

## Notes of Holland Walk Area Housing Panel 21 January 2009

---

### Present

Justine Gordon-Smith	Ilex House TRA
Katherine McInerney	Hollins and McCall TRA
Robert King	Hilldrop Crescent TRA
Thomas Cooper	Lower Hilldrop CRA
Tracy Willoughby	New Orleans Estate TRA
Eileen Avis	1 in 1000 Rep/ Associate Director HFI
Arthur Perry	1 in 1000 Elderly and Disabled Rep
Ron Vince	1 in 1000 Rep
Daniele Pond	Wedmore TRA
Cllr Tracy Ismail	St George's ward
Wally Burgess	St George's Councillor
Janet Burgess	Councillor
Baljit Sheemar	Area Housing Manager
Liza Durrant	Community & Service Development Officer
Winston Morris	Customer Services and Estate Services Manager
Nicholas Arthur	Anti-social Behaviour Manager
Doug Goldring	Director of Operations
Aiden Stapleton	

### Apologies

Dean du Moulin	Hilldrop Crescent TRA – Chair
Philip Boothby	Holly Park Estate TRA
John Slaughter	Moelwyn Hughes TRA
Miranda Estate TMO	
Sue Bineham	Wedmore Estate TRA
Monica Parris	Sussex Close TRA
Cllr Greg Foxsmith	Hillrise ward
Cllr Catherine West	Tollington Ward
All remaining councillors	

ITEM	Matter raised	Action
<b>1.0</b>	<b>Introductions</b>	
1.1	Introductions were made.	
<b>2.0</b>	<b>Previous Minutes and Feedback</b>	
2.1	Agreed	
2.2	Ongoing issue of Free Parking on Burness Close (Lyon St area) - sub contractors are vandalising signs and have had free parking as a result. Dave Hutchinson to respond to TC. Issue has been raised twice previously.	<b>DH</b>

<p><b>2.3</b></p> <p><b>2.3.1</b></p> <p><b>2.3.2</b></p> <p><b>2.3.4</b></p> <p><b>2.3.5</b></p>	<p><b><u>Feedback Item 2</u></b> Ongoing Issue of Wall on Hilldrop Crescent being knocked down by Mansell. Panel not satisfied with response given and request further clarification. Panel request full report on what happened with Mansell on Hilldrop and ICSL on Holly Park regarding wall damage.</p> <p>Discussion around procedures for insurance claims where contractors damage HFI property.</p> <p>Panel recommend HFI to review procedures for counter claims from damages to HFI property. Needs to be clearer procedure in place and feel HFI need to be more robust in regaining costs. Residents should be informed of what evidence is needed to help with claims such as witness testimony, video evidence, photos. The chair raised that residents on her estate had provided video evidence, photographs and witness statements, but no money was recovered from ICSL and residents did not feel they were supported by HFI.</p> <p>Cllr WB- requests a list of claims that have been made should be presented to the panel and a report as to how much damage has been caused, what the costs are and how much has actually been recovered from 3<sup>rd</sup> parties like ICSL and contractors.</p> <p>HFI Confirmed that there are costs to tenants for insurance claims because for the majority of cases HFI self-insure and they just cover costs from existing budgets.</p>	<p><b>PS</b></p> <p><b>ES</b></p> <p><b>PS</b></p>
<p><b>3.0</b></p>	<p><b><u>Local Issues</u></b></p>	
<p><b>3.1</b></p> <p><b>3.2</b></p> <p><b>3.2.1</b></p> <p><b>3.2.2</b></p> <p><b>3.2.3</b></p>	<p><b><u>Petitions</u></b> Two petitions brought to the panel.</p> <p><b><u>Petition 1 – Kingsley House</u></b> A petition was submitted on 4<sup>th</sup> November 2008 from residents of Kingsley House regarding the antisocial behaviour of a resident in the block. The report involved the playing of loud music and constant dog barking emanating from a particular address in Kingsley House.</p> <p>Prior to receipt of the petition, the perpetrator had been interviewed following previous complaints from the lead petitioner and been sent a Final Warning Letter.</p> <p>On receipt of the petition, diary sheets and ASB Support Packs were sent to each of the petitioners with a request they complete and return the diary sheets to the ASB Officer by 8 December 2009. Contact was made to the petitioner's to discuss the issue. They were advised and given information to contact HFI's out of hours anti social behaviour team to report incidents as they happen. In addition to this, the ASB Officer contacted the Animal Warden and Islington's Noise Patrol team.</p> <p>On 8 December 2008, four of the petitioners had returned Diary sheets, the information they gave was sufficient for a Notice of Seeking possession to be served on 9 December 2008. During the early part of January 2009, all petitioners were contacted and the majority reported that the problem with noise is much improved.</p>	

3.2.4	Although most of petitioners have stated that they are happy with the outcome of the actions taken, this case will continue to be monitored over the next four weeks during which liaisons with the Animal Warden and Noise Patrol will be maintained. The petition is therefore closed but the anti social behaviour case will remain open during the monitoring period.	
3.3	<p><b><u>Petition 2 – Coombe House</u></b>  A petition was submitted on 19<sup>th</sup> November 2008 from residents of Coombe House regarding the restriction of access via an Access Gate of Coombe House.</p>	
3.3.1	Petitioners have advised HFI that access to Dalmeny Avenue from Coombe House and vice versa via the gate is vital to many residents, particularly the elderly, other vulnerable and disabled residents as the access gate is the shortest and most accessible route to local shops.	
3.3.2	A consultation letter was issued to affected residents in both Coombe House and Ivinghoe House informing them of the petition and the request for extended opening hours of the gate. Residents were asked for their views on this request.	
3.3.4	Four replies were received. Three are in agreement with extended opening and one against. On receipt of the responses we informed the TRA of the outcome.	
3.3.5	A resident that has a key to the gate has agreed to open and close the gate at the requested times of 8.30am – 9pm. These times will be monitored by officers for a period of three months. The petition is now closed.	
3.4	Article from Inside Housing circulated regarding ALMOs from inside housing.	
4.0	<b>Consultative Panel Reports</b>	
4.1	<p><b>Report 1 - Rent charges and proposals 2009/10</b>  This report is for consultation. DG takes panel through the report.</p>	
4.1.2	<p><b><u>General comments</u></b>  Discussion on paper. TC raises issue of Thames Water. DG confirmed that HFI are in discussions with Thames Water on how to resolve issue of installing water meters into large blocks as Thames Water have previously said it's not feasible.</p>	
4.1.3	DG states loft & cavity insulation does make a big difference. Islington Council are trying to save energy across the board but unfortunately some people will not benefit directly.	
4.1.4	Panel think it's unreasonable that rather than ensure every tenant benefits, by erecting scaffolding to ensure every flat in a block gets cavity wall insulations, HFI propose only the first 3 floors of a block will receive energy saving measures, yet HFI want to charge every tenant for improvements. This is not fair and also not really going to have a lot of impact in terms of energy efficiency or eradicating fuel poverty for council tenants	
4.1.5	JGS pointed out that anyone can ring up Energy Saving Trust for free now, so why spend tenants money employing two advisors?	

4.1.6	The panel felt that for any energy efficiency scheme to work it should be done in organised phases over a period of time and integrated into major works programmes to reduce costs. The panel were not confident that the measures outlined in the proposal would have any real benefit in terms of supporting environmental needs and felt much more planning needed happen to ensure schemes benefit all residents, not just a token few.	
4.1.7	It seems shortsighted that insulation works didn't start along with the Decent Homes Programme. DG noted comments but it's a question of resources and the Council/HFI have to meet statutory requirements first.	
4.1.8	<p><b><u>Recommendations</u></b></p> <p>2.1.1 – Panel propose that there is no rent increase as it's not justified and cavity wall insulation could be paid for by government and levies on council tenants in current scheme totally unacceptable. If this is not viable then option 1 because they haven't seen enough cost savings from council. They should evidence this more and provide rigorous detail to support informed decision making.</p>	
4.1.9	2.1.2 - Panel don't support the proposal to set rents for newly let homes at a higher rate.	
4.1.10	2.1.3 – Panel defer making decision as none currently have communal boilers. Long discussion on problems and inefficiencies with communal experienced by panel members	DH
4.1.11	Discussion on individual heating issues. HFI are looking at options for reducing communal heating.	
4.2	<p><b>Report 2 – Bike Parking on estates</b></p> <p>This report is for consultation. DG takes panel through the report.</p>	
4.2.1	Dave Hutchinson to contact Eileen Avis regarding individual matter.	
4.2.2	Discussion over bikes. General opinion is that they don't cause too many problems/ discussion over pram sheds.	
4.2.4	<p><b><u>Recommendations</u></b></p> <p>Bike stands at no rental costs:  Yes- 1 No- 7  Decisions should be made at a local level.</p>	
4.2.5	<p>Bike stands with rental costs  Yes - 3 abstentions - 6  Decisions made at local level. There needs to be a standard charge.</p>	
4.2.6	<p>Motor bike space  No - unanimous</p>	
4.2.7	Tow away service. Where circumstances are appropriate, if it's illegally parked in a bay or causing damage/risk to life or property. Panel member specified bikes	

	<p>should only be towed away if blocking a parking bay or really inappropriately parked, not one blanket excuse to charge motor bikes.</p>	
<p><b>4.2.8</b></p>	<p>One panel member could not attend asked that her comment be included. I welcome consultation on bike and motorbike parking and have no strong opinions one way or the other. On Wedmore there is a small bike shed but could do with more facilities. What is missing from this report is parking for people with motorised wheelchairs. We have 2 people on our estate who would like to purchase one and it would considerably improve their quality of life but they have concerns about dry, secure parking as currently there is no where on the estate. There is not room to park inside the block and outside it would need some sort of protection. I think it would be impractical to be expecting these older people to be putting big tarpauling over them to keep them dry. Some sort of covered area with some sort of system that the wheelchair could be secured to it a bar, like for bikes. These issues need to be explored.</p>	
<p><b>4.3</b></p>	<p><b>Report 3 – 5% Sustainability, Tenants Compact, Community Safety and Estate Security</b></p>	
<p><b>4.3.1</b></p>	<p>This report is for consultation. DG takes panel through the report. Panel agree to allocate Tenant Compact in separate meetings. Issue that some estates have yet to have this years TC works completed.</p>	
<p><b>4.4</b></p>	<p><b>Report 4 – Financial Inclusion Statement</b> This report is for consultation. DG takes panel through the report.</p>	
<p><b>4.4.1</b></p>	<p>Panel seriously questioned why tenant’s rents should be funding sustainability options that should be funded through other forms of taxation, when cuts are impacting on services like repairs that should be funded from rents.</p>	
<p><b>4.4.2</b></p>	<p>Panel comments that whilst it’s happy for HFI to involve other partners, its aim should be to ensure that tenant’s money is spent on maintaining tenants homes. The financial inclusion work is vital but should be funded by other service providers i.e. Islington Strategic Partnership, European Social funds and other sources of government funding. The chair, (JGS), questioned why effectively tenants, often some of the poorest people in the community, should be paying for employment schemes in the first place for their neighbours. The poor neighbour effectively paying to support the poorer neighbour. She also mentioned Prospects, and many charities such as the Migrant Resource Centre, The Shaw Trust, etc. involved in IAG who would do this work on estates free of charge and suggested HFI look into setting up further partnerships to save on costs. The panel indicated support for her proposal and points made.</p>	
<p><b>4.4.3</b></p>	<p>8.1. Panel request more information on financial implications. How much funding for this work is taken from the existing budgets? What are the different budgets used for this scheme, and what are the percentages? The panel would like to know exactly what this scheme is costing council tenants?</p>	<p><b>EM</b></p>
<p><b>4.4.5</b></p>	<p>DG states that the amount invested is minimal in comparison to the outcome gained. Agrees that it would have been good to have a breakdown of the financial</p>	

	implications.	
<b>4.5</b>	<b>Report 5 – Tenant Satisfaction Survey</b> This report is for information only. TC asked if the improvement in tenant satisfaction bore any relation to the large value of rent increases in the last 4 years? Panel notes report.	
<b>4.6</b>	<b>Report 6 – Disposal of Land Managed by HFI</b> This report is for information only. Panel notes report.	
<b>4.6.1</b>	Panel are dissatisfied that the Islington Scout Hut on Holloway Road is being sold and that panel's comments are not being taken into consideration. They had previously expressed that they didn't want it sold off. A well used resource.	
<b>4.6.2</b>	Land disposal updates to be kept at 6 months.	
<b>4.7</b>	<b>Report 7 – HFI and Consultative Panel Update</b> This report is for information only. Panel notes report.	
<b>4.7.1</b>	Panel ask if the harrier hawk will be used in the north of the borough. HFI looking into. Extremely high costs.	
<b>4.8</b>	<b>Report 8 – Forward Plan</b> This report is for information only. Panel notes report.	
<b>5.0</b>	<b>AOB</b>	
<b>5.1</b>	Wings security- Wedmore. Cars getting clamped when only doing short deliveries. This should be incorporated in new contract that they need to be more patient. DG to check the current situation but clarified that they should wait 10mins before clamping any cars. Confirmed that levels' of complaints from the original contract has reduced considerably.	
<b>5.2</b>	New Orleans entry phones. Where are they going to go as there are no communal doors. BS to investigate and respond to the TRA separately.	
<b>5.3</b>	Hilldrop lights outside community centre. LD to raise with Estate services	
<b>8.0</b>	<b>Date of next meeting</b>	
	Wednesday 18 <sup>th</sup> March 2009	