

WOODBERRY DOWN COMMUNITY ORGANISATION

Board Meeting Minutes

Thursday 20th January 2022

7.15 pm Zoom Meeting

Attendance

Philip Cooke	William Sheehy	Elaine Gosnell
Andrea Anderson	Adrian Essex	Geoff Bell
Lesley Benson	Kalu Amogu	Noemi Menendez
Kristina Zagar	Ngozi Obanye	Eleanor Anderssen
Hilary Britton	Leonora Williams	Philip Dundas
Oonagh Gormley	Barbara Panuzzo	

Guests Included

Anne Byrne, Isobel Pierce, Hermione Brightwell, Trevor Hughes, Jaime Powell, Caroline Selman Colin Boxall, Miriam Burke, Cllr Sarah Young.

Observers Included

Catherine Slade, PC Noah Strange, PC Megan Wells, Mike Price.

Simon Slater, Roda Hassan

Section 0 - Introduction

0.1. Apologies for absence

0.1.1 Apologies for absence were received from:

Euphemia Chukwu, Eoghan Mitchell, Jason Morgan, Mina Faragalla Jacquie Knowles, Jackie Myers

0.2 Minutes and Matters Arising

0.2.1 The board agreed the minutes of December 21 noted all actions completed. .

Section 1 - Partner Updates

Statement Woodberry Aid and Manor House Development Trust

1.1 Following board questions about Woodberry Aid and Manor House Development Trust (MHDT) at an earlier WDCO Board. Miriam Burke read out a joint statement prepared by Manor House Development trust and Woodberry Aid. This statement outlined the arrangements for emergency food aid structure that had been developed across

Hackney during COVID and the role played by Manor House Development Trust and Woodberry Aid in providing such aid.

- 1.2** MHDT acted as the lead coordinating body for the Northeast area of Hackney. They also provided expertise and advice in fundraising for Woodberry Aid and other similar organisations, and prepared partnership bids for funds and logistical arrangements for delivery of donated food.
- 1.3** Woodberry Aid distribute food to local people and families identified as in need in and around Woodberry Down estate. The food that Woodberry Aid distribute largely comes from a separate independent charity. Euphemia Chukwu and Jackie Myers weren't in attendance and questions weren't taken.

ACTION: ITLA to circulate the MHDT / Woodberry Aid statement to the Board.

- 1.4** Miriam went onto introduce MHDT report, this was the first written report and she was open to suggestions and comments from the board. The Redmond Centre was gradually reopening for bookings and community activities such as the digital connect project. There was interest in weekend bookings, but the centre wouldn't be fully open until the kitchen refit which was being provided by Berkeley Homes was completed. MHDT were looking to refresh the decor of the Centre and had applied for lottery funding to pay for this. She informed the board that Woodberry Blooms, a trading subsidiary of Manor House Development Trust were doing well, selling coffee, and crafts, they also run workshops in the shop unit. She highlighted that it was the intention of MHDT to make an application to LBH to take over the whole of block D and include Woodberry Blooms in that application potentially they would look to lease the whole building and sublet. They were interested in local partners putting themselves forward to work with them to develop a partnership bid for the space.
- 1.5** She also briefly outlined the funding of MIDT in that they were an independent charity, where the room hire income covers the centre's running costs, core staffing costs are covered by grants such as LBH and NHG and community activities are funded through bidding to lottery organisations and charitable trusts.
- 1.6** The Chair asked for questions to Miriam, after Simon Slater had clarified that he had informed partners that there was no need to read out previously circulated updates. Elaine asked about opening hours and if the Centre was open at weekends and Miriam confirmed it was for booked events. There was discussion on the need for MHDT to update their website, to reflect the reopening of the Centre.
- 1.7** Kristina asked about the sustainability of Woodberry Blooms did it provide additional funding to MHDT was it a drain on their resources? Miriam replied that it was looking to break even in six months time, but they were hoping to improve that timescale. They now had advice from an expert volunteer in marketing from NatWest, sales in the shop are steady, and they are looking to develop of levels online sales and providing flowers to events such as weddings.
- 1.8** Hilary asked for figures of the percentage utilisation of the space in the Redmond Centre including weekends, and evenings. Miriam

responded but they didn't have figures for the number of people using the events that are booked in the community centre although they do provide full impact studies for those projects funded through external organisations such as the lottery.. There was a discussion by the board including contributions from Oonagh and Leslie questioning why MHDT did not record participants entering the Redmond Centre, some board members were concerned that it meant that there was no metric of usage that could act as a baseline for assessing bids to the block D space. Andrea recalled originally people visiting the Redmond Centre needed signing in. Miriam committed to providing information on visitor numbers to a future board.

ACTION: MHDT to provide user numbers to future WDCO Board

- 1.9** Anne Byrne introduced the Hackney update as written and highlighted one issue, which hadn't been included as part of the Hackney update. A tree had been cut down that day on Woodberry Down Road. The tree had a tree protection order (TPO) and was on land owned by the school. Hackney regeneration weren't aware of the proposal to cut it down so they contacted the Planning Department and were informed that the tree was diseased and in danger of falling down. Hackney Regeneration Team had also asked Planning about what future mitigation would be provided.
- 1.10** It was noted that the TPO was placed on this tree because of the campaigning of a long-standing WDCO board member, Donna Fakes. Leslie raised a question regarding the tree which had been observed as part of the tree task and finish group a few months previously; where they had been advised that it had been badly maintained. She wanted to know if trees on private land have to be looked after by the landowner and why it had deteriorated so quickly?
- 1.11** Catherine Slade, a planning officer, answered questions on the process of the removal of the tree. The school contacted Hackney and asked for a five day notification at the end of last year this was a legislative mechanism regarding an unsafe tree that might be a public danger. The tree officer inspected the tree and concluded that it was unsafe with potential harm to public health. When the tree was removed it was clear that there was severe rot running throughout the tree. She also highlighted that with a five day notice there isn't the need for public consultation. Questions were asked regarding if a TPO impacts on the tree management, apparently, works such as pruning requires planning consent. In 2005 the tree was TPOed, and Ms Slade wasn't sure when the tree was pollarded, but it had been pollarded by 2008 She commented that the Council were reliant on getting information from third parties when works are taking place on trees. There were no other questions on the Hackney Council update.
- 1.12** Trevor Hughes introduced the BHs update. He highlighted an issue of a window coming detached from the 6th floor or Residence Tower on 28th December. BHs were carrying out a full inspection of all the flats in residence tower to check on their safety and Rendall and Rittner had advised residents to keep the window shut until the inspections had been completed. They had also appointed a specialist independent

consultant to look at the reasons why the window was detached. The inspection had identified that one or two windows where restrictors had been removed. Around 80 apartments of 175 in Residence Tower had been inspected the full inspection will take around 3 to 4 weeks he would keep the board informed of progress and outcomes of the inspection. Lesley asked if the specialist consultant report would be shared with the Board, Trevor responded that he couldn't share the whole report as elements may be confidential but would share a summary.

1.13 Kristina about elevator breakdowns in Nature View. Trevor responded that blocks in KSS1 had had poor response times from contractors so BHs now had direct contracts with the companies that installed the lifts Schindler and Kone. They were keeping a record of reasons for lift breakdowns and the majority of the breakdowns are due to "user errors" where people are holding doors open. He was also asked about works carried out on the second floor Nature View? These were a result of a leak in the flat which required significant repair work. Barbara raised concerns about possible damage to her block as a result the demolition work because there were cracks alongside the window frames. He replied that in KSS3 structural engineers carried out a full survey and there was no damage to the buildings at all he agreed to share this report with Barbara.

ACTION: Trevor report back to Board with outcome of window safety consultants report and to send report summary to Barbara from Structural Engineers.

1.14 Colin Boxall answered questions on the NHG report. Lesley raised a question on the number of water damage leaks in NHG blocks across the neighbourhood wanting to know was there any common problems across the build? He responded that he was aware of KSS1 heating issues namely Watersreach and Reservoir whilst Ashview is due to be discussed in the M & M meeting. They use 4 to 5 different plumbing contractors and he wasn't aware of common issues across blocks as a result of the build quality. He did say that in phase 2 there were very few issues and NHG were using lessons learnt to improve on early defects. Andrea raised the issue of vermin in Hartington's Court, Colin responded that she needed to contact the NHG housing manager. Elaine asked for the contact list of the Woodbury Down Youth Forum as she was concerned it was an exclusive group. Colin said they were preparing a collaborative paper with BHs on what's happened so far with the Forum and the capacity building they are carrying out. This would be reported to the Round Table and then he would bring it back to a future board.

ACTION: Colin to discuss in more detail issue of Youth Group by email with Elaine and report back to future board.

Meeting moved to Confidential Session