

NOTES OF THE CENTRAL STREET AREA HOUSING PANEL

Thursday 8th March 2007 – Central Street Area Housing Office – 7pm

Present:	<p>Helen Cagnoni (HC) Greenwood Wilmington and Farringdon TRA (Chair)</p> <p>Sharon Hayward (SH) Finsbury Estate TRA</p> <p>Danny Unstead (DU) Pleydell Estate TMO</p> <p>Shirley Lefevre (SL) Pleydell Estate TMO</p> <p>Terry Lefevre (TL) Pleydell Estate TMO</p> <p>Joe Trotter (JT) Peregrine House resident</p> <p>Blanche Woodbridge (BW) King Square TRA</p> <p>Frances Sullivan (FS) King Square TRA</p> <p>A Menia (AM) Cluse Court TRA</p> <p>V Sempler (VS) Cluse Court TRA</p> <p>Maureen Smith (MS) Brunswick Estate TMO</p> <p>Irene Francis (IF) St Lukes TRA</p> <p>George Allan (GA) Councillor, Clerkenwell Ward, LBI</p> <p>Jyoti Vaja (JV) Councillor, Bunhill Ward, LBI</p> <p>Justin Ho (JH) Antisocial Behaviour Team, LBI</p> <p>Jessie White (JW) Board Director (Resident), HFI</p> <p>Adam Borrie (AB) Board Director (Independent), HFI</p> <p>Ann Lucas (AL) Board Director (Chair – Independent), HFI</p> <p>Doug Goldring (DG) Director of Operations, HFI</p> <p>John Farrant (JF) Senior Area Housing Manager, HFI</p> <p>David Salenius (DS) Area Housing Manager, HFI</p> <p>Mike Rees (MR) Area Programme Manager, HFI</p> <p>Mary Caudron (MC) Performance and Partnership Officer, HFI</p>
-----------------	---

1	Welcome and Introductions	Action
1.1	<p><u>Welcome and Introductions</u></p> <p>a. Resident representatives and guests were welcomed to the meeting, which was the first Central Street area housing panel covering the Bunhill, Clerkenwell, and St Peters wards.</p> <p>b. Introductions were given around the table.</p>	~
2	Apologies	
2.1	<p><u>Apologies received from:</u></p> <p>a. Cllr Coupland, Cllr Ray, Jean Trotter, Jenny Robinson.</p>	~
3	ELECTION TO CHAIR (DECISION)	
3.1	<p><u>Background</u></p> <p>a. DS advised that a Chair needed to be elected for this meeting only. Normal elections for the financial year 2007/8 would take place at the May round of meetings.</p> <p>b. DS took the position whilst the election was carried out.</p>	~

3.2	<p><u>Elections</u></p> <p>a. DS asked for nominations to Chair. HC and JT were nominated.</p> <p>b. A vote was taken and HC was voted in as Chair by 4 (votes to 2.</p> <p>c. HC took the Chair for the remainder of the meeting.</p>	~
4	MAGPI PRESENTATION (INFORMATION)	
4.1	<p><u>Update on MAGPI</u></p> <p>a. JH informed the panel about MAGPIs (Multi-Agency Geographical Panels in Islington), advising what the panels were, when they were rolled out and how they worked.</p> <p>b. The Central Street area was covered in the south MAGPI, which consisted of Clerkenwell, Bunhill, St Peters and Canonbury Wards.</p> <p>c. JH updated on the work taking place in the area such as detached youth mobile vans, lighting, tasking in King Square and liaison with Exmouth Market traders association.</p> <p>d. DS confirmed that referrals could go to MAGPI via any of the agencies such as the police, young peoples' service, Greenspace etc.</p> <p>e. JH advised that MAGPI was looking at how it could feedback more effectively to residents. Currently they were carrying out door knocking for the community safety day. Surveys were carried out, bulletins published and revisits undertaken in three months time.</p>	~
4.2	<p><u>Feedback from Residents</u></p> <p>a. IF raised issues with rough sleepers on the estate. DS advised IF that she should pass the details to the office first, then he would raise at MAGPI if unable to resolve.</p> <p>b. SH was concerned about the problems on the Camden side of Kings Cross Road spilling out into Islington and asked if JH worked with other boroughs?</p> <p>c. JH advised that in other areas of Islington, partnership meetings had been set up such as at the Brecknock Road border, but not at Kings Cross Road. JH informed the panel that it often depended on the good faith of other organisations.</p>	IF
5	MINUTES OF LAST MEETING AND MATTERS ARISING	
5.1	<p><u>Notes of Last Meeting</u></p> <p>a. The notes of the last meeting were agreed as a true and accurate record.</p>	
5.2	<p><u>Matters Arising</u></p> <p>a. DS distributed a written update on the rent review queries from the last meeting, giving a breakdown of tenants in receipt of housing benefit, details on the benefits of unpooling the rent charge and details of the impact on the HRA of transferring the Packington Estate.</p> <p>b. The update also advised where on the website residents could access the community engagement strategy and information on the Borough Beat</p>	

	<p>scheme.</p> <p>c. SH was confused by some of the answers. DS suggested SH write to Anne Bagland, head accountant at HFI.</p> <p>d. DS advised DU that charges such as rent and concierges generally increased year on year in line with the Governments rent restructuring. DU to inform DS of any specific problems with the security.</p> <p>e. SL asked why if more blocks were added to the security system, did the prices not go down. DG advised that there may be a reduction in the level of subsidy from the HRA but in terms of what tenants pay, it is a set price. For leaseholders, the more people using the system, the cheaper it is.</p> <p>f. HC requested details on how concierge systems were 'sold' to residents and an outline of future costs.</p> <p>g. MC confirmed that the contact details of the Clerkenwell panel had been sent to PC Leach requesting that he advise them of the dates of the Safer Neighbourhood panel meetings.</p>	<p>DU</p> <p>DS</p>
6	ESTATE SECURITY FUNDING (DECISION)	
6.1	<p><u>Allocation of Bunhill Funding 2007/8</u></p> <p>a. MC advised that there was £12,140 of estate security funding for the Bunhill ward that needed to be allocated. MC distributed an update from the Youthreach project on the work carried out in 2006/7.</p> <p>b. JV was not happy with the funding going to the YMCA Youthreach project. JV felt the funding should be advertised.</p> <p>c. MC to write to TRAs and local groups inviting proposals for the funding that improved the security of residents. Bunhill representatives would decide on the allocation at their sub panel in April.</p>	MC
7	GOVERNANCE ARRANGEMENTS (CONSULTATION)	
7.1	<p><u>Background</u></p> <p>a. DG summarised the report and requested comments from the panel on the future of the sub boards, size of the board, allowances for directors and election process. DG stressed that the report was for consultation.</p> <p>b. SH and HC felt in general that the report did not give enough information on the impact to residents and TRAs of the options given. SH was concerned that the report did not mention any 'accountability' of the board directors.</p>	~
7.2	<p><u>Future of Sub Boards</u></p> <p>a. JT queried what the cost of sub board meetings were. AL advised that one meeting was not significant however with two sub panels there were 12 meetings in a year so there would be some savings made if sub boards were abolished.</p> <p>b. JT felt that board members should go to the housing panels and report back. JV reminded JT that the Central Street panel had decided not to put someone forward at the start. JW reminded the panel that there were</p>	~

	<p>associate directors from each panel on the sub boards.</p> <p>c. SH asked who was accountable if the sub boards made the decisions? AL clarified that the sub boards were made up of board directors but also had representation from resident associate directors. AL advised that the sub boards had been frustrated that they wanted their role to be more meaningful.</p> <p>d. The panel discussed the sub boards at length, and went through each of the options one by one.</p> <p>e. The panel did not support the option to abolish the sub boards.</p> <p>f. The panel could not see any advantage in moving to one sub board.</p> <p>g. The above decisions meant that the last option available was to leave the sub boards as they were. The panel then took a vote on the principle of delegation to sub boards and voted against delegation (against 6, for 1, abstentions 1).</p>	~
7.3	<p><u>Allowances for Board Directors</u></p> <p>a. The panel discussed the issues of allowances. HC didn't think board directors should be paid and that it should be done voluntarily. SH thought that paying the directors would put them in a different position. JT queried what the benefit would be to residents.</p> <p>b. SH commented that only a handful of ALMOs paid their board directors.</p> <p>c. AL advised that if the directors were paid allowances, it would be more rigorous what was expected of them.</p> <p>d. The panel voted against paying board directors allowances (against 6; for 1; abstentions 1).</p>	~
7.4	<p><u>Reducing the Board Size</u></p> <p>a. The panel voted against reducing the size of the board (against 8; for 0; abstentions 0; no votes 2). The panel felt the board should stay the same size.</p>	~
7.5	<p><u>Resident Elections to Board</u></p> <p>a. The panel were concerned that the election process was changing before the south of the borough had held theirs.</p> <p>b. The panel also felt that the proposed changes would lead to the south of the borough being less represented.</p> <p>c. The panel agreed the elections should remain the same and took a vote in favour of option 1 (against 0; for 6, abstentions 0; no votes 2)</p>	~
8	CONSULTATIVE PANELS (DECISION)	
8.1	<p><u>Background</u></p> <p>a. DG introduced the report and MC distributed suggested dates, times and locations for the Central Street consultative panel.</p>	~
8.2	<u>One or Two Panels</u>	

	a. The panel had previously agreed to hold one area housing panel meeting.	~
8.3	<p><u>Dates, Time and Location</u></p> <p>a. The panel agreed to hold the meetings on Thursday evenings at 7pm. MC went through the suggested dates and advised that these had been cross referenced with the Council diary to avoid any potential clashes.</p> <p>b. The panel agreed to the suggested dates (10th May 07, 12th July 07, 13th September 07, 15th November 07, 24th January 08, 20th March 08). MC stressed that these could not be changed once set.</p> <p>c. The panel agreed for the meetings to take place at the Brunswick meeting room in Mulberry Court. MS to book the room on the agreed dates.</p>	MS
8.4	<p><u>Sub Panels</u></p> <p>a. MC distributed the membership list for each of the three wards and proposed the two sub panels continued with the membership reorganised to accommodate the St Peters TRAs.</p> <p>b. MC advised that resources would be stretched in facilitating a third sub panel as well as the area housing panel. In addition, with only four TRAs, a St Peters panel would not achieve a quorum.</p> <p>c. MC suggested that the four St Peters TRAs joined the Bunhill membership and the four Percival/Triangle TRAs that were previously in Clerkenwell prior to the ward boundary change remain with the Clerkenwell membership.</p> <p>d. JV objected to this and stated that she wanted all the Bunhill TRAs to meet as one sub panel. JV added that each ward should have a sub panel.</p> <p>e. HC felt that the four TRAs currently attending Clerkenwell should decide which sub panel they attended. IF thought that three sub panels would be too many for any business to be done.</p> <p>f. DG clarified that there was no requirement on the office to have sub panel meetings and that these were additional meetings facilitated by officers. DG was happy for discussions to take place such as the possibility of informal meetings with St Peters.</p> <p>g. DS to progress by contacting the four TRAs on the Clerkenwell/Bunhill boarder to find out what they wanted.</p>	DS
9	RESIDENT INVOLVEMENT STRATEGY (CONSULTATION)	
9.1	<p><u>Draft HFI Resident Involvement Strategy</u></p> <p>a. DG introduced the report and highlighted the proposals.</p> <p>b. The panel commented on the following points. All other points were noted.</p>	~
9.2	<p><u>Resident Sounding Board</u></p> <p>a. DG advised that sounding boards happened in a number of places and was considered to be good practice.</p> <p>b. SH didn't think the sounding board had any accountability, but was rather just cherry picked. SH said that most tenant groups didn't like the idea, as</p>	

	<p>people weren't elected.</p> <p>c. JT thought that HFI needed other channels to consult with residents other than through tenant associations.</p> <p>d. HC asked if anyone was in favour of the sounding board and no members indicated that they were.</p>	~
9.3	<p><u>Resident Involvement Awards</u></p> <p>a. The panel discussed the awards and took a vote as to whether they should be implemented.</p> <p>b. The panel voted against the awards (against 6; for 1; abstentions 1).</p>	~
9.4	<p><u>Reviewing FITA Service Agreement</u></p> <p>a. DG advised that the proposal was to review the agreement, as with any organisation funded by the Council.</p> <p>b. HC felt that FITA gave a good service and did lots for TRAs. HC asked if anyone was in favour of a review of the service agreement and no members indicated that they were.</p>	~
10	DECISION ITEMS AND BOARD AND SUB BOARDS (INFORMATION)	
10.1	<p><u>Decision Items</u></p> <p>a. The panel noted the report.</p>	~
11	HFI UPDATE (INFORMATION)	
11.1	<p><u>HFI Update</u></p> <p>a. The panel noted the report.</p>	~
12	FORWARD PLAN (INFORMATION)	
12.1	<p><u>Forward Plan</u></p> <p>a. The panel noted the report.</p>	~
13	CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING 2006/7 – 3RD QUARTER (INFORMATION)	
13.1	<p><u>Capital Programme Update</u></p> <p>a. MR updated the panel on capital works in the Bunhill and Clerkenwell area. MR advised that all current works on site in St Peters ward would continue to be dealt with by the Upper St project team.</p> <p>b. MR to provide updates on St Peters in the future.</p> <p>c. JT to get a list of properties from the TRA of residents affected by fuses being blown and problems with appliances. JT to pass list to MR. MR confirmed that the properties were not signed off by inspectors and wanted to know of any issues.</p> <p>d. JT advised that he attended a recent meeting about the 'Getting it right' booklet. The panel discussed such consultation meetings and SH was concerned about where the information went after the meetings. IF queried why she wasn't invited considering works were due to start on the estate.</p>	<p>MR</p> <p>JT</p> <p>MR</p>

13.2	<p><u>Tenant Compact Update</u></p> <p>a. MR advised the sign at King Square had been ordered. The TRA would be contacted, as the sign was due to go up.</p> <p>b. SL advised the yellow lines at Pleydell were not completed. MR to take back. MR to chase up speed humps.</p> <p>c. MR was waiting for the date from Kiers when the flooring at St Lukes would be done.</p>	<p>MR</p> <p>MR</p>
14	ANY OTHER BUSINESS	
14.1	<p><u>Date of Next Meeting</u></p> <p>a. The next meeting would be held at 7pm on Thursday 10th May at Brunswick Meeting Room, Mulberry Court.</p>	~
