



Adrian Essex <omotng@gmail.com>

First Masterplan

5 messages

Hilary Britton <hcbritton@aol.com>

4 May 2024 at 20:42

To: OOnagh Gormley <oonagh_gormley@hotmail.com>, adrian Essex <omotng@gmail.com>, Barbara Panuzzo <ballerb@libero.it>

Hi All,

I suddenly remembered that before buying here I had looked through the MAsterplan and downloaded quite a lot of it. So I checked my old compute files and found quite a lot of info. I can quite see how confusion has set in over numbers. Although the 1st Masterplan and Outline Planning App are Dec 2006/March 2007 one doc mentions that some decants started in 2004 and then some demolitions followed.

What is interesting is that The Outline PLanning App and the 1st Masterplan were prepared by a firm called Scott Wilson for Hackney Homes Ltd on behalf of the London Borough of Hackney. There is no mention of WDCO as an organisations although mention of views of local residents and BH were not involved. Although it is mentioned that BH had been appointed to develop the Kick Start sites.

The housing figures quoted in these two docs vary slightly from place to place.

The outline Planning App is for a total of 4644 homes of which 41% (1904 homes) affordable made up of 35% social rent (1578 homes) and 7% (325) intermediate - to be able to be bought by key workers etc. This is the most commonly quoted total but others show 4842 total with 31% social rent and 10% intermediate but some of these are stated to be built on land not owned by Hackney(no further detail) At one point this doc mentions that the original 1458 social rented homes minus the 104 units demolished so far at the time of submission of the Planning App, are sought to be replaced through the redevelopment. At another point it refers to increasing housing provisions from 1980 to 4644.

The Masterplan starts of describing Woodberry as having 2013 homes of which 1980 are existing or formerly Hackney Council and 33 privately owned to give total of 2013 for the Estate. So some agreement here but also some confusion!

What is clear though is that BH appear to have n involvement in the 1st Masterplan. And at the early stages it never intended to replace all the social rented with new social rent but instead to have some intermediate housing replacing some social rented.

I am guessing here, but I suspect that once BH became more involved and prior to entering into the partnership agreements to develop the whole site rather than just the Kick Starts, a viability exercise was carried out and it was realised that 59% private housing would not cover the large number of social rented homes originally envisaged plus the smaller % of intermediate. I need to look at the 2nd Masterplan (2014) which I think is still on the Hackney website and possibly the Partnership Agreement.

It is interesting that this 1st Masterplan gives all the details of the facilities to be provided that Geoff is always quoting.

I am attaching part of the docs in case you want to look at them. (Only part of the Masterplan) The second doc, a non tech summary, gives a good overview.

3 attachments



ep-woodberry-planning-statement.pdf
12397K



ep-woodberry-non-technical-summary.pdf
108K



ep-woodberry-masterplan-a.pdf
5300K

Adrian Essex <omotng@gmail.com>

5 May 2024 at 11:08

To: Hilary Britton <hcbritton@aol.com>

Cc: OOnagh Gormley <oonagh_gormley@hotmail.com>, Barbara Panuzzo <ballerb@libero.it>

Hilary

Well done for finding these. I often wonder what I'd actually be able to find should I ever need to in my various backups.

You offer them to us in case we want to look at them. I have begun to look at them (there's a lot to take in) and they provide useful back up for arguments. Unless you object I will add them to the WDCO website. This link to the Hackney Planning portal is already on the website. <https://wdco.org.uk/document/outline-planning-permission-2103-masterplan/> I think this may be the 2014 Masterplan to which you refer.

Throughout, Geoff has referred to the 'promises' made over the years. Not only is it clear that the masterplan documents demand flexibility, and response to changing social and economic conditions, it would be unreasonable to expect promises to survive a global pandemic, swingeing cuts in central government grants and a conflict which has severely disrupted global gas and grain supplies.

And, as I think you've said already, if one of the original intentions was to build courtyards, then they might as well be podiums. The courtyard promise being one that Geoff has not pursued.

A

[Quoted text hidden]

--

Adrian Essex
07970705411

Oonagh Gormley <oonagh_gormley@hotmail.com>

5 May 2024 at 11:55

To: Adrian Essex <omotng@gmail.com>, Hilary Britton <hcbritton@aol.com>

Cc: Barbara Panuzzo <ballerb@libero.it>

I too have spend some time looking at these documents. All very interesting. As BH was not involved in some of the early planning, it is nonsense to try to hold them to any 'promises' made. And interesting Geoff never mentions the promises about private gardens!

I think the issue of 'private' spaces is more Geoff's own ideological position than WDCOs. If WDCO members want to make it public space it is only to reduce their perceived service charge costs, it is not about private versus public space.

I have not heard back from Jackie - Adrian, has my message been circulated to the Exec or is it just being ignored?

O

From: Adrian Essex <omotng@gmail.com>

Sent: 05 May 2024 11:08

To: Hilary Britton <hcbritton@aol.com>

Cc: OOnagh Gormley <oonagh_gormley@hotmail.com>; Barbara Panuzzo <ballerb@libero.it>

Subject: Re: First Masterplan

[Quoted text hidden]

Hilary Britton <hcbritton@aol.com>

5 May 2024 at 12:30

To: Adrian Essex <omotng@gmail.com>, OOnagh Gormley <oonagh_gormley@hotmail.com>, Barbara Panuzzo <ballerb@libero.it>

Hi, Yes lets get them on the website so it is a proper archive.

I do have some more parts of the 2007 Masterplan - it was too huge to down load in one go so I just downloaded various sections. See attached. Will send in two or three emails as large files

[Quoted text hidden]

2 attachments



ep-woodberry-masterplan-c2.pdf
11120K



ep-woodberry-masterplan-c3.pdf
13303K

Hilary Britton <hcbritton@aol.com>

5 May 2024 at 21:06

To: Adrian Essex <omotng@gmail.com>

Cc: OOnagh Gormley <oonagh_gormley@hotmail.com>, Barbara Panuzzo <ballerb@libero.it>

Adrian, I used your website link and looked at the revised Masterplan that is now known as the Second Masterplan. There are two interesting docs that are worth looking at:

The 5.2.2014 Planning Sub Committee report and a report on Community Involvement.

It seems that people were saying exactly the same thing back then as now. But the latter is an interesting read and shows that the Masterplan Review did have a lot of community involvement including WDCO. IT does not discuss numbers.

But the Planning Sub Committee report does have quite a lot of information. It mentions that the the Review of the Masterplan was for various reasons but primarily as a consequence of the down turn in the economy. They need to ensure the momentum maintained and the development completed in accordance with aspirations.

At this stage only KSS1 to 5 were complete and Block E in build. There is reference to the previous agreed masterplan numbers - a total of 4664 homes with 40.8% affordable. But we have here an increase to 5557 in total but still with 40.8% affordable - now 2265 affordable in

total. That is an increase of 329 affordable units it says. But it is clear that it was never intended that the original social housing should be replaced as social rental units, just as affordable housing. It does also state that due to viability the number of social rental units has reduced as a part of the affordable. But it is noted that the Housing Directorate supports the commitment of 41%affordable overall and the new social rental/intermediate mix, even though it is not planning compliant, as it is needed to improve viability and ensure the needs of existing residents are met. They would like to improve the imbalance in Phases 6 to 8. In fact it was laid out that the total % of social rent/intermediate would be lower in Phases 1 and 2, reach 41% in phases 3 to 5 and then correct the imbalance in 6 to 8 to reach 40.8% overall. The message is all about the affordability percentage never the split between rented and intermediate.

There is also mention of podiums in the reviewed masterplan so the concept is not new. I suspect Geoff has been running these same arguments for the last ten years or more. It is a matter of principle for him.

H (sending attachments in 2 emails)

On Sunday, 5 May 2024 at 11:09:03 BST, Adrian Essex <omotng@gmail.com> wrote:

[Quoted text hidden]



818092741662648619__ - __2013-3223-PSC-report.pdf
791K