

# LONDON BOROUGH OF HACKNEY

PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE  
04/02/2026

ADDENDUM SHEET

## **ITEM 5: 2025/1797: Buckland Court Garages Buckland Street, London, N1 6TY**

New Objection (submitted 4 February 2025)

*"In refusing my extension request and proceeding without an accessible garage/parking solution, the Council is declining a reasonable adjustment under section 20 Equality Act 2010, despite clear evidence that standard arrangements place me at a substantial disadvantage as a disabled resident. Section 20 requires steps to avoid that disadvantage; it is not enough to treat me the same as non-disabled residents where that removes essential access to my home.*

*I wish to highlight to the Chair, under sections 20 and 149 of the Equality Act 2010, you must have substantive due regard to how this scheme affects disabled residents' access and safety, not just state that there are 'no equality issues'. In LDRA v SSCLG, permission was quashed because an Inspector failed to grapple with what losing a car park really meant for disabled people's access to the riverside. Here, the loss of my secure garage and boundary protections, combined with an unsuitable 'alternative' and shared Blue Badge bays, risks removing my practical ability to reach my home safely at all. Unless and until a workable, conditioned adjustment is secured, granting permission would repeat the same legal error.*

*As a result of having no proxy and being unable to attend due to this meeting conflicting with a prior necessary medical treatment appointment I wish to submit additional notes to the Committee Report for further clarify my comments to the Committee."*

*Below are points you can lift directly into Committee comments*

1. *Garage loss and "only storage" claim .*

*Inclusive design is a core planning duty, not optional "good practice". The report says garages are "primarily used for general storage rather than vehicle parking, with only one car known to be parked within the garages."*

*I have submitted evidence to the garage, housing & parking teams that it is used for both parking and essential disability-related storage, making my case a clear site-specific exception that Hackney Local Plan Policy LP45 expects the council and planning committee to consider before treating the loss as "minimal." London Plan Policy D5 requires developments to demonstrate inclusive design, showing how the needs of disabled people have been considered in access and movement. Granting permission on the basis of abstract "capacity for three more bays" without a secured, step-free, close-to-door arrangement for the only resident losing a garage is inconsistent with D5's requirement to embed inclusive design, not rely on theoretical future adjustments.*

## 2. Alternative garage not yet proven as mitigation

Officers describe the alternative garage as an option “subject to modifications to the gate/door,” approximately a “15 minute walk,” and say it is already in use with first month’s rent paid. My January and February 2026 correspondence shows the garage is physically too narrow for an adapted vehicle and too distant for a resident with severe mobility impairment, and I explicitly asked for written confirmation of how it would be made suitable, which has not been provided. Illegal parking and enforcement can be material where mitigation relies on it. NPPF requires decision-makers to ensure new development is appropriate for its location, taking account of pollution, health and the sensitivity of receptors, and to “mitigate and reduce to a minimum potential adverse impacts.” If the only mitigation for loss of a secure garage is on-street disabled bays that are frequently obstructed, the scheme is not mitigating impacts to an acceptable level for a known vulnerable resident; the practical enforceability is therefore material to sound planning.”

## 3. Discrepancy with “matter resolved” statement

The Development Manager’s letter to Victim Support says an “alternative suitable and secure garage” has been provided and that this “specific matter” is resolved. My later emails demonstrate the suitability and accessibility of that garage remain actively disputed, so Members should not rely on it as a settled mitigation.

## 4. Blue Badge bays vs personalised access

Disabled bays must be usable, not a generic supply figure. London Plan Policy T6 requires appropriate disabled persons parking for Blue Badge holders wherever parking is provided. DfT’s Inclusive Mobility guidance says accessible parking should be provided as close as practicable to the destination and is part of the “accessible journey”. Relying on general Blue Badge bays, known to be misused and distant, instead of securing a specific, proximate solution for a named disabled resident is capable of being a failure to make a reasonable adjustment, so it is a material consideration in determining this planning application.

I have over 1 year’s worth of photographic evidence that shows long-standing misuse of my personalised bay, refusal of carer VRM access, damage to my car in the bay from vandalism and the need for a secured, individualised arrangement, meaning generic shared bays do not replace the functional benefit of a near-home garage and suitable personalised bay.

## 5. Security fence and cycle stores on ASB hotspot

The report supports removal of the existing metal security fence and proposes cycle stores about 2.2m from the boundary, relying on new building massing, overlooking and CCTV to reduce ASB. Housing/ASB correspondence and extensive police evidence show the side green at 61 Buckland Court is an identified ASB hotspot where fencing was specifically commissioned to remove a “hiding place.” On 9th January 2025 these safeguarding concerns were also raised in my Formal Objection to Proposed Bike Hangar Installations proposed Outside 59 Buckland Court (opp LP 5)- ST 633 (Object) & 61 Buckland court off Mintern street- ST 634 (Object) so removing that barrier and adding a new attractor (cycle store) contradicts the documented risk history.”

## 6. Ivy-clad wall: “intention” vs secured protection

Officers record only that councils “intention is to retain” the ivy-clad boundary wall and that design solutions are being “explored,” and they explicitly note it is excluded from the BNG green-wall accounting.

*On September 2025 my formal letter requested a specific retention and protection strategy (mapped wall sections, RPZ, CEMP/AQDMP integration), this received no response and has not been converted into a condition, contrary to London Plan G5/G6 and LP47 expectations for established green infrastructure.”*

#### *7. Agent of Change and sensitive receptors*

*The report accepts significant demolition/construction and new massing at the centre of the block but treats measures such as the ivy wall and security fence as discretionary enhancements rather than mitigation for an existing sensitive receptor (a disabled ground-floor resident with police-logged ASB).*

*In this case the ‘Agent of Change’ principle applies to the Council, as developer, must secure conditions that preserve or replace existing protective features (garage, personalised access, boundary vegetation, fencing) rather than shifting the burden of change onto me.”*

#### *8. Conditions currently lack precision and enforceability*

*The report proposes generic conditions for Secured by Design, blue-badge parking and tree protection but none that:*

- fix a deliverable accessible-parking solution for a displaced resident;*
- secure an “Ivy-clad boundary wall retention and protection strategy”; or*
- maintain a high-security boundary between cycle stores and the Buckland Court communal garden.”*

#### *9. Equality duty not adequately evidenced*

*Paragraph 5.19 states the development “is not considered to raise any equality issues,” relying on a brief cross-reference to paragraph 8.237.*

*My compiled evidence sets out progressive disability, repeated requests for reasonable adjustments, safeguarding risks, and the dependence on secure parking and storage, indicating the Equality Act 2010 duty has not been substantively engaged with at site level.”*

*Purposed Parking/Garage Solution:*

*I am asking members to require, as a condition or s106 obligation, that before any garage demolition or occupation:*

- 1. A dedicated, extra-wide disabled bay is delivered on the Buckland Court side, as close as physically possible to your front door, with: step-free route, marked transfer zone on the side you enter/exit, and bollards or build-outs so it cannot be casually obstructed.*
- 2. That bay is secured as a personalised bay (tied to your permit / vehicle and your address), not just a generic Blue Badge bay that anyone can use.*
- 3. If an enclosed space is feasible in the layout, the preferred option is a small secure parking/storage unit (effectively a replacement garage) at ground-floor level within the estate, reserved for you as the displaced disabled tenant, so that disability-related equipment can still be stored dry and securely. The extensive root system of the ivy has already grown into the brick wall of the first 4 storage units, the layout of the cupboards is such that they currently the closest space to the residence and as part of the boundary protection wall/fence/ASB keep the structural integrity of the communal garden edge intact for both residents minimising disruption to flora & fauna.*

4. *Condition that if a closer off-site garage cannot be demonstrably widened and made safely usable for an adapted vehicle within a short, fixed timescale, the Council must instead deliver the on-site dedicated bay/secure space described above.*
5. *Require written confirmation of measurements, door widths and walking distances, signed off by an access professional, before officers can treat the off-site unit as mitigation.*
6. *Boundary protection package (wall + fence + ASB) Alongside parking, the most reasonable pro-resident compromise is a protection package around your communal garden edge:*
7. *A specific “ivy-clad boundary wall retention and protection strategy” as a pre-commencement condition (mapping retained sections, method for supporting the wall as garages are demolished, RPZ-style protection in the CEMP/AQDMP).*
8. *A requirement that security at the Buckland Court side green is not reduced overall: retain the existing high-level metal fence and continue the brick wall with more secure boundary treatment between the new cycle stores/access path for the new development and the garden edge for Buckland Court residents, informed by prior ASB history and Secured by Design advice.*
9. *Further details, photos and computer generated imagery has been produced to illustrate points made.”*

Officer Response:

The neighbour has previously requested that the case be postponed at committee for at least 12 weeks. This is due to their disability and a medical appointment currently making their personal attendance not possible. In response to this the Council offered a variety of alternative options: a written statement which could be read aloud, a representative who could speak on behalf of them, or a video call to allow them to speak remotely. The Council then suggested that a voice note could be submitted and played at Committee within the allocated timeframe, or Officers could call the resident and record their objection which would then be signed off as accurate by them. In the end a further written objection as set out above was received. The Planning Service considers that printing this objection in full is sufficient to inform committee members of the issues that have been raised.

In terms of the car parking provision and loss of garage, it is acknowledged that the resident uses a garage within the estate for their car. The resident has also been provided with a blue badge parking space on a nearby street. It is understood that the resident prefers not to use this space due to her car previously being broken into and confrontations with other drivers who have parked in the space. The Council have since provided the resident with a secure garage to park her car on Kingsland Road a 15 minute walk away and it is understood that the resident now uses this garage to park her car. The resident has been in discussions with the Council over widening the door to provide better access to it and as of writing Officers understand that the Regeneration Team have agreed to pay for this.

The proposal includes two blue badge parking bays on site, with the capacity for three more. This is in line with Local Plan Policy LP45. The proposed two blue badge bays would be located 50m from the resident's property. The additional three bays would be closer, with one just over 10m away. The Council is more than willing to designate one of these bays to the resident.

As such, given that a replacement for the lost garage has been offered and that offer is acceptable in conventional planning terms, plus a total of five blue badge bays are being proposed, the loss of the garage would not form a justifiable reason for refusing the scheme.

In terms of security concerns, the applicant has undergone a number of meetings with the Secured by Design officer as part of the planning process. A condition has been attached to ensure the proposal achieves a Certificate of Compliance in respect of Secure by Design Guides.

In terms of noise and disturbances, the report includes a number of conditions to protect existing residents from noise and disturbances during construction including a construction management plan, dust management plan, and the installation of Noise, Vibration and Dust (NVD) monitoring systems.

In terms of the ivy clad wall - Officers have spoken with both the applicant and the architects and are seeking for this to be retained. Moreover, the protection of ivy is not a planning requirement.

In terms of the Equality Act 2010, as stated above, there has been substantive engagement regarding reasonable adjustments and accessibility for the resident. Officers have considered and provided alternatives for the occupant such as dedicating a parking bay and also imposed conditions such as the Secured by Design Certificate of Compliance, that will address the occupants safety concerns. These specific, enforceable measures ensure that reasonable adjustments are integrated into the scheme's delivery. Furthermore, outside of the planning process the Regeneration Team have confirmed that they are happy to help find a solution that is satisfactory for the occupant.

Revised Plans (due to a discrepancy in the red line boundary) :

NHP2\_ARC\_BUC\_4001 - Existing Location Plan B  
NHP2\_ARC\_BUC\_4010 - Proposed Location Plan C  
NHP2\_ARC\_BUC\_4100 - Existing site plan B  
NHP2\_ARC\_BUC\_4120 - Demolition site plan A  
NHP2\_ARC\_BUC\_4200 - Proposed site plan G  
NHP2\_ARC\_BUC\_6210c - Proposed Plan - Level 00 C  
NHP2\_ARC\_BUC\_6211c - Proposed Plan - Level 01 C  
NHP2\_ARC\_BUC\_6212c - Proposed Plan - Level 02 C  
NHP2\_ARC\_BUC\_6213c - Proposed Plan - Level 03 C  
NHP2\_ARC\_BUC\_6214c - Proposed Plan - Level 04 C  
NHP2\_ARC\_BUC\_6215c - Proposed Plan - Level 05 C  
NHP2\_ARC\_BUC\_6216c - Proposed Plan - Roof Level C  
NHP2-ARC-BUC-6253c - Proposed elevation - West C  
845-FH-BC-00-DP-L-101 - Landscape General Arrangement Plan P2  
NHP2\_ARC\_BUC\_4290 - Fire strategy B  
NHP2\_ARC\_BUC\_4291 - Maintenance and waste strategy B  
NHP2\_ARC\_BUC\_4292 - Parking strategy B  
NHP2\_ARC\_BUC\_4293 - Access strategy B

Error in Para 5.4 states:

*In response to the objection which reads "Submitted documents include the use of the large, fenced-off communal garden as new communal space for all residents. Proposed plans also omit the existing fence which separates this" Officers responded "The large garden to the east of the development is not included within the red line plan and there are no intentions for new residents to have access to it. Proposed site plans do note the existence of it".*

This is incorrect. The proposals would remove the existing fence. Instead, access to the garden would be blocked by the proposed building and a fence to the north and south of it. A resident only gate in the fence will provide access to the courtyard to residents of the new block, but not to the

general public. Though it should be noted that the new building would not result in any loss of the existing garden or access to it for existing residents.

### Changes to Condition 35 (Energy Statement)

The following change has been proposed for consistency with previous NHP approved schemes:

*“Prior to the above ground works of the development hereby approved, a revised Energy Statement shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority, providing full details to demonstrate at least the following standards and key metrics have been achieved or improved upon as set out in the hereby approved Energy Statement (Revision P04 by XCO2 dated November 2025):*

- A. Minimum carbon savings of 30.7 % / 13.29 tonnes CO<sub>2</sub>e against Part L 2021 through fabric efficiency (Be Lean)*
- B. Minimum overall carbon savings of 45.8 % / 19.82 tonnes CO<sub>2</sub>e Part L 2021*
- C. The operational carbon emissions shall be calculated using the appropriate methodology, following guidance as set out by the GLA Guide for Energy Assessments.***
- ~~*D. The development hereby approved shall not be carried out otherwise than in accordance*~~
- ~~*E. with the details thereby approved.*~~
- ~~*F. Maximum U-values (W/m<sup>2</sup>K): walls 0.15; floors 0.10; roof 0.10; windows 0.80 unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority*~~
- ~~*G. Maximum G-values for windows and doors of 0.4 unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority*~~
- ~~*H. Maximum Air permeability 1m<sup>3</sup>/h/m<sup>2</sup>@50pa unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority*~~
- ~~*I. Maximum Space Heating demand of 15kWh/sqm/yr using a predictive modelling calculation methodology such as PHPP, TM54 or equivalent the applicant will be expected to demonstrate and quantify how further design works have been carried out to seek to achieve the planning application target of 5.6 kWh/sqm/yr unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority*~~
- ~~*J. Maximum Energy Use Intensity of 35 kWh/sqm/yr using a predictive modelling calculation methodology PHPP, TM54 or equivalent the applicant will be expected to demonstrate and quantify how further design works have been carried out to seek to achieve the aspirational target of 58.14 unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority the applicant will be expected to benchmark the results against the UK Net Zero Carbon Building Standard relevant data sets*~~
- ~~*K. A third party review report of the as-design predictive modelling calculations*~~
- ~~*L. Updated GLA Carbon Emission Reporting Spreadsheet*~~

~~*The operational carbon emissions must be calculated using the appropriate methodology for all the identified units in the exceptional circumstances that all units can not be reasonably assessed, a representative sample must be used and include:*~~

- ~~*A. at least one unit for each identified flat type/area type, and*~~
- ~~*B. any unit subject to the following criteria: units (a) with large glazing areas, (b) on the topmost floor, (c) having limited shading, (d) having large, sun-facing windows, (e) having a single aspect, or (e) having limited opening windows*~~

~~Prior to the occupation of the development hereby approved, air permeability certificates prepared by a suitable contractor must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority confirming the approved figures have been achieved or improved upon~~

**The development hereby approved shall not be carried out otherwise than in accordance with the details thereby approved.**

REASON: In the interest of addressing climate change and securing sustainable and net zero development and construction, in accordance with LP54, LP55 and LP56 of the Hackney Local Plan, SI2, SI3, SI4 and SI7 of the London Plan, and Section 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework.”

#### Changes to condition 36 (Air Source Heat Pump)

The following change has been proposed for consistency with previous NHP approved schemes:

~~“Prior to above ground works full details of the communal heat pump based heating system specification and supporting drawings shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Authority. This shall demonstrate at least the following standards been achieved or further optimised as set out in the hereby approved Sustainability & Energy Statement (Revision P04 by XCO2 dated November 2025) and relevant supporting documents:~~

- ~~A. Minimum Heat pump Coefficient of Performance of 3 for the domestic hot water supply / heating supply to provide 100% of the heating and hot water demand.~~
- ~~B. Details of location of the condenser units from the heat pump systems and noise solutions to mitigate impact for nearby sensitive receptors;~~
- ~~C. Details of refrigerants that are required confirming a Low or Zero Global Warming Potential (GWP) and Zero Ozone Depleting Potential (ODP)~~

~~The heat pump thereby approved shall be installed prior to occupation of the development hereby approved~~

~~Prior to the occupation of the development hereby approved, full details including as-built heating system (or any other related fixed plant adopted) specification and supporting drawings and installation certificates by an MCS registered installer must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority confirming the system performance has been achieved or improved upon the pre-commencement figures.~~

~~Where compliance is not met, a remedial plan and associated cost plan must be prepared and submitted to the Local Authority for approval detailing the necessary measures to meet the required level of performance. Shortfalls may attract an additional financial contribution to the carbon offset fund.~~

REASON: In the interest of addressing climate change and securing sustainable and net zero development and construction, in accordance with LP55 and LP56 of the Hackney Local Plan, SI2 and SI3 of the London Plan, and Section 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework”

#### Changes to condition 38 (MVHR)

The following change has been proposed for consistency with previous NHP approved schemes:

~~“Prior to the above grade works of the development hereby approved, full details including ventilation system (or any other related fixed plant adopted) specification and supporting drawings~~

must be submitted to and approved by the Local Authority to demonstrate at least the following standards been achieved or improved upon as set out in the hereby approved Sustainability & Energy Statement (Revision P04 by XCO2 dated November 2025):

- A. Minimum MVRH efficiency of 96.00% for residential units unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority
- B. Details of summer by pass where applicable including provision and location across the development

The MVHR thereby approved shall be installed prior to occupation of the development hereby approved

~~Prior to the occupation of the development hereby approved, full details including as built ventilation system (or any other related fixed plant adopted) specification and supporting drawings and installation certificates by a suitable contractor must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority confirming the ventilation system has achieved or improved upon the pre-commencement figures;~~

~~Where compliance is not met, a remedial plan and associated cost plan must be prepared and submitted to the Local Authority for approval detailing the necessary measures to meet the required level of performance. Shortfalls may attract an additional financial contribution to the carbon offset fund.~~

REASON: In the interest of addressing climate change and securing sustainable and net zero development and construction, in accordance with LP54 and LP55 of the Hackney Local Plan, SI2 and SI4 of the London Plan, and Section 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework”

#### Changes to condition 39 (Overheating)

The following change has been proposed for consistency with previous NHP approved schemes:

“Prior to the above grade works of development a dynamic overheating risk assessment shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Authority, assessing all units and following the CIBSE TM52 (non residential) & TM59 (residential) methodology.

The assessment must include design specific details of how each steps of the Cooling Hierarchy has been implemented, for reference

Step 1: Reduce the amount of heat entering a building in summer through orientation, shading, albedo, fenestration, insulation and green roofs and walls

Step 2: Minimise internal heat generation through energy efficient design

Step 3: Manage the heat within the building through exposed internal thermal mass and high ceilings

Step 4: Passive ventilation

Step 5: Mechanical ventilation

Step 6: Active cooling systems

All report results of the dynamic modelling in line with the CIBSE TM52 and TM59 compliance criteria must clearly set out the pass rate (%) of each of the Cooling Hierarchy steps, using

baseline scenario and additional modelled scenario to test all mitigations (passive first, active as last resort) measures required until all units pass the overheating risk assessment - as follows:

Step 1: mitigation measures description leading to pass rate of X%

Step 2: mitigation measures description leading to pass rate of XX% etc

All units must be assessed against weather files CIBSE TM49 DSY1, DSY2 & DSY3, results should demonstrate a 100% pass rate for all units shown under weather file DSY1 - in the exceptional circumstances that all units can not be reasonably assessed, a representative sample must be used and include:

at least one unit for each identified flat type/area type, and

any unit subject to the following criteria: units (a) with large glazing areas, (b) on the topmost floor, (c) having limited shading, (d) having large, sun-facing windows, (e) having a single aspect, or (c) having limited opening windows

The applicant should provide supporting evidence such as scope drawings highlighting what unit/area have been included in the modelling.

If 100% pass rate is not achieved under weather files DSY2 & 3, a retrofit plan must be submitted to and approved by the Local Authority detailing how further mitigation measures can be installed and who will be responsible to manage future overheating risk for 100% of units to pass under both weather files DSY2 and DSY3

~~Where any additional remedial mitigation measures are required, the product specifications and details must be provided.~~

~~Prior to the occupation of the development hereby approved, a final "as built" overheating risk assessment shall be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, assessing all units and following the CIBSE TM52 (non residential) & TM59 (residential) methodology, confirming % pass rates for each TM49 weather file have or improved upon pre-commencement figures following the prospective retrofit measures.~~

**The development hereby approved shall not be carried out otherwise than in accordance with the details thereby approved.**

REASON: In the interest of addressing climate change and securing sustainable and net zero development and construction, in accordance with LP54 and LP55 of the Hackney Local Plan, SI2, and SI4 of the London Plan, and Section 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework"

#### Changes to condition 41 (Water Efficiency)

The following change has been proposed for consistency with previous NHP approved schemes:

"Prior to above ground construction works, the applicant shall provide a statement to confirm that the development has been designed to be water efficient and reduce water consumption as far as possible, demonstrating that the development will not exceed a maximum water use of 105 litres of water per person per day, with an additional maximum water use allowance for external water consumption of 5 litres.

~~Strategy, evidence and supporting documentation should be provided and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority pre-commencement showing how water saving measures, recycling~~

~~and water efficiency measures have been incorporated in the design to limit both internal and external water use and promote efficient water use.~~

**The development shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted Sustainability Statement, including ensuring that sanitaryware and fittings do not exceed the water efficiency targets set out therein.**

*REASON: Addressing the need to conserve water, to mitigate and adapt to climate change, taking into account the full range of potential climate change impacts in accordance with the London Plan, GLA guidance, Hackney Local Plan policy and the NPPF.”*

#### **ITEM 6: 2025/1791: Garages Adjacent To, Cropley Court Cavendish Street, London**

New objection (received 4 February 2025)

The new objection is from the same residents as per the original objection, and raises the same points. These points - and the Officer's response to them - are covered in the Officer's Report.

Changes to condition 36 (Energy Statement)

The following change has been proposed for consistency with previous NHP approved schemes:

*“Prior to the above ground works of the development hereby approved, a revised Energy Statement shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority, providing full details to demonstrate at least the following standards and key metrics have been achieved or improved upon as set out in the hereby approved Energy Statement (Revision P04 by XCO2 dated November 2025):*

- A. Minimum carbon savings of 32.5 % / 15.83 tonnes CO<sub>2</sub>e against Part L 2021 through fabric efficiency (Be Lean)*
- B. Minimum overall carbon savings of 77.3% / 21.86 tonnes CO<sub>2</sub>e Part L 2021*
- C. The operational carbon emissions shall be calculated using the appropriate methodology, following guidance as set out by the GLA Guide for Energy Assessments.***
- ~~*D. Maximum U-values (W/m<sup>2</sup>K): walls 0.15; floors 0.10; roof 0.10; windows 0.80 unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority*~~
- ~~*E. Maximum G-values for windows and doors of 0.4 unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority*~~
- ~~*F. Maximum Air permeability 1m<sup>3</sup>/h/m<sup>2</sup>@50pa unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority*~~
- ~~*G. Maximum Space Heating demand of 15kWh/sqm/yr using a predictive modelling calculation methodology such as PHPP, TM54 or equivalent – the applicant will be expected to demonstrate and quantify how further design works have been carried out to seek to achieve the planning application target of 11.12kWh/sqm/yr unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority*~~
- ~~*H. Maximum Energy Use Intensity of 35 kWh/sqm/yr using a predictive modelling calculation methodology PHPP, TM54 or equivalent – the applicant will be expected to demonstrate and quantify how further design works have been carried out to seek to achieve the design target of 57.92 unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority – the applicant will be expected to benchmark the results against the UK Net Zero Carbon Building Standard relevant data sets*~~

- ~~I. A third party review report of the as-design predictive modelling calculations~~
- ~~J. Updated GLA Carbon Emission Reporting Spreadsheet~~

~~The operational carbon emissions must be calculated using the appropriate methodology for all the identified units—in the exceptional circumstances that all units can not be reasonably assessed, a representative sample must be used and include:~~

- ~~A. at least one unit for each identified flat type/area type, and~~
- ~~B. any unit subject to the following criteria: units (a) with large glazing areas, (b) on the topmost floor, (c) having limited shading, (d) having large, sun-facing windows, (e) having a single aspect, or (e) having limited opening windows~~

~~Prior to the occupation of the development hereby approved, air permeability certificates prepared by a suitable contractor must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority confirming the approved figures have been achieved or improved upon~~

**The development hereby approved shall not be carried out otherwise than in accordance with the details thereby approved.**

REASON: In the interest of addressing climate change and securing sustainable and net zero development and construction, in accordance with LP54, LP55 and LP56 of the Hackney Local Plan, SI2, SI3, SI4 and SI7 of the London Plan, and Section 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework.”

#### Changes to condition 38 (Air Source Heat Pump)

The following change has been proposed for consistency with previous NHP approved schemes:

“Prior to above ground works full details of the communal heat pump based heating system specification and supporting drawings shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Authority. This shall demonstrate at least the following standards been achieved or further optimised as set out in the hereby approved Sustainability & Energy Statement (Revision P04 by XCO2 dated November 2025) and relevant supporting documents:

- ~~D. Minimum Heat pump Coefficient of Performance of 3 for the domestic hot water supply / heating supply to provide 100% of the heating and hot water demand.~~
- ~~E. Details of location of the condenser units from the heat pump systems and noise solutions to mitigate impact for nearby sensitive receptors;~~
- ~~F. Details of refrigerants that are required confirming a Low or Zero Global Warming Potential (GWP) and Zero Ozone Depleting Potential (ODP)~~

~~The heat pump thereby approved shall be installed prior to occupation of the development hereby approved~~

~~Prior to the occupation of the development hereby approved, full details including as-built heating system (or any other related fixed plant adopted) specification and supporting drawings and installation certificates by an MCS registered installer must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority confirming the system performance has been achieved or improved upon the pre-commencement figures.~~

~~Where compliance is not met, a remedial plan and associated cost plan must be prepared and submitted to the Local Authority for approval detailing the necessary measures to meet the required level of performance. Shortfalls may attract an additional financial contribution to the carbon offset fund.~~

*REASON: In the interest of addressing climate change and securing sustainable and net zero development and construction, in accordance with LP55 and LP56 of the Hackney Local Plan, SI2 and SI3 of the London Plan, and Section 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework”*

#### Changes to condition 39 (MVHR)

The following change has been proposed for consistency with previous NHP approved schemes:

*“Prior to the above grade works of the development hereby approved, full details including ventilation system (or any other related fixed plant adopted) specification and supporting drawings must be submitted to and approved by the Local Authority to demonstrate at least the following standards been achieved or improved upon as set out in the hereby approved Sustainability & Energy Statement (Revision P04 by XCO2 dated November 2025):*

- C. Minimum MVRH efficiency of 96.00% for residential units unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority*
- D. Details of summer by pass where applicable including provision and location across the development*

*The MVHR thereby approved shall be installed prior to occupation of the development hereby approved*

~~*Prior to the occupation of the development hereby approved, full details including as built ventilation system (or any other related fixed plant adopted) specification and supporting drawings and installation certificates by a suitable contractor must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority confirming the ventilation system has achieved or improved upon the pre-commencement figures,*~~

~~*Where compliance is not met, a remedial plan and associated cost plan must be prepared and submitted to the Local Authority for approval detailing the necessary measures to meet the required level of performance. Shortfalls may attract an additional financial contribution to the carbon offset fund.*~~

*REASON: In the interest of addressing climate change and securing sustainable and net zero development and construction, in accordance with LP54 and LP55 of the Hackney Local Plan, SI2 and SI4 of the London Plan, and Section 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework”*

#### Changes to condition 40 (Overheating)

The following change has been proposed for consistency with previous NHP approved schemes:

*“Prior to the above grade works of development a dynamic overheating risk assessment shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Authority, assessing all units and following the CIBSE TM52 (non residential) & TM59 (residential) methodology.*

*The assessment must include design specific details of how each steps of the Cooling Hierarchy has been implemented, for reference*

- Step 1: Reduce the amount of heat entering a building in summer through orientation, shading, albedo, fenestration, insulation and green roofs and walls*
- Step 2: Minimise internal heat generation through energy efficient design*

*Step 3: Manage the heat within the building through exposed internal thermal mass and high ceilings*

*Step 4: Passive ventilation*

*Step 5: Mechanical ventilation*

*Step 6: Active cooling systems*

*All report results of the dynamic modelling in line with the CIBSE TM52 and TM59 compliance criteria must clearly set out the pass rate (%) of each of the Cooling Hierarchy steps, using baseline scenario and additional modelled scenario to test all mitigations (passive first, active as last resort) measures required until all units pass the overheating risk assessment - as follows:*

*Step 1: mitigation measures description leading to pass rate of X%*

*Step 2: mitigation measures description leading to pass rate of XX% etc*

*All units must be assessed against weather files CIBSE TM49 DSY1, DSY2 & DSY3, results should demonstrate a 100% pass rate for all units shown under weather file DSY1 - in the exceptional circumstances that all units can not be reasonably assessed, a representative sample must be used and include:*

*at least one unit for each identified flat type/area type, and*

*any unit subject to the following criteria: units (a) with large glazing areas, (b) on the topmost floor, (c) having limited shading, (d) having large, sun-facing windows, (e) having a single aspect, or (c) having limited opening windows*

*The applicant should provide supporting evidence such as scope drawings highlighting what unit/area have been included in the modelling.*

*If 100% pass rate is not achieved under weather files DSY2 & 3, a retrofit plan must be submitted to and approved by the Local Authority detailing how further mitigation measures can be installed and who will be responsible to manage future overheating risk for 100% of units to pass under both weather files DSY2 and DSY3*

~~*Where any additional remedial mitigation measures are required, the product specifications and details must be provided.*~~

~~*Prior to the occupation of the development hereby approved, a final "as-built" overheating risk assessment shall be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, assessing all units and following the CIBSE TM52 (non residential) & TM59 (residential) methodology, confirming % pass rates for each TM49 weather file have or improved upon pre-commencement figures following the prospective retrofit measures.*~~

***The development hereby approved shall not be carried out otherwise than in accordance with the details thereby approved.***

*REASON: In the interest of addressing climate change and securing sustainable and net zero development and construction, in accordance with LP54 and LP55 of the Hackney Local Plan, SI2, and SI4 of the London Plan, and Section 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework"*

#### Changes to condition 42 (Water Efficiency)

The following change has been proposed for consistency with previous NHP approved schemes:

*“Prior to above ground construction works, the applicant shall provide a statement to confirm that the development has been designed to be water efficient and reduce water consumption as far as possible, demonstrating that the development will not exceed a maximum water use of 105 litres of water per person per day, with an additional maximum water use allowance for external water consumption of 5 litres.*

~~*Strategy, evidence and supporting documentation should be provided and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority pre-commencement showing how water saving measures, recycling and water efficiency measures have been incorporated in the design to limit both internal and external water use and promote efficient water use.*~~

***The development shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted Sustainability Statement, including ensuring that sanitaryware and fittings do not exceed the water efficiency targets set out therein.***

*REASON: Addressing the need to conserve water, to mitigate and adapt to climate change, taking into account the full range of potential climate change impacts in accordance with the London Plan, GLA guidance, Hackney Local Plan policy and the NPPF.”*

#### **ITEM 7: 2025/1324: Fellows Court, Weymouth Terrace, London, E2 8LP**

1. Since publication of the Committee Report, a Daylight, Sunlight & Overshadowing Addendum (Dated 02.02.2026) has been submitted. This clarifies queries officers had in regard to the methodology and sources used for the modelling of neighbouring properties as well as the overshadowing impacts on the nursery playground to the north. This document is recommended to be added as an approved document on the decision notice.
2. Since publication of the Committee Report, three of the proposed section drawings listed in the report have had minor amendments made to them. These changes relate to the key plans and not to the design of the proposed building. Therefore, the three drawings listed in the Committee Report are recommended to be superseded. The updated drawings are: ‘Proposed Long South Section - NHP1-NO-FC-XX-DR-A-2000 Rev.E’; ‘Proposed Short South Section - NHP1-NO-FC-XX-DR-A-2002 Rev.E’; and ‘Proposed Short South Section Stairs - NHP1-NO-FC-XX-DR-A-2003 Rev.E’. The new drawings are recommended to be added as approved drawings on the decision notice
3. Paragraph 6.2.201 of the Committee Report states that some financial contributions were still to be confirmed at the time. For clarity, the figures can now be confirmed as follows: £16,273.20 Open space shortfall contribution, £108,746.50 Education contribution, £4,995 Financial contributions monitoring fee and £3,885 Non-financial contributions monitoring fee.
4. A slight change is proposed to the proposed wording of the recommended Urban Greening Factor (UGF) condition at paragraph 9.1.26 of the Committee report. This is to provide the applicant with some flexibility, should unforeseen material planning considerations arise that make achieving the target UGF score impossible. For clarity, the new wording would read as follows:

*“Prior to the commencement of above ground works (excluding demolition), a detailed UGF plan must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, demonstrating how the development on the application site will achieve a minimum UGF score of 0.4 (unless robust details are submitted to demonstrate why this is not*

**achievable)** . The submission must include a clearly colour-coded plan identifying all surface cover types within the development. A completed UGF calculation table must be provided, detailing each surface cover type with its corresponding UGF value, the total area of each surface type, the weighted score for each feature, and the cumulative total UGF score for the site. The planting must be implemented in accordance with the details hereby approved, which must be implemented prior to first occupation of the development, and the urban greening measures and soft landscaping must be maintained thereafter for the lifetime of the development.

*REASON: To ensure that the development incorporates appropriate urban greening measures to enhance biodiversity, mitigate urban heat effects and contribute to environmental sustainability, in accordance with Local Plan policy LP48 and the London Plan policy G5.”*

#### **ITEM 8: 2025/1205: Weymouth Court, Weymouth Terrace, London, E2 8LT**

1. Since publication of the Committee Report, a Daylight, Sunlight & Overshadowing Addendum (Dated 09.01.2026) has been submitted. This clarifies queries officers had in regard to methodology and sources used for the modelling of neighbouring properties as well as the overshadowing impacts on a 1st floor terrace to the west.. This document is recommended to be added as an approved document on the decision notice.
2. Since publication of the Committee Report, an updated Fire Safety Strategy Report and Fire Statement, Ref: TRG-230282-NHP3-WC-RT-02-I04, Dated 02.02.2026 and Landscape Plan (Ground) plan - 032-BM-XX-00-DR-A-01200 Rev. D have been submitted. The updates relate to the addition of a fire door at the base of the staircase. As set out in paragraphs 4.14 and 6.2.174 of the Committee Report, this door was requested by LBH Building Control. Therefore, the change is supported by Planning officers. The current document and drawing listed in the Committee Report are recommended to be superseded and the updated ones added on the decision notice.
3. Paragraph 6.2.34 of the Committee Report should read “*The proposed housing mix for this application is 46% 2-bed and 54% ~~2~~3-bed*”.
4. The Local Supplier Procurement Plan obligation listed in the “Non-financial contributions’ and the ‘Employment, Skills & Construction’ sections of the Committee Report is no longer recommended.
5. Paragraph 6.2.178 of the Committee Report states that some financial contributions were still to be confirmed at the time. For clarity, the figures can now be confirmed as follows: £10,245.24 Open space shortfall contribution, £14,928.55 Education contribution, £4,995 Financial contributions monitoring fee and £3,885 Non-financial contributions monitoring fee.
5. A slight change is proposed to the wording of the recommended Urban Greening Factor (UGF) condition at paragraph 9.1.27 of the Committee report. This is to provide the applicant with some flexibility, should unforeseen material planning considerations arise that make the target UGF score impossible. For clarity, the new wording would read as follows:

*“Prior to the the first occupation of the development hereby approved, a detailed UGF masterplan must submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, demonstrating how the development on the application site (within the application site’s red line) together with a proposed planting scheme in the grassed area at the corner of Turtle*

Road and Kent Street (within the location plan's blue line) will achieve a minimum UGF score of 0.3 (**unless robust details are submitted to demonstrate why this is not achievable**). The submission must include a clearly colour-coded master plan identifying all surface cover types within the development. A completed UGF calculation table must be provided, detailing each surface cover type with its corresponding UGF value, the total area of each surface type, the weighted score for each feature, and the cumulative total UGF score for the site.

The planting must be implemented in accordance with the details hereby approved, within 12 months of first occupation of the development, and the urban greening measures and soft landscaping must be maintained thereafter for at least 5 years.

REASON: To ensure that the development incorporates appropriate urban greening measures to enhance biodiversity, mitigate urban heat effects and contribute to environmental sustainability, in accordance with Local Plan policy LP48 and the London Plan policy G5.”

#### **ITEM 9: 2024/2201: Site bounded by Worship Street, Curtain Road, Scrutton Street and Holywell Row, EC2A**

1. For the avoidance of doubt, the development description should be amended to read, with amended wording in bold::

“Redevelopment of the majority of an urban block by demolition and part demolition of existing buildings to facilitate an office-led, mixed use development by the erection of 6 buildings with maximum heights of between six and 18 storeys (**plus plant storeys, plus basements**), the erection of a terrace mews of 6 buildings of two storeys, and the refurbishment and/or extension of Nos.26-24 Holywell Row, Nos.42-46 Scrutton Street and Nos.87-105 Worship Street; in order to provide 65448sqm of office (Use Class E), 4075sqm of retail floorspace (Use Class E), 78 residential units (Use Class C3 uses), an 770sqm Urban Room (Sui Generis), together with creation of a new central courtyard and pedestrian routes through the site, hard and soft landscaping and other associated and ancillary works (in association with Listed Building Consent 2024/2162). [Description for the purposes of consultation only]. This application is accompanied by an Environmental Impact Assessment.”

2. Four new letters of support have been received, on the following grounds:

- New office space should be supported.
- New housing should be supported.
- The scheme is well designed and Shoreditch should change to include buildings of the scale proposed.

One new letter of objection has been received, on the following grounds:

- Commercial properties will also be affected by loss of daylight and sunlight, it shouldn't just be residential properties that are considered.
- Commercial properties can be converted to residential properties.
- The cumulative traffic, servicing and construction impacts of this proposal alongside the approved Castle / Fitzroy House development must be considered.

*Officer's Note:* These aspects are considered in the committee report. Commercial properties are generally considered less sensitive than residential properties when considering daylight/sunlight impacts and it would not be typical to refuse an application on the basis of loss of light to commercial premises. While it is understood that this may limit their future use as residential

properties, there are no such applications before us to consider and it is noted that this is a Priority Office Area where loss of office space is controlled by policy.

With respect to the cumulative impacts of multiple construction projects, had this recommendation been for approval a construction management plan would have been required by condition that demonstrated how the construction period for this scheme would work alongside other nearby construction sites and the coordination between them.

3. Status of Future Shoreditch Area Action Plan(AAP): Since the publication of the committee report, consultation on the Regulation 19 submission version of the Future Shoreditch Area Action Plan commenced on Monday 26th and runs until 9th March 2026.

**ITEM 10: 2025/2513: Gillett Square Car Park, Gillett Street, London, N16 8JH**

Three new letters of support have been received, on the following grounds and with the following comments:

- The proposed changes could help significantly in addressing long-standing issues with persistent anti-social behaviour affecting the area and the community.
- The removal of the carpark and temporary shipping containers that have remained at its edge, along with the landscaping proposed will transform the potential of Gillett Square.
- The inaccessible strip of proposed landscape to the north boundary should be carefully designed and maintained to support wildlife and maximise its potential to provide an acoustic buffer, visual privacy and shade to the occupants of the flats to that side of the square. Any community garden element should be considered for a different location.
- Opening hours should reflect the proximity of residential neighbours so that Gillett Square changes from being a night time destination to one that has day time offering.
- The positioning of the proposed retail pods and play container should be rethought, to allow better visibility around all of them.

*Officer's Note:* The retail pods are not new, they are just being relocated. As such, it is considered that any opening hours can remain as before. We note, in terms of the final point, that the December 2025 public consultation positioning of the retail pods has been further refined in the submission documents and the arrangement is considered acceptable as presented.

The soft landscaping of the scheme is subject to the recommended condition.

**Signed..... Date.....**

**NATALIE BROUGHTON  
Assistant Director Planning & Building Control**