

	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Upper Street South Area Housing Panel Meeting</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;">16th July 2009</p>	
	<p>Present: Pritpal Chhoker – Upper Street Area Housing Manager (PC) Dave Selo – Director of Resources (DS) Winston Morris – Homes for Islington (WM) Virginia Stephens – Homes for Islington (JG) Stephen White - Homes for Islington (JB) Conrad Giwa - Homes for Islington (CG) Jessie White – Hawthorne Close TRA (JW) Lorna Reid – Highbury Estate TRA (LR/Chair) Mrs Lea – 1 in 1000 (ML) Carol Johnson – Burder Close TRA (CJ) Colin Rennie – Western Isles TRA (CR) Marge Johns – Kerridge Court TRA (MJ) Rebecca Hogdson – Highbury Quadrant TRA (RH) Patrick Schunemann – Park View TRA (PS) Pat Krouse – Hathersage TRA (PK) Margaret Johns – Kerridge Court TRA (MJ)</p> <p>Guest: Eileen Digby (ED), Alf Digby (AD), D.Hamilton (DH), R.Elderton (RE), J.Simmonds (JE).</p> <p>Apologies: Phil Stevens (1 in 1000 rep)</p>	
Item		Action
1	<p>Individual introductions made by those in attendance.</p> <p>Western Isles TRA - Complained about the late receipt of the papers and reports to be discussed at panel.</p> <p>Chair – Proposing that if the local report is late again that Upper Street AHO ensure that the central reports go in time. Recommending that late reports should be hand delivered.</p> <p>PC – Apologised to panel and agreed to chairs proposal.</p>	

<p>2</p>	<p><u>Minutes of last meeting</u></p> <p>Burder Close</p> <p>CJ – Updated panel on outcome of joint inspection with technical officer.</p> <p>PC – Confirmed that he had responsibility for ensuring that follow up actions regarding this matter were taking place.</p> <p>Estate Service Efficiencies Review</p> <p>Collective concerned expressed re: Abena’s apparent failure to contact TRA’s in regards to this issue.</p> <p>Signage on Highbury Estate</p> <p>WM – Confirmed that this work will be completed by early August.</p> <p>LR – Expects to be told if this timescale/deadline changes.</p> <p>Tenants & Residents Associations</p> <p>JW – Highlighting TRAs that are not applying for their Admin and Publicity grants.</p> <p>Procurement of Repairs & Maintenance Contract (HFI)</p> <p>JW – Phil Stevens nominated to customer panel on procurement. Would like clarification that this was done</p>	<p>PC</p> <p>PC</p> <p>WM</p> <p>SW</p>
<p>3</p>	<p><u>Questions from panel</u></p> <p>Item 5 – JW – Issue of what happens when the ALMO(s) comes to an end, raised in Parliament. When the ALMO comes to the end of its period, there should be a ballot of all the residents in respect of future management and the way forward.</p> <p>PC – Agreed to print newsletter and leaflets produced by TRAs</p> <p>LR – Thanked HFI for report in regards to Worklessness Initiative.</p>	

<p>4</p>	<p><u>Petitions</u></p> <p>i) Mildmay Street – <i>petition re: closure of alleyway</i></p> <p>WM – Provided panel with an update on the current situation regarding this matter. Alternative solution has now being arrived at. Met with residents on 15th July 2009 and they did not like the proposal. Now considering court action which can be potentially long and drawn in regards to blocking off the alley way. This seems to be what the resident at Mildmay Street want. Cost my be prohibitive on this and the legal advice is that there is a 60 - 40 chance that we won't get this.</p> <p>JW – Disputes police information contained in the report.</p> <p>PC – The difficulties and ASB issues in the area are accepted. Issue now is the establishment of the right of way status. The physical alternatives in tandem with the current legal position, has been explained to residents. The legal advice has been discussed with the Director and as chances of success in obtaining an order are only 40% would not go down the legal route.</p> <p>LR – Queried reasons behind a stopping order in one instance and crime prevention order in the other.</p> <p>PC =- Each case is looked at on its merits and each case is different and as such different approaches apply. With regards to Kerridge Court, again chances of getting a stopping order is low and the TRA does not wish to take the legal route.</p> <p>JW – Highlighted service charges paid for the cleaning of the alley way near Mildmay Street.</p> <p>WM – Unaware of this and undertook to look in to it and update residents.</p> <p>ii) Kerridge Court – <i>petition re: proposed closure of walkway on estate as part of security works</i></p> <p>WM – Updated panel on the situation. Once again has met with Legal on site. Private residents will also need to be written to in regards to proposal to close off the walkway.</p> <p>MJ – TRA not waiting for an order and are now looking at alternatives in conjunction with Groundwork so works can proceed.</p> <p>LR – Is this issue now approaching resolution?</p>	<p>WM</p>
----------	---	------------------

<p>5</p>	<p>MJ – Yes and we are now looking at what can be done in regards to the other entrances to the estate.</p> <p><u>Estate Security Budget</u></p> <p>WM – Lights bids should be placed on hold whilst we go through looking at sustainability and a budget that is available in that respect.</p> <p>LR – As several bids are related to lighting, can these be agreed tonight?</p> <p>CG – The extra funding is to upgrade all lighting to a sustainable level.</p> <p>LR – If sustainability budget is large enough we should get the money back.</p> <p>CG – Budget will supplement cost and not replace the full cost.</p> <p>DS – Recommending issue be looked at again at the next panel meeting when ideally there should be more information to hand.</p> <p>PC – Highlighted that money must be spent this year. Recommending that if more money does become available that we come back to panel and update them.</p> <p>LR – Concerned that there is money available that affects the panel that has only being brought to the panels attention tonight.</p> <p>CG – Advised that information regarding the sustainability funding only became available about two weeks ago.</p> <p><i>At this point panel made its ways through the list of schemes submitted for funding from this budget.</i></p> <p>Brancaster House – Deferred to next meeting as this is a lighting issue. Panel requesting details as to precisely how many lights are to be provided.</p> <p>Horsefield House – Lighting – deferred to next meeting.</p> <p>Kerridge Court – reason for bid explained by resident representative in attendance at meeting.</p> <p>Bid agreed.</p> <p>Sinclair Court – WM clarified reason for bid.</p> <p>Bid agreed</p>	<p>WM</p> <p>WM</p>
----------	---	-----------------------------------

<p>LR – Requesting that in regards to Kerridge Court and Sinclair that reports are prepared for the September panel in regards to ASB strategies on these estates as both of those bids are ASB related.</p> <p>Eric Fletcher House – Lighting – deferred to next meeting.</p> <p>85 Caldly Walk - reason for bid explained by resident representative in attendance at meeting.</p> <p>LR – Recommending that this work be funded from any savings made from money allocated from the Tenants Compact for fencing works on Caldly Walk.</p>	<p>MM</p>
<p>PC – Agreed that we will do this.</p> <p>Caldly Walk - reason for bid explained by resident representative in attendance at meeting.</p> <p>PC – Highlighted ASB problems on the estate and action taken to date.</p> <p>LR – Concerned why there are a lack of ABCs in relation to this matter.</p> <p>RE – Highlighted initiatives undertaken on the estate and ASBO served on one youth in the area. Also concerned about allocations policy on the estate.</p> <p>LR – Would like a report from HFI on the New Generation Scheme in the context of property allocation on the Marquess Estate/Caldly Walk. Also would like to know what steps are being taken to support those re-housed on Caldly Walk.</p>	<p>PC</p>
<p>JW – Proposed to raise the New Generation Scheme issue with Doug.</p> <p>Bid agreed</p> <p>Newington Green Mansions</p> <p>Bid agreed</p> <p>Mildmay Street -</p> <p>Bid rejected</p>	<p>LBI</p>

	<p>Upper Caldby Walk - reason for bid explained by resident representative in attendance at meeting.</p> <p>Bid agreed</p> <p>Burder Close</p> <p>CJ – Raised an issue regarding agreed improved lighting to the estate under last years tenants compact. Apparently out of the 8 blocks 3 have been done with the remainder still outstanding.</p> <p>WM & PC – Undertook to look into this and bring a report to the next panel.</p>	<p>WM & PC</p>
<p>6</p>	<p><u>Estate Security Budget – Rosebowl & Canonbury Youth Project</u></p> <p>LR – Thanked both projects for the reports that they had submitted but sought clarification around precisely what they were seeking to fund</p> <p>JS – To continue funding the support we provide the youths who attend the Rosebowl of which 45 are very difficult. There have been 5 other funding bids submitted of which 3 have been turned down.</p> <p>LR – Enquired about providing 50% of the funding requirement to cover the HFI youths which attend the facility.</p> <p>RE – Advised that youths attend from HFI managed estates and not just the Marquess/New River Green area.</p> <p>LR – Sees this as an LBI responsibility and all we can do is make a contribution. This service is needed and LBI cannot afford for it to stop. The request this year is for more funding then last year.</p> <p>JS – Highlighted that Rosebowl and Canonbury Youth Project are now totally separate schemes.</p> <p>LR – Believes that Rosebowl has the option of seeking alternative where as residents do not in relation to bids/schemes submitted.</p> <p>JS – Will take whatever is on offer from the panel but does not believe that LBI will provide any further funding. Highlighted how the work undertaken by the Rosebowl benefits the youths and residents.</p>	

	<p>LR – Panels lack of funds is not a reflection of a lack of support. The Rosebowl and its funding needs need to be discussed in another forum.</p> <p>JS – Believes that prevention is better then cure in the context of this project.</p> <p>LR – Compact schemes seem to be coming in under budget with a few going over. As a matter of urgency can we have clarification as to where we are with this budget.</p> <p>CG – Savings from P.1s should go to P.2s in regards to the Tenants Compact.</p> <p>JW – Proposing that in principal we agree the same level of funding as we agreed last year.</p> <p>LR – Proposed to the panel that we make a contribution of £6k to the Rosebowl and £3k to the Canonbury Youth Project subject to costings being agreed in regards to the Tenants Compact and the Estate Security Budget.</p> <p>Put to a vote:</p> <p>7 for 1 Abstention</p> <p>Vote carried.</p> <p>For the record LR requesting that all information to be discussed at panel be brought to chairs attention at the beginning of the meeting which would avoid scenarios like those experienced at this meeting. If this does not happen we will follow the complaints procedure.</p> <p>JS – Thanked panel and would like to be considered for any additional funding if this becomes available.</p>	CG
7	<p>Central Reports</p> <p>All reports introduced by Dave Selo</p> <p>i) Feedback from May 2009 Consultation Items</p> <p>Report noted</p> <p>ii) Climate Change Briefing</p>	

	<p>LR – Would like figures in regards to savings in relation to the installation of double glazing.</p> <p>DS – Undertook to take this back and see what figures HFI could provide.</p> <p>LR – Where HFI have made bids for funding what is plan B if the funding fails to come through.</p> <p>DS – We do have some funding and it is really how we go about spending it. If we do not have the money we can't do it.</p> <p>LR – Will we be receiving update reports on what is going ahead and what is not?</p> <p>DS – Yes</p> <p>iii) Repairs and Maintenance Re-procurement.</p> <p>Report noted</p> <p>iv) Supporting Tenants & Residents Associations (TRAs)</p> <p>Report noted</p> <p>v) Complaints Monitoring October 2008 – March 2009-07-29</p> <p>Report noted</p> <p>vi) Capital Programme 2008/09 Monitoring Qtr 4</p> <p>Report noted</p> <p>vii) Homes for Islington – Consultative Panel Update</p> <p>Report noted</p> <p>vii) Forward Plan</p> <p>Report noted</p>	DS
8	<u>Performance Indicators & Local Reports</u>	

	<p>Reports noted</p> <p>LR – Enquired about Kiers poor performance in relation to voids and what HFI proposed to do. Requested that a report be brought to panel on this matter for the next meeting.</p>	GB
9	<p><u>AOB</u></p> <p>None</p>	
	<p>Date of next meeting</p> <p>17th September 2009</p> <p>In</p> <p>Committee Room 1, Town Hall</p>	