

Notes of Lyon Street Area Housing Panel 16th March 2009 @ 7.00PM

Present:

Richard Beal	(RB)	Keighley & Staveley TRA (Chair)
Bill Millett M.B.E.	(BM)	Westbourne, 1 in 1000
Liz Colloppy	(LC)	Sturmer Way, 1 in 1000
Pat Croci	(PC)	Papworth Gardens, 1 in 1000 (LH)
Irene Spence	(IS)	Mersey Estate TRA
Amanda Arnold	(AA)	Fairdene Court TRA
Brian Potter	(BP)	Pleasant Place TRA
Gonzalo Coello	(GC)	Thornhill Houses TRA
Cllr Fieran –Reed	(EFR)	St Mary's Ward
Cllr Edwards	(BE)	Holloway Ward
Cllr Spall	(LS)	Caledonian Ward
Kathy Daley	(KD)	Guest – Poynder Court
George Colloppy	(GC)	Guest – Sturmer Way
Dolly Sparks	(DS)	Guest – Papworth Gardens
Lee Williamson	(LW)	Guest – Mersey Estate
Mary Bowman	(MB)	Guest – Sebbon Street
Garry Bates	(GB)	Head of Service, Operations (HFI)
Seval Halil	(SH)	Area Housing Manager (HFI)
Lyn Edwards	(LE)	Area Programme Manager
Lee McDermott	(LM)	Community & Service Development Officer (HFI)

Apologies:

Sadie Lambert	(SL)	Lion Court 1 in 1000 (LH)
Mary Barnard	(MB)	Fairdene Court TRA

ITEM	Matter raised	Action
1.0 1.1	Introductions Introductions were made. LM advised the panel that Seval Halil had become the area housing manager at Lyon Street AHO.	
2.0 2.1 2.2	1/100 Post and Tenant Compact Options: LM advised the panel that Kathy Martin's departure had left a vacancy at the Lyon Street Panel and asked if the panel would like to elect anyone to this post for that meeting as new elections would be held in March. BM nominated himself and this was agreed by all. LM told the panel that Property Services had finally received enough quotes back on the proposals put forward under tenant compact and asked the panel whether they would prefer to allocate funding the following Monday evening or whether they would prefer to meet at the centre in the morning and inspect some of the previous and proposed schemes and then return to the centre for lunch and allocate the compact funds in the afternoon. All except one panel member agreed that the meeting should take place in the day and welcomed the opportunity to see what they were being asked to fund.	
3.0 3.1 3.2	Minutes and Matters Arising Panel Agreed the notes of the meeting on 19.01.09 to be a true and accurate record. BP asked the HFI officers present to ensure that the Consultative Panel Reports were referred to as Area Housing Panel Reports as they were an Area Housing Panel and not a Consultative Panel. LM explained that the term was generic and the reports were used for purposes of consultation with other panels which explained the terminology. Lyon Street Panel was still very much an Area Housing Panel.	
4.0 4.1 4.1.0	Consultation Items Report 1 – Consultative Panel Meeting Dates and Venue LM took the panel through report one. Panel agreed to the venue for its meetings to remain as Westbourne Community Centre and agreed the following dates and times for meeting of the panel:	

<p>4.1.1</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monday 18th May 2009 @ 7.00PM • Monday 20th July 2009 @ 7.00PM • Monday 21st September 2009 @ 7.00PM • Monday 16th November 2009 @ 7.00PM • Monday 18th January 2010 @ 7.00PM • Monday 22nd March 2010 @ 7.00PM 	
<p>4.1.2</p>	<p>BP asked that LM ensure that these dates did not clash with Board Meetings at Highbury House and this was supported by IS.</p>	<p>LM</p>
<p>4.2</p>	<p>Report 2 – Implementation of Estate Services Review</p> <p>GB took the panel through this report.</p>	
<p>4.2.0</p>	<p>Panel made following comments on recommendation 1.3:</p>	
<p>4.2.1</p>	<p>BP and BM advised that the loss of residential CTs would result in poorer relationships between residents and their caretakers and a lack of local knowledge.</p>	
<p>4.2.2</p>	<p>BP asked that Cllr Garry Doolan be invited to the next area housing panel to provide the views of the caretakers.</p>	<p>LM</p>
<p>4.2.3</p>	<p>EFR advised that the loss of a caretaker would result in increase of ASB or dumping on estates. Residents who felt unsafe to contact the police could rely on caretakers to report ASB and other incidents. Also, Caretakers may clean up dog mess or remove lumber over the weekend or evening rather than waiting for the working day.</p>	
<p>4.2.4</p>	<p>LS advised residents were a lot happier knowing there was a caretaker on site whose door they could knock.</p>	
<p>4.2.5</p>	<p>GB advised that all residents would be part of the consultation process and there would be plenty of opportunities to discuss the review and changes before they were implemented.</p>	
<p>4.2.6</p>	<p>Panel made the following comments on recommendation 1.5:</p>	
<p>4.2.7</p>	<p>GB advised that HW AHO had recently undertaken a trial where it removed the weekend element of caretaking for up to twenty blocks and that this resulted in no comments, complaints or implications of a reduction in service.</p>	
<p>4.2.8</p>	<p>BE There will obviously need to be estates that do still have a weekend caretaking service and in particular the estates around the Emirates Stadium when there are matches on at the weekends.</p>	
<p>4.2.9</p>	<p>Panel made the following comments on recommendation 1.8</p>	

<p>4.2.10</p>	<p>LS suggested that written tick sheets were installed in the entrance ways to blocks for caretakers to sign and indicate that they had attended. GB advised that this was considered an option but there were complications where blocks/ estate had a number of entrances.</p>	
<p>4.2.11</p>	<p>Report 3 – Review of Tenant & Resident Constitutions</p>	
	<p>GB took the panel through the report and the panel made the following observations:</p>	
<p>4.2.12</p>	<p>Leaseholder representation:</p>	
<p>4.2.13</p>	<p>BP advised that amending the constitution was for TRAs to do. The makeup of leaseholders and tenants was brought to the panel previously and rejected and felt it was unfair to ask and then ask again if HFI did not get the answer it wanted.</p>	
<p>4.2.14</p>	<p>LM explained that the current wording precluded leaseholders from taking the majority of roles within a TRA and this was the only reason we were seeking this change.</p>	
<p>4.2.15</p>	<p>GC told the panel the Thornhill Houses tried on a number of occasions to establish a TRA but were constantly thwarted by this rule and that he would welcome a change.</p>	
<p>4.2.16</p>	<p>Panel voted on this and seven voted against any changes being made and one voted in favour. The panel would therefore like the wording around the makeup of committees to remain the same.</p>	
<p>4.2.17</p>	<p>Biennial General Meetings:</p>	
<p>4.2.18</p>	<p>Panel discussed the proposal to make General Meetings Biennial and voted five in favour and two against.</p>	
<p>4.2.19</p>	<p>Code of Conduct:</p>	
<p>4.2.20</p>	<p>Panel again discussed this and agreed unanimously with proposed changes.</p>	
<p>5.0</p>	<p>Information Items:</p>	
<p>5.1</p>	<p>Report 4 – HFI Consultative Panel Update</p>	
	<p>This report was for information only. Panel noted this report</p>	
<p>5.1.0</p>	<p>BP asked that HFI stop referring to Council Tenants as theirs as in item 3.1 of this report.</p>	

5.2	<p>Report 5 - Business Plan Objectives 2009/14</p> <p>This report was for information only. Panel noted this report</p>	
5.3	<p>Report 6 – Demystifying HFI’s Finances – HRA Made Simple</p> <p>This report was for information only. Panel noted this report</p>	
5.3.1	<p>BP advised this was a ‘Noddy’ report and that he would prefer some meaningful figures around HFI’s finances.</p>	
5.4	<p>Report 7 – 2008/09 Capital Programme Update</p> <p>This report was for information only. Panel noted this report</p>	
5.4.1	<p>RB asked the panel if they felt it was necessary that the capital updates should include all the other areas and that it was an unnecessary waste of paper as people were not interested. LM advised, that as surprising as it may sound, there were actually individuals who liked to know what was happening across the areas and pointed out again that this was a generic consultation document used by a number of panels.</p>	
5.4.2	<p>The panel agreed that they would prefer not to receive the additional reports and asked that they be excluded in future as it was very wasteful. LM advised he would raise the matter with the Governance Team.</p>	LM
5.4.3	<p>BP highlighted to the panel that there seemed to be the same names that appeared again and again in the framework contractors allocated work and he wanted to know why? LM advised that BP had raised this question at previous panel meetings and had received full explanations from Peter Taunton in response and that he was happy to provide copies of these.</p>	
5.4.4	<p>PC advised that she and the panel should not be concerned with other areas.</p>	
6.0	AOB	
6.1	<p>AA asked why the small planting scheme on Fairdene Court cost £2,000 and wanted to know how this could be justified. LM advised he would request a breakdown of costs from property services.</p>	LM
6.2	<p>RB also advised that a planting scheme recently installed in Keighley and Stavely was carried out via tenant compact but that there had been no maintenance programmed into costs and that there had been a suggestion from property services that tenants should water it. LM advised that he believed the current directive was that all planting schemes should include six months maintenance before being handed</p>	LM

6.3	<p>over to Greenspace to manage. LM advised he would request an explanation for this.</p> <p>IS advised the panel that she had recently received the rent increase letter from LBI and was absolutely disgusted with the wording regarding the increase of rent and the options open if residents were unhappy. IS said that she had written to Cllr Kempton about this and that he assured her future letters would be worded differently.</p>	LM
	Date of next Meeting: Monday 18 th May 2009 @ 7.00PM	