

NOTES OF THE CENTRAL STREET AREA HOUSING PANEL

Thursday 15th November 2007 – Central Street Area Housing Office – 7pm

Present:

Helen Cagnoni (HC)	Greenwood, Wilmington, Farringdon & Yardley St TRA (Chair)
Frances Sullivan (FS)	King Square TRA
Blanche Woodbridge (BW)	King Square TRA
Maureen Smith (MS)	Brunswick Estate TMO
Terry Lefevre (TL)	Pleydell Estate TMO
Shirley Lefevre (SL)	Pleydell Estate TMO
Danny Unstead (DU)	Pleydell Estate TMO
Joe Trotter (JT)	Peregrine House
Jackie Cross (JC)	Quaker Court
Pat Freeman (PF)	Quaker Court
Abdelhak Menia (AM)	Cluse Court TRA
Valerie Semper (VS)	Cluse Court TRA
Barbara Coventry (BC)	Popham TRA
Sharon Hayward (SH)	Finsbury Estate TRA
Dennis Kleinberg (DK)	Whitbread Estate TRA
D Chadwick (DC)	Whitbread Estate TRA
B Ward (BWard)	Whitbread Estate TRA
Cllr Jyoti Vaja (JV)	Bunhill Ward Councillor
Doug Goldring (DG)	Director of Operations, HFI
David Salenius (DS)	Area Housing Manager, HFI
Aiden Stapleton (AS)	Manager – Project Management, HFI
Lena Shah (LS)	Project Officer, HFI
Mary Caudron (MC)	Community and Service Development Officer, HFI

1	Apologies	
1.1	Apologies received from: a. Francois Smit, Ben Crowe, Ray Yates, Rachel Himbury, Ben Phegan and Hugh Partridge.	~
2	Whitbread Estate Petition	
2.1	Background a. AS distributed a report responding to residents' concerns about the state of their windows. The petition was received by HFI on the 19 th September and was signed by 102 residents. b. The report advised that HFI would not be looking to renew the windows as they could be retained by repair for a further 7 years. The report referred to IDC's decision in January 2007 that if windows are single glazed but do not require renewal then they should be maintained. c. AS added that the number of repairs carried out did not warrant the windows being replaced.	~
2.2	Feedback from Residents a. DK advised that he, BWard and DC were representing the many residents from Whitbread that had wanted to attend the meeting. b. DK raised his concern that about the about the late response and the fact that	

	<p>the petition had been sent to AS but responded to by the project officer LS.</p> <p>c. DK reiterated his concerns about health and safety, rotting frames and condensation. The TRA were also unsure if anyone had visited the estate to carry out a survey before responding. HC asked if one had been carried out and AS advised a visual inspection had been done. AS added that he was happy to meet DK on site next week.</p> <p>d. There was concern from the panel that these windows were 26 years old but windows less old than this were being replaced.</p> <p>e. HC was concerned that the panel had not been consulted with on the IDC's decision.</p> <p>f. DG advised that the IDC's decision was reasonably binding, however residents were owed details of any surveys that had been carried out. DG advised that the survey would be reviewed to confirm whether the correct decision had been made on window replacement.</p> <p>g. DK accepted this and HC asked to be copied into the survey and response.</p>	<p>AS</p> <p>AS</p> <p>AS</p>
3	Notes of Last Meeting and Matters Arising	
3.1	<p>Notes of Last Meeting</p> <p>a. The panel agreed the notes as a true and accurate record of the last meeting.</p>	~
3.2	<p>Matters Arising</p> <p>a. MC distributed a feedback sheet updating the panel on the actions from the last meeting.</p> <p>b. AS confirmed that the Cyrus House petition had gone to the sub Board and IDC following the panel. The decision had remained that the works would be carried out in 2009/10 and the TRA had been responded to.</p> <p>c. MC confirmed the offer of helping advertise the safer neighbourhood panel meetings had been extended to the police.</p> <p>d. MC advised that Una O'Halloran was the current rep on the Estate Services Improvement Group although she had not been able to attend some meetings. It had been suggested a second rep or deputy be nominated to ensure the area was represented however no members of the panel were interested. MC to email round details to TRAs and see if anyone is interested.</p> <p>e. DS confirmed that tenant satisfaction survey results for the Central Street area had been presented at the sub panels. The antisocial behaviour update report had also been amended to include the month that each case was opened.</p>	MC
4	Business Plan 2008-13 – Consultation	
4.1	<p>Background</p> <p>a. DG introduced the report and highlighted the 23 proposals. DG asked the panel what their priorities were and if they felt that there was anything missing. At the request of the panel DG then went through each item in detail.</p>	~
4.2	<p>Feedback from the panel</p> <p>a. The panel had no overall view but made a number of comments regarding the proposals.</p> <p>b. Item 1 – SH was concerned that her emails to HFI were bouncing back and asked if there was some kind of block. DS to look into.</p> <p>c. Item 9 – JT complained that he had tried to get in contact with Property Services regarding the satellite dishes but staff did not respond to messages.</p>	DS

	<p>DG acknowledged there were some issues, but the response rates at the area offices were over 90%. DG advised that the proposal to record calls would ensure residents were dealt with the respect they deserve.</p> <p>d. Items 1-10 – HC commented that the first 10 items were all relating to IT with priority 1 or 2, but not all residents have access to IT and not all are of benefit to residents. DG advised that the latest survey showed 50-60% have IT access, which would only increase in the future. The benefit to residents was the increased number of ways they could get in contact.</p> <p>e. Item 11 – AM complained that on 2 occasions Kier had said they attended a repair but there was no access, although the resident had been sitting in all day both times. DS to take up with Kier.</p> <p>f. Item 15 - it was queried whether HFI would use CCTV footage to catch or evidence dog fouling. DS confirmed that this could be used if the perpetrators could be identified.</p> <p>g. Item 16 – DK complained that residents from the Whitbread Estate were being charged for Greenspace services but had no green areas on the estate. DG advised this was a valid point and asked DS to look into.</p> <p>h. JC was concerned that the TMO at Quaker Court were not being notified of voids or being allowed to see it before hand. DG advised that the area office should carry out an inspection with the TMO although costs were mostly now nearer £3k so TMOs would not be responsible. DS added that often the office did not know there would be a void for example if keys were just handed in at reception. DS to take up with the New Tenancy Liaison Officer.</p> <p>i. DG advised that if the panel had any further comments in the next 2-3 weeks, they could pass them on to Paul Davey whose contact details were at the end of the report.</p>	<p>DS</p> <p>DS</p> <p>DS</p>
5	Consultative Panel Terms of Reference – Consultation	
5.1	<p>Background</p> <p>a. DG introduced the report and went through the proposed amendments to the panel's terms of reference.</p>	
5.2	<p>Feedback from Residents</p> <p>a. 1 in 1000 – DG advised there were a number of vacancies and asked the panel what they thought. HC commented that it would be even more unlikely to get that many 1 in 1000 reps now, because of the change in demographics. Overall the panel had no particular opinion.</p> <p>b. TMOs and TMCs – the TMOs present preferred attending the area housing panel and there was no opposition to changing the TMO/TMC panel to more of a business meeting.</p> <p>c. SH queried the TMO versus TRA preference and DG advised of the thinking that the TMO were the consultative body as were elected with a board and were effectively doing the job of a TRA. MC confirmed she was aware of only 1 estate with a TMO and TRA, which was Pleydell Estate.</p> <p>d. Councillors – JV felt it more important that the terms of reference read that Councillors didn't have voting rights. The panel agreed that it should read that Councillors have no voting rights and couldn't be members. This was no different to what happened at the panel anyway.</p> <p>e. Partners – the panel agreed with the proposed change.</p> <p>f. Frequency – the panel agreed with the proposed change.</p> <p>g. Conduct – DG went through the points and no objections were made. HC added that they had always maintained the meeting was public and observers were able</p>	<p>~</p> <p>~</p>

	to contribute. No further comments were made.	
6	Charging Proposals – Consultation	
6.1	<p><u>Digital TV</u></p> <p>a. DG introduced the report and advised that there had been lots of concerns about the charging following the last meeting. DG advised that the proposals put forward to LBI would include all the comments made by the panel. DG explained the funding gap and stressed that the switchover needed to be met by 2012.</p> <p>b. DK asked if these were the final figures or assumptions? DG advised these were the figures HFI would recommend to LBI.</p> <p>c. JT advised he hadn't had any feedback regarding the satellite dishes and that better communication was needed with residents about the proposals.</p> <p>d. JV queried why Sky were providing the service rather than anyone else. DG clarified that Sky would be doing the work but that residents could chose which service provider they wanted once the work was completed.</p> <p>e. JV asked how long the 25p contribution would be for and DG advised it was indefinite.</p> <p>f. HC had been informed that an expert had stated there was no 'specifically manufactured digital cabling' therefore the existing cabling did not need replacing and could be used at no extra cost. HC raised her concerns about future costs of possible litigation if replacement cabling was forced on tenants unnecessarily.</p>	~
6.2	<p><u>Service Charges</u></p> <p>a. DG explained how the unpooling worked and asked if residents wanted to see any further breakdown relating to their estate. DG stressed that the total rent would not change.</p> <p>b. DK advised he would like to see individual charges at Whitbread because of his concerns that residents were being charged for a Greenspace service they weren't getting.</p> <p>c. HC was concerned she could never find out how many hours her caretaker was meant to work on her estate. DS to advise.</p> <p>d. SH queried if this would allow HFI to increase the charges to these unpooled services that were previously capped when included within the rent charge? SH also queried if new services would be additional to these costs. DS to raise with David Selo.</p> <p>e. Overall the panel agreed the proposals seemed reasonable if no extra costs were involved.</p>	<p>DS</p> <p>DS</p>
6.3	<p><u>Green Parking</u></p> <p>a. DG went through the proposed vehicle bands and advised that HFI was not looking to make money but to be cost neutral.</p> <p>b. HC was concerned that the bands did not include a usage qualification that would establish if a car was causing pollution, as many were used infrequently and should not be charged extra if not used. HC also stated that the banding proposals were not part of the previous consultation and therefore not part of the previous cutting pollution agreement.</p> <p>c. HC added that tenants with older cars would be penalised for not being able to afford a vehicle fitting in the cheaper bands.</p> <p>d. Overall the proposals were agreed by the panel.</p>	~
6.4	<p><u>Concierge Services</u></p> <p>a. DG introduced the report and referred to the updated indicative charges that should have been tabled at the meeting. MC to distribute following the meeting.</p>	MC

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. DG explained the differential charging and went through how the proposals would work for estates with concierges in the Central Street area. c. BW queried what would happen to properties on the ground floor of blocks that benefited from CCTV but were not linked to the concierge via a handset. It was felt these properties should be charged 45% rather than 75% or 100% as they were not getting the same service as other properties in the block. An example of this was President House. d. JT felt that people were paying for a service that they weren't getting when scaffolding blocked CCTV and should get a refund. e. The panel agreed with the principle of differential charging and felt this should be on a block by block basis, and in some cases property by property. 	~
7	Repairs Budget Policy – Consultation	
7.1	<p>Background</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. DG distributed copies of HFI's repair obligations and advised the panel that HFI had bowed to customer pressure and carried out repairs over and above its repair policy. DG advised that HFI would be looking to more strictly apply the repairs policy. 	~
7.2	<p>Feedback from the panel</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. BW advised she had been told that elderly residents would get a new letterbox. DG didn't think this was in the repairs policy. b. DG confirmed that caretakers could go up to a certain height using a ladder and that all had received this training. c. JV felt that it was important that residents were told HFI was now sticking to the policy. a. SH suggested a booklet with diagrams was suggested and DG confirmed diagrams were in the tenants handbook and online. 	~
8	HFI/Arsenal Football Positive Futures Partnership – Information	
8.1	<p>Positive Futures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. HC had attended a meeting where some young people felt they couldn't get in contact with anyone to set something up in their area. DG advised that 2 new estates had just been rolled out and they should get in touch with John Lane. b. The panel noted the report. 	~
9	Review of Complaints and Ombudsman – Information	
9.1	<p>Complaints</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. DG advised that there were a reduced number of complaints in operations and clarified the stage 3 process for JT. b. The panel noted the report. 	~
10	HFI and Consultative Panel Update – Information	
10.1	<p>Decision Items</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. DG advised that JT and BC had been elected to the Board. HFI had also been reaccredited with the Charter Mark. b. The panel noted the report. 	~
11	Decision Items at last Board and Sub Board – Information	
11.1	Decision Items	

	a. The panel noted the report.	~
12	Forward Plan	
12.1	Forward Plan a. The panel noted the report.	~
13	Capital Programme Monitoring 2007/8, 2nd Quarter – Information	
13.1	Capital Programme a. The panel noted the report.	~
14	Consultative Panel Development	
14.1	Panel Training a. The panel noted the report.	~
15	Central Street Performance Report – Information	
15.1	July 2007 Performance Report a. DS distributed the performance report for September and advised that the office had done extremely well, coming top for the month. b. DS asked the panel for comments on the report and for any other information they wanted to be included.	~
15.2	Antisocial Behaviour Update a. DS distributed an antisocial behaviour update detailing the status of each of the live cases. The panel noted the report and agreed it was very helpful. b. DS asked attendees to advise of any other cases they were aware of which were not included in the report.	~
16	AOB	
16.1	Tenants of Leaseholders a. SH raised her concerns about the tenants of leaseholder properties causing lots of problems on estates. SH suggested a bundle of leaflets that could be put through the door so they knew what was expected. b. DG confirmed that leaseholders were bound by the same conditions as tenants. DG added that buy to let was a big issue for HFI and was the next big challenge.	~
16.2	Date of Next Meeting a. The next meeting would be held at 7pm on Thursday 24th January 2008 at the Brunswick Meeting Room, Mulberry Court.	~