

WOODBERRY DOWN COMMUNITY ORGANISATION

Board Meeting Minutes

Thursday 16th March 2023

7.15 pm Redmond Centre

Attendance

William Sheehy, Jackie Myers, Jacquie Knowles, Ngozi Obanye, Euphemia Chukwu, Leonora William, Hillary Britton, Geoff Bell, Oonagh Gormley, Phil Cooke, Andrea Anderson, Elaine Gosnell, Barbara Panuzzo

Guests Included

Tom Anthony, Jaime Powell, Cllr Sarah Young, Jane Havemann, Samehra Arif, Anthony Green, PC Zaka Ullah, Roda Hassan, Martin Kiefer, David Mackay

Section 0 - Introduction

Apologies for absence were received from: Kalu Amogu, Adrian Essex, Eleanor Andressen, Omar Villalba, Mina Faragalla, Phillip Dundas

0.1 Minutes and Matters Arising

0.1.2 Berkeley is currently not in a position to issue the report to Hackney on the windows in Residence Tower.

0.1.3 Colin Bright updated that they are currently working and concentrating on the split household for Phase 4 and are looking to make offers shortly. Cllr Sarah Young noted that there were residents in Phase 1 who were moved to later Phases and double decanted. She asked if those individual households would be treated as if they were in the later Phase or would be given a priority. Colin Bright noted that they would need to review this on a case by case basis.

0.1.4 A programme of meetings for the DHN commencing in April are to be agreed.

ACTION: Jane Havemann will chase this with Nicola Hudson to get dates in the diary for the DHN meetings.

0.1.5 A verbal update was provided at the February Board on damp and mould; a written update was subsequently circulated on the 6th March by the ITLA.

0.1.6 NHG will be providing the report of the outcome of their investigation on the WGN sewage at the May Board.

0.1.7 The Chair welcomed PC Zaka Ullah and asked if there were any questions for the Police. The Board members asked what the plans are for resolving the issues of anti-social behaviour at Rowan Apartments, such as vandalism and drug-related anti-social behaviour. PC Zaka noted that they have issued additional patrols which are currently taking place in regards to these issues and are working with residents, who are happy to engage, by asking about the specific time frames this behaviour occurs. The majority of issues appear to be centred around the car park areas and the police have been given fobs to access all the blocks, including the car parks.

0.1.8 Cllr Sarah Young highlighted there were discussions about the police getting access to CCTV. However, PC Zaka noted there has been a recent escalation of ASB in one of the blocks in NHG when the police discovered that CCTV had broken down and was no longer working.

0.1.9 Cllr Sarah Young noted that they have been in correspondence with the police regarding cases of ASB near Bernwood House and asked for an update on this issue. PC Zaka reported that the police are currently in the process of engaging with residents at a separate address to identify the individuals involved and will provide an update on the engagement plan. Euphemia also asked if the police could increase patrol at Green Lanes, as the gate there is broken and there appears to be more anti-social behaviour. The Board also requested whether the police can coordinate their CAT meetings prior to the Board meeting.

ACTION: Samehra Arif will ensure an update and estimated completion time is provided for the Rowan Apartments gate.

ACTION: Roda will email PC Zaka the dates of the Board.

ACTION: Roda will circulate details for the upcoming CAP meeting.

1. Presentation on Masterplan Process

1.1 The Chair welcomed Martin Kiefer and David Mackay from LDS, who had been invited at the request of the Design Committee. Martin highlighted that the presentation gave a background on what the masterplan process is and what is contained within an outline planning application. He noted that they were not preparing a completely new masterplan, but instead working within a context that Woodberry Down has had two masterplans already. They would be adhering to the broad principles that have already been established. However, there was a need to refresh the masterplan. This was primarily due to changes in planning and environmental regulation policies, namely fire safety and Carbon Net Zero, but also

changing residential design quality standards and external impacts such as Brexit and Covid.

1.2 Martin explained that the outline planning application will not contain all of the detailed design for each phase. Instead, it sets the broad parameters that a detailed design and planning application will work within, such as the heights and massing of buildings and positions of roads and outdoor spaces. The outline application will ensure there is clarity on what is coming forward in a broad sense, and will set the board principles each phase will be designed to achieve.

1.3 Martin outlined what is being approved as part of the masterplan.

- The principle of development in which certain buildings will be demolished to be replaced with new housing and facilities.
- The maximum and minimum number of apartments and other uses coming forward. Martin highlighted the importance of having the maximum and minimum figures, as this will allow them to analyse the maximum number from an environmental impact but also allows for flexibility.
- Broad location of building and spaces.
- Maximum and minimum building sizes and open space.
- A strategy for the future architectural approach to buildings. This will provide general guidance to know the kind of architecture and place that will be developed as part of the application.
- Options for how the landscape could come forward.

1.4 When an outline application is being prepared, there are two types of documents that are submitted. A number of documents will be submitted for approval, which is referred to as 'the Primary Control Documents'. Others will provide background, illustrative and supporting information, referred to as the 'the Secondary Control Documents', to help the London Borough of Hackney to reach their decision as to whether to grant permission for the application being made.

1.5 The primary document lists what the development must do and sets out the legal criteria of what the masterplan will deliver, such as the red line boundary plan, development schedule, parameter plans and design principles document.

1.6 The secondary document is only for guidance, focusing on the impacts of the masterplan, and are not legal documents. Some examples of the secondary document are the illustrative masterplan, planning statement and design and access statement.

1.7 Martin and David shared the parameter plans for Phase 7 of the 2014 masterplan to demonstrate. These showed the area included in the application, the area of demolition, the proposed uses, the open space and urban structures, the maximum development height, minimum development height and proposed plot extents. The

plans highlighted a series of coloured lines which showed different aspects of the development, outlined below:

- The Application Plan showed what area is included in the application, which is highlighted by the red line boundary.
- The Demolition Plan highlights the areas to be demolished.
- The Proposed Uses were highlighted by the blue lines and orange lines. The blue lines indicated where residential uses could be located. The orange lines indicated where non-residential uses could be located, i.e. the areas where non-residential frontage can be provided at ground/first floor level.
- The open spaces and urban structure provided the location of open space, streets, street car parking, and pedestrian access. The yellow lines indicate the location of public and open space. The green indicates the street through open space. The reference to public open space was picked up in the design reference document.
- The Minimum Development Heights highlights that there is a minimum height for buildings in the blue zone.
- The Maximum Development Heights highlights that there is a maximum height for buildings in the blue zone.
- The Proposed Plot Extents shows how the frontage of the building should sit between the purple and blue space.

1.8 Kristina noted that there is a margin between the smallest footprint and the largest and asked what determines how much margin is needed and when this gets settled. David clarified that, as the building form or mass for future phases hasn't been determined, this will be determined at the Reserved Matters application for each Phase, which allows for some flexibility for the designers to test. Kristina also asked what makes the masterplan a success. David explained that there are a series of design principles as to what the masterplan should be delivering: this would be a way to test the success of the masterplan.

1.9 Martin and David also shared the illustrative masterplan from Phase 7 of the 2014 masterplan. The illustrative plan is not submitted for approval, but shows one way in which a development of the type and scale proposed might fit within the Specified Parameters for the outline components, for which Planning Permission is being sought. It is used to help communicate & test the parameter plans. The National Model Design Code provides guidance on how to approach this. It contains 8 key design principles that should be explored within the design codes: movement, nature, public space, built form, identity, homes and buildings, use and resources. The Design Code sets out in more detail the list of future development, what the design should adhere to and the criteria that planning officers adhere to which are broken down into categories:

- Vision - what they are trying to achieve.
- Guidance - things to consider when looking at the detail of buildings.
- Instruction - things that the future plans must consider, such as the pavement width.

1.10 Geoff felt this was a rather restrictive definition of what a masterplan should be. He noted that the 2021 London Plan was not mentioned which set out strong recommendations of what a regeneration should aim to achieve, such as that 50% of homes should be affordable homes, as well as how it should consider tackling poverty. The presentation also did not take on board the type of community infrastructure the delivery partners want to build. Geoff asked if the London Plan recommendations and the infrastructure will be discussed as part of the masterplan. Martin clarified that the purpose of this presentation was more about understanding the process and what one can expect to see in terms of the documentation for the outline application. Jaime noted that the London Plan is something they will need to consider, however, the purpose of the presentation was to help everyone understand what a masterplan is and what is required in terms of planning.

1.11 Geoff felt that there appears to be a difference in the definition of masterplan and this is a limited aspect of what a masterplan should be. The masterplan should address how communities are going to be built, as well as how to tackle poverty and inequality; this should be part of the process. Jaime clarified that what was presented was the planning process and the documents required for a successful planning application. However, what Geoff highlighted are other documents and discussions that the Design Committee will need to have. Jane agreed that this is perhaps a technical view of what a masterplan is, however, she acknowledged the placemaking aspects of the masterplan is something they will need to consider as delivery partners.

2. General questions for partner updates;

2.1 Geoff explained that the WDCO reps for the Design Committee met on Thursday 16 March; they considered the ways in which the Design Committee process is working and how the Design Committee documents should be handled. Geoff highlighted that the terms of reference of the Design Committee document state that documents should be sent 5 days in advance. However, the Partnership Agreement, which he contends is the superior document, outlines the requirement that the Design Committee papers should be sent 7 days in advance. Geoff expressed concerns that discussing matters of great importance such as the vision and principles of the masterplan only 5 days in advance is too restrictive and suggested that it would be easier for WDCO members to contribute to the discussion if they adhered to 7 days. He noted that providing more time will help improve discussion at the Design Committee.

2.2 Tom Anthony clarified that whilst the masterplan engagement programme shows a longer period between Design Committee meetings, there will still continue to be standalone Design Committees for other matters in the interim - Phase 3 and 4, as well as estate-wide matters such as the Cultural Strategy and Ground Floor Strategy. Therefore, the design team will still need as long as possible to pull together these packs, to make sure it has the most up to date information and can be as informative as possible. Geoff asked why Berkeley cannot put back the meetings and provide a longer time between meetings. Jaime explained that this would elongate the process and would delay the delivery of homes. She suggested that they will try and see if they can provide the documents any earlier.

2.3 Kristina asked for an update on Block D so that the Board has a better stance on the process.

ACTION: Roda and Jane will contact Hermione regarding updating the Board members on Block D.

2.4 Hilary asked if there is a clause in the lease agreement that Block D would need to be in operation by a particular date. Jane clarified that there is an intention for it to be in operation later this year but she will check if this is stipulated in the lease.

ACTION: Jane will check what the lease stipulates in terms of when Block D should be in operation by.

2.5 The Board members asked what support Hackney Council is providing to temporary tenants and those renting in the private sector. Jane explained that Hackney Council has provided details of housing support that private sector residents can contact. They have also written to temporary tenants, advising them of the next steps and that there are dedicated officers that are dealing with their cases.

2.6 Elaine asked for assurance that those in later Phases are being addressed in tandem with Phase 4. Colin clarified that they are focusing on Phase 4, as this impacts on the allocations to the new build units. However, he noted that Hackney had a meeting on March 16th in regards to the lack of progress and will be able to provide an update soon. Jane also noted that the Council is due to review the LLP in spring as it has been a year since it was changed by the Cabinet.

3. Board discussion without partners

3.1 Roda reported that 3 Board members have resigned from the Board. There was a suggestion to hold bi-elections from May-June and use the King's Coronation that the partners and WDCO are organising as an opportunity to campaign and provide information to residents. Roda suggested starting the campaigning process in May and holding the bi-elections in June.

3.2 The Board members mentioned thinking about the quantity of members, the number of housing and how many people would join the Board in regards to managing the Board, to consider what is an efficient and effective representation for the community. Roda informed the Board that there should be 24 Board members and 6 members to co-opt. Based on the number of units in existing blocks, there is one Board member for 128 properties, which are divided into constituencies based on the proximity of the blocks. The Board also suggested allowing online voting for the bi-elections for residents who are unable to vote in person.

ACTION: Roda will provide the Board with all of the constituencies that have vacant positions so that Board members can think about how to approach bi-elections.

3.3 The Board is in agreement to hold bi-elections. They have also agreed to review the number of Board members for each constituency next year before the elections.

3.4 Public Forum: Roda reported that there was a motion passed in December 2021 in which there was a commitment from the Board to hold a public/community forum in regards to the masterplan. The Executives came up with sets of questions regarding the objectives of the community forum, to understand what WDCO wanted to achieve from the forum, how they intend to use the information, how the forum would be advertised, managing people's expectations and what areas they wanted community input.

3.5 Roda also noted that a suggestion made by Adrien at the January Board was to have a number of Board members or Comm's subgroup (assigned to look at the website) to consider the logistics of the meeting. They could come back to the Board on factors such as the venue or having people on the panel. There were concerns from the Board members that the Board does not have the capacity to organise a community forum. Board members also highlighted that it might be confusing for the community when there will be a number of public consultations held.

The Board members also highlighted that WDCO should consider ways to make the Board meetings relevant for new residents, particularly by making the meetings more organised.

3.6 Away Day Report: Roda reported that the Away Day report outlines the action plans for the three priorities for the year. There are a number of actions for the WDCO Executives who wanted to discuss this with the Board and get their feedback. The Executives are due to meet on Tuesday 21st March to review existing meetings, purpose, correct outputs and how block-level meetings can be more effective and efficient. They have invited Board members to attend the meeting to provide their views and feedback.

ACTION: Roda will send an invite to all Board members to Tuesday's Executive Committee meeting.