

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE

WEDNESDAY 4 FEBRUARY 2026

Councillors Present:	Cllr Jessica Webb in the Chair
	Cllr Michael Desmond, Cllr Jon Narcross (Vice-Chair), Cllr Ali Sadek, Cllr Ifraax Samatar, Cllr Sheila Suso-Runge, and Cllr Penny Wrout
Apologies:	Cllr Clare Potter
Officers in Attendance:	Nick Bovaird, Major Projects Planner (Development Manager) Robert Brew, Major Team Leader Natalie Broughton, Assistant Director, Planning & Building Control Louise Claeys, Principal Sustainability & Climate Change Officer Edmund Couldrey, Development Surveyor (virtual) Joe Croft, Senior Transport Planner (virtual) Oliver Enticott, Major Projects Planner Luciana Grave, Conservation Urban Design and Sustainability Manager Pippa Gueterbock, Assistant Director of Regeneration and Economic Development Casandra Johnson, Planning Paralegal Peter Kelly, Principal Urban Design Officer Charlie Michael, Tree Preservation Officer Lucy Morrow, Principal Conservation and Design Officer Matt Payne, Deputy Conservation Urban Design and Sustainability Manager Courtney Blackwood-Swaby, Legal Officer Tanveer Rahman, Major Projects Planner Gareth Sykes, Governance Officer John Tsang, Development Management and Enforcement Manager Natalie Williams, Senior Governance Officer
Absent:	Cllr Humaira Garasia and Cllr Ian Sharer

1 Apologies for Absence

1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Potter.

1.2 Councillors Garasia and Sharer were recorded as being absent from the meeting.

2 Declarations of Interest

- 2.1 Councillor Narcross declared an interest regarding agenda items 7 and 8 (the planning applications were in his ward) due to extensive conversations with residents and officers. The Councillor Narcross would recuse himself from the meeting for these agenda items.
- 2.2 All the Planning Sub-Committee members knew fellow Hackney Ward Councillor Ben Lucas, who was speaking in support of the planning applications at agenda items 5 and 6.

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 The Sub-Committee considered and agreed the minutes of their previous meeting held on 14 January 2026.

Decision:

The minutes of the previous meeting, held on 14 January 2026, were agreed as an accurate record of that meeting's proceedings.

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

- 5.1 PROPOSAL:
Demolition of existing garages and external stores and construction of 45 new residential dwellings (Use Class C3) with associated amenity space, cycle parking, refuse stores, hard and soft landscaping, play space, improvements to public realm, and other associated works

POST SUBMISSION REVISIONS:

Design and Access Statement, Rev A (Sergison Bates)
Daylight, Sunlight & Overshadowing Assessment, November 2025 (XCO2)
Energy Statement, November 2025 (XCO2)
Design note - 5679-MOM-XX-XX-DN-S-11042-P01 (Momentum, 19.11.25)
C Bay Study Communal Entrance - NHP2-ARC-BUC-6351-B
C Bay Study Typical Facade - NHP2-ARC-BUC-6350 B
Proposed Elevation East - NHP2-ARC-BUC-6251 B
Proposed Elevation North - NHP2-ARC-BUC-6250 B
Proposed Elevation South - NHP2-ARC-BUC-6252 B
Proposed Elevation West - NHP2-ARC-BUC-6253 B
Proposed Section AA - NHP2-ARC-BUC-6275 A
Proposed Section BB - NHP2-ARC-BUC-6276 A
Proposed Site Sections - NHP2-ARC-BUC-6205 A
Buckland Open Space Diagram

- 5.2 The Planning Case Officer introduced the application, referencing the published addendum and subsequent report amendments (see the published addendum for full details):

- A new objection was received on the day of the meeting;
- Revised Plans (due to a discrepancy in the red line boundary);
- Error in Paragraph 5.4;
- Changes to Condition 35, 36, 38, 39 and 41.

5.3 Mr Oscar Brealey spoke in objection to the application.

5.4 Hackney Ward Councillor Ben Lucas, Sophia Bromfield, the Council's Head of Housing Delivery, Michael Hughes and Mark Tuff from Sergison Bates architects, and Ben Peirson from HTA Design, spoke in support of the application.

5.5 During the course of a discussion a number of points were raised including the following:

- The proposed bedrooms would meet minimum space standards, with overall apartment sizes being marginally larger than required;
- The daylight and sunlight assessment was not considered significant, but the Greater London Authority (GLA) had set alternative, lower VSC targets for urban environments. No VSC levels fell below 15% along Buckland Court. This was considered least acceptable in an urban context;
- Addressing a resident's concerns about Blue Badge parking and estate issues, the Planning Service confirmed the resident had been allocated an on-street blue badge bay and a secure garage (with door widening planned). The proposals included blue badge bays, with the potential for three extra, and one of the current proposed bays could be designated to the resident;
- Concerns raised about mould and drainage on site were not material planning considerations;
- The scheme, along with the Croyley Court scheme, was policy compliant with a 33% split between one, two, and three beds for affordable housing tenure. One -third of all units would be family-sized houses across the two sites;
- The Applicant explained that the overshadowing assessment for Buckland Court used the spring equinox (21 March) as a midpoint, as setting it in winter would be unfairly harsh. The applicant confirmed the scheme received 70% of sunlight exposure for the area with at least 2 hours of sunlight.

Vote:

For: Cllr Michael Desmond, Cllr Jon Narcross (Vice-Chair), Cllr Ali Sadek, Cllr Ifraax Samatar, Cllr Sheila Suso-Runge and Cllr Jessica Webb (Chair).

Against: None.

Abstained: Cllr Penny Wrout.

Resolved:

To grant conditional planning permission subject to completion of a legal agreement.

6 2025/1791: Garages Adjacent To, Croyley Court Cavendish Street, London

6.1 PROPOSAL:

Demolition of existing garage structure and construction of 45 new residential dwellings (Use Class C3) with associated amenity space, cycle parking, refuse stores, hard and soft landscaping, play space, improvements to access and public realm, and other associated work

POST SUBMISSION REVISIONS:

Energy Statement, November 2025 (XCO2)

Daylight, Sunlight & Overshadowing Assessment, November 2025 (XCO2)

Design and Access Statement, Rev. B (Sergison Bates)

Proposed Section AA - NHP2_ARC_CRO_6275 A

Proposed Section BB - NHP2_ARC_CRO_6276 A

Proposed Elevation North - NHP2_ARC_CRO_6250 B

Proposed Elevation East - NHP2_ARC_CRO_6251 B

Proposed Elevation South - NHP2_ARC_CRO_6252 B

Proposed Elevation West - NHP2_ARC_CRO_6253 B

C Bay Study - Typical Facade - NHP2_ARC_CRO_6350 A

C Bay Study - Communal Entrance - NHP2_ARC_CRO_6351 B

Croyley Court Open Space Diagram

6.2 The Planning Case Officer introduced the application, referencing the published addendum and subsequent report amendments (see the published addendum for full details):

- A new objection to the application was received on 4 February 2025;
- Changes to conditions 36, 38, 39, 40 and 42.

6.3 No persons were registered to speak in objection to the application.

6.4 Hackney Ward Councillor Ben Lucas, Sophia Bromfield, the Council's Head of Housing Delivery, Michael Hughes and Mark Tuff from Sergison Bates architects and Ben Peirson from 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 Applicant justified the use of white, rather than Buckland Court's red, brick by citing the different contexts of the estates. The white brick was chosen after a design competition to complement the trees and adjacent buildings;
- The Planning Officer accepted the 35-metre bin storage distance exceeded the recommendation for some units but considered this minor and insufficient to withhold permission. Redesign would be necessary to reduce the distance. The Applicant's representative defended the 34.5-metre distance for one apartment as an acceptable compromise to avoid locating the bin store near the main entrance;
- On Roof Features and Solar Panels, the Planning Officer confirmed that that the proposals would include a Photovoltaic (PV) panels condition;
- The Planning Officer stated they could not provide a construction timeline for the proposals. They clarified that the inclusion of a

condition to cover the impact of the proposals on existing residents' buildings was not a material consideration, though the public realm surrounding the buildings would be improved;

- The Sub-Committee Chair noted the current balcony visuals lacked the lived-in look and suggested integrating architectural screening for privacy, stressing that residents valued privacy and would otherwise use makeshift screens.

Vote:

For: Cllr Michael Desmond, Cllr Jon Narcross (Vice-Chair), Cllr Ali Sadek, Cllr Ifraax Samatar, Cllr Sheila Suso-Runge and Cllr Jessica Webb (Chair).

Against: None.

Abstained: Cllr Penny Wrout.

Resolved:

To grant conditional planning permission subject to completion of a legal agreement.

At the conclusion of agenda item 6 Cllr Narcross recused himself from the Council Chamber for the duration of agenda items 7 and 8.

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

7.1 Proposal:

Demolition of existing garage and construction of a new 6-storey 28 unit (13 x 2-bed & 15 x 3-bed) residential block (C3 use class) with associated amenity space and child playspace, cycle parking, refuse stores, hard and soft landscaping, playspace, public realm works and on-street Blue Badge parking.

POST SUBMISSION REVISIONS:

Minor changes were made to drawings and documents during the application stage. Given the limited scale and nature of these amendments, it was not considered necessary to undertake further consultation.

7.2 The Planning Case Officer started by informing Members that an amended proposed site plan and ground floor plan (changing a plant room door from opening outwards to inwards) had been submitted by the applicant team since the publication of the addendum. The Planning Case Officer introduced the application, referencing the published addendum and subsequent report amendments (see the published addendum for full details):

- Since publication of the Committee Report, a Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing Addendum (Dated 02.02.2026) has been submitted;
- Since publication of the Committee Report, three of the proposed section drawings listed in the report had had minor amendments made to them;
 - NHP1-NO-FC-XX-DR-A-2000 Rev.E;
 - NHP1-NO-FC-XX-DR-A-2002 Rev.E;
 - NHP1-NO-FC-XX-DR-A-2003 Rev.E;
- 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 were now confirmed;

- 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.

- 7.3 No persons were registered to speak in objection to the application.
- 7.4 Jennifer Langton, Hackney Council's Development Manager (Acting), Housing Regeneration and Delivery, Ramsey Yassa, from Nooma Studios, Tomas Keating of XCO2, Robert Nicholas of HTA planning and Jerry Van Veldhuizen, of Haworth Tompkins Architects, spoke in support of the application.
- 7.5 During the course of a discussion on the planning application a number of points were raised including the following;
- The Applicant attributed the lack of balcony privacy to the quiet nature of Appleby Street and anticipated minimal exposure. The Sub-Committee Chair responding by emphasising residents' need for balcony privacy regardless of street activity advising the Applicant to integrate subtle, uniform screening into the design;
 - The project budget, not future occupiers, would cover street scene improvements. Construction for the scheme and the next agenda item (Weymouth Court) were expected to take 18 months;
 - On the potential impact of the proposals on the nearby Haggerston School, the Planning Officer stated that a Construction Management Plan condition was recommended to manage details like delivery vehicles, noise, and dust. Engagement with the school had occurred to negotiate access for food deliveries and waste removal.

Vote:

For	Cllr Michael Desmond, Cllr Ali Sadek, Cllr Sheila Suso-Runge, Cllr Penny Wrout and Cllr Jessica Webb (Chair).
Against	None.
Abstained	None.

Resolved:

To grant planning permission subject to conditions and completion of a Legal Agreement (Unilateral Undertaking).

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

- 8.1 Proposal:
Demolition of 14 existing lock-up garages and a store room; and construction of a new 5-storey 18 unit (14 x 1-bed & 4 x 2-bed) residential block (C3 use class) with associated amenity space, cycle parking, refuse stores, hard and soft landscaping, new external stairs and entrance to a neighbouring block and on-street Blue Badge parking.

POST SUBMISSION REVISIONS:

The following amendments were made during the application stage:

- Living roofs added to external cycle/bin stores to improve Urban Green Factor (UGF). This was at the request of officers.

- Screens added to some ground floor windows for overheating mitigation reasons. This was not at the request of officers.

Given the limited scale and nature of these amendments, it was not considered necessary to undertake further consultation.

8.2 The Planning Case Officer started by informing Members that an updated proposed ground floor plan (with a fire door added to the base of the communal stairs) and a document setting out the need for 1-bed wheelchair homes had been submitted by the applicant team since the publication of the Update report. The Planning Case Officer then introduced the application, referencing the published addendum and subsequent report amendments (see the published addendum for full details):

- Since publication of the Committee Report, a Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing Addendum (Dated 09.01.2026) had been submitted;
- Since publication of the Committee Report, an updated Fire Safety Strategy Report and Fire Statement had been submitted;
- Paragraph 6.2.34 of the Committee Report should read “The proposed housing mix for this application is 46% 2-bed and 54% 23-bed”;
- The Local Supplier Procurement Plan obligation listed in the “Non-financial contributions’ and the ‘Employment, Skills and Construction’ sections of the Committee Report is no longer recommended;
- 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 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.

8.3 No persons were registered to speak in objection to the application.

8.4 Jennifer Langton, Hackney Council’s Development Manager (Acting), Housing Regeneration and Delivery, Fran Balaam of Balaam Murphy (Architect), Tomas Keating of XCO2, Robert Nicholas of HTA planning, Jerry Van Veldhuizen, of Haworth Tompkins Architects and Ingrid Petit from Balaam Murphy, spoke in support of the application.

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

- Some of the Sub-Committee members expressed their support for deck access, as they felt that it was very sociable and helped to build communities
- The Council’s Assistant director for Housing Regeneration explained the site was very constrained, and while the design was adaptable, allocation policy, not the design, dictated who would occupy the site. The scheme’s design was considered high-quality, energy-efficient, and suitable for any resident allocated there;
- The Applicant explained that they had held four formal public consultations which were held. They had seen a lot of the residents, as well as holding one to one visits to a couple of residents that were closest to the new block;

- The design of the balconies, which moved from the courtyard to the street elevation, were a response to residents' concerns about overlooking and loss of privacy.

Vote:

For: Cllr Michael Desmond, Cllr Ali Sadek, Cllr Ifraxx Samatar, Cllr Sheila Suso-Runge, Cllr Jessica Webb (Chair) and Cllr Penny Wrout.

Against: None.

Abstained: None.

Resolved:

To grant planning permission subject to conditions and completion of a Legal Agreement (Unilateral Undertaking).

On the conclusion of agenda item 8, Cllr Jon Narcross returned to the Council Chamber.

9 2024/2201 and 2024/2162: Site bounded by Worship Street, Curtain Road, Scrutton Street and Holywell Row, EC2A

9.1 Proposal:

2024/2201: 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 two storeys of plant) 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 Planning Sub-Committee – 04/02/2026 association with Listed Building Consent 2024/2162). [Description for the purposes of consultation only]. This application is accompanied by an Environmental Impact Assessment.

2024/2162: Listed Building Consent for internal and external works, including the demolition of later rear additions at 91-101 Worship Street to facilitate use as dwelling houses; Internal and external works to 103-105 Worship Street including the demolition of later rear additions, to provide a residential unit at the upper floors of 103 Worship Street and a ground floor commercial unit, and to facilitate the continued commercial and residential use of 105 Worship Street; New hard and soft landscaping, and other associated and ancillary works (in association with Planning Permission 2024/2201)

POST SUBMISSION REVISIONS:

The removal of a cantilevered section of the Verso tower and a top storey of plant. Submission of amended documents to describe the change.

The Assistant Director, Planning and Building Control explained that the proposals were brought to committee due to the site's importance.

- 9.2 The Planning Case Officer introduced the application, referencing the published addendum and subsequent report amendments (see the published addendum for full details):
- The development description would 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.”
 - Four new letters of support and one letter of objection were received;
 - 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.
- 9.3 No persons had registered to speak in objection to the application.
- 9.4 Sarah Bard of Linea Properties Ltd and Jacqui Webster Roberts, of the Shoreditch Trust, spoke in support of the application. Technical consultants and representatives from GIA Surveyors, Good People, Green Lab, Hanover Cube, Hoare Lea, KPF Architects, Linea Properties Ltd, Montagu Evans, and Pinsent Masons were also present to answer questions.
- 9.5 During the discussion on the planning application, a number of points were raised including the following;
- The Applicant had submitted a formal ‘without prejudice’ financial offer to the planning authority to resolve the second reason for refusal; which was concerned with the deemed financial surplus from affordable workspace;
 - The Planning Service was recommending refusal on the grounds of the harmful impact on the conservation area and townscape and an inadequate quantum of affordable workspace;
 - The application before the Sub-Committee was submitted as a full planning application, although the level of detail was similar to an outline scheme. The Sub-committee could not grant outline permission;
 - The site is within the South Shoreditch conservation area;
 - Initial fire safety objections from the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) on gateway one were resolved. The Planning Service had reviewed a late-2025 Applicant response and was satisfied that remaining fire safety details could be addressed post-planning and through building control, removing the immediate fire safety concern;

- The Shoreditch Trust highlighted that the project was co-designed in partnership with them and other community stakeholders;
- On the issue of design and Infrastructure capacity clarification, the Applicant explained that they had discussed with Council Planning Officers suitably worded conditions to address detailed fire safety matters later, providing necessary assurance;
- A representative from KPF Architects explained that the experience of the Verso Tower was primarily street-level, not through axonometrics. They noted, out of the 49 submitted views, the Planning Service had only identified five as having an adverse effect. They added that the building's form was designed to be recessive, and a significant 9.4-meter setback on Curtain Road was incorporated at Heritage England's request to establish the scale of the conservation area;
- The Applicant highlighted that none of the relevant statutory bodies had objected to the proposals regarding water and electricity supply. Additionally, they explained that the Verso building's height was essential as it provided the specific range and type of floor plates appealing to the local office market, ensuring flexibility;
- The Applicant claimed their offer (just over 12%, based on a contested understanding of the wording of Local Plan policy LP29 (Affordable Workspace)) was the maximum viable. To address the Council's perceived shortfall, a commuted sum was offered in addition to physical provision. An independent consultant had found the 6.6% disparity resulted from different policy interpretations regarding calculation basis (uplift versus all space) and measurement (net internal area versus gross).
- The Applicant's workplace consultant described urban rooms as purpose-built, flexible spaces integral to the co-design career pathway, curated by local young people. They offered accessible space for grassroots start-ups unable to afford London show space. The Applicant assured that the urban room's operation would be protected by a steering committee which would set priorities, thus preventing developer control. Any rare profits from for-profit events would be ring-fenced to subsidise other community events;
- A representative for the Applicant corrected a misunderstanding within the submission documents, confirming recognition of a 60% discount. They cited Legal Counsel's opinion warning of potential costs if the Council opposed their definition of new employment floor space. They proposed an aggregate discount position for the Shoreditch innovation centre, offering some operators (e.g., lab, artist space) deeper than 60% discounts;
- The Applicant disputed the Council's viability assessment, claiming an £80 million deficit versus the Council's £350,000 surplus, which they offered as a without prejudice payment. They highlighted that the scheme tripled residential floorspace and more than doubled units (from 38 to 78). The applicant did not clarify what they meant by new units in this context;
- The Planning Case Officer contested the Applicant's viability argument for affordable workspace quantum, citing the lack of any detailed examination of the costs of the proposed scheme. However, the core dispute centered on the definition of gross new employment floorspace; the Council included all provided space, in the manner that has been used by all previous applications since the adoption of the Affordable

Workspace policy, and rejecting the Applicant's deduction of the demolished low-cost workspace;

- The Planning Case Officer clarified that the aggregate discount approach, using some deeper discounts and some areas, was not meeting the 40% target (60% discount). This meant that those less-discounted areas would not qualify as affordable workspace. They added that policy prioritised on-site affordable workspace, suggesting that a payment for off-site provision, which was raised at the meeting, would need to be fully justified to be acceptable, as the site had sufficient space to provide additional Affordable Workspace;
- The Council's Assistant Director of Regeneration and Economic Development clarified that a prior email of support from the Regeneration team for the scheme was 18 months old and based on a pre-application discussion, before the details of the workspace proposals had been submitted;
- Sub-Committee members were concerned about the precedent-setting risk of accepting the Applicant's gross new employment floor space definition. The Planning Case Officer noted that it could reduce affordable workspace in future applications and those that had already been approved but not yet constructed:
- The Applicant stated that planning policy allowed flexibility in land use balance and housing targets, noting the adopted site allocation envisions an office/commercial-led mixed-use scheme. They added that the 400-unit housing figure was an 'up to' limit and they stated that the current scheme aligns with adopted land use policies, giving limited weight to emerging or adopted site allocations;
- The Planning Service stated that under the proposals the net internal area of affordable workspace provided was 2,869 square metres, noting the underprovision against the policy target was about 1,442 square metres. It was also noted by officers that the deeper affordable workspace discounts could be prioritised over floorspace quantum if the design of a scheme suggested this would be beneficial in a particular circumstance, although that was not what was being proposed by the applicants in this instance;
- The Planning Case Officer noted that the public benefits were usually delivered upfront, and were scheduled for the final phases of this proposal. It had been understood that the Applicant had not linked the occupancy of the Verso building to public benefit delivery or agreed to cap commercial occupancy at 85%, including affordable workspace.;
- Sub-Committee members questioned why the heritage restoration of listed buildings was relegated to the final phase. The Applicant replied that they were taking a phased approach based on the scheme's size and shared infrastructure. They added that they were committed to limiting commercial occupation to 85% until the Web Terrace restoration was finished;
- The Planning Case Officer noted that Historic England had stood by their initial comments recommending refusal or withdrawal if the public benefits do not outweigh the harm. Historic England's comments had not been formally withdrawn or changed. A representative for the Applicant responded by stating that Historic England had formally withdrawn their objection. The Planning Officer pointed out that it is not within Historic England's gift to 'object', they can only note that the harm they identify must be adequately balanced against the public benefits of the scheme;

- One of the Sub-Committee members raised concerns about the project's viability, citing the £80 million deficit claim and the late phasing of the heritage element, suggesting it would likely fall away if viability issues arose. A representative for the Applicant offered to frontload the restoration of the entire Web Terrace in Phase One;
- The Planning Service advised that current legislation required a weighing up of heritage harm against public benefits. However, approving a tall building without townscape justification, even with public benefits, risks setting a precedent in the conservation area. Council design and conservation officers considered the harm significant noting the building did not comply with tall building policy;
- The Planning Service noted that the proposals would severely damage the historic scale and character of the Shoreditch conservation area, appearing overbearing and incongruous. Extensive demolition of the urban block for larger, taller buildings would fundamentally alter the townscape, overshadowing and absorbing retained historic structures, even if the individual buildings demolished were unremarkable.;
- The Council's legal officer reminded Sub-Committee members of the Council's statutory duty under sections 66 and 72 of the Listed Buildings Act and the national planning policy framework to accord great weight to harm to the significance of designated heritage assets when balancing it against public benefit;
- The Planning Case Officer was concerned that the application did not meet the 10% policy request for affordable workspace, offering only 6.6%, and also falls short on affordable housing targets, failing to meet the 50% policy target and providing fewer residential units and a less diverse housing mix than expected;
- An Applicant representative argued that they were providing 12% affordable workspace based on the uplift of new floor space and they had a legal opinion supporting this interpretation of the policy;
- The Planning Case Officer stated that the Applicant's interpretation of the policy was based on gross new floor space, and their interpretation would lead to a significant loss of affordable workspace compared to existing provisions;
- The Planning Case Officer noted that the sheer volume of the massing, and the detailed design of the scheme had weakened and minimised many of the public benefits;
- The Applicant's Heritage consultant stated the development would enhance the severely bomb-damaged, unique edge-of-city site. They maintained the plans would not set a precedent due to the site's unique conditions;
- The Sub-Committee Chair highlighted that during the meeting members had heard from the Applicant new offers that had not been included in the published application report or agreed by Planning Officers;
- Sub-Committee members noted if the officer's recommendation of refusal was not carried the application would be deferred for an alternative recommendation and the submission of further documents.

Vote:

- For: Cllr Jon Narcross (Vice-Chair) and Cllr Jessica Webb (Chair).
Against: Cllr Michael Desmond, Cllr Ali Sadek, Cllr Ifraax Samatar, Cllr Sheila Suso-Runge and Cllr Penny Wrout.
Abstained: None.

Decision:

The Planning Sub-Committee voted on the officer's recommendation; the vote was two in favour of the recommendation and five against the recommendation. Consequently, the officer's recommendation was not carried, and the item was deferred.

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

10.1 Proposal:

Relocation of existing retail container units to the edges of the existing car park on the northern part of square, with hard and soft landscaping to facilitate the change of use from a car park (Sui Generis Use Class) to a multi-use play and retail space (Sui Generis) as an extension to the square.

POST SUBMISSION REVISIONS: None.

10.2 The Planning Case Officer introduced the application, referencing the published addendum and subsequent report amendments (see the published addendum for full details):

- Three new letters of support had been received;
- The soft landscaping of the scheme was subject to a recommended condition.

10.3 No persons were registered to speak in objection to the application.

10.4 Mr Peter Dudridge spoke in support of the application.

Vote:

For Cllr Michael Desmond, Cllr Jon Narcross (Vice-Chair), Cllr Ali Sadek, Cllr Ifraax Samatar, Cllr Sheila Suso-Runge, Cllr Jessica Webb (Chair) and Cllr Penny Wrout.

Against None.

Abstained None.

Resolved:

To grant planning permission, subject to conditions.

11 Delegated Decisions

11.1 The Planning Sub-Committee noted the delegated decisions document.

Resolved:

To note the delegated decisions document for the 5 January 2026 to 22 January 2026 period.

12 Any Other Business the Chair Considers to be Urgent

12.1 The Planning Sub-Committee noted that their next meeting was on 26 February.

Duration of the meeting: 6.30pm - 11.40pm

Chair of the Planning Sub-Committee meeting, Councillor Jessica Webb.

DRAFT