

Title	Woodberry Down Partnership Board Meeting		
Location	Vision Suite, Berkeley Homes		
Date/Time	26/3/2026 9:30 to 11:00		
Present	Deputy Mayor Guy Nicholson (GN) - Chair Justin Tibaldi, Berkeley Homes (JT) Tom Anthony Morgan, Berkeley Homes (TAM) Adrian Essex, WDCO (AE) Jackie Myers, WDCO (JM) Simon Slater, ITLA (SS) Julian Rodriguez, Notting Hill Genesis (JR) James Glass (JG) Jake Brodetsky, Notting Hill Genesis (JB) James Glass (JG) Simon Donovan, MHDT (SD) Cllr Sarah Young, London Borough of Hackney (SY) Roda Hassan, Public Voice (RH)	Suzanne Johnson, London Borough of Hackney (SJ) Pippa Gueterbock (PG) Gareth Crawford, London Borough of Hackney (GC) Caroline Westhart (CW) Francis Kwarteng (FK) Matt Jenner (MJ) Dujon Harvey (DH) Carlene Liverpool, London Borough of Hackney (CL) - minutes	
Apologies	Hilary Britton, WDCO (HiB) Lizzie Stevens (LS) Cllr Caroline Selman, London Borough of Hackney (CS) Julian Rodriguez, Notting Hill Genesis (JR)		
Items	Minutes		Action
Standing Item	Welcome & Introductions Apologies as above.		
Standing item	Previous Minutes and Action Log The minutes were agreed. GC provided an update on the action log. Action 80 - SY queried whether the Decant and Dart team will process applications for the Anchor Housing over 55 scheme. FK confirmed that the Decant team will process these applications. It was noted that visibility of the costs are needed. SJ confirmed that a written update will be provided by GC.		GC

1.0	Woodberry Down Regeneration Programme Dashboard	
1.1	GN referred to the dashboard. The following points were noted:	
	Berkeley Homes	
1.2	JT reported that construction is a challenge in the current climate. Sales numbers are down by 20% and sale prices are being reduced as a result. It was also noted that market instability and rising energy costs are increasing build costs. The combination of reduced sales volumes and increasing costs is impacting viability. Additionally, there are ongoing challenges with the Building Safety regulator in terms of approval timescales. JT reported that negotiations with the Building Safety regular for phase 4 are currently underway. During the discussion, JT asked for Member support to help raise the issues with Senior political and Officer officials.	
1.3	JT reassured the Partnership Board that Berkley Homes is fully invested in Woodberry Down and committed to delivering homes. It was noted that Berkeley Homes have successfully delivered homes during difficult periods, such as the Covid-19 pandemic.	
1.4	Questions/Discussions JM sought clarity about the impact of the current climate on the delivery of the Woodberry Down Regeneration. JT replied that any delays will be outside of Berkeley Homes control and will have a knock on effect on other phases.	
1.5	AE referred to the phase 6 viability risk and sought clarity about the management strategy. It was noted that various considerations go into viability assessments, including overage, the changing economic context and phase design.	
1.6	JT advised that the GLA is also committed to the Woodberry Down regeneration and assured the Partnership board that all GLA support options will be explored if required. Members of the Partnership board offered to meet AE outside of the meeting to discuss viability further.	
1.7	The dashboard risks were discussed. SJ highlighted that risks are things that may come up in the future and are tracked continuously by the Regen team.	
1.8	GC queried whether the drop in sales numbers related to the whole of Berkely's portfolio or just WoodberryDown. JT reported that Woodberry Down sales remain strong, with Central London being more impacted.	
1.9	SJ added that delays to the regeneration could also be caused by various factors, including the Compulsory Purchase Order process and the need for a Public Inquiry.	
2.0	TAM highlighted that the phase 5 consultation is underway and has been positive to date.	
	LBH Regeneration	
2.1	GC provided a brief update on the phase 5 consultation & engagement and the split household review. It was noted that members of the Regen team carried out door to door engagement with affected secure tenants during March. GC	

	reported that the Split Household review will take place after summer 2026. It was noted that written confirmation of the current position has been provided to partners, WDCO, and the ITLA.	
2.2	CW referred to the Community/commercial strategy procurement and reported that the Request for Quotes (RfQ) process runs from 23 March until 1 May. CW reported that following this, a panel consisting of Delivery Partners will select the winning bidder by June.	
2.3	CW reported that Block D will be handed over from Berkeley Homes to the Council at the end of March. It was noted that there will be a period of preparatory work before Block D is able to launch in the summer. Questions/Discussions	
2.4	Clarity was sought about whether MHDT and WDCO would be involved on the evaluation panel. CW confirmed that WDCO and Development Partners will be on the panel.	
2.5	SY shared concerns about the length of time taken to activate Block D. SJ explained that a number of factors including design adaptations, legal issues and costs have impacted on timescales. SY asked for a written update setting out the reasons for the delays and an indicative timeframe for completion.	<u>GC</u>
2.6	CW reported that she will share the brief following the Partnership Board meeting. Nottinghill Genesis	<u>CW</u>
2.7	JB reported that Phase 3 is completed and Phase 4 is in the latter stages of agreements to finalise the specification. It was noted that Phase 4 has secured GLA grant funding and that NHG will continue to submit funding bids for future phases.	
2.8	JB referred to the Service Charge update presented by JR in a previous Partnership Board. It was noted that an update will come back to the Partnership Board later on in the year.	
2.9	JB reported that a draft terms of reference for the Service Charge working is in development and will be shared with the Partnership Board once internal sign off is obtained from NHG.	
3.0	JG reported that the 25-26 historic service charges are still being worked through. Reasons for the delay included issues with NHG's financial systems and the subsequent manual intervention required. Questions/Discussions	
3.1	JM queried why service charges were not being issued yearly. JG acknowledged that historic system issues had impacted on delivery of timely service charge information. JG reported that NHG will be appointing a dedicated Director to oversee this work, with recruitment for this post due to take place on September 26.	

3.2 3.3 3.4	RH queried whether WDCO could have a follow up meeting with the consultant (working on the system improvements) to review next steps and outcomes. JG to double check and get back to RH. AE sought clarification about the operational changes made to the handy man service and whether this linked to the compliance work. JG reported that the decision was based on efficiency and outputs and reassured AE that the new service will aid performance improvements. SD added that AE and TAM are joining MHDT as new board members. SS reported that Miriam Burke (Chief Operation Officer MHDT) will be moving on to a new role.	<u>JG</u>
2.0 2.1 2.2 2.3 2.4 2.5 2.6	Employment & Skills - Woodberry Down DH provided an update on employment & skills in Woodberry Down for noting and information purposes. DH reported that good progress has been made in providing employment support for people with disability and Learning Disabilities. DH referred to the Hackney Works employment stats within Woodberry Down, highlighting that current performance at 30% is slightly below other comparable sites within Hackney (40%). DH referred to the up and coming move into the Phase 3 community space. It was noted that the benefits of the move include: increased visibility and improved access to private spaces. It is anticipated that the move will increase footfall and improve overall performance. Questions/Discussion JM thanked Hackney Works for its work with young people with Additional Needs and suggested a breakdown of who is supported and the types of support offered would be welcomed. DH to provide information on support needs and what support young people are obtaining. AE queried how apprenticeships were supported and promoted. It was noted that BH has targets to support Hackney residents into work via the S106 agreement. SJ reported that the apprenticeship offer in Woodberry Down is an area which the Council would like to develop further, including exploring the possibility of developing an apprenticeship offer with NHG.	<u>DH</u>

2.7	SY reported that Skinners Academy is keen to have the Council and BH speak to them about apprenticeships. During the discussion, it was suggested that having a centralised contact for school engagement would be better than having several services contact them. DH to work with partners to co-ordinate centralised contacts for schools	<u>DH</u>
2.8	The Partnership Board endorsed the move to the Phase 3 community building.	
3.0	Seven Sisters Road Update	<u>CL/GC</u>
3.1	CW provided a high level progress update on Seven Sisters Road. The following key points were noted:	
3.2	The Seven Sisters Road Steering Group met in March. TfL have listened to feedback regarding Cycleway 50 route and are considering options which avoid Finsbury Park and Woodberry Grove.	
3.3	CW reported that TfL have advised that the wider improvements to Seven Sisters Road will be looked at following 'design freeze' of the Manor House junction and Cycleway 50 alignment.	
3.4	It was noted that the Council has asked TfL to provide a formal "letter of comfort" restating TfL's written commitment to deliver the wider scheme. The next Seven Sisters Road Steering Group will be held on April 26. Questions/Discussions	
3.5	GN requested a set of agreed outcomes with TfL to be reported at the next Partnership Board in relation to the key points included in the update. GN suggested that Street Scene attend the Partnership Board in July to update on Seven Sisters Road.	
3.6	It was also noted that there are now enquiries coming to Councillors about the SSR improvements, and there is a public awareness that the S106 money is no longer index linked.	
4.0	Woodberry Down Cultural Programme Update	
4.1	MJ provided an update on the cultural programme.	
4.2	MJ referred to the phase 4 public art commission and highlighted the project's three key components including: 1) commissioning public art piece(s), 2) appointing a specialist consultant who will manage the project and 3) taking a social engagement approach. It was noted that Woodberry Down residents will be paid and supported to lead the commission and for their ongoing participation in the project.	
4.3	MJ reported that the project will start in early 2027 and take 3 years to complete. It was noted that there is potential slippage depending on what happens to phase 4.	

	Questions/Discussions	
4.4	SY sought clarity on community group involvement and whether WDCO would be involved. MJ reported that the Community Commission group will consist of people who volunteer. It was noted that there will be a Steering Group for this project which will be made up of key stakeholders. It is anticipated that WDCO will be a part of the Steering Group. MJ also reported that the projects will endeavour to work with key partners and advised that he can attend a future WDCO board meeting.	<u>MJ</u>
4.5	TAM highlighted that MJ has overseen successful public art projects with similar budget envelopes. MJ reported that the £300k allocated budget is sufficient. It was noted that the winning bidders will be expected to fundraise for additional money to maximise opportunities for engagement.	
4.6	GN queried who the Public Art commission will be socialised with, beyond the Partnership Board. MJ reported that he will share the brief with key stakeholders, providing them with an opportunity to input.	
4.7	GN sought clarification about whether MHDT will be involved in the project. MJ replied that MHDT will be represented in the Steering Group.	
4.8	It was noted that the tender for the external delivery team will be issued in August and MJ will invite key stakeholders to be involved in the selection panel.	
5.0	Forward Plan	
5.1	There were no items added.	
6.0	AOB	
6.1	AE referred to the regulatory compliance updates on NHG's website. AE noted that the website updates were high level and queried the role of the Partnership Board in providing additional scrutiny. JB reported that NHG's Executive Board reviewed regulatory compliance on a monthly basis and highlighted that due to the confidential nature of some of the work, caution is required in relation to what is shared more broadly. JB to consult with the NHG governance team to identify what can and can't be shared with the Partnership Board.	<u>JB</u>
6.2	SY reported that she is receiving queries about non openable windows in phases 4 and 5. There is some anxiety about this and a clearer picture is needed.	<u>LBH Regen</u>
6.3	SY also reported that she is receiving a significant number of emails about service charges. SY has asked for a combined meeting across residents associations to help address these concerns. Sarah Moore in LBH's regeneration team to liaise with SY and NHG to convene.	
6.4	JB highlighted that the SC working group ToR is in draft and out for internal comment (within NHG). Once concluded, the draft will be shared with Hackney's Regen team.	<u>JB</u>