for its maintenance lies with the London Borough of Islington. Camden's highways officers have been in discussions with their counterparts in Islington around Brecknock Road about necessary improvements.

Islington have reported that Brecknock Road is not on their programme of carriageway works for 2025/26 but that they will be undertaking condition surveys for the 2026/27 highways maintenance programme. They will update Camden once these are undertaken with regard to Brecknock Road. I will also write to the relevant cabinet member in Islington to convey residents' and ward members' concerns about the road and the necessity of its resurfacing.

## **QUESTION 7**

**TO THE: CABINET MEMBER FOR BETTER HOMES**

**BY: COUNCILLOR IZZY LENGA**

Camden Council's Neighbourhood Action Days have been a valuable opportunity to connect directly with tenants, identify local priorities, and take visible action in our communities.

How can we further develop and expand this kind of engagement to ensure that tenants' voices are heard, and they more actively reached out to within their communities and neighbourhoods?

## **REPLY**

The Neighbourhood Action Days held over the summer have been a tremendous success, with 11 events taking place over a six-month period. These events provided our residents with the opportunity to engage with council teams who offered help and advice on various topics, including repairs, assistance with booking larger maintenance jobs, housing and tenancy inquiries with a Neighbourhood Housing Officer, cost-of-living support, health and wellness guidance, and community safety concerns. Throughout the 11 events, we recorded over 1,000 face-to-face conversations with residents, and the feedback we received was overwhelmingly positive. We also tried to use local venues such as TRA halls, community centres, and churches instead of larger venues, as it is clear that residents have a local connection to these facilities.

As a result of this engagement over the summer, we will be hosting smaller events focusing on repairs, damp and mould, and Awaab's Law support in our libraries during the winter.

The Neighbourhood Action Days will continue next year, and we are currently planning the programme. We encourage residents, members, and staff to suggest locations that could benefit from these local events so that we can cover as much of the borough as possible.

We recognise that there is no one-size-fits-all approach to tenant engagement. Therefore, we have created various opportunities for residents to get involved and ensure their voices are heard. Our website features dedicated pages outlining all the ways tenants can influence housing decision-making and participate in their estates and neighbourhoods. This includes the work of Tenants' and Residents' Associations (TRAs) and Resident Panels.

We also understand that some vulnerable residents, or others, may wish to participate but find it difficult to engage as part of a group or organisation. To address this, we launched the Tenancy Visiting Programme earlier this year, in which our Neighbourhood Housing Officers have face-to-face conversations with tenants in their homes, providing help and support wherever possible.

## **QUESTION 8**

**TO THE: CABINET MEMBER FOR VOLUNTARY SECTOR, EQUALITIES AND COHESION**

**BY: COUNCILLOR REBECCA FILER**

Can the Cabinet Member provide an update on Camden's current leisure, sport, and physical activity programmes, including the availability and uptake of concessionary

leisure centre memberships (particularly among women and minority groups), the outcomes of the Get Active and Active for Life initiatives, ongoing capital investment in leisure facilities, and progress of the Sports Education and Training Programme?

## REPLY

### Context

By encouraging active lifestyles among groups at higher risk of inactivity such as older adults, people with disabilities, or low-income families we can help prevent chronic conditions like obesity, heart disease, and diabetes while also promoting social inclusion and enhancing mental wellbeing in Camden. While some people simply need places to be physically active, others require additional support, which is where our targeted programmes come in. The latest Active Lives data 2023/24 (Sport England survey) highlights Camden as the most active borough in London for adults at 77.4%.

**Concessions** account for 45% of Camden's leisure centre membership, with 12,521 people enjoying an average discount of 41%. The qualifying criteria is broad, and includes citizens on income support, over 60s, those with a disability & students. 57% of our concessions are women and girls, while 51% of the total membership are female. The concessionary membership base is more ethnically diverse than the total, with Asian representation at 17.3% and 14.8% respectfully.

**Active for Life** (Summer 2024) was a joint behaviour change initiative between our Leisure and Health and Wellbeing Teams encouraging Camden residents aged 60+ to be more active. Working with community partners, it engaged 599 residents, with 19% completing a post-campaign survey which has provided good data and insight. White participants most often cited low motivation as a barrier, while Black, Asian, and Mixed groups mentioned illness or injury. After the campaign, 71% felt able to be active locally (up from 55%), 64% reported greater confidence, and over half tried new or at-home activities. Physical activity levels among Black, Asian, and other ethnic groups rose from 19% to 41%. Participants found campaign materials inclusive, engaging, and informative. I'd like to share a quote from a participant, '*It has helped me to come out of my flat..... this campaign has given me the confidence to go out for walks at my own pace.*' I'm pleased to say that we are planning a second campaign for the summer next year, building on these insights.

The **Get Active Programme** (GAP), is funded by the Health and Wellbeing Team and delivered by Leisure Services. Face-to-face interactions within GP surgeries, provides residents with personalised physical activity and wellbeing plans, connecting them to a broad range of community fitness opportunities. At six months, 39% successfully achieved and sustained the Chief Medical Officer physical activity guideline of 150 minutes or more per week, demonstrating positive engagement and behavioural change. The programme predominantly supported adults aged 35–64 years (67%), with female participants representing 66% of the cohort. Approximately 31% identified as from Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) backgrounds, while 41% did not disclose ethnicity, and 86% of participants were drawn from areas of high deprivation.

The Leisure Service work with LaSWAP Sixth Form consortium to deliver the **Sports Education and Training Programme** (SETP) for young people aged 16–19. In 2024/25, the programme introduced BTEC Level 3 qualifications, with 32 students graduating across NVQ L2 and BTEC L3 courses, many progressing to further study, apprenticeships, or employment. Enrolment for 2025/26 is strong, with 43 students enrolled across Levels 2 and 3, supported by maths and English provision. The partnership remains strong through outreach events and collaboration with careers advisors and universities. Alongside academic learning, the programme emphasises wellbeing, PSHE, and pastoral care, helping learners develop confidence, resilience, and life skills for future success. Since September 2005, 472 young people have completed the SETP, with 690 NVQ/BTEC qualifications gained and 193 young people having found employment in sport, education, youth and playwork.

## **QUESTION 9**

**TO THE: CABINET MEMBER FOR BETTER HOMES**

**BY: COUNCILLOR JONATHAN SIMPSON**

Given the growing concern that short-term letting platforms (such as those used by Airbnb and similar companies) are unresponsive when problems occur in our communities, provide no effective channel for elected representatives to engage with them, and are reducing the stock of long-term rental housing available for local residents, will you comment on the recent decision by the mayor of Barcelona to phase out tourist-let licences and ban such short-term lets by 2028?

## **REPLY**

The recent decision by the Mayor of Barcelona to phase out tourist-let licences by 2028 reflects growing international concern about the impact of short-term letting platforms on housing availability, community cohesion, and local governance. Camden shares many of these concerns.

In Camden, it is estimated that over 6,000 entire homes are currently used for short-term holiday lets. Research by Central London Forward found that across London, 117,000 homes were listed for short-term use last year, with over 43,000 operating as full-time short-term let, effectively removed from the long-term rental market.

Short-term letting has become increasingly attractive to landlords due to higher returns, fewer regulations, and greater flexibility compared to traditional renting. For example, a one-bedroom studio in Camden could earn £2,000 per month on the private rental market, but up to £1,173 per week as a short-term let. Unlike long-term rentals, short-term lets are not subject to tenancy protections such as deposit schemes, eviction rules, or rent controls.

The Deregulation Act 2015 allows properties in Greater London to be let short-term for up to 90 nights per year without planning permission. However, our monitoring shows that 52% of Camden's short-term lets exceed this threshold, meaning over 3,000 homes have been unlawfully removed from residential use.

Camden's planning policies strongly resist the loss of residential accommodation to short-term letting. Enforcement action has been upheld by the Planning Inspectorate, and we continue to challenge unauthorised use. In the most recent operation, carried out in October 2025, action was taken against 27 short-term let properties, of which 6 were leaseholders on Council owned estates.

Despite these efforts, enforcement remains challenging, both because of the scale of the problem, the ability to conceal it and resources. Platforms rarely provide sufficient data, listings change frequently, and hosts often obscure their activity. Even when enforcement notices are served, proving continued breaches to the criminal standard required for prosecution is difficult.

We are also concerned about the lack of accountability and engagement from short-term letting platforms.

Camden has formally raised its concerns with Government, opposing (the former Government's) proposals to expand permitted development rights allowing for more homes to be used as short-term lets. We welcome the current Government's apparent decision not to proceed with those changes and cautiously support the introduction of a national registration scheme, provided it includes meaningful penalties and adequate resourcing.

To strengthen our response, Camden has recently established a multi-disciplinary working group focused on tackling short-term letting in Council-owned properties. This includes targeted enforcement, leaseholder education, and co-ordinated legal action. However, the scale of the issue far exceeds current resources.

In summary, Camden recognises the serious impact of short-term letting on housing supply and community well-being. We support stronger national regulation, improved data access, and platform accountability. The Barcelona model offers a bold example of what can be achieved when housing is prioritised over short-term profit. We will continue to advocate for reforms in London which will allow us to ensure our communities have greater access to homes.

## **QUESTION 10**

**TO THE: CABINET MEMBER FOR BETTER HOMES**

**BY: COUNCILLOR LORNA JANE RUSSELL**

Could you confirm the number of missed appointments for all Camden housing repairs, broken down per ward, per contractor, and per year for the last five years. What is Camden's policy to hold its contractors to account for missed appointments?

## **REPLY**

We recognise that missed appointments are frustrating, inconvenient, and can be distressing for our residents. We are committed to reducing missed appointments

and making sure appropriate appointment slots are arranged and resourced. We are also making system improvements as part of the transformation programme.

Up until December 2024, missed appointments were captured through calls made by residents and where our schedulers manually logged a missed appointment. These are shown in Table A. These figures will not capture all missed appointments, although they do reflect some variance in operating conditions, for example in 2021/22 when the repairs service was navigating the ongoing impact of Covid. Overall, it shows 296,945 orders completed and 2,868 (1%) appointments manually logged as being missed over the five-year period.

With the new “ROCC” system, introduced December 2024, all day-to-day repair appointments carried out by the in-house team are tracked in real time. This identifies automatically whether the operative is in attendance during the appointment slot. These are shown in Table B. As expected, this real time monitoring of every works order captures a higher volume of missed appointments and is more accurate. It also means repairs managers can examine which trades and locations are most affected and take appropriate action. The table shows that in the last 11 months since the new system went live, 54,272 repairs have been completed and 2,365 (4%) of visits were recorded as outside of the appointment slot. It is noted that in most cases operatives attended the same day and analysis shows less than 1% of visits were on a day different to that on the appointment.

During 2026/27 our mechanical and electrical contractors are expected to be added to the ROCC system, meaning we will be able to capture and analyse contractor data in the same way. From April 2026, the new in-house domestic heating team will also be using ROCC, providing greater visibility on this area of the service.

At present contractor missed appointments are not captured on the repairs system and cannot be reported in the same way. They are logged however when formal complaints are made. The Lessons Learned Lead reviews complaints data with contract managers so they can address this with contractors at monthly performance meetings alongside other service data, and action taken accordingly.

#### Missed appointments logged manually in repairs system

Table A Ward	Financial Year					Total
	20/21	21/22	22/23	23/24	24/25	
Holborn and Covent Garden Ward	60	219	138	77	140	634
Kings Cross Ward	40	133	98	56	97	424
Bloomsbury Ward	48	147	95	43	57	390
Regents Park Ward	67	98	86	30	13	294
St Pancras & Somers Town Ward	47	98	91	23	9	268
Haverstock Ward	8	30	10	35	35	118
Gospel Oak Ward	11	21	5	47	26	110
Kilburn Ward	8	16	7	25	43	99
Highgate Ward	23	20	12	21	2	78
Kentish Town South ward	26	16	7	19	3	71

South Hampstead ward	2	10	1	24	32	69
Camden Square ward	20	11	10	11	4	56
Fortune Green Ward	2	6	4	15	23	50
Primrose Hill ward	5	12	7	5	11	40
Kentish Town North ward	9	9	11	11		40
West Hampstead Ward	3	8	2	9	15	37
Camden Town ward	3	5	7	14	4	33
Hampstead Ward	1	4		11	2	18
Frognal ward	1	3	1	4	8	17
Out of Borough (No Ward)	4		1	5	4	14
Belsize Ward	1	3		1	3	8
<b>Logged missed appointments</b>	<b>389</b>	<b>869</b>	<b>593</b>	<b>486</b>	<b>531</b>	<b>2,868</b>
<b>Total orders completed</b>	<b>50,277</b>	<b>58,613</b>	<b>60,602</b>	<b>64,313</b>	<b>63,140</b>	<b>296,945</b>

**Visits outside appointment slot, recorded in ROCC in real-time by handheld devices**

<b>Table B</b>	
<b>Ward</b>	<b>Dec 24 to present date</b>
Holborn and Covent Garden ward	286
Bloomsbury ward	153
Kings Cross ward	157
Out of borough (no ward)	34
Fortune Green ward	76
Belsize ward	30
Camden Square ward	106
Primrose Hill ward	79
Kilburn ward	166
Frognal ward	20
West Hampstead ward	59
Haverstock ward	197
Camden Town ward	51
Gospel Oak ward	192
St Pancras and Somers Town ward	224
Regents Park ward	166
Highgate ward	112
South Hampstead ward	88
Kentish Town North ward	57
Hampstead Town	17
Kentish Town South ward	95
<b>Visits outside appointment slot</b>	<b>2,365</b>
<b>Total orders completed</b>	<b>54,272</b>

**ENDS**