
Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 2 December 2025

by **Simon Hand MA**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 February 2026

Appeal A Ref: APP/X5210/F/23/3328412

Koko, 1A Camden High Street, LONDON, NW1 7JE

- The appeal is made under section 39 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by The Hope Lease Ltd against a listed building enforcement notice issued by the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The enforcement notice was issued on 13 July 2023
 - The contravention of listed building control alleged in the notice is: without listed building consent internal alterations and installation of a generator terminal and louvres on the Crowndale Road side elevation and external lighting and security cameras on the front and side elevation.
 - The requirements of the notice are: 1. Totally remove the louvres that have been installed on the wall at 2nd floor level on the Crowndale Road elevation; 2. Totally remove the internal louvres that have been installed behind the windows located on the far western side of the building at 2nd floor level on the Crowndale Road elevation; 3. Totally remove the generator terminal that has been installed at ground floor level on the Crowndale Road elevation; 4. Totally remove the internal light fixings installed and that are associated with the external lighting installed on the front and side elevations of the building; 5. Totally remove the CCTV camera on the Crowndale Road elevation; 6. Repair any damage caused in regards to methods used, and match the materials, colour, texture, and profile as a result of these works.
 - The period for compliance with the requirements is 1 month.
 - The appeal is made on the ground set out in section 39(1) (e), (g), (h), (i) and (j) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/X5210/W/23/3328413

Koko, 1A Camden High Street, Camden, London, NW1 7JE

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by The Hope Lease Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application Ref is 2022/1862/L.
 - The works proposed are installation of a generator terminal and louvres on the Crowndale Road side elevation and external lighting and security cameras on the front and side elevations and installation of advertisements on Camden High Street, Bayham Place, Bayham Street and Crowndale Road elevations.
-

Appeal C Ref: APP/X5210/Y/23/3328414

1A Camden High Street, LONDON, NW1 7JE

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by The Hope Lease Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
- The application Ref is 2022/1123/P.
- The development proposed is I. Installation of a generator terminal and louvres on the Crowndale Road side elevation and external lighting and security cameras on the front and side elevations; II. Installation of a generator terminal and louvres on the Crowndale Road side elevation and external lighting, security cameras and signage on the front and side elevations; III. Installation of

advertisements on Camden High Street, Bayham Place, Bayham Street and Crowndale Road elevations.

This decision is issued in accordance with section 56 (2) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 as amended and supersedes that issued on 8 December 2025.

Decisions

Appeal A

1. It is directed that the listed building enforcement notice be corrected by: adding the words “and external” between “the internal...” and “...light fixings” in requirement 4. Subject to this correction the appeal is allowed and the listed building enforcement notice is quashed. Listed building consent is granted for the retention of internal alterations and installation of a generator terminal and louvres on the Crowndale Road side elevation and external lighting and security cameras on the front and side elevation at Koko, 1A Camden High Street, London, NW1 7JE.

Appeal B

2. The appeal is allowed and the listed building consent is granted for the installation of a generator terminal and louvres on the Crowndale Road side elevation and external lighting and security cameras on the front and side elevation and installation of advertisements on Camden High Street, Bayham Place, Bayham Street and Crowndale Road elevations at Koko, 1A Camden High Street, London, NW1 7JE in accordance with the terms of the application reference 2022/1862/L and the plans submitted with it.

Appeal C

3. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the installation of a generator terminal and louvres on the Crowndale Road side elevation and external lighting and security cameras on the front and side elevations, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2022/1123/P, and the plans submitted with it.

Preliminary Matters

4. A separate advertisement appeal¹ was made to deal with signs 1, 4, 5 and 6a and this was determined in October 2023. All the signs were granted advertisement consent. While this includes planning permission for the structures associated with the signage it does not include listed building consent which is a separate matter. I shall deal with the signs in terms of their impact on the listed building in this appeal.
5. Of the three appeals, the listed building enforcement notice is the primary, as determining that will largely determine the outcome of the other 2. I shall deal with that appeal first.

Appeal A – Appeal on Ground (e)

6. This ground is that consent should be granted for the matters alleged. Success on this ground would avoid the need to consider the other grounds. The matters alleged are the installation of a generator terminal; the replacement of two

¹ APP/X5210/Z/23/3324417 Issued 20 October 2023

windows with louvres and the provision of a third opening with louvres; installation of four downlighters to the front façade; and installation of 4 security cameras along the Crowndale Rd frontage.

7. Koko is a substantial building with a significant presence in this part of Camden. It was originally a theatre, built in 1900, and is now a music venue. It is described in the listing as 'Baroque pastiche style' and the interior as a mixture of Baroque and Rococo ornament. This rather underplays the drama and power of the front elevation and the sumptuously impressive interior. That said it is a commercial building and was designed and built as such. It therefore needs to adapt to modern usage whilst preserving the essential features that make it so noteworthy in the first place.
8. Much of the argument around the generator and the louvres turns on their necessity. Obviously it would be preferable to not have removed windows for louvres, or to have cut 4 holes in the side wall and covered them with circular patches, but the appellant claims they are the minimum required.
9. The generator terminal, I was informed, is where an external generator can be 'plugged in' to the system to provide more power when an act has a particularly power-hungry stage show. The generator, by necessity, has to sit outside the building on the pavement and is connected through the four circular holes. These are about 10cm in diameter and covered with circular patches painted the same colour as the surrounding brickwork. They are at about knee to waist height and pretty much unnoticeable. They are located next to the stage entrance where equipment is brought in from Crowndale Road which is the logical place to position the generator. There is no suggestion this was a frivolous act by the appellants; the generator is clearly needed to enable the concert venue to function at full capacity and so the terminals would have to go somewhere. Given that, the minimal impact of the 4 terminals is acceptable.
10. Similar logic applies for the louvres, which are set high up on the third floor. It is unclear whether they replaced glass or whether the windows were already blocked in as the middle window currently is. But again, louvred windows are hardly a surprise on the side of a theatre. The square, third, opening is more unfortunate but is apparently essential to the operation of the system. The purpose of the louvres is to provide inlets for ducting that runs through the ceiling to provide ventilation to the audio/visual room. I was shown the small room where the ducting meets the windows and given technical specifications that the ducts have to be a minimum distance from each other, hence the three, evenly spaced louvres. Evidence was also provided from the appellants' engineers that this was the optimum location for the ducts.
11. The Council argue the AV room could be moved and ducting provided somewhere else. Although I am not an expert on the interior of theatres, the appellants' argument that this would be massively disruptive for no apparent gain seems reasonable. It is obvious this system is necessary, so somewhere on the exterior there will need to be three louvred outlets. No preferable location has been suggested and I agree this seems to be the least intrusive option.
12. The problem with the exterior lighting was not clear to me until the site visit. Four small downlighters have been installed on the front of the building beneath the glass canopy that shelters the entrance doors. The Council do not object to the

lights themselves as they simply replace older lights, but claim the wiring and external junction box, that I saw to the side of the main entrance, were not in the same position as those that served the old lights. The appellant denies this and states no new holes have been cut in the fabric of the building to support the new lights. I have no evidence as to the position of the old wiring. The Council say the old fixings were clearly not used, but there is no sign of these fixings, or unused holes in the brickwork. I have no reason to disbelieve the appellants when they state they have simply replaced like for like.

13. One oddity of the notice is that requirement 4, that refers to the lights only require the removal of *“the internal light fixings installed and that are associated with the external lighting”*. It is unclear why the Council have an issue with the internal fixings, or of what they comprise. The notice certainly does not bite on the external fixtures, although that would seem to be the Council’s concern. It could be argued that to correct the requirement would make the notice more onerous, but I shall do so, in order to grant consent for the external lighting and associated fixtures.
14. The security cameras are ranged along the Crowndale road frontage. This is the long, side wall of the building where people queue to obtain entrance to the venue. Adjoined to the building and covered by the cameras is the Hope and Anchor pub, which would attract its own crowd. The police have written in support of the security cameras and it is accepted that some cameras are needed. However, the Council argue the two original cameras were sufficient. The appellant argues there was a blind spot on Crowndale Rd hence the need for more cameras. In any event I have been shown photographs of the old cameras which looked like two cameras mounted on fixtures pointing down the road. The new ones are in smaller, modern, semi-spherical housings, in white to match the paintwork. I found it difficult to pick them out from the pavement and in my view they are discrete and less intrusive than the old ones.
15. Consequently, while the works alleged have affected the special architectural or historic interest of the listed building that harm is minor and outweighed by the reasons given above. In terms of the NPPF, while there is less than substantial harm to the listed building, it is very much at the lower end of the spectrum and outweighed by the public benefits outlined above. It follows that the works do not contravene the Council’s policy D2 (heritage). I shall therefore correct the notice and grant consent for the matters alleged. I do not need to consider the other grounds.

Other Matters

16. The advertisements comprise the large KOKO sign on the frontage, two poster boxes on the front pillars and three externally illuminated signs along Crowndale Road. All these have been granted advertisement consent on appeal, and the Inspector considered their impact on the historic building and the conservation area. I have no reason to disagree and shall grant listed building consent accordingly. No conditions are required as they are attached to the advertisement consent.
17. Appeal C is for planning permission for the works described above and the advertisements. Planning permission is not required for the advertisements as

that is provided by the grant of advertisement consent. No specific planning reasons have been adduced to refuse permission beyond those covered above.

Conclusion

18. On Appeal A, I shall correct and quash the notice and grant listed building consent for all the matters alleged. On Appeal B I shall grant consent for all the matters including the advertisements. On Appeal C I shall grant planning permission for all the matters applied for except the advertisements.

Simon Hand

INSPECTOR