

# NOTES OF THE CENTRAL STREET AREA HOUSING PANEL

Thursday 13<sup>th</sup> September 2007 – Central Street Area Housing Office – 7pm

**Present:**

Helen Cagnoni ( <b>HC</b> )	Greenwood, Wilmington, Farringdon & Yardley St TRA (Chair)
Alice Liken ( <b>AL</b> )	Greenwood, Wilmington, Farringdon & Yardley St TRA
Frances Sullivan ( <b>FS</b> )	King Square TRA
Blanche Woodbridge ( <b>BW</b> )	King Square TRA
Jean Grout ( <b>JG</b> )	Pleydell Estate Resident
Ellen Grout ( <b>EG</b> )	Pleydell Estate Resident
Maureen Smith ( <b>MS</b> )	Brunswick Estate TMO
Felix Ngonadi ( <b>FN</b> )	Bentham Estate TRA
Martha Mansfield ( <b>MM</b> )	Cyrus House TRA
Sophie Bardy ( <b>SB</b> )	Cyrus House TRA
Jamie Fry ( <b>JFry</b> )	Cyrus House TRA
Jon Farrant ( <b>JF</b> )	Senior Area Housing Manager, HFI
David Salenius ( <b>DS</b> )	Area Housing Manager, HFI
Mary Caudron ( <b>MC</b> )	Community and Service Development Officer, HFI

<b>1</b>	<b>Apologies</b>	
1.1	<b><u>Apologies received from:</u></b> a. Danny Unstead, Terry and Shirley Lefevre, Hugh Partridge, Irene Francis, Sonya Andermahr, Ben Crowe, Andrulla Bardy, Mark Kelly, Stephen Keeler, Stephen Brogan, Cllr Allan, Cllr Ray.	~
<b>2</b>	<b>Cyrus House Petition</b>	
2.1	<b><u>Background</u></b> a. <b>DS</b> distributed a report produced by the project team responding to residents' concerns about the poor state of their kitchens.  b. The report advised that Cyrus House would be programmed for decent homes works in 2009/10 and that all works would be subject to survey to determine the extent of the works that would take place.  c. <b>DS</b> advised that a representative from the team had been invited to attend the meeting however no one had been available. <b>DS</b> confirmed that the area programme manager role was currently vacant.	~
2.2	<b><u>Feedback from Residents</u></b> a. <b>SB</b> asked why residents were originally told the works would be done in 2011, if they could now be done in 2009/10? The TRA weren't happy with the briefness of the report or the outcome and felt works should be carried out sooner.  b. <b>SB</b> advised that surveys were done 18 months to 2 years ago and asked why they needed to be done again?  c. <b>JFry</b> added that the kitchens were in a really poor state, with no cupboards or drawers and some kitchens were literally rotting. <b>JFry</b> thought that only 18-20 kitchens needed doing so why couldn't the works be added to the	~

	<p>current contract?</p> <p>d. The TRA also wanted to know why Cyrus House had been left out when other blocks on the Percival Street estate were having works done now, such as the Triangle, which was a newer building.</p> <p>e. <b>JF</b> advised that he would go back to property services and get a more detailed response explaining the decision. <b>JFry</b> asked when they would receive a full response and <b>JF</b> advised it would be next week.</p> <p>f. <b>HC</b> felt that this was one of the problems brought about by the project teams being centralised. <b>HC</b> asked that she be copied into the response.</p> <p>g. <b>FS</b> advised he would take the issue up at the next managed property sub board meeting on the 3<sup>rd</sup> October.</p>	<p><b>JF / DS</b></p> <p><b>FS</b></p>
<b>3</b>	<b>Notes of Last Meeting and Matters Arising</b>	
3.1	<p><b>Notes of Last Meeting</b></p> <p>a. <b>MC</b> to add in <b>FS</b>'s apologies at the last meeting.</p> <p>b. <b>HC</b> clarified point 6.1b, that she would be happy to rotate the chair to give others the opportunity to gain competence and experience.</p> <p>c. Otherwise the notes were agreed as a true and accurate record of the last meeting.</p>	~
3.2	<p><b>Matters Arising</b></p> <p>a. <b>MC</b> distributed a feedback sheet updating the panel on the actions from the last meeting.</p> <p>b. <b>MC</b> distributed copies of the Greenspace Protocol as requested at the last meeting. <b>MC</b> to email an electronic copy to the panel. <b>JF</b> advised that any TRA proposing to look after an area of land themselves should raise this with their estate co-ordinator.</p> <p>c. <b>DS</b> confirmed that a professional witness had visited the Pleydell Estate and had witnessed noise that was deemed obtrusive. <b>DS</b> advised that further action could now be taken. <b>JG</b> and <b>EG</b> advised that the noise was still on going.</p> <p>d. <b>EG</b> thanked the panel for their assistance. <b>HC</b> felt it should be recognised that noise nuisance often happened out of hours and therefore professional witnesses needed if officers weren't able to attend.</p> <p>e. <b>FS</b> advised that he would be happy to attend the Clerkenwell safer neighbourhood meeting. <b>MC</b> to pass on <b>FS</b>'s details to the team. The panel suggested that attendance might be helped if the dates were set in advance and advertised further. <b>MC</b> to contact the police to offer assistance.</p>	<p><b>MC</b></p> <p><b>MC</b></p>
<b>4</b>	<b>Islington Under Occupation Scheme – Information</b>	
4.1	<p><b>Background</b></p> <p>a. <b>JF</b> introduced the report, which had been included following requests for further information on the scheme from the panels.</p> <p>b. <b>JF</b> highlighted the incentives such as £500 offered per spare bedroom, up to £300 towards removal costs and a dedicated under occupation officer to assist tenants through the process.</p>	~

	<p>c. <b>JT</b> also highlighted the Smart Move scheme where the Council actively matched up mutual exchanges for tenants, which allowed them to have one extra bedroom that was not allowed with a normal transfer.</p>	~
4.2	<p><b><u>Feedback from the panel</u></b></p> <p>a. The panel felt that Smart Move was an important part of the scheme as many tenants would want an extra bedroom for e.g. visiting family and without this they might not consider downsizing.</p> <p>b. <b>FS</b> felt that a publicity campaign should be carried out and all tenants in 3/4 bed properties written to. <b>JF</b> confirmed that this had happened previously with positive results.</p> <p>c. The panel also felt that moves within an estate should be given more priority, as many tenants would want to stay local, near their friends and family. <b>HC</b> felt that if a 1 or 2 bed became vacant on an estate, it should be offered to tenants with larger properties to downsize to.</p>	~
<b>5</b>	<b>Funding Options for Resident Participation – Consultation</b>	
5.1	<p><b><u>Background</u></b></p> <p>a. <b>HC</b> advised the panel that FITA were having a meeting on Monday to discuss the issues within the report. As a result <b>HC</b> didn't feel that the report should be discussed at this panel meeting but deferred to the next one.</p> <p>b. <b>FS</b> felt it would be a good idea to know what the other options were and what the panel felt about FITA's effectiveness.</p> <p>c. <b>HC</b> proposed that the report was deferred to the next panel to include the outcomes of Monday's meeting and the panel agreed.</p>	~
<b>6</b>	<b>New Build Development – Consultation</b>	
6.1	<p><b><u>Background</u></b></p> <p>a. <b>JF</b> introduced the report, which set out the key strategies (e.g. reduced water consumption and no net loss of open space) and the eight objectives of LBI's local development framework that HFI would adopt.</p> <p>b. <b>JF</b> highlighted the schemes in the Central Street area, which were at Mora Street and Graham Street. <b>MC</b> advised that residents local to these sites had been written to and invited to view the provisional drawings at the area housing office.</p> <p>c. <b>JF</b> asked for comments from the panel about the scheme and the concept of HFI building new homes.</p>	~
6.2	<p><b><u>Panel Feedback</u></b></p> <p>a. <b>HC</b> felt that no net loss of open space was an important factor and hoped that this would be the case. <b>HC</b> did raise some concerns that car parks might suddenly be deemed unused and flats built on top.</p> <p>b. <b>HC</b> hoped that the strategy to use at least 20% of renewable energy would be through solar panels and not wind turbines, as although panels may be more expensive, they were also longer lasting, less obtrusive and could be used to heat water.</p> <p>c. <b>HC</b> was concerned that residents weren't listened to at planning meetings</p>	~

	<p>and stressed the point that residents did not want tall skyscrapers to be built.</p> <p>d. The panel liked the idea of less water being used.</p> <p>e. There was general concern regarding the infrastructure being able to take all the new properties being built, especially concerning issues such as back surging and flooding.</p>	~
<b>7</b>	<b>Proposal to Meet Digital Switchover – Consultation</b>	
7.1	<p><b>Background</b></p> <p>a. <b>JF</b> advised that the report set out HFI's proposal to meet the digital switchover in 2012, which would remove the need for individual satellite dishes. <b>JF</b> was aware there were some inaccuracies in the property listings and invited the panel to raise these.</p> <p>b. <b>JF</b> advised the proposal included a one off charge of £75 for leaseholders plus 25p per week. <b>JF</b> didn't think that this was something leaseholders could opt out of, which had been queried at other panels.</p> <p>c. <b>JF</b> confirmed that the programme had been produced to try and coincide with other works to minimise disruption. <b>JF</b> added that existing conduits could not be used for technical reasons.</p>	~
7.2	<p><b>Feedback from the panel</b></p> <p>a. The panel discussed the technology of the scheme and why the existing cables couldn't be used. There was concern that residents would have to have another connection plate installed to their flats.</p> <p>b. <b>FS</b> asked about scaffolding and <b>JF</b> confirmed that this would be used if already in place for major works and if not, HFI would look to other methods to carry out work at height such as abseiling or using a cherry picker.</p> <p>c. <b>HC</b> couldn't understand why it cost so much for leaseholders if a set top box cost about £25. <b>HC</b> thought that as so many properties were involved, the price negotiations hadn't been done very well. <b>HC</b> wanted information on what residents get for the money (28,000 properties x £13 per year). <b>HC</b> felt that if she could get a set top box free from Sky, she didn't see why she should pay HFI £75.</p> <p>d. <b>HC</b> advised that Greenwood House was 22 units, not 10 (page 19).</p> <p>e. <b>JF</b> confirmed that these comments would be passed back and clarification sought. If resident spotted any further corrections, these could be passed to <b>MC</b>.</p>	<b>JF</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>Estate Services Improvement Group – Information</b>	
8.1	<p><b>Background</b></p> <p>a. <b>JF</b> advised that this group was set up in November last year to replace the caretaker improvement group and had generally been successful and regularly attended.</p> <p>b. <b>JF</b> advised however that the Central Street area had not been represented. <b>MC</b> to check who the nominated rep was and see if they still wanted to attend. If not, another rep could be nominated from the panel.</p>	<b>MC</b>

	c. <b>JF</b> stressed that the rep would be working to improve services long term across the area, not just their own block or estate.	~
<b>9</b>	<b>HFI and Consultative Panel Update – Information</b>	
9.1	<p><b><u>Tenant Satisfaction Survey</u></b></p> <p>a. <b>JF</b> highlighted the recent tenant satisfaction survey which showed increased satisfaction in areas including street cleaning and lighting on estates, overall accommodation, out of hours repairs and opportunities to participate.</p> <p>b. The panel asked about what the bad things were and <b>JF</b> advised that satisfaction generally was up across the board however areas such antisocial behaviour needed further work.</p> <p>c. <b>BW</b> asked if there were results of the survey by estate? <b>DS</b> advised that the survey did not drill down that far but he would provide further details specific to the Central Street area.</p>	<b>DS</b>
9.2	<p><b><u>Estate Parking</u></b></p> <p>a. <b>JF</b> advised that residents' comments from the last meeting were passed to the estate parking team and a further report would come to panels in November.</p> <p>b. <b>BW</b> reported lots of problems on the King Square estate with contractors blocking people's bays. <b>JF</b> suggested <b>BW</b> pass the details to the area office so this could be looked into.</p> <p>c. <b>JF</b> updated the panel on the work being done by HFI's two parking co-ordinators to improve the management of parking and bring all the data held up to date.</p> <p>d. <b>HC</b> felt that the income from parking should be ring fenced and used to improve garage and parking areas. <b>JF</b> informed the panel about the spend to save scheme which put money into bringing run down garages into use.</p>	~
<b>10</b>	<b>Items Considered at Board and Sub Board – Information</b>	
10.1	<p><b><u>Decision Items</u></b></p> <p>a. The panel noted the report.</p>	~
<b>11</b>	<b>FORWARD PLAN - INFORMATION</b>	
11.1	<p><b><u>Consultation Items</u></b></p> <p>a. <b>HC</b> felt that the land disposal report should be for consultation, not information.</p> <p>b. The panel noted the report.</p>	~
<b>12</b>	<b>Capital Programme Monitoring 2007/8, 1st Quarter – Information</b>	
12.1	<p><b><u>Capital Programme</u></b></p> <p>a. The panel noted the report.</p>	~
<b>13</b>	<b>Central Street Performance Report – Information</b>	
13.1	<p><b><u>July 2007 Performance Report</u></b></p> <p>a. <b>DS</b> distributed the performance report for July and updated the panel on</p>	

	<p>the latest figures.</p> <p>b. The office had received 7 complaints in July.</p> <p>c. The rent team had been working well and Central Street currently had the lowest debt per tenant and overall debt in the borough. The team had also just been awarded the team and individual prizes for rent arrears reduction in August.</p> <p>d. The caretaking team continued their good performance and were in top place year to date in the area office independent quality checks.</p> <p>e. <b>DS</b> advised that the void turnaround time had been getting better after some issues at the start of the year. It had taken an average of 20 days to re-service an empty property in July and early figures for August showed 17 days.</p>	~
13.2	<p><b>Antisocial Behaviour Update</b></p> <p>a. <b>DS</b> distributed an antisocial behaviour update detailing the status of each of the 75 live cases. The aim of this was to keep TRAs, TMOs and residents up to date on the cases and actions being taken. Names and addresses were omitted for data protection.</p> <p>b. <b>MS</b> asked about the Brunswick estate case and <b>DS</b> advised that there had been an undertaking in court. <b>MS</b> reported that it had all been quiet recently however she had been slightly concerned opening the meeting room. <b>MS</b> added that the Central Street office had been very quick to take action.</p> <p>c. The panel felt the update sheet was very useful and an excellent idea. The panel suggested the date of when the case was first raised be added to the update as well as a list of actions / outcomes over time so the panel could see how long it took to resolve.</p> <p>d. The panel hoped that the other areas would be giving similar feedback at their meetings.</p>	<b>DS</b>
<b>14</b>	<b>AOB</b>	
14.1	<p><b>Training</b></p> <p>a. <b>HC</b> highlighted the training bulletin that had been sent out. <b>MC</b> confirmed that this had gone to all TRAs and community centre committees.</p> <p>b. The panel thought that this might help encourage residents to get involved on the committee.</p>	~
14.2	<p><b>Bentham Court CCTV</b></p> <p>a. <b>FN</b> asked what was happening with the CCTV scheme? Residents were originally told that this would be a pilot but now it was being looked at again.</p> <p>b. <b>DS</b> updated <b>FN</b> and accepted that proper consultation had not been carried out as <b>DS</b> was lead to believe. <b>DS</b> assured <b>FN</b> that consultation would now be taking place to find out if residents wanted the CCTV.</p> <p>c. <b>DS</b> clarified that the 'pilot' might have referred to a re-locatable CCTV scheme that leaseholders wouldn't have paid for however this scheme was for fixed cameras.</p>	~

14.5	<b><u>Date of Next Meeting</u></b> a. The next meeting would be held at <b>7pm</b> on <b>Thursday 15<sup>th</sup> November</b> at the Brunswick Meeting Room, Mulberry Court.	~
------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---