

Notes of Lyon Street Area Housing Panel 16th July 2007

Present:

Richard Beal	(RB)	Chair
Bill Millett M.B.E.	(BM)	Mackwest TRA
Kathy Martin	(KM)	Papworth Gardens 1 in 1000
Mary Barnard	(MB)	Fairdene Court TRA
Sadie Lambert	(SL)	Lion Court 1 in 1000 (LH)
Pat Croci	(PC)	Papworth Gardens, 1 in 1000 (LH)
Bert Gafney	(BG)	Caledonian Estate TRA
Brian Potter	(BP)	Pleasant Place TRA
Louise Geraghty	(LG)	Field Court TRA
Mat Calvert	(MC)	Boston & Nailour TRA
Mary Bowman	(MB)	Guest – Sebbon Street
Gloria Johnson	(GJ)	Guest – Bemerton Estate
Dolly Sparks	(DS)	Guest - Papworth gdns
Kathy Daley	(KD)	Guest – Poynder Ct
Cllr Lisa Spall	(LS)	Caledonian Ward
Cllr Edwards	(BE)	Holloway Ward
Gary Bates	(GB)	Senior Area Housing Manager (HFI)
John Eustace	(JE)	Area Housing Manager (HFI)
Lyn Edwards	(LE)	Area Programme Manager (HFI)
Lee McDermott	(LM)	Community & Service Development Officer (HFI)
Michael Hooper	(MH)	Project Assistant (HFI)
Lisa Noonan	(LN)	Antisocial Behaviour Officer (HFI)

Apologies:

Liz Callopy	Sturmer Way, 1 in 1000
Cllr Coupland	St Mary's Ward
Cllr Chatterjee	Holloway Ward

ITEM	Matter raised	Action
1.0	Introductions	
1.1	<p>Richard Beal opened the meeting as the new chair of the panel and the Lyon Street Associate Director of HFI.</p> <p>All attendees then made their introductions.</p>	
2.0	New Ground Rules for Panel.	
	<p>RB took the panel through the new ground rules of the panel (attached for your information) and invited the panel to comment or make any further suggestions for consideration.</p> <p>No further suggestions were made and the panel agreed.</p>	
3.0	Previous notes and matters arising	
3.1	<p>Panel agreed the May panel notes to be a true and accurate record. However BP requested the following amendments be made to item 9.1:</p>	
3.2	<p>HFI had unilaterally stopped the CNC meetings and had never given any explanation as to why these were stopped and not allow BP to add to the agenda of future meetings.</p>	
	Consultation Items	
4.0	Estate Parking Initiatives	
	<p>GB took the panel through the paper and explained that they were being asked for their thoughts on four areas of parking:</p>	
4.1	<p>Enforcement fees be increased, in line with other London Boroughs, to £95 for de-clamping and £165 for release of impounded vehicles.</p>	
4.1.1	<p>Cllr Spall expressed concerns at the quality of service being provided by the current contractor as she had received complaints from residents who had been clamped in their own bays.</p>	
4.1.2	<p>GB advised that this had occurred recently on some estates and related to some confusion over the renewal of permits.</p>	

4.1.3	<p>Cllr Edwards stated that the approach HFI were taking in looking to a no fee approach to parking enforcement meant that there was an incentive to clamp and tow as many residents as possible. Cllr Edwards went on to advise that he would like to see great synergy between HFI and LBI on parking policies.</p>	
4.1.4	<p>BP requested that the panel receive more information on the breakdown of facts and figures relating to parking and the revenues raised through the scheme.</p>	
4.1.5	<p>The panel took a vote on this issue and voted as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No one agreed the increases that were proposed in the report. • One person voted in favour of keeping the charges the same. • Six people voted in favour of increasing the charges to £75 for de-clamping and £150 for release of impounded vehicles. • Two people abstained 	
4.2	<p>Vehicle Emission Related Parking Charges be increased or decreased in relation to the vehicles carbon emissions in line with street parking.</p>	
4.2.1	<p>Cllr Edwards advised LBI's consultation on this matter should have been carried out in conjunction with HFI as not doing so meant that half of residents were excluded from decision.</p>	
4.2.2	<p>Cllr Edwards also advised that the bandings that were used were too erratic with charges for similarly polluting vehicles being vastly different.</p>	
4.2.3	<p>GB advised that at this time there were no set proposals being suggested for charges but the September papers would contain more details of the principle of emission related charges were agreed.</p>	
4.2.4	<p>The panel voted on this matter as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seven panel members voted in favour of adopting the proposal in principle, subject to more details being provided on charges. • Two people abstained. 	

<p>4.3</p>	<p>Terms and Conditions of Garage Usage be relaxed to allow greater flexibility in the possible uses to stimulate demand for the currently high level of void units.</p>	
<p>4.3.1</p>	<p>SL advised the panel that she had her reservations regarding this matter as she had experienced or been aware of problems with users storing paint, re-spraying cars and carrying out mechanical works in garages on the Bemerton.</p>	
<p>4.3.2</p>	<p>GB advised that the proposal did not allow these uses and referred the panel to the current agreement (appendix 2).</p>	
<p>4.3.3</p>	<p>BG asked if HFI even knew who was using its garages and for what purposes?</p>	
<p>4.3.4</p>	<p>JE responded to this by telling the panel that there were regular audits of our garages each year and that we were indeed aware who was using our garages. JE went on to advise that there were always dishonest people who misused them but that we were active in enforcing conditions where abuses had come to our attention.</p>	
<p>4.3.5</p>	<p>BP advised that he would rather not see the terms and conditions relaxed in this way and also requested that the third paragraph in appendix one of the new agreement be amended as it reads as though residents need to check with HFI before they can change their vehicle.</p>	
<p>4.3.6</p>	<p>The Panel voted on this matter as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Three voted to relax the terms. • Three voted to keep the current terms • Two members abstained. 	
<p>4.6</p>	<p>Permit renewal be extended to bi annually to reduce administrative demand and provide a more convenient service.</p>	
<p>4.6.1</p>	<p>RB advised that the current system was over bureaucratic and time consuming as the only time that the offices were open to renew permits was during the working week. He went on to advise that he had to produce less documentation to the DVLA for road tax.</p>	
<p>4.6.2</p>	<p>GB responded by telling the panel that the processes were currently being reviewed.</p>	

4.6.3	<p>The panel voted on this matter as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eight in favour of moving to bi-annual permit renewal • One abstained 	
5.0	<p>Consultative Panel Development. The panel were asked to provide suggestions on any training they felt was necessary to assist the panel's development.</p>	
5.1.1	<p>BP expressed concerns that this was a progressive move to exclude people from positions on the panel simply because they had not undergone training and advised that the purpose was to get residents' views.</p>	
5.1.2	<p>GB explained that this was simply an extension of the training that was currently available to TRA representatives and in no way a move toward excluding anyone.</p>	
5.1.3	<p>BM advised that there was already training offered to representatives.</p>	
5.1.4	<p>BP advised the panel that he recently attended training at Stafford House and was happy to pass on this information to anyone who was interested.</p>	
5.1.5	<p>LM advised that BP could pass the details to him and he would include them with the circulation of the notes.</p>	
5.1.6	<p>No members of the panel expressed any interest in attending any developmental training courses.</p>	
	<p>HFI Information Items</p>	
6.1	<p>Report 3 – Resident Involvement Awards This report is for information only. Panel noted report</p>	
6.2	<p>Report 4 – HFI 2006/07 Performance Indicators This report is for information only. Panel noted report.</p>	
6.2.1	<p>BP however asked if 15 in appendix one of this report was inclusive of the general service charge? Also advised that this figure may include items that were currently in disputes being heard and LVT.</p>	
6.3	<p>Report 5 – Disposal of Land Managed by HFI This report is for information only.</p>	

6.3.1	BP told the panel that LBI had recently revealed that it had entered into partnership with HFI with a view to new build developments. He advised the panel to watch both closely and any open spaces locally as they could be at threat.	
6.3.2	SL asked the panel what was happening with the sites at Dunoon House.	
6.3.3	JE advised that once the new development adjacent was completed the sites were being looked at by as for potential development as social housing/ affordable housing.	
6.3.4	The panel requested information on what was considered 'affordable'	
6.3.5	GB advised that HFI did not dictate what was considered affordable and LBI and ultimately central government dictated the policies around new developments and affordability.	
6.3.6	Be told the panel that there was a paper on LBI planning procedure that was available to the public if required.	
6.4	Report 7 – Items Considered at Board/ Sub Boards June 07 and forward Plan This report is for information only.	
6.4.1	BP told the panel that after much effort it was only recently that the boards allowed twenty minutes for questions.	
6.4.2	BP advised that many people were put off attending meetings at Highbury House due to the fear of attack when leaving Highbury House after evening meetings and requested that the board meet at the Town Hall.	
6.4.3	RB advised that he would bring this matter to the board's attention.	
6.5	Report 8 – Homes for Islington Update This report is for information only.	
6.5.1	BP advised, in relation to point 3.4.3 or this report, that he had received a number of complaints regarding works that residents did not want. BP will forward the two email to LE.	
7.0	AOB	
7.1	Cllr Edwards asked if HFI would be participating in LBI's new Neighbourhood Regeneration Programme and asked if reports regarding this could be brought back to the panel.	
7.2	Panel asked for details of how resident board members were selected. LM advised he would send this information out with the notes.	LM

7.3	<p>LM told the panel that there was some £30k left over in the LS compact budget due to savings that were made and asked the panel if it was ok to off set these funds against shortfalls in other works at Willow Court, Keighley & Staveley, Westbourne Estate and Paradise Passage.</p> <p>The panel agreed.</p>	
	<p>Date of next Meeting: 10th September 2007 at Westbourne CC</p>	