

WOODBERRY DOWN COMMUNITY ORGANISATION

Board Meeting

MINUTES

Thursday 18th April 2024

7.15 pm Redmond Community Centre

Section 0 – Introduction

Phil Cooke, Adrian Essex, Oonagh Gormley, Jackie Myers, William Sheehy, Dulce Laluces, Jacquie Knowles, Gloria Obiliana, Hilary Britton, Leonora Williams, Barbara Panuzzo, Geoff Bell, Kristina Zagar, Euphemia

Andrea Anderson and Tina Parrott joint on zoom.

Anthony Green (NHG), Andy Lord (NHG), Carol Boy (LBH), Isobel Pierce (LBH), Jaime Powell (BH), Tom Anthony (BH), Sarah Fabes (BH), Cllr Nicholson, Cllr Young, Fionnuala Keane-Conley (MHDT)

0.1 Welcome/apologies for absence

Kalu Amogu, Mina Faragalla, Elaine Gosnell, Maggie Lewis, Omar, Donna

0.2 Acceptance of minutes of the 18th April

With the amendment noting that Jacqueline Knowles was not at the last meeting but was listed on the attendance list, the minutes of the meeting held on 18th April were accepted.

0.3 Matters arising/action tracker

Matters arising

0.31 NHG reported that the energy team is still looking into the solar panel issue.

0.32 Adrian's reported that MHDT presented a new format of reporting the utilisation of the Redmond Centre at the LDT Board.

0.33 Anthony will report back on the level of interest they have had in the Business start-up at a later date, he is chasing this with Sarah Connelly

0.34 Oonagh compiled a list of play facilities for the website which she shared with Adrian to upload onto the website.

Action tracker

0.35 Roda noted that the latest update at the Liaison meeting, on the window, report is that Berkeley's legal team is currently reviewing the report. Once the review has been completed, Berkeley will be in a position to provide an update.

0.36 Roda reported that the service charge actuals for 2020-21, 2021-22, and 2022-23 should hopefully be finalised soon. NHG is currently determining whether refunds will be issued as credits or direct refunds to resident accounts. Anthony stated that an update on the timeframe for publishing the information will be provided in two weeks.

0.37 Roda spoke with Isobel, and they are in the process of organising a session with the working group in the next few weeks where Expedition will share a summary of the feasibility study.

0.38 The out-of-phase split household update is due for the July board meeting.

0.39 NHG is awaiting the budget from R&R, and this is currently being finalised. Once NHG have the budget, they will arrange a service charge meeting with WDCO and partners.

Masterplan presentations

1.11 Tom Anthony presented the Masterplan on behalf of Berkeley Homes, reporting on several engagement activities. These included three in-person events as part of the public exhibition and one online webinar. 123 individuals attended the in-person events, while 14 participated in the live webinar; additionally, 80 viewed the recorded webinar. Tom noted the webinar turnout was positive, with a Q&A session concluding the presentation. Following the proposal presentation, attendees posed 23 questions, all of which were addressed by the relevant members of the project team. A 'quiet session' was also held for those who prefer a calmer setting, such as those with SEN such as autism. Berkeley will continue to do these sessions but acknowledge they need to advertise these better.

1.12 Tom acknowledged that the decision to host the webinar online on a Wednesday may not have been optimal. This prompted Berkeley to consider scheduling future webinars on a different day to attract a larger live audience for consultations.

1.13 In this round of consultation, Berkeley prioritised gathering qualitative feedback over quantitative feedback. This approach stemmed from their experience during the November public consultation, where the quantitative feedback did not provide clear direction for their next steps. Therefore, in the latest round of consultation, they focused on obtaining qualitative feedback and converting it into quantitative data to provide more structured insights.

1.14 In terms of feedback sources, only 10% came from within the Woodberry Down Estate, 5% from other areas, and the remaining 85% from the immediate surrounding areas. However, this data only includes those who shared their postcode, which was 82 out of the 150 respondents. Notably, the Orthodox Jewish community attended one of the consultation events, took feedback forms, and submitted them later, accounting for 70% of the total feedback.

1.15 Cllr Young noted how feedback has traditionally been recorded on forms, but much of the immediate community's feedback is given verbally and is not

being documented. She requested this verbal feedback be recorded in future, as it constitutes the majority of local responses. Tom acknowledged that the consultation process is not perfect, but assured that they do consider the verbal feedback provided at the events, and relay this feedback to the Design team. Whenever residents provide verbal feedback, they are also encouraged to fill out feedback forms or give feedback online to ensure there is a documented record of the conversation. Even if residents do not complete the forms, their verbal feedback is usually taken into account, although it may not be officially logged.

1.16 Tom shared a table summarising the feedback themes, noting that amenities were frequently mentioned. There was also significant feedback and requests for large affordable homes. He clarified that the outline consent they would be applying for does not specify a set number of homes at this stage; this is determined at each Reserved Matters stage based on demand and housing need. For instance, if there is demonstrable demand in Phase 5 for social rent housing, with 5 and 6 bedrooms, Berkley will be able to respond to that. Hilary asked if the requests for larger homes were primarily for social housing, or for those who want to buy. Tom explained that the majority of requests were for social housing, based on his conversations. Cllr Young highlighted that the requests from the Orthodox Jewish community were not for larger social rented homes, but for larger shared ownership and private properties.

1.17 Tom reviewed additional topics from the feedback received and provided a brief explanation regarding whether each issue will be addressed by the Outline Planning Permission, at the Reserved Matters stage, or if it falls outside the applicant's control.

- Parking: The maximum number of parking spaces will be fixed by the Outline Consent and is determined by planning policy.
- New MUGA: This is subject to a separate standalone planning application.
- Affordable Housing: This will be fixed by the Outline Consent, which will be viability tested and in accordance with the PDA. The target affordable housing provision across the final phases of the Masterplan will be 42.9%.
- Community Space: A maximum floor area will be fixed by the Outline Consent. The decision on The Edge, including its location and layout, will be determined at the Reserved Matters stage for Phase 6.
- Building Heights: The maximum heights will be fixed by the Outline Consent, but they will be further refined at the Reserved Matters stage along with additional details on their overall design.
- Wind and Sun Impacts: These will be further tested at the Reserved Matters stage.
- Environmental Impact: This has been assessed as part of the Outline Consent, but further testing will be undertaken during the Reserved Matters stage.
- Impact on Community Facilities: This has been assessed as part of the Outline Consent, but further testing will be undertaken during the Reserved Matters stage.
- Podiums: The ability to provide podiums will be established by the Outline Consent, but the consent will also allow for these podiums to be removed

if they are no longer considered necessary. This will be reviewed at each Reserved Matters stage, with opportunities to revisit their necessity.

1.18 Geoff appreciated the degree of flexibility but asked if this flexibility will be documented in the masterplan. He noted how the flexibility needs to be clearly outlined in the masterplan and recorded somewhere. Tom explained that their goal is to ensure the masterplan has enough built-in flexibility so that it does not need to be changed again. This flexibility should allow for adjustments based on feedback without requiring another complete overhaul of the masterplan.

1.19 Hilary suggested that it should be acknowledged that potential economic and social changes need to be reflected in the masterplan. Tom explained that the planning application will include provisions for this, allowing the permission to be modified as long as it is approved by the local council.

2. Hackney Council presentation

2.1 Isobel Pierce presented the housing numbers. The presentation was in response to a request from WDCO and while it seemed like a straightforward question, she stressed that it was incredibly difficult to provide precise figures due to the complex history of Woodberry Down and the varying economic, and social contexts over time. She also highlighted that any numbers presented are only a snapshot and will constantly change due to factors such as the right to buy and people moving off the estate.

2.2 Isobel highlighted that Woodberry Down is a complex project with changes in red line boundaries and amendments that make direct comparisons challenging. With this context in mind, she explained that the original 2008 Woodberry Down Masterplan referred to a total of 1,458 rented homes, consisting of 1,295 social rented properties, and 163 temporary accommodation properties.

2.3 For further context, Isobel noted that the 2008 masterplan was initiated by the council, following the area action plan from 2005. At that time, Berkeley had been procured for Phase 1, with the assumption that Phases 2-8 would be transferred to a Registered Social Landlord (RSL) as part of a stock transfer. There was also a different funding context then, with the assumption that sufficient funding would be available to advance the masterplan. At the time, it was deemed feasible to deliver a masterplan that included 1,458 social rented homes, representing 31% of the overall homes, along with an additional 10% designated as intermediate homes.

2.4 The second number that Isobel highlighted was 1,115 homes. She noted the council's core commitment was to rehouse all existing residents at that time. In 2006, they began the procurement exercise for future phases (2-5). At the beginning of this exercise, a calculation was made to determine the number of homes that would need to be provided. This calculation took into account that the developer for the 'kick start sites' had been procured. Therefore, the number of secure tenants to be rehoused included those living in Phases 2-8 and any secure tenants who were to be 'double decanted' from the kick start sites. They

then went through the procurement exercise, bringing Berkeley and NHG on board, and the PDA was agreed at the end of that process.

There were fundamental points that were agreed upon:

1. A minimum of 1,115 homes had to be provided by the end of the regeneration.
2. At least 41.7% of the homes delivered had to be affordable.
3. The overage agreement between Hackney and Berkeley was established, stipulating that profits over a certain threshold would be split 50/50 between the council and the developer. This agreement ensures that any excess profit is reinvested to make future phases viable.

2.5 Isobel emphasised how these fundamental points have not changed. The key message she wanted to convey was that the council's commitment to rehouse the existing residents remains unchanged. Additionally, there was a clear objective to deliver a mixed and balanced community, with intermediate housing being a critical part of that vision. She acknowledged the issues concerning the affordability of intermediate homes now, but reiterated that achieving a mixed and balanced community was the intended outcome when the commitment was made.

2.6 Isobel also highlighted that each masterplan must be tested for viability. In 2008, when the masterplan was first tested, it had to meet the standards of the available funding context at the time. Similarly, the 2014 masterplan had to be viable at the point of submission. The same rigorous viability testing applies to the current masterplan and each phase as it progresses. This viability is reviewed both by the Regeneration team and through a separate planning process.

2.7 William Sheehy thanked the Regeneration team for their work on this and for providing this information.

3. Partner updates

3.1 The partners provided a brief summary of their reports, before they took questions from the Board.

3.2 Isobel provided an update on Phase 3 allocations and West Reservoir applications. She reported Phase 3 allocations are progressing well, with the decant team pre-allocating the remaining properties to residents in phases 6-8. Additionally, she informed that the Planning Application for Phase 4 was recommended for approval by the Planning Sub-Committee on 8th May. Approval has also been granted for the West Reservoir applications. She also noted preparations are underway for Block D to be presented to the cabinet in June.

3.3 The Board expressed interest in understanding the prioritisation criteria for allocation of the new homes in phase 3, specifically whether home conditions influence these decisions. Isobel clarified properties are allocated on a phase-by-phase basis. Initially, allocations were opened to Phase 4, followed by Phase 5. Currently, they have been opened to Phases 6, 7, and 8 for the surplus units. The ITLA further explained that prioritisation is based on the phase first, and for the surplus units, after this the length of tenancy is used as an additional criterion.

3.4 Jaime from Berkley provided a brief update on the progress of Phase 3. She announced the last set of cranes will be removed in June, indicating significant progress in the construction phase. The review of A block is currently underway by NHG. She also shared that the Planning Application for Phase 4 was recommended for approval by the Planning Sub-Committee. The application will then be referred to the Greater London Authority (GLA), which will have two weeks to review it. After the GLA's review, a Stage Two report will be prepared, followed by the issuance of the decision notice.

3.5 Jaime highlighted how 15% of the workforce consists of local labour, with 18 apprentices involved in the project. She noted the Fun Day scheduled for June 22nd, and the summer screening will take place from July 14th to 16th. Jaime also noted that 2024 marks the 15th anniversary of the regeneration, and there will be a celebration to mark this milestone, to which the Board members have been invited.

3.6 Jackie inquired about the possibility of hosting an apprenticeship fair and a job fair. Sarah confirmed there will be such an event, scheduled for Tuesday, 16th July, which will focus on providing opportunities for jobs and apprenticeships.

3.7 Adrian asked if Roda has the information of move-in dates for Phase 3. Jaime explained this information can be circulated.

ACTION: Jaime will share the move in date for Phase 3 blocks with Roda.

3.8 Sarah enquired about the local and overseas sales percentage for Phase 3.

ACTION: Jaime will provide this information for the next Board.

3.9 Anthony provided an update on several key issues and the ongoing discussions regarding the Phase 3 community space. He noted the negotiations are continuing and they will provide the Board with an update in due course. Anthony mentioned they are currently drafting ideas for the space. During the discussion, Jackie raised a query about how NHG intends to include WDCO in the discussions and decision-making processes. Cllr Nicholson further added that during the Round Table discussions, there was a collective effort among partners to explore activating ground floor spaces with various activities. He emphasised that the council would bring forward proposals based on these discussions.

Jackie expressed a strong desire for community input into the plans for the Phase 3 community space, stressing the importance of consulting with WDCO before final decisions are made, rather than after. This collaborative approach is crucial for fostering effective partnerships and ensuring community needs are adequately addressed.

3.10 Concerns were also raised about the potential for empty spaces similar to current examples, such as block D and other commercial spaces, which could detract from the estate's overall appearance. The Board stressed the importance of pre-planning these spaces with consideration for community usage, to avoid prolonged vacancies post-construction.

3.11 The Board reiterated the importance of community participation in the decision-making process. They also observed how the current planning documents for Phase 4 specify the inclusion of shops, but do not mention a library. Hilary emphasised the importance of having comprehensive information about the number of community groups, their space requirements, and their funding needs. Isobel outlined the progress made so far in the masterplan process, which involves establishing a baseline understanding of existing community presence and activities. The next step will be to consolidate this data and develop a strategy that takes into account future needs and developments.

3.12 Additionally, residents voiced complaints about the lack of dedicated spaces for the elderly within the estate. They pointed out other estates provide such spaces and feel discriminated against by the current focus on youth-oriented spaces. There is a call for the inclusion of facilities for the elderly in the development plans to ensure their needs are adequately addressed. Oonagh suggested that the current reality that spaces now require payments. However, she proposed that these groups could approach the Redmond Centre to negotiate a deal and seek council funding to cover the costs of the space.

3.13 Anthony explained that they will present proposals, allowing WDCO to provide input once the proposals have been presented. Sarah clarified these proposals will be brought forward to the MHDT Board for a decision on whether to proceed. Roda and Adrian expressed concerns that consulting WDCO after the discussion and proposal preparation phase feels untimely. They emphasised the importance of including WDCO in discussions with Hackney and NHG from the outset.

3.14 Andy Lord provided an NHG update, mentioning that sewage work is progressing as planned and is expected to be completed by the end of June, including the installation of new pumps. Regarding billing for the heat networks, he explained that the change in billing provider was necessary due to the expiration of the previous contract, with Vital chosen as the new provider. However, the simultaneous change in billing provider and operator of the heat network posed challenges, which NHG acknowledged as an oversight. In terms of tariff issues, these are historical and steps have been taken to ensure all

residents are now on the correct tariff. Efforts are underway to resolve these historical issues, with corrections scheduled to be completed by the end of August. Priority will be given to homes facing disproportionate tariff charges, aiming for resolution by the end of August for the remaining cases. All credits and refunds are expected to be processed by the end of August.

3.15 Andy assured that measures are being taken to prevent similar issues in the future, with a priority on fixing the current mistakes. Improved communication with residents is a key focus, with clearer information on billing processes. The new billing contract is set for a 5-year period. Letters have been sent out regarding previous incorrect tariffs, advising residents to continue paying their regular monthly amounts and disregard the incorrect letters. Flexibility in billing payments has been assured.

3.16 William raised concerns about reminder letters for outstanding bills and how these are causing worry among residents. He emphasised the need to cease sending reminder letters. Andy noted that in terms of credit control, they are not actively pursuing collections.

ACTION: Andy Lord will consult with Laura Coleman regarding the reminder letters.

3.17 One observer asked when residents can expect accurate bills. Andy reiterated their commitment to resolving all billing issues by the end of August. Additionally, Rowan and Hornbeam issues will be addressed by the end of June or early July.

3.18 Sarah highlighted a core issue with WGN sewage, specifically its uphill flow rather than downhill. She inquired if the masterplan includes provisions to review and potentially reroute sewage in phases 7 and 8 to facilitate downhill flow. Tom responded that the masterplan will address sewage management comprehensively. Cllr Young also asked if Andy's team is responsible for ground maintenance, stressing ongoing concerns about garden quality, which involve both design and maintenance factors. She suggested involving WDCO in discussions about their experience using these gardens and how they could be improved.

3.19 William noted this is the second time pumps have needed replacement and asked about their expected lifespan. Andy explained the lifespan is significantly longer than their current durability, attributing failures to the misuse of waste pipes rather than their design compliance. William mentioned contractor feedback indicating issues with narrow pipes.

3.20 Fionnuala provided the MHDT update, mentioning previous considerations by the Friends of Woodberry Down regarding the Redmond Centre. There were scheduling conflicts with another lunch club during their requested booking times. Despite this, the Redmond Centre bookings are progressing well with

many regular users. They are working on providing an accurate booking breakdown.

3.21 Regarding projects, they recently held their third annual Eid party at the end of April and launched the first Woodberry Wetland Action Group in collaboration with the Neighbourhood Forum. They successfully secured £40k funding from Hackney to establish a community kitchen for asylum seekers and refugees. William inquired about Woodberry Blooms and its current lessee.

ACTION: Fionnuala will check and provide details on the current tenants of Woodberry Blooms.

3.22 Oonagh asked about the three rooms being rented out long-term and whether the groups occupying them serve the community directly. Fin clarified that these groups are private companies.

4. Board discussion without partners.

4.1 Roda presented the Board with the constituencies for the 24 elected Board members. She explained that the number of occupied properties per board member is calculated by dividing the total number of units by 24 board members.

4.2 Several Board members raised concerns that Phase 3 residents should have representation in WDCO. However, other board members countered that seats should not be reserved for a phase that has not been completed yet and for residents who have not yet moved in. This led to objections regarding the allocation of a seat for Phase B6, with members asserting that if Phase 3 isn't being included in its entirety, then block B6 should not be included either. The discussion continued regarding whether Phase 3 should be included in the constituency.

4.3 The Board then voted on whether Phase 3 should be included in the constituency and consequently in the elections:

Vote results:

6 votes for the inclusion of Phase 3

6 votes against the inclusion of Phase 3

The Chair cast the deciding vote against the inclusion of Phase 3.

4.5 Geoff proposed that the private homes in Woodberry Grove North should be included in the WGN constituencies since they are part of the masterplan and the estate. Hilary also noted that the number of units for each constituency was inaccurately reflected in the document presented by ITLA. Roda explained that she used the number of occupied units, as recommended by the Executive Committee. The Board agreed that this should be changed to reflect the accurate

number of units, including voids and unoccupied units. The breakdown of constituencies was approved, provided that the agreed changes are made.

ACTION: Roda to adjust the number of seats for each constituency.

ACTION: Roda to amend the figures to reflect this.

4.6 The WDCO budget for 24/25 was also approved by the Board.