

# WOODBERRY DOWN COMMUNITY ORGANISATION

## Board Meeting Minutes

Thursday 9<sup>th</sup> December 2021

7.15 pm Zoom Meeting

### Attendance

Philip Cooke	William Sheehy	Elaine Gosnell
Andrea Anderson	Jacquie Knowles	Eoghan Mitchell
Lesley Benson	Jason Morgan	Geoff Bell
Kristina Zagar	Ngozi Obanye	Jackie Myers
Hilary Britton	Leonora Williams	Philip Dundas
Oonagh Gormley	Adrian Essex	Kalu Amogu
Barbara Panuzzo	Eleanor Andressen	

### Guests Included

Simon Slater, Roda Hassan

### Section 0 - Introduction

#### **0.1. Apologies for absence**

**0.1.1** Apologies for absence were received from:

Euphemia Chukwu, Mina Faragalla, Noemi Menendez

#### **0.2 Minutes and Matters Arising**

**0.2.1** Issue of accuracy was raised in 1.18, need to take out sentence on task and finish group.

**0.2.2** Matters Arising: ITLA read out answers to questions from Lesley by Berkeley Homes regarding local labour and LBH on Seven Sisters Road meetings, namely that in terms of the Local Labour requirement, a minimum of 30% of the workforce within the Development are to comprise of Local Labour and the Section 106 Agreement defines the required number of apprentices as being 1 apprentice per £2 million worth of contract value. On SSR the officer working group reconvened in July and there has been 1 meeting since then. There was a further meeting scheduled for December.

**0.2.3** Lesley noted that the local labour levels hadn't been met and were usually around 10%. ITLA advised that WDCO had asked for a comparison with Hackney run regeneration estates and would ask again.

**ACTION:** ITLA to ask for comparative figures of local labour on Hackney council run regeneration projects.

### **Partner Updates For information only**

- 1.0 The circulated partner updates were agreed without major discussion although Board members would like partner contact details for the Christmas period.

**ACTION:** ITLA to get Christmas contact details and circulate to Board

### **2.0 Motion on Berkeley's Pre Planning Meeting with LBH Planning Committee**

- 2.1 The Chair, Phil Cooke and Simon Slater explained to the board the process of debating the motion. The Executive Committee had submitted an amended motion to that that was previously seen by the board in November. This would become the main motion for debate; however, the original motion was still included in the board papers and individual board members could move it as an amendment if they so wished. With the Board's agreement the debate commenced along those lines.
- 2.2 William Sheehy proposed the motion on behalf of the Executive Committee. He said the Executive Committee had accepted the apology given by Berkeley Homes at the last board and in writing subsequently. They felt that Berkeley Homes were ready to engage in genuine discussion with an open mind and had done so at the last design committee. However, he also highlighted that for the master plan to be successful the design committee had to work to a sensible timetable to enable full discussion and significant resident involvement.
- 2.3 Geoff Bell spoke on the motion, he highlighted that although he was in broad agreement with the motion he felt one aspect could be improved. He believed that the wording of taking account of the community views was weak. He highlighted that throughout the regeneration and in the partnership agreement was the principle of consensus working. He felt this had been established by the second master plan review and highlighted that in the Partnership Agreement if consensus couldn't be agreed it would go to the Round Table for discussion, where the issue would be decided, probably, by the Mayor. Geoff felt that, in effect, this approach gave each partner the right to veto. Hence, his suggested wording was that the partners will adhere to consensus working as in the partnership agreement when developing design details and the overall plan.
- 2.4 The ITLA commented that WDCO, or any other partners, would not have a veto on the planning application as the application will be made by Berkeley Homes. He highlighted the terms of reference in the design committee where Berkeley Homes needed to make "best endeavours" to gain agreement amongst partners but this did not prevent Berkeley Homes from submitting an application. Similarly, Berkeley Homes, couldn't take away the ability for WDCO to oppose any submitted planning application. He also highlighted that the

Round Table and Mayor couldn't act as a veto as the Planning Committee have a quasi judicial role in deciding an application. He stressed however that although WDCO didn't have a veto and the partnership couldn't compel Berkeley from submitting an application there was no reason why WDCO couldn't ask for consensus working to be followed when developing design proposals.

- 2.5 There was further discussion by Board members of the amendment, Kristina felt that whilst WDCO might not have veto rights, they should look to develop consensus by encouraging all partners to work together and develop trust. Hillary felt that point 3 in the motion, taking account of community views, was based on trying to achieve consensus, rather giving the power to the community to decide, as it wasn't possible for a community at large to produce a consensus. Oonagh also felt WDCO needed to look at how it worked itself and asked if the views of different design committee members reflected the views of the Board as whole.
- 2.6 There was discussion on whether Berkeley Homes had broken previously made promises with Lesley, Kalu and Geoff feeling that they had over tall buildings, in particular in Phase 4. Whereas Hilary believed that they were discussing a new masterplan and hence needed to get agreement on current proposals under current policy rather than being restrained by previous masterplan.
- 2.7 The Board also discussed the role of a community forum, when it should be held and what influence it should have over the WDCO reps on the design committee. Previously, a Community Forum had been held once the overall masterplan had been agreed by partners, Geoff felt that holding it earlier on would allow WDCO Design committee representatives to listen to the community and give them more power when discussing issues with the other partners within the design committee. Others felt that it would clash and replicate the consultation processes of the masterplan. Lesley proposed a new sentence, seconded by Jackie Myers that "This board also agrees to hold an open Community Forum to discuss what all in the community wish" This was voted upon and passed 10-5. Following which the overall motion was adopted by the Board.
- 2.8 As there had been considerable discussion on the zoom call with additions and deletions of different parts of the motion, it was agreed that the ITLA should send out a clean version of the final adopted motion to all Board Members as well as send it out to the partners on the Design Committee.

**ACTION:** ITLA to send out to Board finalised motion and write to partners sharing the motion for response.

3.0 Proposal for WDCO Board Workshop.

- 3.1 The ITLA fed back to the Board discussions that the WDCO Executive had had about getting the new Board working better together. These discussions had partly come from concerns raised by newer Board members about the arrangements for WDCO Board aimed at streamlining board meetings and providing back bench Board members more information; enabling greater discussion between Board members at Board meetings.

- 3.2 The ITLA had also discussed with the Executive whether they wished to have a facilitated discussion by an external consultant on how the Board could work better together. Rather than come to a conclusion themselves, the Executive wanted to hear board views.
- 3.3 Several Board members gave views, all felt that the Board needed to improve working together and to general better understanding of issues. Philip Dundas highlighted that the Board was moving from being primarily a social rented long term community organisation to one that had a broader mix, differing views and experiences and that this had thrown up governance issues. Some Board members felt that the Board would begin to work better once face to face meetings of the Board could be held, i.e. once Covid regulations allowed it.
- 3.4 At the end of the discussion there was no consensus amongst the Board on having a facilitated workshop. Some Board members felt that an external consultant would prove useful to facilitate understanding and empathy, to work constructively together and be more efficient, assuming they knew the issues on Woodberry Down. Others felt that the Board wouldn't benefit from such an "awayday" and it wasn't necessary.

**ACTION:** ITLA to circulate proposals on changes to Board meeting structure and Executive response, to all Board members.

#### **4 Any Other Business**

- 4.1 The issue of the Board Christmas Dinner was brought up by Elaine, unfortunately, due to Covid this wasn't able to go ahead.
- 4.2 The proposal by the Hackney to open up to the wider community West Reservoir was also raised. Simon had sent information to all board members outlining the aims of a bid that had been submitted to the Greater London Authority. This had generated a range of views about whether the West Reservoir should provide wider access to the public. Simon had passed these views to the Council. He had also asked the Council to come to a future Board once the outcome of the GLA bid were known, this would probably be in early Spring.

**Meeting Ended 9:45pm**

