

WOODBERRY DOWN COMMUNITY ORGANISATION

Board Meeting

MINUTES

Thursday 17th October 2024
7:15 pm Redmond Community Centre

Attendance: Kalu Amogu, Geoff Bell, Hilary Britton, Adrian Essex, Leonora Williams, Mina Faragalla, Phil Cooke, William Sheehy, Ann Hunt, Nicolas Attalides, Geoff Baron, Livis-Jeanne Lupumba, Dulce Laluces, Gloria Obiliana, Omar Villalba, Andreea Stoica, Gita Sootarsing, Francis McDonagh, Jackie Myers, Andrea Anderson, Kristina Zagar, Necdet Ozturk, Shifra Appich

Visitors: Tom Anthony (BH), Hermione Brightwell (LBH), Bronwen Thomas (LBH), Julian Rodriguez (NHG), Cllr Guy Nicholson

Roda Hassan, Simon Slater, Emre Ozturk

Apologies: Donna Fakes, Tina Parrott, Oonagh Gormley, Barbara Panuzzo, Ann Kelly, Anwar Idris, Willian Martinez, Jada Guess (NHG), Cllr Sarah Young, Cllr Caroline Selman

Section 0 - Introduction

- 1. Acceptance of minutes:** The minutes were reviewed for accuracy and accepted.
- 2. Matters Arising / Action Tracker**
 - 2.1. Julian Rodriguez announced that he has taken over from Anthony Green as Assistant Director and will be attending Board meetings.
 - 2.2. Roda had circulated an update from the Billing team to the WDCO members from the NHG blocks on what was agreed regarding the reconciliation of the accounts at the meeting.
 - 2.3. The action tracker stated that Berkeley would provide an update on the window report within the next 8 weeks. Tom updated that this has been escalated by Trevor. Berkeley plans to update on the window report at the Liaison meeting then will be referred back to the November Board.

ACTION: Trevor will provide an update on the window report at the Liaison meeting.

- 2.4. Hermione provided an update on the split household policy but did not clarify whether the October discussion meeting on the policy is internal to LBH; if WDCO will be included; or if a separate workshop with WDCO will be held. She did confirm, however, that there will be an engagement with WDCO. A policy review is underway, and officers have put together several options for discussion that will first be presented internally. Before the policy is submitted to the Cabinet, there will be a consultation that specifically includes WDCO.

- 2.5. Simon asked if Hackney will consult with WDCO while multiple options are still under consideration, or if they intend to narrow down to a single option before consulting. Roda raised WDCO's primary concern—that the policy may be diluted and that there hasn't been sufficient transparency on the scope of the review. For example, it is unclear if the review will consider the entire out-of-phase split household policy or just address specific gaps.
- 2.6. The Board emphasised that the original agreement made with Woodberry Down residents should remain intact. While future regeneration schemes across the borough may evolve, the commitment made to Woodberry Down residents should be preserved.

ACTION: WDCO has asked Hackney to clarify the purpose and specific elements of the policy review.

- 2.7. Roda noted Hillary's comments on the balance report, revenue statement, and audit report.

ACTION: Roda will confirm with Amanda and Friends of Woodberry Down whether NHG has contacted them regarding its support for elderly residents.

- 2.8. Roda included the written questions and answers from NHG in the minutes as requested.
- 2.9. Roda reported that NHG will be conducting CCTV inspections to address drain issues with the stack pipe at Birchwood and Maplewood, sampling several flats in each block to identify the source of the sewage smell.
- 2.10. Roda shared the election voting results with the Board.
- 2.11. Jada provided a written update to the WDCO members in the NHG blocks on 20th September regarding the NHG service charge actuals for the past three years. She stated that additional time is needed to review the costs further, and NHG is working with colleagues across the business to establish a timeline for completion. The Chair noted that NHG has missed its own completion timeline for this review four times over the past two years, which has disappointed residents. Omar had suggested that the Chair escalate the matter to NHG's director and CEO, which led to an email being sent on 1st October. In response, the Chair was informed that the email had been forwarded to Gemma Harvey, the Head of Operations, but has not received any updates or responses since. Omar mentioned a conversation in February acknowledging this issue, which has been pursued for over two years without progress or feedback. Hillary suggested escalating the matter to NHG's CEO, setting a deadline by the end of the month, or the issue will be raised elsewhere.
- 2.12. The Regeneration Team is scheduling a meeting with Hackney's Energy and Sustainability Team to discuss the project's progress, next steps, and the way in which updates will be provided to the District Heat Network working group and the Board. They have also requested that the feasibility study be presented at the Board meeting.
- 2.13. The Service Charge working group meeting with partners was initially scheduled for last week but has been rescheduled for Thursday 24th October, to discuss Phase 3 service charges. Hillary will be attending in place of Oonagh. During the September meeting, several actions were assigned to Hackney and NHG. The WDCO members have requested responses to these actions prior to the meeting, so they can review the information before 24th October. Additionally, WDCO has asked Hackney to provide comparable charges for other blocks ahead of the meeting.

ACTION: NHG will provide an update on when responses to the meeting actions will be shared with WDCO members.

ACTION: Hackney will provide comparable charges for their other new-build estates prior to the Service Charge Working Group meeting.

Section 1 - Introduction

3. Berkeley Masterplan Presentation:

- 1.1. Tom Anthony delivered the Masterplan presentation, highlighting key information from the previous eight sessions to the Board and outlining the structure of the Masterplan application.
- 1.2. Berkeley has delivered 2,317 homes to date, with 584 under construction. They have achieved a 154% biodiversity net gain and provided 25 tennis courts' worth of community/ retail space. Berkeley has also invested 5 million in education, skills, and training, and completed 161 affordable units in Phase 3, with residents moving in from mid-November. The Phase 4 planning application was approved, and the move for the football pitch application from Phase 5 to Phase 2 has been approved. Berkeley noted that the Masterplan's red line boundary focuses on Phases 5, 6, 7, and 8.
- 1.3. **Why are Berkeley submitting the outline planning application?** Tom explained that an outline application establishes general principles for the entire site and is used for schemes like Woodberry Down, that have multiple phases to give flexibility to respond to future environmental, economic and policy changes. This ensures Berkeley takes a consistent approach to design across the future phases and demonstrates their commitment to Woodberry Down. Once Berkeley has outlined consent for the whole Masterplan, they will then submit reserved matters applications for each individual phase.
- 1.4. **What is approved as part of this?** They will be establishing the principle of development, the maximum number of homes, the general locations for buildings and open spaces, the maximum building heights, an architectural strategy, and options for future landscaping.
- 1.5. The Board asked if new technology is being used to address wind, as high buildings may create significant wind effects, and whether there is a strategy to mitigate this. Tom responded that the Phase 4 planning application includes technology such as a skirt around the buildings to disrupt wind flow. For the masterplan, Berkeley tests large groups of buildings in a wind tunnel in Milton Keynes, and the results show no cause for concern. These tests will be re-conducted during the detailed design of each phase. William inquired why precautions taken in other locations haven't been applied to Woodberry Down. Tom explained that these measures will be implemented at Woodberry Down, but the masterplan does not indicate wind-related issues. He stated that Phase 4 will address any wind issues near Sainsbury's. The Board expressed concern that while testing was done, it doesn't reflect the lived experiences of residents. Kristina emphasised that more time is needed to address this, as wind issues are not limited to the Sainsbury's area.
- 1.6. Necdet noted that businesses at the entrance level of Woodberry Down have reported that residents are avoiding cafes and shops due to the wind and the

location's history. Omar requested a separate meeting with Berkeley to address the wind issue.

ACTION: Tom will relay this feedback to the Berkeley estates team to address the concerns.

- 1.7. **Primary control documents** – Tom explained that these are approved documents that each future phase must comply with. The parameter plans set broad guidelines for building locations, while the development specification document outlines key metrics, such as maximum housing units, community space, car parking, and cycle parking. The Design Principles document establishes rules and procedures for building design, including storey heights, entrances, and guidelines for treating building edges.
- 1.8. **Secondary control documents** - Tom noted that documents like the illustrative masterplan, design and access statement, and technical reports, along with secondary control documents, outline how the proposals will function in the future. These documents are periodically updated, and Berkeley will need to revisit the energy strategy.
- 1.9. There are 6 key parameter plans that will be submitted - the **Demolition Plan** sets what buildings will be demolished in the future, **Urban Structure** gives the broad location of buildings, open spaces, streets and pedestrian routes, **Proposed Uses** for residential and non-residential frontage, **Plot Extents** show minimum and maximum areas for buildings, **Minimum/Maximum Heights**, and **Site Levels**, which sets the building heights.
- 1.10. The Phase 6 parameter plans show how they will come together in the future. No final decision has been made on the Phase 6 properties in Woodberry Grove North and the Edge. This will come forward again in the Reserved Matters stage. These parameter plans set the flexibility using the same approach as 2014 and now includes The Edge Youth Club. The Phase 6 parameter plans show how Berkeley build up through each plan to get to the maximum parameters.
- 1.11. Factors controlling building design in Phase 6 - the key factors that are set in outline stage are highlighted in orange in the presentation and show areas of open space and commits to setbacks at roof level and the edge of the road. There will be no lollipop trees as seen in Phase 3, as there is a further building setback from Seven Sisters Road in future phases. This will enable Berkeley to put in real trees. Once the outline planning application is approved, WDCO needs to be aware of the planning policy and matters such as overheating, building depth, daylight/sunlight, etc.
- 1.12. **Woodberry Down Vision and Objectives:** Berkeley had 2 sessions with the Design Committee and presented the vision, objectives and principles at the WDCO Board and received feedback at public consultation. The Berkeley architects and design team made sure the masterplan has been designed with these factors in mind which will be the visions, objectives and principles that future reserve matters will have to accord with.
- 1.13. **April 2024 Proposals:** Berkeley was looking at up to 3,200 homes. They set a maximum figure for the purpose of testing for environmental matters and this figure relies on building being 100% efficient, which has rarely been achieved, so there is a range between 2997-3200 homes. Berkeley is providing 41.7% affordable and the open space is at a minimum of 12,500 sqm. Once Berkeley has had all the detailed assessments together, they can look at information holistically.
- 1.14. **Summary of changes:** Building heights in Phases 5, 6 and 8 have gone down from those previously shown to the Board and the number of homes has

dropped by 116. Berkeley have also revisited public open space and have removed roads and service routes to be directly comparable to the 2014 masterplan. Potential for podiums in phase 5 open space has been removed. Numbers for affordable homes have increased from 41.7% to 43%. Car parking spaces have increased from 35 spaces for returning residents in Phase 5 to 70 spaces across Phase 5-7.

- 1.15. **Design Amendments:** A key change in Phase 5 is the reduction of 30-33 homes. Along the southern frontage with the new river, they were previously at 12 storeys, 10 storeys and 8 storeys and these wings have been reduced to 10 storeys, 8 storeys and 6 storeys - they are now lower than building heights for Phase 6. The key changes in Phase 6 are the central courtyards and have lost 42-45 homes across the entire phase. Phase 7 has been a largely successful stage and supported by the design review panel but as a result of amending the affordable housing provision, there is a 2-3 home increase. There have been larger changes in Phase 8, such as removing a whole building, and 14-storeys buildings have been reduced to 11 and 13 storeys. There are roughly 41 homes reduced in Phase 8. Changes made to public open space in Phase 5 in 2014, making sure servicing routes are taken out of public open space calculations. Berkeley committed to an emergency route through the southern half of Phase 5 and public open space in Phase 6 should never be crossed by vehicles.
- 1.16. **Proposals for submission:** Illustrative proposals show one way the masterplan could come forward - this is subject to change and Berkeley will go through the detailed design with the architect.
- 1.17. **Masterplan benefits:** Opening up New River North, 55 basketball courts worth of public open space, retention of the majority of trees (2014 Masterplan retained 30%, now looking to target 60%), connecting into a Sitewide Energy Centre in Phase 3, and commitment to achieving 10% biodiversity net gain. Range between 2,868 to 3,083 new homes comprising up to 1,758 market homes, 583 social homes and 742 shared ownership/shared equity homes. The 950sqm of community floorspace allows for the re-provision of The Edge and the Community Club, as well as a new 50sqm of Satellite Community Facility.
- 1.18. Hackney clarified that there is no commitment from Hackney to rebuild the Community Club but there is an assurance that the floor space will be provided. This is a re-provision of the floor area of the Community Club and how the space is used will be determined when they get to Phase 6. Simon clarified that Berkeley would need to re-provide the Edge but does not necessarily mean that the Community Club equivalent space will be provided as community space and a decision will be made when going into planning.
- 1.19. Mina asked Berkeley and Hackney about car parking and how this has translated into restricted parking policies across the estate and expressed concern that these restrictions will get worse. Mina asked if Hackney and Berkeley are committed to doing more than the minimum for providing car parking and facilitating car usage on the estate. Tom answered that Berkeley are driven by planning policy that is set at a national, regional and local level and because of how accessible Woodberry Down is to public transport, this means that policy is made on the basis that Woodberry Down should be car-free. Mina asked if Hackney is driving this planning policy, how much leeway does Hackney have as this is not a practical solution as many residents rely on cars as a necessity. Tom responded that this policy is driven by the Mayor's office and TFL, Hackney and Berkeley would not be able to progress through the planning system if they started offering car spaces for general users in Woodberry Down. Hackney are in the process of revisiting their local plan and this is the best opportunity for residents to put forward their views on future

policies. Tom also raised that the cost of upgrading Manor House to being step-free is insurmountable.

- 1.20. The Board asked for clarification on what the site wide energy centre is. Tom explained that this is another planning policy requirement as policy asks for centralised heating networks using air-source heat pumps systems. This is enough to power the entire estate in Phase 3 and is a more sustainable and cheaper system for residents.
- 1.21. Regarding the junction on Seven Sisters Road, Berkeley has committed S106 money to TFL to upgrade Seven Sisters Road. However, TFL have gone through financial troubles and can no longer guarantee to deliver narrowing Seven Sisters Road and putting cycle lanes. Hackney, Berkeley and NHG have regular meetings with TFL about Seven Sisters Road and are ensuring that they refocus money on different matters, such as the crossing point on Seven Sisters Road to allow people to move across more easily.
- 1.22. Andrea inquired about the solar panels for NHG blocks. Roda clarified that it had been reported to WDCO that the panels are operational in the Berkeley blocks, but NHG indicated they may not be commissioned for their blocks. Tom added that Berkeley is investigating the solar panel issue.
- 1.23. **Programme and Next Steps:** Berkeley stated that the submission date for the outline planning application may be delayed until November due to a busy period completing Phase 3, securing the CPO for Phase 4, and obtaining planning permission for the football pitch. After submitting the application to the council, it will take two weeks to validate and publish online. Following that, there will be a four-week period for stakeholders and consultees to submit letters.

2. Partner Updates and written questions:

- 2.1. **Written questions:** Wilian provided a written question regarding Phase 3. There was a written response from NHG on the question. Asked about the completion of Phase 3 and what the cause of the delays. NHG stated that the delays were a result of settling the valuation of the shared ownership units in Phase 3 and that handover is due to take place on 23rd October. NHG stated that they have submitted necessary information to the building safety regulator and need them to confirm. This may take until mid-November.
- 2.2. **Tom provided the Berkeley update:** There are no health and safety incidents and Phase 3 is still on for full completion in July 2025. Berkeley achieved practical completion last Thursday and delivered affordable homes in Woodberry Down. Phase 4 has seen progress and the CPO was made last week. Berkeley is looking to formally start on site in Phase 4 once the CPO process has gone through. The technical and site teams will be doing preliminary surveys on site to look at where utility surveys and tree routes are.
- 2.3. **Julian provided the NHG update:** Achieved completion on Phase 3 A blocks last week and are looking to handover to their operations team at the end of the month ahead of confirmation in November. The operational team will be leading the service charge working group going forward. The Heat Network team is continuing to collaborate with Vital Energy to resolve ongoing issues. Work has been carried out on the heating systems in Rowan and Hornbeam, as well as in Watersreach and Reservoir. A meeting is scheduled for 23rd October to discuss communications.

2.4. A resident asked NHG whether Berkeley or NHG is responsible for the materials used in the buildings that allow mice to climb to the 7th and 8th floors.

ACTION: Julian will bring this issue to NHG to address the pest control concerns.

2.5. Friends of Woodberry Down asked what initiatives NHG have in place for the older people as they have not had any response. Julien answered that he has spoken to Sarah Connelly, manager for regeneration, and she mentioned looking at organisations operating in the area to see how NHG can liaise with them.

ACTION: Julian will follow up on this with Sarah Connelly on behalf of Friends of Woodberry Down.

2.6. Andreea expressed the need to arrange a meeting with Jada to discuss service charges for shared ownership blocks. This matter was raised with Anthony by Roda in August, and a response is still pending. There are unresolved questions regarding the service charges for the NHG shared ownership blocks managed by R&R in Phase 2 (Hartington Court and Willowbrook). In her email to Anthony, Roda outlined the specific issues requiring resolution.

ACTION: Roda will forward the email outlining the service charge issues to Julian and has requested that NHG provide a response to the Willowbrook RA. She also asked NHG to arrange a meeting with the RA Chair at Hartington and Willowbrook, along with Ekaterina and NHG representatives responsible for service charges in shared ownership blocks.

2.7. Shifra highlighted that tenants allocated to Phase 3 are currently assessing the affordability of the new homes due to the rent and service charge costs. She noted that some residents are considering organising collectively to decline the properties because of these costs. Omar inquired about the potential outcome if all residents decide to decline the allocations. NHG responded that a workshop is scheduled for 24th October to discuss the Phase 3 service charges. Omar also mentioned that these concerns have been raised with the Mayor of Hackney.

ACTION: Simon will send an email to NHG about a resident living in Hornbeam with inadequate heating.

2.8. Gloria inquired about the service charges and rent levels for Phase 3 and asked what would happen if residents declined their properties. NHG explained that rents are regulated and capped, and they can only charge in accordance with national rent-setting policies.

2.9. Friends of Woodberry Down raised concerns that NHG had promised to contact them but had not followed through.

2.10. William noted that it took NHG 12 years to inform residents that the solar panels on the roof were not commissioned. The Board asked NHG whether the panels are now operational and what the generated energy will be used for. Julian confirmed that the panels are connected to the communal lighting and power but are awaiting clarification from someone on the Assets team.

ACTION: Julian to follow up with the Assets team to confirm the operational status of the solar panels and provide clarity on how the generated energy is being utilised.

- 2.11. **Hermione and Bronwen provided the Hackney update:** Hackney's teams have been working to allocate tenants to Phase 3. The team involved for temporary accommodation has been involved in making offers to tenants. Hackney have been working with NHG to prepare for moves in Phase 3 and are still in process of resolving allocations and engaging directly with individual tenants. Hackney has made a compulsory purchase order for Phase 4. Regarding the Ground Floor Strategy, Hackney and Berkeley have been looking at social infrastructure at Woodberry Down and are due to bring the final work together into a strategy. They will provide an update soon which will clarify how this will move forward. For Block D, Hackney is progressing with the legal aspects and discussing fit-outs with Berkeley, aiming to begin fit-out work after Christmas. Millco is set to engage with prospective tenants locally. They also plan to arrange a working group meeting within the next week.
- 2.12. Hackney is conducting a final review of the latest information on the Masterplan. Once this is resolved, Hackney will confirm submission dates with Berkeley. The Seven Sisters Road Steering Group has been urging TfL to follow up on a meeting held in April, which is now scheduled for the next couple of weeks. The meeting will focus on discussing the Section 106 funds earmarked for improvements on Seven Sisters Road. The aim is to agree with TfL on the design for enhancements, including improvements to crossings and traffic calming measures.
- 2.13. The construction of the new children's centre is now complete, allowing Berkeley to proceed with relocating the football pitch. The West Reservoir improvements received planning permission in May. Michelle is currently working on parking information. The completion of the 'satellite community facility' space has been delayed in line with Phase 3.
- 2.14. William questioned the value of spending money on Seven Sisters Road and mentioned five options that he felt would not lead to improvements. Hackney responded that the funds will be used for improvements, with the main issue being the Manor House junction and TfL's assessment of the traffic volume in the area. However, the principles behind the Section 106 funds remain unchanged, focusing on reducing the separation of the estate by improving crossings, widening pavements, adding cycle lanes, and other enhancements.
- 2.15. Simon expressed concern over Tom's suggestion that Seven Sisters Road may not be narrowed and requested that the partners provide WDCO with more details on the discussions currently taking place with TfL.

ACTION: Hackney will come back with an update after discussing with the head of transport planning.

- 2.16. Geoff raised that the Design Committee has not received an update on the narrowing of Seven Sisters Road. Hackney clarified that there is no agreed design yet, as the original design was created pre-COVID by a company called Acom, and TfL's priorities for the area have since changed. The delay with TfL is due to the need for a workable design to be proposed. Hackney believes there is still potential to narrow Seven Sisters Road.
- 2.17. Adrian inquired whether planning permission for the football pitch has been granted. Tom confirmed that approval was given in September.
- 2.18. Roda raised the issue with TfL, emphasising that more information and transparency regarding the discussions in the meetings would help the Board better understand the challenges, as well as when and what changes are taking place. Tom noted that Berkeley and Hackney will inform the Board as soon as there are updates, emphasising that delays have been caused by TfL. Roda

mentioned that this issue was raised at the Round Table, where it was suggested that the delivery partners and WDCO should jointly write a letter to TfL to help expedite the process.

- 2.19. Mina asked why the narrowing of Seven Sisters Road is necessary as the traffic is a 20mph zone and will cause more congestion. Simon clarified that Seven Sisters Road is under TfL's control and their main concern is regarding the length of time it takes to provide buses along the road. There are national and local policy changes which lead to issues reducing car usage.
- 2.20. Friends of Woodberry Down asked for a copy of the minutes before the Board meeting.

ACTION: The minutes will be circulated to Friends of Woodberry Down prior to the next meeting.

5. **Board discussion without partners**

- 5.1. **Resolution:** Geoff noted that the final Masterplan was received on Friday, therefore Berkeley did not provide the required 7 days' notice. Roda clarified that she received the presentation from Berkeley 7 days prior to the Board meeting but only distributed it with the Board papers on Friday. Regarding the governing of the Woodberry Down masterplan, Geoff mentioned the partnership agreement and how this states that the partners, which includes WDCO, can ask for special meetings with partners if there is not general agreement on the way forward. The resolution asks for a discussion with Hackney, NHG and Berkeley on the masterplan and highlights issues. This argument has been put forward to tackle the issue of social homes. Geoff also raised that the original figure of 1520 social homes on the estate remains the same and that the Masterplan cuts the number of social homes by 230 overall. This regeneration was meant to replace all existing council homes due to their condition but this is not happening as the number of social homes have dropped by 15%. Geoff also raised the issue of the shared ownership homes which he believed are not affordable for those on an average wage. This was not the regeneration that was promised to the estate. The preferences of residents in social homes were not discussed, such as considering taller buildings and more buildings which would lead to more social homes, or having a shift from shared ownership to social homes and how this would be afforded. The resolution allows WDCO to put forward their options after a negotiation with Hackney, NHG and Berkeley.
- 5.2. Hillary stated that before the regeneration there were 2000 homes on this site, the first Masterplan was for 4664 homes, and 35% social rented and 7% shared ownership. In 2014, the Planning Subcommittee report stated that a second Masterplan was needed as a consequence of the downturn of the economy and the council wanted to ensure that the momentum maintained and the development continued. The 4664 homes increased to 5557 with 41% affordable homes. This report shows that it was never intended for all the social housing to be replaced as social rented units and the housing director supported the 41% affordable number with a roughly 50/50 split between social rent and shared ownership even though it was not planning compliant but was needed to support viability of this site. This confirmed the current split of over 20% shared ownership and 60% private, which is the basis of the development since then. More homes in Phase 3 led to an increase to 5782 under pressure from the council, which ties up with the report from Berkeley homes and shows social rent had 1193. The third masterplan shows that housing numbers increased to 6500 and this should be the number focused on the total number

of homes on this site (1327 social rented, 1350 shared ownership, and the rest private). Hillary raised that WDCO should fight for a cap on the total number of homes on this site to ensure this remains within the Woodberry vision.

- 5.3. Geoff stated that the drop of social homes was because of the financial crisis and that there was an economic situation when the percentage of social homes fell from 33% to 7%, but this percentage stayed the same despite the economic situation having changed. Geoff suspected that Berkeley and NHG are making too much profit out of this.
- 5.4. Geoff noted that the Public consultation is due to start in November. If the Board waits to vote on a resolution in the November Board, they will not be able to have the type of discussion with partners and will not have a mandate on the Board. The only way to have a mandate on the Board is to vote. Geoff mentioned that this resolution should be discussed in time for the public consultation at the end of the year.
- 5.5. The Board members noted that more time is needed to discuss this, and there isn't enough time remaining. They stated that this item should not have been tabled for the final part of the meeting.
- 5.6. Following further discussion, during which the seconders of the resolution withdrew their support, Roda clarified Geoff's proposal. Specifically, the resolution could be withdrawn with the understanding that the Board agrees to engage in discussions with partners. However, if partners are unwilling to address these issues, the Board will not support the masterplan.
- 5.7. The proposers withdrew the resolution with the understanding that the masterplan would be discussed at a future meeting, where the Board would subsequently take a view on the masterplan.
- 5.8. Omar proposed scheduling an emergency meeting next week with all decision-makers from NHG and Hackney. Other members noted that the Mayor had not responded to the Chair's email sent three weeks ago. The Chair reported that she spoke with Guy Nicholson, who was unaware of the original email and has agreed to follow up on it. The Board accepted Omar's proposal for an emergency meeting to address the Phase 3 affordability concerns, which Omar will lead on.

The Items below weren't discussed as the Board ran out of time.

- 5.9. **Board to agree what powers it wants to delegate to the Executive Committee:**

6. **AOB:**

Meeting Ended 10:30pm