

## Notes of Lyon Street Area Housing Panel 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2010 @ 7.00PM

---

### Present:

Brian Potter	<b>(BP)</b>	Pleasant Place TRA (Chair)
Bill Millett M.B.E.	<b>(BM)</b>	Westbourne, 1 in 1000
Liz Colloppy	<b>(LC)</b>	Sturmer Way, 1 in 1000
Sadie Lambert	<b>(SL)</b>	Lion Court, 1 in 1000 (LH)
Ray Tapper	<b>(RT)</b>	Thornhill Houses TRA
Kathy Daley	<b>(KD)</b>	Invited Guest – Poynder Court
Mrs Newson	<b>(MN)</b>	Arrived late with no introduction made.
Jon Farrant	<b>(JF)</b>	Head of Service (HFI)
Seval Halil	<b>(SH)</b>	Area Housing Manager (HFI)
Catherine Curzon	<b>(CC)</b>	Special Projects Manager (HFI)
Lyn Edwards	<b>(LE)</b>	Area Programme Manager (HFI)
Lee McDermott	<b>(LM)</b>	Community & Service Development Officer (HFI)

### Apologies:

George Colloppy	<b>(GC)</b>	Guest – Sturmer Way
Dolly Sparks	<b>(DS)</b>	Guest – Papworth Gardens
Cllr Barry Edwards	<b>(BE)</b>	Holloway Ward
Cllr Lisa Spall	<b>(LS)</b>	Caledonian Ward
Irene Spence	<b>(IS)</b>	Mersey Estate TRA
Pat Croci	<b>(PC)</b>	Papworth Gardens, 1 in 1000 (LH)
Richard Beal	<b>(RB)</b>	Keighley & Staveley TRA (Chair)

ITEM	Matter raised	Action
<b>1.0</b>  1.1	<b>Introductions</b>  Introductions were given by all. Panel numbers were low but meeting agreed it would proceed and that it was quorate for second meeting in succession. Apologies were given and noted.	
<b>2.0</b>	<b>Minutes and Matters Arising</b>	
2.1  2.2  2.3	2.1 Panel agreed the minutes of the previous meeting on 18 <sup>th</sup> January 2010 to be a true and accurate record.  2.2 CC advised that works had been raised following 4.3 of the minutes and should be completed in the next few weeks.  2.3 SL advised that she had decided not to take up the Post of the Panel Representative on the re-procurement board as she did not feel it was right that she would not be able to discuss the issues and procurement openly with residents.	
<b>3.0</b>	<b>Report One: Feedback from January Panels.</b>	
3.1	JF took the panel through the paper. The panel read through and noted its contents.	
<b>4.0</b>  4.1	<b>Consultation Items:</b>  <b>Report Two – Consultative Panel Meeting Dates and Venues:</b>  LM advised the panel that historically the panel met at Westbourne on the third Monday of alternative months. On this basis he recommended to the panel that they should continue to meet at Westbourne Community Centre at 7pm on the following dates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monday 17th May 2010</li> <li>• Monday 19th July 2010</li> <li>• Monday 20th September 2010</li> <li>• Monday 15th November 2010</li> <li>• Monday 17th January 2011</li> <li>• Monday 21st March 2011</li> </ul>	

4.2	Panel agreed unanimously on the basis that these meetings did not clash with open HFI board meetings.	
<b>5.0</b>	<b>Report Three – Community Safety and Estate Security Budgets:</b>	
5.1	LM advised the panel that Lyon Street had previously allocated all Estate Security funding to youth diversion but that as a result of Arsenal Positive Futures withdrawing its activities in 2009 there had been some funding spare for small localised initiatives to reduce ASB. These took the form of additional railings on Westbourne and Spinners on the garage roofs at Mersey Estate. It was recommended by the AHO that we should reserve a similar amount of £15k for such schemes in the 2010/11 financial year and allocating the remaining £25k for Youth Diversion initiatives as in previous years.	
5.2	The panel discussed the merits of funding Youth Diversion from the HRA and whilst it was widely recognised it was a good thing, the panel agreed that this would be the last year that it would fund youth diversion activity from this budget. It asked LM to convey this decision to youth providers to allow them to seek alternative funding for the following year but invited bids for schemes to be submitted for this financial year. Anyone submitting a bid were to be invited to the meeting in May and make a presentation to the panel.	<b>LM</b>
	<b>Information Items:</b>	
<b>6.0</b>	<b>Report Four: Business Plan 2010-2015 Feedback:</b>	
6.1	BP asked if the new bedrooms and accommodation being made under 2.1 of the appendix to this report were of sufficient size to meet the 'Parker Morris' standard?	<b>LM</b>
6.2	On 3.3 of the report BP asked what the actual numbers involved in the Involvement Register were and whether he could have a full explanation of how the register was used as he and a number of other people were still very confused.	<b>LM</b>
6.3	BP also asked why and how staff from the HOU were to be housed at HH and asked how they were able to fit. JF explained that there had been a number of reviews and that staff numbers in many departments had been reduced at HH. JF also explained that some services had been relocated out to AHOs and that better use had been made of the space with some teams moving to different areas of the building.	
<b>7.0</b>	<b>Report Five: Repairs Re-procurement:</b>	
7.1	JF took the panel through the report.	
7.2	SL advised that she and many of the panel felt that an emphasis should be given within the re-procurement to contractors who would place and	

	<p>emphasis on local employment. She felt that far too many staff commuted into work from outside the borough.</p>	
7.3	<p>BM asked if all residents would receive a booklet or some information on who and what organisations were responsible for what under the new contract. JF advised it was unlikely due to the expense but that we would hope that all reports would be taken on one telephone number as it is currently so residents should not need to know.</p>	
7.4	<p>On 4.1 Mrs Newson asked whether there were moves to bring forward cyclical maintenance as she previously understood it was seven year cycles but knows of schemes taking place again within five years. JF advised he understood it was still seven.</p>	
7.5	<p>Mrs Newson went on to ask how criticism regarding consultation with leaseholders she understood had been made by the Audit Commission had been taken into account during the new procurement process. JF responded by advising that he was not aware of the specific criticism but that any comments from the Audit Commission would always be taken into account.</p>	
<b>8.0</b>	<p><b>Report Six: Allocation Policy Changes</b></p>	
8.1	<p>This report was for information only. Panel Noted the report</p>	
<b>9.0</b>	<p><b>Report Seven: HFI and Consultative Panel Update</b></p>	
9.1	<p>This report was for information only. Panel Noted the report.</p>	
<b>10.0</b>	<p><b>Report Eight: Capital Programme Update</b></p>	
10.1	<p>This report was for information only. Panel Noted the report.</p>	
10.2	<p>BP made the comment that still there were only four main contractors and that it was evident to see that the borough had been carved into four distinct areas with each contractor getting their slice. BP added that many of these contracts were too large and not value for money.</p>	
11.0	<p>AOB</p>	
11.1	<p>CC advised that following the tenant compact meeting many of the costs were now in and that initially the panel had agreed to re-visit the priority 2 schemes later in the year to agree which of these would be prioritised. CC advised that there was still a substantial chunk unallocated and that she would like to bring this back to the meeting earlier – perhaps at the May panel or a separately convened meeting.</p>	
11.2	<p>The panel agreed to this.</p> <p>Mrs Newson commented that whilst the panel’s work should be lauded that they should all bear in mind that agreeing to tenant compact work would end up in charges on leaseholders’ bills. CC advised that all work agreed by the panel was consulted upon with the residents directly</p>	

	affected and that this should not mean that vital improvements should not be made.	
9.0	Date of next Meeting: Monday 17 <sup>th</sup> May at 7.00pm	



improving housing through partnership