

**Homes for Islington
Tenant Management Forum**

Minutes of 16th July 2007

Present:	Richard Smith (RS) Chair	Halfmoon Crescent Co-op
	Thomas Cooper (TC)	Spa Green Management Organisation
	Hugh Partridge (HP)	Stafford Cripps TMO
	Lorraine Constantinou (LC)	Brooke Park
	Pat Brock (PB)	Miranda TMO
	Vic Fellah (VF)	Miranda TMO
	Trish Hayes (TH)	Charteris Co-op
	John Bevan (JB)	Holbrook Co-op
	Patrick Browne (PAB)	Brunswick TMO
	Paul Shepherd (PS)	Bemerton TMO
	Bernie Tibbs (BT)	Arch-Elm Co-op
	Tony Fernandes (TF)	Redbrick & Quaker Court
	Mary Selormey (MS)	Pleydell TMO

HFI Officers

Simon Kwong (SK)	Head of Performance and Service Development
Anthony Jonas (AJ)	Performance Manager
Stacey Wright (SW)	Commissioning Officer

Items	Issues	Actions
1. 1.1	Apologies for absence Lorraine Welland (Elthorne 1 st), Brenda Windsor (Holbrook), Tom Kane (Taverner & Peckett), Dave Frankel (Harry Weston), Jim Stuchbury (Harry Weston), Terry LeFevre (Pleydell), Shirley LeFevre (Pleydell),	
2. 2.1	Accuracy None	
2.2	Matters arising from minutes of 17/5/07	
2.2.1	3.4 – AJ reported that Ferenc Morath – Head of Programme Management is to meet TMO to discuss as MW issues	
2.2.2	3.5 – JB asked if allowances for MW would be paid weekly or monthly. SK confirmed that these allowances would not be funded in this cycle.	
2.2.3	4.2.2 – AS confirmed that TMO/C's can procure their own Tenant Compact works provided they follow the procurement P&P and comply with the TC requirements.	
2.2.4	4.3.5 - See 3.4 above	
2.2.5	7.2 – Cllr Terry Stacy had been invited to meeting but had not sent apologies	
2.2.6	10.2 – The strategy for this MW working group needs clarification from Tom Kane. TC asked how HFI were funded for MW. SK explained that they receive a subsidy from the government and as a result of stock condition surveys, a cycle of programmes is set up.	
2.2.7	10.4 – TC felt that the training event set up to deal with void issues should have the Kiers operatives in attendance.	

2.2.8	10.5 – The Council still provides insurance to cover the building but would expect a TMO to cover the public liability costs for any activities it runs via its own current Public Liability insurance and contents insurance.											
3.	Consultative Panel Reports											
3.1	<p>Estate Parking Initiative – SK spoke through the four options proposed.</p> <table border="0" data-bbox="395 432 1198 600"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;"><u>Recommendations</u></th> <th style="text-align: center;"><u>General view</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Increase enforcement fees</td> <td>Not agree</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Vehicle emission related parking charges</td> <td>Mixed views</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Garage usage</td> <td>No views</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Annual Permit review</td> <td>Agree</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Some organisations felt that they had not received these papers in enough time to discuss them with their committees and will feedback to Dave Hutchison responses from their residents. The general consensus was that the charges be kept the same or lowered. TC pointed out a written error in the ‘Agreement for letting of parking spaces’ first sentence - paragraph 3. SK to forward this on.</p>	<u>Recommendations</u>	<u>General view</u>	Increase enforcement fees	Not agree	Vehicle emission related parking charges	Mixed views	Garage usage	No views	Annual Permit review	Agree	TMO/C’s SK
<u>Recommendations</u>	<u>General view</u>											
Increase enforcement fees	Not agree											
Vehicle emission related parking charges	Mixed views											
Garage usage	No views											
Annual Permit review	Agree											
3.2	<p>Consultative Panel Development – SK briefly talked through paper and requested feedback, as follows:</p> <table border="0" data-bbox="395 902 1198 1070"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;"><u>Recommendations</u></th> <th style="text-align: center;"><u>General view</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1) Training</td> <td>Good idea/Awaydays</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2) Terms of Reference</td> <td>No views</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3) Collective decisions</td> <td>No views</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4) Finance</td> <td>No views</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Recommendations</u>	<u>General view</u>	1) Training	Good idea/Awaydays	2) Terms of Reference	No views	3) Collective decisions	No views	4) Finance	No views	
<u>Recommendations</u>	<u>General view</u>											
1) Training	Good idea/Awaydays											
2) Terms of Reference	No views											
3) Collective decisions	No views											
4) Finance	No views											
3.3	<p>Resident Involvement Awards- SK encouraged panel to put forward nominations in the three award categories.</p>											
3.4	<p>HFI 2006/7 Performance Indicators- SK briefed panel on paper. RY enquired who provides the PI’s. SK explained it was the Performance Monitoring team within HFI, but these figures are audited on an annual basis, which are reviewed and sampled by the auditors.</p>											
3.5	<p>Disposal of Land managed by HFI- Again the panel re-iterated the need to have these papers sooner to bring to their committees for consultation. TMO/C’s would like to be involved in the early stages of any decision making of land disposal on their estates. RY asked:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Will HFI replace or refund new community halls? - Will this affect the landscaped works EC1 ND will carry out Gambier TMO? - Will there be consultation with all residents of estates affected? 	SK										
3.6	<p>Items considered at HFI Board/Sub-Boards No comments</p>											
3.7	<p>HFI update No comments</p>											

4.	Review of TMO Performance reporting to CSSB	
	AJ talked through the TMO's PI's sent to the CSSB and explained the changes to this report which will show the long term trends which provides historical info.	
4.1	-Brooke Park and Elthorne 1 st show the incorrect amount of managed properties. AJ to change.	AJ
4.2	- PS requested that HFI PI's be provided with this report. AJ discussed the PI's currently in the new MMA being supplied by Co-ops and asked for views from panel.	AJ
4.3	- Items 8-12 (Rent collection) Co-op's unsure of how to create formula for these. AJ happy to explain these further to Co-op's.	
4.4	- Co-op's felt that 16-20 (Anti-social behaviour) were only carried out by the AHO	
5.	Review of KLOES	
5.1	AJ presented the KLOES for review of the panel as they have been in use for 2 years. As there were no comments from the panel AJ suggested that they could contact the TMCT to provide feedback. Reviews will be bought back to panel and then to CSSB.	TMO/C's
6.	Equality and diversity training	
6.1	AJ introduced the on-line equality and diversity training to the TMO's and encouraged both staff and committee to undertake this training, which will be free of charge. Some TMO/C's expressed a desire to do this as a paper exercise, which is available. TMO/C's to contact the Tenant Management team to carry out the training.	TMO/C's
7.	Open forum	
7.1	- LC fed back to the panel on a current void, which is in its 8 th week due to rejections from several CBL viewings. LC would like to know who is liable for the rent on this property. SK will discuss further with LC out of meeting.	SK
7.2	- PS asked the panel if it will be looking at the Tenant Empowerment paper currently in circulation for consultation from CLG. As consultation finishes on 11 th September, PS will forward this to all TMO/C's to respond and will invite CLG to the next TMF.	PS
7.3	- TC offered to show the stock transfer DVD to any interested TMO/C's.	
8.	Any other business None	
	Date of next meeting: Tues 18 th Sept '07 - Refreshments 7pm Meeting 7.30pm-9pm Venue: Town Hall, N1	