

# NOTES OF THE CENTRAL STREET AREA HOUSING PANEL

Thursday 10<sup>th</sup> May 2007 – Central Street Area Housing Office – 7pm

<b>Present:</b>	<p>Helen Cagnoni (<b>HC</b>)          Sharon Hayward (<b>SH</b>)          Danny Unstead (<b>DU</b>)          Shirley Lefevre (<b>SL</b>)          Terry Lefevre (<b>TL</b>)          Jean Grout (<b>JG</b>)          Ellen Grout (<b>EG</b>)          Stephen Brogan (<b>SB</b>)          Troy Gallagher (<b>TG</b>)          Owen Hart (<b>OH</b>)          Joe Trotter (<b>JT</b>)          Thomas Cooper (<b>TC</b>)          Ben Mackmurdie (<b>BM</b>)          Maureen Smith (<b>MS</b>)          Francois Smit (<b>FS</b>)          Blanche Woodbridge (<b>BW</b>)          Frances Sullivan (<b>FS</b>)          Adelhak Menia (<b>AM</b>)          Valerie Sempler (<b>VS</b>)          Irene Francis (<b>IF</b>)          Ian Merriman (<b>IM</b>)          Jyoti Vaja (<b>JV</b>)          George Allan (<b>GA</b>)          David Salenius (<b>DS</b>)          Mary Caudron (<b>MC</b>)</p>	<p>Greenwood Wilmington and Farringdon TRA (Chair)          Finsbury Estate TRA          Pleydell Estate TMO          Pleydell Estate TMO          Pleydell Estate TMO          Pleydell Estate Resident          Pleydell Estate Resident          Pleydell Estate Resident          Whitecross Street TRA          Grimthorpe, Crayle and Partridge TRA          Peregrine House Resident          Spa Green TMO          Tompion and Earnshaw TRA          Brunswick Estate TMO          Margery Street TRA          King Square TRA          King Square TRA          Cluse Court TRA          Cluse Court TRA          St Lukes TRA          Wenlake Estate TMO          Councillor, Bunhill Ward, LBI          Councillor, Clerkenwell Ward, LBI          Area Housing Manager, HFI          Community and Service Development Officer, HFI</p>
-----------------	--	---

<b>1</b>	<b>Apologies</b>	
1.1	<p><b><u>Apologies received from:</u></b>          a. Cllr Ruth Polling, Cllr Donna Boffa, Jenny Goble (Wenlake TMO), Una O'Halloran (St Lukes TRA), Mrs Turner (Pleydell Estate Resident), Sonya Andermahr (Quaker Court TMO), Jean Trotter (Peregrine TRA), Jenny Robinson (Peregrine TRA).</p>	~
<b>2</b>	<b>AREA HOUSING PANEL ELECTIONS - DECISION</b>	
2.1	<p><b><u>Background</u></b>          a. <b>DS</b> took the Chair for the purposes of carrying out the elections to Chair and Vice Chair and updated the panel on the process.          b. <b>MC</b> distributed voting cards and a membership list to all TRAs and TMOs and confirmed that each organisation had one vote.          c. <b>MC</b> also distributed information on the role of Assistant Director.</p>	~
2.2	<p><b><u>Elections to Chair</u></b>          a. <b>DS</b> asked for nominations to Chair. <b>HC</b> was nominated by <b>IF</b> and <b>OH</b></p>	

	<p>nominated <b>JT</b>. <b>JT</b> confirmed he was a member of the TRA.</p> <p>b. The panel took a vote and <b>HC</b> was elected to Chair by six votes to five.</p>	~
2.3	<p><b><u>Elections to Vice Chair</u></b></p> <p>a. <b>DS</b> asked for nominations to Vice Chair. <b>JT</b> was nominated by <b>OH</b> and <b>SH</b> was nominated by <b>BM</b>.</p> <p>b. The panel took a vote and <b>SH</b> was elected as Vice Chair by six votes to five.</p>	~
2.4	<p><b><u>1 in 1000 Representatives</u></b></p> <p>a. <b>HC</b> took the Chair and continued with the elections.</p> <p>b. <b>MC</b> had not received any applications for 1 in a 1000 representatives however advised that she would be promoting these positions to blocks not represented by TRAs and the posts could be taken up later in the year.</p>	~
2.5	<p><b><u>Elections to Associate Director</u></b></p> <p>a. <b>FS</b> advised that he would be standing down as Associate Director.</p> <p>b. <b>HC</b> asked for nominations to the position however none were received.</p> <p>c. <b>FS</b> agreed to stand in and advised he would be happy to tell people about the role should they be interested.</p>	~
<b>3</b>	<b>PETITION – PLEYDELL ESTATE NOISE NUISANCE</b>	
3.1	<p><b><u>Petition Report</u></b></p> <p>a. <b>MC</b> distributed the report on the petition. <b>DS</b> updated the panel on the noise nuisance case and advised what steps had been taken by HFI.</p> <p>b. <b>DS</b> advised that unfortunately there had not been enough evidence to support the allegations of machinery noise coming from the property concerned, however noise had now been witnessed this month coming from another property. An appointment had been made for HFI staff to visit and investigate.</p>	~
3.2	<p><b><u>Feedback from Residents</u></b></p> <p>a. <b>JG</b> clarified that there were actually 16 floors in the block, not 17 as indicated in the report.</p> <p>b. <b>JG</b> advised that there had been four noise machines placed in their property and that two had been faulty. <b>EG</b> added that a survey had been undertaken by someone in HFI who had indicated that they weren't even sure about the effectiveness of the machines.</p> <p>c. <b>JG</b> and <b>EG</b> stated that they now went to bed dreading the noise as it made the mattress vibrate. They had come to the office to hear the tapes which showed noises that they hadn't heard such as a baby crying.</p> <p>d. <b>EG</b> added that although some noise had been heard coming from a second flat, it definitely was the original flat causing the ongoing nuisance.</p> <p>e. <b>SB</b> advised that the noise was very intermittent and that HFI needed to tailor their response to the allegations to cover the kind of nuisance that</p>	~

	<p>was happening.</p> <p>f. <b>SB</b> took the point that no one had witnessed the noise and advised that they wanted someone to come to the property for a longer period for example over seven hours.</p> <p>g. <b>SB</b> added that there were a number of problems with the report such as the person saying they spent 30 minutes putting up the satellite dish whereas <b>SB</b> said it was two hours.</p> <p>h. <b>EG</b> and <b>JG</b> said they could not bear to take up mediation with the flat concerned however <b>SB</b> said he would like mediation.</p>	~
3.3	<p><b><u>Feedback from HFI</u></b></p> <p>a. <b>EM</b> advised that he would take the report away and review the steps that had been taken to see if these were appropriate.</p> <p>b. <b>EM</b> highlighted the point that noise equipment had been installed but no noise nuisance had been picked up. In addition, harassment had been alleged against <b>EG</b> and <b>JG</b>. <b>EM</b> advised that both parties had rights and were able to defend themselves. The onus was on HFI to produce evidence however if it was not there, it could be very difficult to take action.</p> <p>c. <b>EM</b> added that it might be that HFI would put the case in court and it would be for the judge to make the decision. An injunction may be a possibility however again would be difficult without any evidence. <b>EM</b> advised it may come down to <b>EG</b> and <b>JG</b> and the alleged perpetrators giving evidence in court.</p> <p>d. <b>EM</b> stressed the need for these issues to be put into context. <b>EM</b> advised that 10 households had been evicted for antisocial behaviour and the fact that HFI now had DAT machines and mediation shows how things had progressed.</p> <p>e. <b>OH</b> raised the point that evidence could be given anonymously in court.</p> <p>f. The panel accepted the petition.</p>	<b>EM</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>NOTES OF LAST MEETING AND MATTERS ARISING</b>	
4.1	<p><b><u>Notes of Last Meeting</u></b></p> <p>a. The panel noted the notes of the last meeting.</p>	~
<b>5</b>	<b>RESPECT STANDARD FOR HOUSING MANAGEMENT - CONSULTATION</b>	
5.1	<p><b><u>Respect Agenda</u></b></p> <p>a. <b>EM</b> introduced the report and advised that HFI would be signing up to the standard in July.</p> <p>b. <b>EM</b> went through the six core commitments and the initiatives and services that HFI had identified to achieve the standard, such as good neighbour agreements and the extension of the out of hours antisocial behaviour (ASB) service.</p>	~
5.2	<p><b><u>Comments from the Panel</u></b></p> <p>a. The panel talked about the issues with dog ownership in the area and the</p>	

	<p>problems with dog fouling and lack of areas to walk dogs. <b>EM</b> confirmed that this was a big issue for residents borough wide. <b>EM</b> advised that enforcement would be a two-stage process. Firstly 'no dog fouling' areas would need to set up, and then enforcement could follow.</p> <p>b. <b>BM</b> and <b>HC</b> were positive about the actions that had been taken by the dog warden and QAOs in tackling issues such as dog fouling or dogs attacking other dogs.</p> <p>c. <b>TC</b> suggested leaflets on responsible dog ownership and the panel agreed this was a good idea. <b>BM</b> felt this would also empower non-dog owners as to what constituted good ownership.</p> <p>d. <b>OH</b> felt a stronger approach was need and that tenants should be written to advising that that their actions were against their tenancy conditions and threatened eviction. <b>OH</b> didn't think NSPs were turning into evictions for neighbours causing hell for others.</p> <p>e. <b>TC</b> queried where the fines from fixed penalty notices would go. <b>TC</b> also queried how the enforcement would work between HFI and LBI, how this might differ on estates and streets and whether one would be targeted over another.</p> <p>f. The panel did not think that the ASB teams should be centralised. It was felt that the local teams had a good relationship with the police and that their actions were beginning to take hold; to centralise would defeat the object.</p> <p>g. <b>DS</b> went through the ASB figures for Central Street. The office had served 19 NSPs, used professional witnesses 3 times, had 2 injunctions and was holding regular meetings with the police. <b>JT</b> felt that these figures/actions should be promoted more. <b>MC</b> to include in panel performance reports.</p> <p>h. <b>EM</b> highlighted the continuing funding for the Arsenal Positive Futures. <b>HC</b> was concerned that HFI put the funding in but there was nothing from Arsenal. <b>HC</b> also felt there needed to be feedback to residents on how they apply or get involved in all of the schemes.</p> <p>i. <b>TL</b> was concerned there was no funding to do up the football pitch at the Pleydell Estate. The TMO had installed a small area for £11k but they needed £85k to bring the pitch into use.</p> <p>j. <b>HC</b> was concerned about the health and safety implications of the mosquito alarms.</p>	<b>MC</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>REVIEW OF TENANTS' COMPACT - CONSULTATION</b>	
6.1	<p><b><u>Review of Tenants Compact</u></b></p> <p>a. <b>EM</b> highlighted the key amendments that needed to be made following for example the recent changes to the area office structure, the vote in favour of the leaseholder association and the new resident involvement strategy.</p> <p>b. <b>EM</b> went through the issues regarding the allocation of the Tenant Compact budget and asked the panel whether it should be by area or by properties.</p>	~
<b><u>Comments from the Panel</u></b>		

	<p>a. <b>DS</b> gave the figures for each option and the panel agreed it would be fairer to split the budget by the number of properties rather than evenly between four areas. The panel felt that leasehold numbers should be included as the works carried out affected them also.</p> <p>b. <b>EM</b> discussed the issue of leasehold membership on TRAs and advised that HFI wanted to take the opportunity to review the wording. Currently there needed to be a majority of tenants however the TRA constitution of Citywest Homes aimed for a committee membership that reflected the ratio of tenants and leaseholders.</p> <p>c. <b>SH</b> advised there were 15% leaseholders on the Finsbury Estate and queried how this would be worked out for a TRA? The TRA currently had 50% leaseholders and 50% tenants and <b>SH</b> thought this worked very well.</p> <p>d. <b>SH</b> added that there weren't more than 50% of leaseholders in Islington so there shouldn't be on a TRA.</p> <p>e. <b>OH</b> felt this discriminated against the human rights of leaseholders and that the current clause of the constitution should be scrapped. <b>OH</b> thought that the Citywest clause should be used and added that Citywest was a three star ALMO.</p> <p>f. <b>IF</b> advised that at the AGM they just asked for nominations to committee members, not whether they were tenants or leaseholders.</p> <p>g. <b>EM</b> commented that there were rights in both arguments. <b>EM</b> advised there were a high number of leaseholders in Islington – more than some boroughs had tenancies. <b>EM</b> added that 'aiming' at reflecting the residents did not stop having a tenant majority but would leave it up to the local residents on an estate.</p> <p>h. <b>HC</b> asked the Councillors what their view was. <b>JV</b> advised this issue had been delegated to HFI.</p> <p>i. The panel took a vote on the issue and voted for having a minority of leaseholders on the TRA by 5 votes to 4, with 1 abstention.</p> <p>j. <b>OH</b> was unhappy with the way the vote was carried out and thought that the issues hadn't been explained clearly.</p>	~
<b>7</b>	<b>SIX-MONTHLY COMPLAINTS MONITORING - INFORMATION</b>	
7.1	<p><b><u>Complaints Figures</u></b></p> <p>a. <b>EM</b> highlighted the main points in the report and advised that the number of stage 1 complaints had increased in the last half of 2006-7 but stage 2 had decreased.</p> <p>b. <b>EM</b> advised this was the first time diversity mapping had been carried out on complaints. It showed for example that 19-30 year olds were less likely to complain than their elders.</p> <p>c. <b>EM</b> confirmed the complaints figures included Partners. <b>HC</b> suggested these were taken out.</p>	~
<b>8</b>	<b>DECISION ITEMS AT LAST BOARD AND SUB BOARDS - INFORMATION</b>	

8.1	<b><u>Background</u></b> a. The panel noted the report.	~
<b>9</b>	<b>HFI UPDATE - INFORMATION</b>	
9.1	<b><u>HFI Update</u></b> a. <b>EM</b> highlighted that HFI had amended its petition procedure so responses would now be sent to all petitioners resident in the borough. This was in line with LBI policy.	~
9.2	<b><u>Satellite Dishes</u></b> a. <b>EM</b> updated on the digital switchover and advised that Islington was one of the last areas to be done (2012). A contract had been agreed with BskyB who were currently on site in the Holland Walk area. b. <b>EM</b> confirmed to <b>TL</b> that there would be one main aerial on the roof so the majority of dishes could come down. The panel discussed the issue of foreign language channels and <b>EM</b> advised this needed to be worked through. c. The panel requested a full programme of when the works would be carried out and whether this would be included with the major works. d. <b>TC</b> advised that Spa Green residents were encouraged not to put dishes back after the major works and were sent a joint letter assuring that there would be a solution to the satellite issue. <b>TC</b> had not had any further information and residents were starting to put the dishes back. e. <b>TC</b> asked if the Councillors thought grade II* buildings should be prioritised given the value of the building. <b>GA</b> advised this was for HFI to decide. f. <b>EM</b> suggested that a 'lay persons' report comes back to panels with details of the works, method and a programme of when they will be done.	<b>EM</b>
<b>10</b>	<b>FORWARD PLAN - INFORMATION</b>	
10.1	<b><u>Forward Plan</u></b> a. The panel noted the report.	~
<b>11</b>	<b>CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING 2006/7 4<sup>TH</sup> QUARTER - INFORMATION</b>	
11.1	<b><u>Capital Programme</u></b> a. <b>JT</b> reported problems at Grimthorpe with missed appointments, workmen leaving early and doing nothing. <b>JT</b> was concerned that the project officers only brought the notes of the last meeting to steering groups. <b>JT</b> queried who was responsible for deciding whether kitchens and bathrooms were installed. b. The panel felt in general that the consultation procedure was lacking. c. <b>IF</b> advised that after sending back a form to be on the steering group in December, she hadn't heard anything. <b>BW</b> added that they had only had two steering meetings, then heard nothing. d. <b>EM</b> advised he would take these issues back.	<b>EM</b>

<b>12</b>	<b>CENTRAL STREET CUSTOMER COMMENT CARDS AND COMPLAINTS - INFORMATION</b>	
12.1	<p><b><u>Central Street Performance</u></b></p> <p>a. <b>DS</b> went through the comment card report, highlighting the good feedback from customers and the changes that had been made following comments that had been given.</p> <p>b. <b>DS</b> highlighted the complaints report for 2006-7 and advised that the number of complaints had reduced from 73 to 52 compared to the previous year. The number upheld had also reduced.</p> <p>c. <b>DS</b> confirmed that managers went through the complaints each month to look at the lessons that could be learnt and <b>JV</b> commented that the number would increase.</p>	~
<b>13</b>	<b>AOB</b>	
13.1	<p><b><u>St Lukes Issues</u></b></p> <p>a. <b>IF</b> raised a repair issue regarding the tank room doors. This had been logged as an emergency but no one had come to repair them despite the best efforts of the Estate Co-ordinator. <b>DS</b> to look into.</p> <p>b. <b>IF</b> advised that the TRA wanted the grass area where the site office was to be turfed, not reseeded. <b>DS</b> to take back.</p>	<p><b>DS</b></p> <p><b>DS</b></p>
13.2	<p><b><u>St Peters Ward TRAs</u></b></p> <p>a. SH asked about the St Peters TRAs and what sub panel they would attend. SH wanted to make sure the TRAs felt welcome. <b>DS</b> advised that the TRAs would be written to and invited to join the Clerkenwell sub panel.</p>	<b>DS</b>
13.3	<p><b><u>Date of Next Meeting</u></b></p> <p>a. The next meeting would be held at <b>7pm</b> on <b>Thursday 12<sup>th</sup> July</b> at Brunswick Meeting Room, Mulberry Court.</p>	~