

MINUTES OF ISLINGTON LEASEHOLDERS FORUM MEETING

WEDNESDAY 10th May 2006 @ 7PM

COUNCIL CHAMBERS, TOWN HALL

Present

Brian Potter (Chair) (BP)	Pleasant Place L. A.
Andrew Jex (Vice Chair) (AJ)	Holland Walk
Chris Radway (CR)	PFI/Partners
Joy Bailey (JB)	Upper Street
B Woods (BW)	Lyon Street
P Mallin (PM)	Boleyn Road
J Arrowsmith (JA)	Holland Walk

Apologies

Leon Yianni	Isledon Road
Ian Duckett	PFI Partners

HFI Officers

Doug Goldring (DG)	Director of Operations
Peter Taunton (PT)	Leasehold Management Consultant
Nigel Freeman (NF)	Home Ownership Manager
Alex Evans (AE)	Home Ownership
Jim Baxter (JB)	Surveyor

Partners Officers

David Westworth
Mark Allum
Claire Thorogood
Lawrence Wakeman

Observers

O Onoh	Barnsbury Road
M Morrissey	Blenheim Court
B Mackin	Blenheim Court
J Tougher	Blenheim Court
R Tankard	Caroline Martin House
J Harwood	Catherall Road
J Fessler	Highbury Quadrant
S Shearman	Mildmay Grove
E Fredenburg	Milner Square
K Donald	Packington Square
C Gillett	Packington Square

J Yule
 R Horton
 T Horton
 C Graham

Penrhos House
 Selkirk House
 Selkirk House
 Tollington Park

Items Discussed

ITEM	MATTER RAISED	ACTION
1.0	<p>Introductions & Apologies</p> <p>Apologies for Ian Duckett and Leon Yianni noted.</p>	
2.0	<p>Question and Answer session with Partners</p> <p>Outline of contract given. 30 year contract for 2400 street properties, of which just over 600 are owned by leaseholders. 1st cycle of works started in July 2003 and will be finished by late 2008. The average estimate for works has been £8,000. The average final account has been £7,000.</p> <p>Partners made an application to the LVT regarding preliminary and profit percentages as elements of leaseholder's charges. Decision expected in December 2006.</p> <p>Q Will Partners have the same permissions to do alterations costs as HFI? A DW Legal costs will be the same, as both use LBI Legal. Costs for surveyors will be different. DG In principle Partners and HFI want to have as similar costs as possible.</p> <p>Q Why is there a difference between Partners' "management costs" for major works and HFI's? A DW A mistake was made. Wait to see outcome of the LVT's decision in December. Leaseholders will be able to challenge that decision if they wish. Interim invoices will be sent out before December, but leaseholders will be informed that they do not have to pay the management costs, just those of the works. The discount given to leaseholders for early payment will stand if they pay the cost of works, but do not have to pay the fees.</p> <p>Q Can leaseholders be involved in the pre-LVT discussion with the experts? A DW This is something for the LVT to decide, not Partners.</p> <p>Q Who identified Partners' mistake? A CT Partners did. The cost of the LVT will be borne by Partners, not the leaseholders. Any court costs incurred by the leaseholders will not be paid by Partners.</p> <p>Q Will HFI pay for Partners' mistakes? A DG No. But LBI may consider it.</p>	

ITEM	MATTER RAISED	ACTION
	<p>Q Can Partners guarantee that their costs for the LVT case won't be passed on to the leaseholders? A DW Yes.</p> <p>Q Would Partners have gone to the LVT if this had not been noticed by leaseholders? A CT Yes</p> <p>Q How do Partners compare with other PFI projects around the country? A DW There is no comparable group. This is essentially a pathfinder project for street properties</p> <p>Q Will the decision of the LVT be carried over to PFI2? A DW Decision will not be binding for anything other than PFI1, but will be taken into account.</p> <p>Q Should HFI supervise Partners, e.g. check that the bills are correct? A DG We cannot check every bill, nor do Partners jobs for them. However, work is monitored, through quality assurance checks.</p> <p>Q 2 years interest free is not a sufficient period to pay £10,000. Why can leaseholders not have 5 years interest free? A DG It was decided at the Council Executive in February 2006 that 2 years interest free was reasonable. Money is needed to be collected in order to fund future projects.</p> <p>Q Did HFI have power to make recommendations to LBI? A DG HFI outlined what other boroughs did, but did not make recommendations. LBI were made aware of what the most expensive bills in Islington are, and what the average bill is.</p> <p>Q Does an LVT decision stop the clock on the 2 year interest free period? A DG The details are still being finalised, but as it is the leaseholder's choice to make an LVT application, the likely answer is no.</p> <p>Q Does the AMP (Agreed Maximum Price) exist for Partners? A CT No. The contracts were not tendered on that basis. However, the works are capped at £10,000.</p> <p>Q Will there be a Partners representative at each serviced ILF meeting? A Partners Yes</p> <p>Q Do Partners' roofs have guarantees? A MA Yes, there is a 12 year latent defect liability.</p> <p>Q Can someone from LBI come to each meeting? A BP I will invite for next meeting.</p>	<p>BP</p>

ITEM	MATTER RAISED	ACTION
3.0	<p>Vote on new ILF members</p> <p>Joanne Arrowsmith unanimously co-opted as new ILF member for Holland Walk.</p> <p>Pleasant Place currently un-recognised as a recognised leaseholder association. Brian Potter unanimously co-opted as new ILF member for Upper Street.</p>	
4.0	<p>Procedures for the replacement of windows by leaseholders</p> <p>Report noted</p> <p>The £150 fee has now been removed.</p> <p>Leaseholders with a Deed of Variation will not have to contribute towards window replacement to the other properties in their block, but will have to contribute towards any communal windows.</p> <p>A further paper will be submitted regarding planning permission and window specifications.</p>	<p>BP & DG</p>
5.0	<p>Guarantees for building components</p> <p>Report Noted</p> <p>JB Insurers will depend on the manufacturer.</p> <p>Windows will not automatically have insurance backed guarantees. This will add a further 2.5% to the cost.</p> <p>DG Decisions on whether leaseholders want insurance backed guarantees to be made individually by each major works steering group, pre-section 20 being sent out.</p> <p>Insurance may not be worth having, as insurers may blame problems on contractors, and not pay.</p>	
6.0	<p>Resident satisfaction with building works</p> <p>Report noted</p> <p>Any further observations to be made to PT or NF</p>	

ITEM	MATTER RAISED	ACTION
<p>7.0</p> <p>7.1</p> <p>7.2</p> <p>7.3</p>	<p>Consultative Panel Reports</p> <p>Subject of report: <i>Sustainability Strategy</i></p> <p>Report not adequate. Recycling should be included. Importance of conserving water should be included. Auditing of green space may lead to sales. New report is needed focusing on the difference between HFI and LBI policy.</p> <p>Subject of report: <i>Proposals to meet digital switchover</i></p> <p>Paper not detailed enough. Individual aerials, e.g. on street properties, need to be taken into account.</p> <p>DG The focus is currently on HFI owned aerials on estates. Focus will be extended to individuals.</p> <p>Subject of report: <i>Consultative Panel Elections</i></p> <p>Report noted</p> <p>ILF will feedback at later date.</p> <p>AJ Can there be an agenda item in July regarding how to raise interest in leaseholders standing in the next ILF election?</p>	<p>DG</p>
<p>8.0</p>	<p>Date of Next Meeting</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Wednesday 12th July 2006</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Council Chambers Town Hall Upper Street. N1 @ 7:00 P.M</p>	