

# **WOODBERRY DOWN COMMUNITY ORGANISATION**

## **Pre-Board Meeting**

Thursday 15<sup>th</sup> February 2024

6:30 pm Redmond Community Centre

## **Phase 4 Planning Application**

### **Attendance**

Andrea Anderson, Geoff Bell, Phil Cooke, Adrian Essex, Oonagh Gormley, Jackie Myers, Tina Parrott, William Sheehy, Leonora Williams, Dulce Laluces, Mina Faragalla, Jacquie Knowles, Barbara Panuzzo, Donna Fakes, Elaine Gosnell, Omar Villalba, Hilary Britton

### **Guests Included**

Roda Hassan, Simon Slater and Emre Ozturk

### **Phase 4 planning application**

- 1.1** The Chair welcomed everyone and outlined the purpose of the meeting. She explained that the Board has received two motions which they would discuss this evening. After the discussion, the meeting will proceed to the next agenda item. The Board will reconvene after the presentation to vote on the motions.
- 1.2** Adrian questioned why they were discussing the matter at all and whether they should feel obligated to reach a resolution regarding the phase 4 planning applications. The Chair explained that there are two motions on the table, thus necessitating discussion and consideration of both resolutions. The Board will then proceed to vote on these resolutions. But ultimately it was up to the Board, what or if they wished to send in the way of comments to the Phase 4 planning application.
- 1.3** There was further discussion about the process. It was highlighted that there were only 13 Board members present, with some Board members questioning the validity of the vote and whether this would be a fair representation. However, the Chair explained that the vote would proceed with those present at the time as long as there is a quorum.
- 1.4** Geoff emphasised the importance of discussing and reaching a resolution. Adrian recognised this but expressed a desire for the vote to be unanimous,

but it was clarified that according to the constitution, a majority vote of the present board members is required for the motion to pass.

- 1.5** Questions arose regarding the possibility of abstaining from voting, and it was confirmed that anyone who wishes to may abstain from voting. A board member raised concerns that this meeting may not be fully representative of the board due to some members being absent. However, Geoff countered by citing the example of the Happy Man Tree incident, where the majority view of WDCO was prioritized over individual opinions. He emphasised that decisions are ultimately determined by the majority. In response, the board member questioned the validity of a vote outcome if it were to result in a narrow margin, such as 7-6. They argued that such a vote might not accurately reflect the views of WDCO.
- 1.6** Adrian felt that the constitution doesn't represent the current board's concern regarding working towards a consensus on most issues and hence delayed its effectiveness by slowing things down. Other Members responded by bringing up the fact that there's a constitutional working group, and any members who aren't happy with the constitutional rules can bring this up and change them. This has happened in the past.
- 1.7** Adrian also highlighted that the resolutions didn't cover all of the items brought up and previously discussed by the Board and the Executive. He noted that that the entire Executive team hasn't agreed on the motions. The ITLA highlighted that under standing orders, Board members could bring motions to the Board and that the Executive Committee hadn't agreed the resolution that they had discussed, hence the two motions on the table for discussion.
- 1.8** The Chair opened the floor for discussion on the first motion which was presented by Adrian and seconded by Hilary. Then second motion presented by Geoff and seconded by Jackie was also debated, and there was discussion with individual Board members supporting and opposing the motions.
- 1.9** Most members of the Board expressed different concerns about different aspects of the design of phase 4, from the mix of homes, the tenure placement with the phase, the impact that the podium and servicing of the phase from Woodberry Down road would have on service charge and the provision of car parking.
- 1.10** A wider concern was expressed about the number of "lost social rented homes" that might occur upon completion of the masterplan. It was felt that around 200 original social rent homes might not be reprovided, despite the overall increase in homes on the estate from around 2000 to 5,500.
- 1.11** Simon noted that the regeneration team within the council were looking to clarify the number of social rent homes that were originally due to be reprovided. He noted that around 30% of the original 1980 homes were leaseholder homes, and suggested that the Board raise this point when discussing the Hackney update.

The discussion of the two phase 4 resolutions ended at 7:15pm when the normal Board started, with further discussion to be held after the partners had withdrawn later in the evening.