

## WDCO Board Member Phase 4 Comments

There have been 6 comments on phase 4. Some of these have commented and added to the original observations made to the Pre planning sub committee. One endorsed it entirely, others disagreed with different elements.

I summarise below under headings the different views expressed. You will see that there are diametrically different views on just about every aspect of the design. I have separated out podium, car parking and communal private garden for clarity, but have them following each other as they are linked.

The original comments of 4 Board members are attached to this summary.

Issue	Comments
Service Charge	<p>2 Board members object on the grounds that the podium and way of servicing the shared ownership via a concierge will make the service charge unaffordable.</p> <p>2 further board members highlighted that SO homes aren't affordable and 1 that they don't meet Hackney definition.</p>
Tenure Issues	<p>2 board members questioned the viability of asking for higher percentage of social rented accommodation, one Board member suggested that the social rented space standards should be reduced to enable higher number of homes.</p> <p>1 Board member suggested that private homes didn't require redesign to take into account needs of private rented sector.</p> <p>1 Board member questioned why social rented got better southerly facing blocks away from Seven Sisters Road, felt that private blocks facing SSR would be difficult to sell and lead to being mainly bought as buy to rent properties.</p> <p>1 board member highlights reduction overall of social rented homes in phase 4, and only 17% of new homes social rented, also highlights that 1 &amp; 2 bedroom affordable SO homes undermines "mixed and balanced community of Woodberry Down, as doesn't allow for family sized accommodation.</p> <p>1 Board member that endorsed previous comments to planning sub cttee would have concerns around amount of social rented homes</p>
SSR and pollution	<p>Concern expressed by 3 board members on the massing and potential canyon effect height alongside SSR. Acceptance need for measuring pollution, but 1 member thinking electric cars will lead to overall reduction in pollution.</p>
Communal Private Garden	<p>2 board members unhappy with proposal to include an element of public access to podium, on grounds of necessity, cost and security. Also 1 notes that public access to gardens would be closer to private blocks than social rented.</p> <p>2 board members comment on size of communal private gardens and note that existing communal private gardens aren't used much.</p>

	<p>1 board member is against privatisation of green space.</p> <p>1 board member highlights benefits of gardens both as a visual amenity and benefit for families with small children.</p>
Podium	<p>2 members support podium, one as it provides sufficient car parking and bike storage, the other as it allows an active frontage to the street, making street feel more safe and liable to reduce ASB.</p> <p>2 member opposed podium due to potential impact on service charge.</p>
Parking	<p>1 member felt Parking for social rented should be provided along Woodberry Down with existing car drivers given access to zone G CPZ permission to park. Similar to WGN and KSS1 Social Rent</p> <p>1 board member felt that podium is best approach to provide cycle and car parking</p> <p>1 member felt parking should continue to be provided</p> <p>1 member wanted review and minimal parking to take away podium and save trees</p>
Servicing	<p>A number of comments against the current proposed servicing arrangements for phase 4, i.e. via Woodberry Down.</p> <p>1 felt that need for concierge to allow access to podium carpark would make the shared ownership service charge unaffordable, 1 felt that the concierge wouldn't have adequate oversight so the undercroft car park would be subject to antisocial behaviour and proposed instead that SSR have pull in bay(s) to allow servicing of northern blocks from SSR.</p> <p>1 Board member felt that servicing of blocks from Woodberry Down would lead to unacceptable increase in traffic along the road.</p>
Massing / sunlight daylight	<p>1 member highlighted concern around increase in height of blocks impact that has on overlooking / daylight and sunlight and impact on mental health and elderly.</p>
Library / shops, town square	<p>1 member wanted planning condition for library / municipal space with access to podium</p> <p>1 member thought library was unaffordable and made more expensive by need to provide public access to podium</p> <p>1 member wanted a mix of shops that public have some say on.</p>