

LONDON BOROUGH OF HACKNEY

PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE
11/03/2026

ADDENDUM SHEET

ITEM 5: 2024/2201 (FP) & 2024/2162 (LBC): Site bounded by Worship Street, Curtain Road, Scrutton Street and Holywell Row, EC2A

Item withdrawn from the agenda.

ITEM 6: 2025/2579: Regents Court, Pownall Road, Hackney, E8 4QB

Parking Details

Typo: There are 13 existing parking spaces on site, not 12.

Para 5. Neighbours and Interested Groups

Additional Information:

A further 34 objections have been received following the printing of the officer report. The issues raised are generally the same as noted in the main report, but for completeness and transparency Officers have summarised the issues raised by the new objections below:

- Design concerns:
 - Overdevelopment / too large / overcrowding
 - Harmful to conservation area
- Impact on neighbour amenity:
 - Overbearing
 - Loss of light
 - Overshadowing of gardens and communal open space
 - Loss of privacy
 - Loss of views
 - Noise and disturbances during construction and operations
- Loss of open space and play space
- Poor UGF score
- Secure by design concerns / safety concerns
- Increased parking congestion
- Loss of garages
- Lack of investment for existing dwellings
- Poor light to new development
- Extra pressure on local services
- Impact on wildlife
- Viability / no financial necessity for 38 social rented units / overdelivery of homes

- Stability of ground for such a development
- Increase in pests / rats
- Development is contrary to leaseholder agreement

The majority of these matters are dealt with in the main officer report. The new issues are dealt with below:

In terms of impact on wildlife, a bat survey and Ecological Assessment was submitted with the application. Biodiversity Officers have been consulted and are satisfied with the results subject to conditions protecting birds and bats. These have been attached.

In terms of the necessity of 38 social rented units, Hackney has one of the longest social housing waiting lists in London, with over 12,100 households registered and 500+ new applicants monthly. Wait times are up to 12 years for those in need. It is therefore absolutely necessary to construct as many affordable homes as possible. Due to being 100% social rent, the development does not require a viability assessment. The objection notes that the New Homes Programme is running a “net present value” of £1.8m. This is considered a positive of the scheme and the Council are committed to providing as many affordable homes as possible, on budget.

In terms of the grounds not being suitable for new development, a construction management plan has been conditioned to ensure the development is built safely. The objection specifically mentions concerns due to its close proximity to the canal but the Canal and River Trust were consulted as part of the planning process and raised no concerns.

Potential increase in pestilence is not a planning matter but is not expected to increase as a result of this application.

Whether the development is contrary to a leaseholder agreement of one of the residents is legal, rather than a planning matter.

Para 8.9:

Typo: The proposal includes the demolition of 14 existing garages along with existing on site parking for ~~42~~ **13** cars, with four new parking bays

Para 8.151

Typo: The proposed development involves the removal of ~~42~~ **13** existing car parking spaces from the

Para 8.152

Typo: On weekdays, the surveyed area showed a peak occupancy of 94%. Following the removal of ~~eight~~ **nine** net spaces, occupancy is forecast to reach 101%,

Para 8.153:

Additional Information from Parking Services:

Due to the reduction in parking spaces resulting from the proposed development, the applicant has agreed with Parking Services that Regents Court Estate parking permit holders who may be displaced or experience parking stress will be permitted to use their estate resident permits on the adjacent Regent Estate, where there is currently available capacity. This arrangement is proposed

to commence if works begin later this year or early next year, and residents will be notified in advance of the effective date.

From March 2026, Parking Services will suspend all new applications for estate resident permits on both Regents Court Estate and Regent Estate. As residents move away from the estates, no new residents will be able to purchase permits during this period. This will allow for a gradual reduction in the number of permits issued across both estates and help bring permit numbers down to a more manageable level. This means that any resident who currently holds an estate parking permit for these zones will retain their existing permit, and there will be no change to their entitlement.

Once parking demand has reduced sufficiently, the ability for new residents to apply for estate permits will be reinstated. This will be monitored and determined by Parking Services.

This is a temporary measure. In due course, a consultation will take place with residents of Regents Court Estate and Regent Estate regarding estate parking arrangements and potential longer-term options to improve parking availability, including the provision of cycle storage.

Parking Services will continue to monitor the impact of the development on parking demand and may introduce additional measures over time should further mitigation be required.

Para 8.157: Blue Badge Permits

Additional Information from Parking Services:

As part of the planning process, one extra general-use disabled bay will be created. This will ensure that the most vulnerable estate permit holders will have more places to park in addition to the on-street parking places listed above.

- It is estimated that approximately 25% of residents hold a Blue Badge. Although provision for the future blue badge bays has not been included as part of the proposal, Blue Badge holders are permitted to park free of charge in the following on-street parking places:
 - Shared-use permit bays
 - Pay and display bays
 - General disabled bays
 - Single and double yellow lines, where no further restrictions apply
 - Temporarily in permit bays during the first six months of the Experimental Traffic Order period

Given this, Officers are satisfied that there is adequate long-term provision for Blue Badge holders.

Para 8.171-8.172: Access and Public Realm Works

Remove

~~The revised estimate and the total cost is: £713,361.22~~

~~The proposal is to reconstruct the Footway & Carriageway on Regents Row. Works will consist of:~~

- ~~● Remove the existing footway material including kerbs.~~

- ~~Provide and lay a new 100mm base/ 50mm 3:1 sand cement bed. Supply and lay Yorkstone as spec clause 1172 AR with "Riven" finish along with new Granite kerb.~~
- ~~Take up and store the existing setts in the carriageway~~
- ~~Provide and lay a new 150mm GBM3 Base/50mm sand bed.~~
- ~~Relay the existing setts and allow for 20% reclaimed setts to be laid and reprofiled if required.~~
- ~~Amend the existing entrance to the garages onsite and provide a new entrance to the development.~~
- ~~Remove existing Gully grate onsite and provide and install x4 new along with associated works.~~
- ~~A new blue badge parking bay and associated works~~

It has since come to light that Regents Row may already be public highway. Further research is being undertaken by the applicant and the Council's Highways team to determine if this is the case or if it requires adoption. Until the highway status of the land is agreed, s278 costs have been removed from the scheme, though there is the assumption that works to this area will be undertaken, the scope and costs will be agreed by the applicant and highways department before any unilateral undertaking is agreed.

Para 8.268 and 10.2: Heads of Terms / Planning Contributions

Amendments

£457,502.50 towards educational costs is incorrect. Officers have now applied a discount for social rented units, which requires only a contribution of 20% of the child yield generated. The actual total costs are therefore 20% of £457,502.50 which is £91,500.50

~~£713,361.22 towards the cost of highway works associated with the development~~

BNG monitoring costs to be paid are £11,340.60

Additional Information

Trees T23, T24, T32, T34, T39, T40 will have their value assessed using the Capital Asset Value for Amenity Trees (CAVAT) method prior to their re-location. If any of these trees die, are removed, or become seriously damaged, diseased or dying within a period of ten years from their relocation, their CAVAT value prior to their re-location will become payable.

Condition 32

Typo: 32. 33. Sound Insulation - Inside and Outside

ITEM 7: 2024/2539: 1 Albion Drive, Hackney, London, E8 4ET

1. Neighbours and Interested parties

Additional Information:

A further three representations have been received following the printing of the officers report.

- One objecting to the proposal from an individual who has previously submitted an objection during the consultation. For completeness and transparency Officers have summarised the issues raised below and to cover those raised in relation to the officers report.
- Two in support of the proposal (One is a letter of support by the Head Teacher of Queensbridge Primary School).

Objection

- Conflicts with Local Plan Policies LP1, LP2, LP3, LP11 and LP12. London Plan D3, D4 and HC1 and National Policy NPF, HC1
- Proposal fails to preserve the conservation area
- No meaningful public benefit
- Proposed mansard roof and rear extension alters the historic form of the building and disrupt the consistent rooflines and scale of victorian houses in the CA
- Mansard roof referenced in Albion Square added without planning permission
- Permission refused for mansards/ windows overlooking other gardens or direct sightlines in CA
- Loss of privacy for neighbours - all windows on west elevation should be obscured glazed
- Overdevelopment of site
- Lack of soft landscaping
- Proposal impacts Root Protection Area (RPA) of neighbouring tree

Officer note: Design, amenity, tree and landscaping considerations have been addressed as part of the report.

Support

- The existing building is currently an eyesore on Albion Drive and supports the refurbishment works and proposal
- School satisfied with amendments made to the proposal
- No direct line of sight into the playground
- Area of nursery playground already affected by shading due to it covered by as shade sail

Objection Cllr George Gooch

Acknowledgement of the support which will revitalise a property that has been derelict for some time. Representing those who are objecting to the proposal on following grounds.

Challenges the officer report's use of land use policies with reference to paragraph 6.1 .

The proposal is misrepresenting a choice between leaving the property or accepting the proposal's expansion, overlooking the option of simply redevelopment on the existing layout. Also raises concerns over the proposal being assessed as derelict and uninhabitable.

Contends the argument made in the officers report suggests that the proposed extension is required for 'maximum viability' of the site. Suggest the high cost set was due to the council's expression of support for the expansion of the property in advance of its sale. The cost of the site was driven by the assumption that the application would be granted.

Inconsistency in valuing tradition. The value of the conservation area is set aside for modern priorities yet precedent in terms of amenity (overlooking) is used to dismiss privacy concerns ignoring the difference between facing windows and the windows perpendicular to the rear of houses looking directly into the windows of bedrooms and bathrooms.

2.0 Consultation - Officers report

Amendment to paragraph 4.0 of the officers report 'Consultation'

For the sake of clarity for this section of the Officers report, it is amended to make reference to the number of signatures submitted in objection received by local residents.

' In addition to the objections received, a letter which included a petition signed by 48 residents was submitted.'

3.0 Condition

Additional information to Officers Report.

Recommendation B: Paragraph 8.21

Amenity

Prior to commencement of above ground works on the development hereby approved, details of secure fixings of the west facing first floor fenestration shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall not be carried out otherwise than in accordance with the details thus approved and retained and maintained thereafter.

REASON: To safeguard the amenity and living conditions of the adjoining residential occupiers.

4.0 Amenity

Para 6.6.6 of the officers report should be amended as follows;

The mansard roof extension follows a traditional profile, set behind the existing parapet line, and does not project materially rearward beyond the established building line. Its scale is consistent with other roof extensions within the Albion Square Conservation Area.

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

NATALIE BROUGHTON
Assistant Director Planning & Building Control