

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE

THURSDAY 26 FEBRUARY 2026

Councillors Present:	Cllr Jessica Webb in the Chair
	Cllr Michael Desmond, Cllr Ali Sadek and Cllr Penny Wrout.
Apologies:	Cllr Clare Potter, Cllr Ifraax Samatar and Cllr Sheila Suso-Runge.
Officers in Attendance:	Robert Brew, Major Team Leader Natalie Broughton, Assistant Director - Planning & Building Control Graham Callam, Growth Team Manager Andrada Calin, Senior Urban Design Officer Adele Castle, Major Team Leader (virtual) David Daines, Urban Design Officer Micheal Garvey, Planning Officer Alix Hauser, Major Projects Planner Cassandra Johnson, Planning Paralegal Peter Kelly, Principal Urban Designer Matt Payne, Deputy CUDS Manager Qasim Shafi, Principal Transportation Planner (virtual) Courtnei Blackwood-Swaby, Legal Officer Gareth Sykes, Governance Officer John Tsang, Development Management and Enforcement Manager
Absent:	Cllr Humaira Garasia, Cllr Jon Narcross (Vice-Chair) and Cllr Ian Sharer.

1 Apologies for Absence

- 1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Potter, Samatar and Suso-Runge.
- 1.2 Councillors Garasia, Narcross and Sharer were recorded as absent from the meeting.

2 Declarations of Interest

- 2.1 As a matter of public record all the Committee members knew one of the speakers, speaking in objection to agenda item 5, who was Cllr Gilbert Smyth, a fellow Councillor.
- 2.2 Councillor Wrout declared an interest: agenda item 7 was in her ward. She would be speaking in objection to the application on behalf of local residents.

3 To consider any proposal/questions referred to the sub-committee by the Council's Monitoring Officer

3.1 None.

4 Minutes of the Previous Meeting

4.1 There were no minutes for consideration at the meeting.

5 2022/1468: Land to the Rear of 1-19 Victorian Grove, London, N16 8EN

5.1 PROPOSAL: Demolition of the existing buildings and erection of a part single, part 2, part 3 and part 4 storey building containing 35 residential units (Use Class C3); associated cycle parking, waste/recycling storage, landscaping and other ancillary works.

POST SUBMISSION REVISIONS: The scheme was revised to remove commercial element of the scheme. A complete set of revised drawings, updated reports, as well as a revised application form, were received. A full period of reconsultation followed. A revised Flood Risk Assessment and addendum were provided. Due to the minor nature of these changes further consultation was not required.

5.2 The Planning Case Officer introduced the application during which they referred to the addendum and the following corrections to the published report (for full details see the published addendum):

- Additional documents were submitted:

Flood Risk Assessment Addendum Rev 2 prepared by Cole Easdon dated February 2026.

- Paragraph 4.5 was amended;
- Additional neighbour comments received;
- Paragraph 4.18 was amended;
- Paragraph 4.19 was added;
- Additional submissions received in relation to drainage;
- Paragraph 6.7.7 was amended;
- Paragraph 6.7.9 was amended;
- Paragraph 6.7.10 was amended;
- Paragraph 6.1.11 was amended;
- Paragraph 6.9.12 was amended;
- The following conditions were revised; 9.1.15 Land & Finished Floor Levels, 9.1.28 DHN future connection readiness (Pre-commencement), 9.1.31 Mechanical Ventilation and Heat Recovery (Pre-commencement), 9.1.32 Ventilation System (Pre-occupation);
- Additional conditions were included; Urban Greening Factor (UGF) and Sustainable Drainage System Post-Completion;
- Paragraph 9.2 was amended.

- 5.3 Hackney Councillor Gilbert Smyth and local residents Anna Tinn and Charles Howarth spoke in objection to the application.
- 5.4 Aaron Henecke, an Associate Director at Hybrid, spoke in support of the application.
- 5.5 During a discussion a number of points were raised including the following:
- The site was outside priority industrial or office areas, where commercial or industrial floor space retention was usually sought. There was a significant amount of usable industrial floor space already on site;
 - The initial application had included two commercial units. However, discussions had determined that omitting commercial floorspace allowed the applicant to significantly improve the affordable housing offer. This was deemed a benefit;
 - The Council's land contamination officer had reviewed the proposals and had recommended a condition to protect the amenity of neighbouring occupiers during construction works;
 - Asbestos clearance was handled under separate legislation, outside of the planning remit. However, other legislation required the applicant to ensure the safety and amenity of neighbours during its removal;
 - The Planning Officer confirmed they had conducted site visits to the surrounding areas and properties to assess the impact on amenity. Based on their site assessment and the submitted Daylight Sunlight report, they considered the impacts acceptable;
 - The proposed single-storey boundary wall matches the existing height; the height of the building slopes up from the wall and increases in height. At its closest point, the building separated from the rear windows of properties on Ormsby Place by at least 13 metres;
 - The Council did not require specific separation distances in tight urban settings like the proposals before the Sub-Committee, where assessment is made on a case by case basis;
 - There was no policy requirement to provide four bedroom units within the area under consideration;
 - A 20% provision of on-site affordable three-bedroom (family size) units was deemed acceptable.
 - The Planning Service acknowledged some impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers but judged it not to be unacceptable;
 - The Council's Urban Design Officer explained that the Council had assessed the separation distances of approximately 18 metres from the listed properties to the south of the site and it was considered to be an appropriate distance;
 - During negotiations some amendments were made to the massing, including the pushing back of the upper storeys;
 - The application would use a simple palette of high quality brick;
 - The proposed balustrades and the architecture were deemed appropriate for the area;
 - Images presented at the meeting showed a finger formation, designed to break up the massing and limit the visual impact on the listed buildings. The articulation and texture would prevent the

proposals from appearing as a single, flat, large mass on the boundary;

- The Planning Officer stated the proposals would be barely visible from road level on Dynevor Road and Victorian Grove;
- The height was reduced between buildings to limit impact and avoid four-storey views, replacing them with smaller, two-storey elements when viewed from Victorian Grove;
- The four-storey bulk would be set back from the boundary, not on it. At the garden fence level on Ormsby Place, it would be single-storey, sloped, and then set back. Though appearing larger than the current single-storey structure, the massing was designed away from the boundary;
- The objectors maintained their opinion that the massing would be visually impactful. The objectors also raised concerns about the measurements used for the daylight/sunlight report. They felt there was potential to reduce the floor to ceiling heights to be the building standard minimums rather than above those might help reduce the massing slightly;
- The Applicant confirmed they had met with local residents in June 2022 and following that meeting they went about a process of gathering additional information. Due to access issues, the Applicant went back and got additional topographical survey data;
- The Applicant acknowledged some impacts to Ormsby Place. However, those impacts were deemed acceptable.

Vote

For: Cllr Jessica Webb (Chair) and Cllr Michael Desmond.

Against: Cllr Ali Sadek and Cllr Penny Wrount.

Abstained: None.

Where an equal number of votes was cast for and against a recommendation, the Chair has a casting vote. The Chair voted for the officer's recommendation as set out in the published application report.

Resolved:

To grant conditional planning permission subject to completion of a Legal Agreement.

6 2020/3309 Thaxted Court, Murray Grove, London, N1 7QQ

6.1 PROPOSAL: Demolition of existing carpark and storage buildings and erection of three buildings of six storeys each to provide 70 residential units (Use Class C3) and ground floor flexible spaces (Use Class E); infilling of basement carpark to street level around Thaxted Court; alterations at ground floor to Thaxted Court; alterations to boundary treatment of Halstead Court; erection of single storey storage shed; and associated car parking, landscaping and public realm works.

POST SUBMISSION REVISIONS: The scheme was revised to reduce the height of the building and reduce the number of dwellings provided. A complete set of revised drawings and reports, as well as a revised application form, were received. A full period of reconsultation followed. Following reconsultation plans were updated to include an additional blue badge space and further information

in regard to drainage and sustainability. Due to the minor nature of these changes further consultation was not required.

- 6.2 The Planning Case Officer introduced the application during which reference was made to the addendum and the following corrections to the report (for full details see the published addendum):

Additional documentation was submitted including the following:

- Acoustic Technical Note Rev 0 prepared by RBA Acoustics dated 10/02/26
- Plant Noise Assessment Rev 0 prepared by RBA Acoustics dated 17/02/26
- Additional plant noise reports

Additional comments were received from Transport for London (TfL).

The Plant Noise Assessment and Acoustic Technical Note had been reviewed.

Paragraph 6.16.7 was amended.

- 6.3 Jennifer Withers spoke in objection to the application.
- 6.4 Sharmin Ahmed, Hackney Council Development Manager, Luke McDonald, Architect at Lynch Architects, Nour Sinno and Ben Peirson, Planners at HTA Design spoke in support of the application.
- 6.5 During the course of a discussion a number of points were raised including the following;
- The scheme had been amended to reduce the height and the number of the proposed dwellings. Additionally there were landscape improvements and a reduction in the number of car parking spaces;
 - In between Halstead Court and the South block, the resident lockers that had been taken out of Thaxted Court would be reprovided;
 - Eleven of the twenty-one residents' lockers were to be removed in order to create a safe, secure fire-rated refuse and recycling store. Seven are proposed to be replaced at ground-floor of Thaxted Court, leaving a shortfall of 4;
 - Standalone lockers are also proposed on the south side of the south building, in addition to the seven being reprovided. The total provision exceeds the lockers being lost by seven. The Applicant suggested the standalone lockers could be delivered sooner than the Thaxted Court works, easing construction-phase problems;
 - Under the proposals 15 car park spaces were to be retained with the loss of 14 spaces. A recent car parking survey had determined the lost spaces could be accommodated by the surrounding streets;
 - The reduction of two storeys had led to a slight shift in the west building's facade. The revised proposals also included improved landscaping, boosting the urban greening factor, and delivering 70 homes;
 - The Planning Officer explained the revised scheme halved the number of three-bed units from 10 (of the 73 overall) to 5 (of the 70 overall). Members noted the proposals must be viewed within the context of the wider Council scheme; Sub-Committee members raised concerns about

the Regeneration team's communication with local residents, hoping for clearer messaging in the future..

Vote

For: Cllr Michael Desmond, Cllr Ali Sadek, Cllr Jessica Webb (Chair) and Cllr Penny Wrout.

Against: None.

Abstained: None.

Resolved:

To grant conditional planning permission subject to completion of a Legal Agreement

Councillor Wrout was relocated in the Council Chamber speaking in objection to the application for the next agenda item, in her capacity as a Councillor for the Victoria ward.

7 2025/1836: 1&3 Albert Close, Hackney, London, E9 7EX

7.1 PROPOSAL: Construction of additional storey to Nos. 1 & 3 Albert Close and replacement of existing windows to No.3 Albert Close.

POST SUBMISSION REVISIONS: Building Research Establishment (BRE) Report.

7.2 The Planning Case Officer introduced the application during which reference was made to the addendum and the following corrections to the report (for full details see the published addendum):

Amended note to members: This application is presented to the Planning Sub-Committee ~~as it constitutes a Council's own change of use planning application.~~ due to the level of objections received.

Paragraphs 3.5.1, 6.1.3 and 6.1.5 were to be amended.

7.3 Councillor Penny Wrout, Clare and Joe Havill, and Rolf Dekker spoke in objection to the application.

7.4 Toby Neilson and Alex Keogh spoke in support of the application.

7.5 During the course of a discussion a number of points were raised including the following;

- The Building Research Establishment (BRE) did not require assessment for spaces such as communal gardens. Its focus was on large or back gardens, however the applicant had conducted an assessment for reassurance, which had shown a 67% impact. This was a slight reduction, with less than a 1% difference between the existing and proposed conditions;
- The Planning Officer reaffirmed that under BRE guidance only rear gardens, not front gardens, were assessed, and those at the rear of flats on Victoria Park Road met the BRE requirement. The Officer also noted the applicant had voluntarily provided the BRE information.

Vote

For: Cllr Michael Desmond, Cllr Ali Sadek and Cllr Jessica Webb (Chair).

Against: None.

Abstained: None.

Resolved:

To grant planning permission subject to conditions

8 Delegated decisions

8.1 The Sub-Committee noted the delegated decisions document for 23 January 2026 to 15 February 2026.

Resolved:

To note the delegated decisions document for the period 23 January 2026 to 15 February 2026.

9 Any Other Business the Chair Considers to be Urgent

9.1 The Sub-Committee's next meeting was on the 11th of March.

Duration of the meeting: 6.30pm - 9.13pm

Next meeting: 11 March

Chair of the Planning Sub-Committee Councillor Jessica Webb.