

**Homes for Islington
Tenant Management Forum**

Minutes of 18th September 2007

Present:	Ray Yates (RY)	Gambier House TMO (Chair)
	Thomas Cooper (TC)	Spa Green Management Organisation
	Tony Fernandes (TF)	Redbrick & Quaker Court
	Pat Brock (PB)	Miranda TMO
	Vic Fellah (VF)	Miranda TMO
	Bob Edwards (BE)	Blackstock BMO
	Barbara Chapman (BC)	Blackstock BMO
	Carol Whooley (CW)	Braithwaite House TMO
	Mick Bavington (MB)	Braithwaite House TMO
	Bernadette Tibbs (BT)	Arch-Elm Co-op
	Lorraine Constantinou (LC)	Brooke Park Co-op
	Tim Bleach (TB)	Elthorne 1 st Co-op
	Alex Scorgie (AS)	Bemerton Villages TMO
	Paul Shepherd (PS)	Bemerton TMO

HFI Officers

Simon Kwong (SK)	Head of Performance and Service Development
Anthony Jonas (AJ)	Performance Manager
Dulal Ahmed (DA)	Tenant Management Team Manager
Roger Paine (RP)	Tenant Management Team (Minutes)
Richard Amoah (RA)	Tenant Management Team

Items	Issues	Actions
1.	Apologies for absence	
1.1	Richard Smith (Halfmoon Crescent), Tom Kane (Taverner & Peckett), Jenny Goble (Wenlake), Mary Selormey (Pleydell).	
2.	Accuracy	
2.1	RY noted that he is quoted in the minutes of the last meeting even though he was not included on the attendance list.	
2.2	Matters arising from minutes of 17/5/07	
2.2.1	3.1 – SK has informed Dave Hutchison of the error on page 3 of the agreement for letting parking spaces.	
2.2.2	3.5 – SK confirmed that when disposing of land managed by LBI, HFI would replace or refund new community halls, it would not affect the landscaped works EC1 ND will carry out on Gambier House TMO, and there will be consultation with all residents of estates affected.	
2.2.3	4.1 – SK informed the meeting that the managed property numbers for Brooke Park and Elthorne 1 st Co-ops reported to the CSSB had now been corrected. AJ noted that the CSSB receives reports on HFI performance at each meeting.	
2.2.4	7.1 – LC noted that SK had not spoken to her about the rent loss on a void due to CBL delays. AJ said that Voids Allowances were covered by clauses 10, 11, and 12 to Chapter 3 of the MMA (2005) and the TMO would not be liable for void losses. AJ would be happy to talk through the details. In answer to a question from the floor, it was confirmed that HFI	

	was on a different type of contract with LBI to the TMOs and its income was not dependent on rental income.	
3.	Consultative Panel Reports	
3.1	Islington Under-occupation scheme – SK introduced the report and noted that this LBI paper was submitted for information only. Section 3.2 set out a list of what is on offer to tenants willing to trade down, section 6 describes the ‘smartmove’ scheme for mutual exchanges and Section 7 considers future plans and cross working.	
3.2	Funding Options for Resident Participation – TC questioned whether this paper even should be discussed in view of the FITA general meeting that had been held the previous evening and was attended by Eamon McGoldrick and Ann Lucas. He felt that it was premature at this stage to assume that FITA funding was in danger of disappearing. SK explained that FITA had a SLA with HFI and the consultation paper had been prepared on a contingency basis in case the SLA was not signed. However, whether or not TMOs wished to give feedback this evening was entirely up to TMF members. TC proposed that the meeting did not discuss this issue and moved on. AS asked whether no feedback from the meeting would be interpreted as the consultation having been completed and proposed that the paper should come back to a subsequent meeting and TC seconded this. RY asked what the timeline was for deciding on this. SK explained that, given the timescale for submitting papers to panels, this paper would have been written at least two weeks ago and could not have taken into account anything discussed at the FITA general meeting that was held yesterday. HFI was not operating on the basis that the SLA would not be agreed and was simply acting strategically in order to cover this eventuality if it should arise. Even if the SLA was not signed, FITA would have to be given three months notice so there would be time to bring the paper back to the next meeting.	SK
3.3	New Build Development - SK introduced the report and explained that sections 3.4 and 3.6 set out the basis on which the building would be done and section 3.8 lists the proposed sites. These proposals were agreed by the LBI Executive on 13 September. AS pointed out that as Islington was already one of the most densely populated areas in the country, it might be better to consider creating a better environment rather than building more properties. He asked what the drivers were for this proposal. SK explained that these were the new build initiative coming from the Mayor of London and housing demand within the borough. However, the scale of this proposal would not have a huge impact and it would be subject to the constraints of the planning system. AS noted that planning would be unlikely to object as the scheme was Council led. TC asked for more specific information to be provided on the sources of renewable energy as the paper was too vague. For example, solar panels would be acceptable but windmills would not. RY noted that any housing provision should be linked to social services provision and that	

<p>3.4</p> <p>3.5</p>	<p>the need for disability units should be taken into account along with the provision of disability services. PS asked whether the properties would be Council owned or HFI owned and SK noted that the report referred to “new Council owned social housing”.</p> <p>TMOs were invited to email if they wished to comment on the proposals.</p> <p>Digital Switchover - SK introduced the report and noted that the analogue terrestrial TV service in the London area would be switched off and digital would be the only means of receiving it. The paper described an HFI programme of works, starting in the north of the borough and working southwards, to meet the digital switchover. Tenants would be required to pay a service charge of 25p per week to cover the installation and maintenance of the system and leaseholders would be charged their proportionate share of the actual costs.</p> <p>TC asked why there were different arrangements for tenants and leaseholders, why HFI had not considered free options and how this would affect tenants on low income/HB. SK explained that leaseholders and tenants were on different contracts and the way in which they are required to pay is different. Leaseholders are required to pay their proportion of the cost, whilst tenants pay their rent week by week. SK said that, in the absence of a detailed knowledge of the digital options available, he was not in a position to comment about the option chosen by HFI. However, the service charge would be covered by HB. SK was asked whether residents could opt out and he undertook to come back to the meeting on this point.</p> <p>PB noted that leaseholders were being given no choice in this and BT asked whether estate freeholders would also be included. SK advised that this would depend on whether they were part of an existing communal aerial system or not. LC pointed out that many co-op properties were missing from the list. RP noted that a spreadsheet, setting out the digital switchover work programme, had already been emailed out to TMOs/TMCs and a number of tenant managed properties, missing from the list, had been drawn to the attention of the section managing the project. TMOs were invited to contact RP if any additional missing properties were identified.</p> <p>AS asked why BVMO had not been offered the option of managing this programme as set out in the management agreement. It was pointed out that the management agreement, as it stood, did not provide for the TMO to take on these works and it would require a variation. However, HFI was open to discussing TMOs taking on additional major works if they were interested in doing so. In response to a question as to whether the works to meet the digital switchover could be timed to coincide with other work on site, SK noted that on page 16 it was stated that it was intended to bring blocks forward in the programme if they were undergoing major works.</p> <p>Update on Estate Services Improvement Group - SK introduced the report and noted that this paper was submitted for information only. RY noted that he and Mary Selormey were the representatives on this group.</p>	<p>TMOs</p> <p>SK</p> <p>TMOs/RP</p>
-----------------------	---	--------------------------------------

<p>3.6</p> <p>3.7</p> <p>3.8</p>	<p>HFI and Consultative Panel Update - SK introduced the report and noted that this paper was submitted for information only. It was noted that the results of the tenant satisfaction survey were good and the levels of satisfaction were up on previous years. HFI has signed up to the Government's Respect standard for housing along with RSLs and LBI. Section 4 of the report sets out the feedback from Consultation Panels in July and Section 5 refers to the elections for Resident Board Directors. When the results of the elections are known, they will be posted on the HFI website. PS asked if a copy of the full resident survey report could be provided and SK undertook to see what could be done about this.</p> <p>Items considered at Board/Sub-Boards - SK introduced the report and noted that this paper was submitted for information only. Attention was drawn to item 4, which related to FITMO recognition. FITMO had provided a copy of its constitution and its request for formal recognition by HFI was to be considered at the HFI Board on 15 October. The report also contains a forward plan for Consultation Panels in 2007/08.</p> <p>207/8 Capital Programme - SK introduced the report and noted that this paper was submitted for information only. There were no comments.</p>	<p>SK</p>
<p>4.</p> <p>4.1</p>	<p>Voids – managing the process between TMOs, HFI and Keir - AJ noted that there was no report on this item, which had been put on the agenda by the TMOs. RY asked for feedback on the recent void training session. It was noted that at this session, the suggestion was made that with the improved Void Standard, most voids would now come in at over £2,000. TC stated that the current repairs standard being achieved in voids as appalling. The document reads well but is not being delivered.</p> <p>AS noted that there was no opportunity for TMOs to pre-inspect voids to agree what needed to be done and post-inspect to check on the standard of work. This is contrary to the management agreement, which clearly states TMOs should be involved in the process. As it stands, when repair requests subsequently start to emerge, TMOs will be told that the voids work is past the defects liability period.</p> <p>SK said that the New Tenant Liaison Officer should contact TMOs and a system needs to be in place to ensure that this happens. BE noted that at the void training session, it had been stated that the NTLO would pass the void to the TMO if it was thought to be a TMO void and that TMOs should contact the Quality Team if there were problems with the standard of voids coming back from Kiers. However, when the TMO pointed out that a void had been returned with no room for a fridge or a washing machine even though there was a way to accommodate this, Keirs simply refused to do it.</p> <p>LC pointed out that as the co-ops collected rent, the keys would be returned to them and they would want a joint inspection. SK noted that HFI would have to work with the reality of this situation. Where HFI needed to change an agreement, it should negotiate this and not just inform the TMOs and this applied both ways.</p>	<p>SK/AJ</p>

	<p>TF asked if this was going to happen. An email was sent to the Quality Team regarding a poor standard of repair but the property was not inspected. The TMOs do not want to be put in the position of picking up outstanding repairs. RY asked who monitored Kiers and it was pointed out that HFI monitor Kiers by inspecting a sample of the voids returned.</p>	
5. 5.1	<p>All Aboard – TMO Training Event on 29 September - RP reminded the meeting of the training event on 29 September, asked TMO representatives to raise this with their committees and encouraged attendance from all TMOs. A sheet was also made available for people to put forward names if they had not already done so.</p>	TMO/C's
6. 6.1	<p>Proposals to revise TMO monitoring arrangements - RP introduced the paper, which was submitted for consultation. AS noted that his Board had only just seen this paper and they would need to be consulted on it.</p> <p>Discussion followed in which some concerns were expressed about HFI subjecting TMOs to levels of scrutiny that were over and above what was required by the management agreement. It was also felt that those present were not mandated to make decisions on behalf of their committees.</p> <p>AS asked who inspected HFI and AJ advised him that HFI produced a huge number of PIs. SK added that there was now a lot more HFI performance information in the public domain.</p> <p>It was agreed that TMOs would take this report to their committees for proper discussion and feedback their views to HFI.</p>	TMO/C's
7. 7.1	<p>Proposed KLOEs for assessing TMO Performance - AJ introduced the paper, which was submitted for consultation. The need to review the KLOEs was previously put to the TMF in July but no TMO comments have been received by HFI. The KLOEs involve an evaluation of between zero and three diamonds, with one diamond signifying a TMO meeting the basic MMA requirements and three diamonds representing best practice. The paper proposes revisions that have added some things but left others out. The CSSB will be considering the KLOEs at its next meeting.</p> <p>RY noted that there were proposals for two new KLOEs on Employment and Customer Service/Diversity. AJ noted that these would reflect legal requirements and best practice and set out general principles so TMOs could see if there were any areas in which they needed to improve. A draft will be submitted to the TMF for consultation in November.</p> <p>AS stated that TMOs were small organisations in which everyone knew each other and being very small, they did not require the same level of bureaucracy as a large organisation like HFI. Also, as the KLOEs are not mentioned in the management agreement, he thought that this would require a variation to the agreement. AJ pointed out that KLOEs are based on the approach used by the Audit Commission.</p> <p>As for the report on revising the TMO monitoring arrangements, it was felt that those present were not mandated to make decisions on behalf of their committees. It was therefore agreed that TMOs would also take this report to their committees for proper discussion and feedback their views to HFI.</p>	<p>SK/AJ</p> <p>TMO/C's</p>

8. 8.1	<p>Proposals for TMO performance reporting - AJ introduced the paper, which was submitted for consultation. It was proposed to submit a small number of KPIs to CSSB as shown on page 2 of the report. These would cover complaints, repairs, rent, voids and estate cleaning. At appendix A, there is a larger list of PIs, which includes those for the CSSB. Some of these are required monthly, some quarterly and a few annually. The co-ops have signed up to these in their new MMA but HFI will be able to collect some of them through its own systems. The monthly PIs relate to key services that TMOs should be reporting to their committees anyway and the annual PIs relate to things like audited accounts. The PI returns will be in lieu of monitoring returns and will be used as part of HFI's assessment. Where TMO's PI's show good performance, this should mean less rather than more monitoring.</p> <p>AS noted that again, this would need to be taken back to TMO committees for consideration.</p>	TMO/C's
9 9.1 9.2	<p>Open forum - AJ noted that HFI would start consulting on next year's allowances in November when resource indications were available. At this point, HFI would explain the financial situation to TMOs. In December, HFI would write to TMOs with draft allowances. In January, HFI would then meet again with TMOs to discuss general issues collectively. It could also meet with individual TMOs to discuss individual issues. As Council budgets are agreed in mid to late February, final TMO allowances will be agreed by the end of February.</p> <p>AS asked if asked why TMO allowances were not based on actual expenditure, rather than budgets, as required by the management agreement. AJ said this could be considered at the first meeting. TC asked whether these meetings would be convened as part of the TMF meetings or separately and AS requested that they be separate meetings.</p> <p>TC noted that the Major Works on Spa Green had involved him putting in a lot of extra hours, chasing it up, going through issues, making telephone calls and sending emails. The cost of this fell on the TMO and was a drain on resources. An invoice for this cost had been sent to Eamon McGoldrick who passed it to SK to action. However, the TMO was then told that the AHO would have dealt with these issues. He noted that 11% of the £6.2M cost was listed as an HFI management fee but the TMO got none of this. RY noted that the contractor should have a RLO who residents should raise issues with.</p>	AJ AJ
10.	<p>Any other business None</p>	
	<p>Date of next meeting: Weds, 21st November '07 - Refreshments 7pm Meeting: 7.30pm-9pm Venue: Vibast Centre, 163 Old Street, London EC1V 9NH</p>	