



**Minutes of the  
Residents Forum Meeting 19 January 2006  
Held at the Partners Offices, Colebrooke Place, N1 8HZ**

---

**PRESENT:**

**Forum members:** Georgina Galliers (GG) **CHAIR**  
Muriel Duncan (MD) **VICE-CHAIR**  
Ann-Marie Greensmith (AMG)  
Chris Radway (CR)  
Dave Gorman (DG)  
Leigh Norgrove (LN)  
Rosemary Hilton (RH)  
Sally Ingrey (SI)

**Partners:** Susan French (SF)  
Tom Irvine (TI)  
Lawrence Wakeman (LW)  
Liz Voss (LV)  
Michelle Harrison (MH minutes)

**HFI:** Anthony Jonas (AJ)

**HFI Tenant Director:** Des Smith (DS)

**Observers:** Eugen Hockenjos (EH)  
Michael Read (MR)

---

**APOLOGIES:**

**Forum members:** Dawreen Charles  
**Partners** David Westworth

	<p><b><u>Co-option of new member onto the forum</u></b></p> <p>Mr Hockenjos introduced himself to the group with a short speech. The forum discussed the co-option and then voted in a closed ballot.</p> <p>At the end of the meeting the votes were counted by Anthony Jonas (HFI) and Sally Ingrey (member of the Forum).</p> <p>The Forum did not support the co-option of Mr Hockenjos to the membership of the Forum.</p>	

<p><b>1.</b></p> <p><b>1.1</b></p> <p><b>1.2</b></p> <p><b>1.3</b></p> <p><b>1.4</b></p>	<p><b><u>Minutes of the last meeting</u></b></p> <p><b>AMG:</b> I was very disappointed that there was so little coverage of the NEETARA presentation in the minutes. There is not even a mention in the minutes of the fact that we had done a satisfaction survey. I would like to see that amended in the minutes to include relevant information about the presentation.</p> <p><b>GG:</b> It was an excellent, informative presentation last time by NEETARA and very well presented by <b>AMG</b> and <b>SI</b>.</p> <p><b>AMG:</b> Would it be possible to add a keypoint summary from the presentation or a copy of the full presentation on the Partners website?</p> <p><b>TI:</b> Yes, we will add these to the website and we will add an amendment to the minutes to include more information. I am very sorry about this because it was an excellent presentation and a huge piece of work that you did, and it has been very valuable to us. Copies of the presentation in full were handed out in the last meeting, but I recognise that this should have received much fuller coverage in the minutes.</p> <p><b>SF:</b> We will also put a keypoint summary into the next Partners residents newsletter</p> <p><b>SF: GG/MD</b> will, from now on, sign off the minutes at the end of each meeting</p> <p><b>AMG, LN, GG:</b> We must start to receive papers further in advance of the meetings. Need to have them about one week after.</p> <p><b>TI:</b> We will aim to get minutes out to members ten days after the meeting but other papers (HFI consultation papers, performance etc) are not produced in time for that and will be sent out accordingly. We have always aimed to send out papers a week in advance, but we shall make sure this happens in the future.</p> <p><b>GG:</b> Does any of the Forum have any objections to the meetings now starting at 6:45 instead of 6:30? This will give everyone time to get to the meeting and not have to rush about.</p> <p><b>CR:</b> Feel that this would not allow enough time for the agenda, which is already quite long to be covered.</p> <p><b>GG:</b> We will streamline the agenda from the next meeting so we will see how the start time goes, from the next meeting.</p>	
<p><b>2.</b></p>	<p><b><u>Partners Performance Report – Susan French</u></b> <b><u>'Performance at a glance'</u></b></p>	

<p><b>2.1</b></p>	<p><b>SF</b> took the forum through Partners performance for December/January.  <b>AMG:</b> In future can we have the pages of this report numbered or lettered as is quite confusing when reading it?  <b>SF:</b> Yes, will do for next meeting and onwards.</p>	
<p><b>2.2</b></p>	<p><b>LN:</b> Does the 1007 pieces of recorded correspondence include emails?  <b>MH:</b> Yes – anything that comes into us and needs an answer will be logged for a reply.</p>	
<p><b>2.3</b></p>	<p><b>DS:</b> Could text be used as a method of contact, to report repairs etc?  <b>SF:</b> We looked at this some time ago and we decided not to implement it as there are various potential problems, particularly with proper diagnosis of repairs. We do however have a Typetalk for residents who have impaired hearing.</p>	
<p><b>2.4</b></p>	<p><b>CR:</b> Are we monitoring the portion of leaseholders that have received their section 20's but have not had an invite to the open days?  <b>LV:</b> Leaseholders, as part of our new procedure will be invited to open days within 3 months of their start dates and will from now on also receive an invite when they receive their Section 20's.  <b>CR:</b> We have had this discussion before and I thought we had received assurances that there would be consultation before leaseholders receive their Section 20s. Leaseholders only have a limited time to respond under the statutory timescale and they should be able to go to these open days before they receive their Section 20 so that they are better prepared to respond.  <b>SF:</b> I shall ask David Westwoth [Head of Housing] to write to CR and LN to address this issue and to explain the process. I really feel it is not correct that the first a leaseholder would hear about the refurbishment is through their Section 20 notice. For a start, I know that there have been a number of newsletters that have gone out to all residents with information about the refurbishment programme. There has also been a newsletter specifically for leaseholders about the refurbishment. But I think it is right that David Westworth [Head of Housing] should explain the process to you in more detail in writing.</p> <p><b><i>Annual Service Plan</i></b></p>	
<p><b>2.5</b></p>	<p>The forum received a summary introduction to the Partners Annual service plan. Natasha Wyeth will be arranging a</p>	

	<p>meeting separately from the forum meeting, to get input on the plan from the forum members.</p> <p><b>GG:</b> Does anyone object to this being arranged  <b>There were no objections.</b></p>	
<b>3.</b>	<p><b><u>HFI comments on Partners performance</u></b>  <b><u>Anthony Jonas</u></b></p>	
<b>3.1</b>	<p><b>AJ:</b> Homes for Islington agree with the performance report given by <b>SF</b>.  Repairs statistics are excellent  Good void turnaround</p>	
<b>3.2</b>	<p><b>CR:</b> Could we have a copy of the Partners performance report in with the papers in future?  <b>TI:</b> It is usually included but was not this month and this is an exception, apologies for that.</p>	
<b>3.3</b>	<p><b>AJ:</b> Telephone answering is excellent.  Responding to correspondence within timeframe is extremely good.  An action plan has been put into place to try to reduce Partners complaints by half, and the most recent position is a reduction in levels of complaints by 45% compared with last year.  HFI now have their own technical surveyor, Dean Sitton who has been conducting site visits to the works team. Unfortunately he will be leaving us shortly.  Discussions have been happening around the length of time taken in each property for the works. Will be trialling a few properties to HFI's new timescales to see if they are viable. We welcome the high number of completions in December and are pleased that Partners now look well placed to achieve the milestones.</p>	
<b>3.4</b>	<p><b>AMG:</b> Could we see more details on length of works in properties?  <b>LW:</b> at the moment, with new time trials it will be difficult to have levels that are representative.</p>	
<b>3.5</b>	<p><b>CR:</b> Is HFI confident that Partners' milestones will be met?  <b>AJ:</b> If Partners have not met 2006 milestones it would not constitute a major failure. The important one is the milestone of 2008.</p>	
<b>4.</b>	<p><b><u>Works Team Update – Lawrence Wakeman</u></b></p>	
<b>4.1</b>	<p><b>LW</b> presented the works team update to the forum</p>	

<p><b>4.2</b></p>	<p><b>CR:</b> I have spoken to many people in the Blue zone, which is supposedly finished, and they have said that they have had their properties left, with works still outstanding and no sign of anyone coming back to finish.  <b>LW:</b> Please pass me the details and I will follow up.</p>	
<p><b>4.3</b></p>	<p><b>CR:</b> I still have concerns over the length of time that leaseholders are given with their notice of works.  <b>SF:</b> David Westworth [Head of Housing] will write to <b>CR</b> to state clearly what the leaseholder process for works notification is.</p>	
<p><b>4.4</b></p>	<p><b>SF:</b> Partners sent out a newsletter devoted to leasehold residents in December giving lots of information on the works and also directing residents to the website where more specific information is held.</p>	
<p><b>4.5</b></p>	<p><b>LN:</b> I would like to support <b>CR</b> on this issue as time after time we find ourselves talking about Section 20's during these meetings.  <b>SF:</b> I think that this is a different issue with the sections 20's than before. I am not aware that any issue has been left unaddressed over several meetings.</p>	
<p><b>4.6</b></p>	<p><b>LW:</b> <u>NEETARA feedback</u>  The works team would like to thank <b>AMG</b> and <b>SI</b> for their hard work on the Customer satisfaction survey of residents. Lots of valuable ideas and suggestions came out of it and LV is working with a lot of them now. As a result of the survey we have seen that we need to place a lot more emphasis on communication with the residents.  <b>TI:</b> Jess Ward [Works Team Customer Focus Manager] is working on a 'now that works are finishing' sheet to let residents know exactly what should and shouldn't happen at the end of the works (sign off). This will hopefully make residents aware of what to expect at the end of the works in their homes.</p>	
<p><b>4.7</b></p>	<p><b>MD:</b> Do the Customer Service Team have information on what works are being carried out and where in relation to raising repairs?  <b>TI:</b> Yes, they have a constantly updated list that must be checked before any jobs are raised.</p>	
<p><b>4.8</b></p>	<p><b>AMG:</b> Can the Resident Forum see the advice sheet about what happens at the end of the works before it goes out?  <b>TI:</b> Yes – we will send it out to the forum once it is fully drafted.</p>	
<p><b>4.9</b></p>	<p><b>DS:</b> HFI are starting a new initiative to give tenants a</p>	

<p><b>4.10</b></p>	<p>'goodie bag' for when they move into their homes. This would include the basics tea bags, toilet paper etc. Would Partners consider doing this?  <b>AMG:</b> This is taxpayers' money that would be spent and I find it highly patronising.  <b>AJ:</b> I think DS is referring to the starter pack given to new tenants when they move into their new home.</p> <p><b>MD:</b> I had to call Partners before Christmas to say that there was a lot of mess in the garden from next door's external works and while carrying out the works they cracked the plaster on the outside frontage of my property, did not put right (even when was pointed out) and then took the scaffolding down.  <b>LW:</b> I will look into this and get sorted out.  <b>GG:</b> I have to say that there has been a marked improvement in the scaffolding contractors on the whole.  <b>LW:</b> We are constantly looking at our subcontractors and ways to improve the service.</p> <p><b>4.11</b></p> <p><b>CR:</b> What guarantees do Leaseholders if repairs are needed following the works?  <b>TI:</b> 1 year Defects Liability Period for any defects. This means that if a repair is needed within the first year because of a defect, this will be done without charge to leaseholders.</p> <p><b>4.12</b></p> <p><b>TI:</b> RLO's went through NEETARA presentation and found that it was a great help. They found it very helpful to get such a clear presentation of residents' feedback – both the positives and the areas for improvement.</p> <p><b>4.13</b></p> <p><b>LN:</b> Do you give 10 Year guarantees for anything?  <b>LW:</b> I think it is a 25yr guarantees for damp proofing - but will double check on that for you.</p>	
<p><b>5.</b></p> <p><b>5.1</b></p>	<p><b><u>Refurbishment Performance Indicators</u></b>  <b><u>Anthony Jonas</u></b></p> <p>HFI would like to bring in new KPI's for the works team. A list of these indicators were included with the forum papers.  The works team will be supplying data to be measured monthly or quarterly, depending on indicator. <b>AJ</b> asked the forum for any queries on these before they were finalised and put into place. The forum was told that they could come back with any ideas straight to <b>AJ</b>.</p> <p><b>AJ:</b> These indicators are not based on the current contract</p>	

<p><b>5.2</b></p>	<p>standards, they are separate from those.</p> <p><b>CR:</b> The target for void turnaround (in days) should be set and not altered for any reason.  <b>AJ:</b> We have a process where by if properties are in a very bad state of repair they can have an extended time frame for given for special works.  <b>AMG:</b> Will the days calculated in working days or calendar days?  <b>AJ:</b> The new PI's will be in calendar days</p>	
<p><b>5.3</b></p>	<p><b>CR:</b> Can there be more indicators to illustrate satisfaction alongside satisfied?  <b>SF:</b> There are 5 categories under which satisfaction is being monitored (very satisfied, fairly satisfied, neither, fairly dissatisfied, very dissatisfied).  <b>RH:</b> There is a form given to everyone that has had the works to rate their satisfaction.</p>	
<p><b>5.4</b></p>	<p><b>AMG:</b> Will the results of the KPIs be brought to the forum?  <b>AJ:</b> Yes they will and we will try to fit in with the meeting cycles but for some meetings old data will be received.</p>	
<p><b>6.</b></p> <p><b>6.1</b></p> <p><b>6.2</b></p> <p><b>6.3</b></p>	<p><b><u>Decisions Brought Forward from November meeting: Homes For Islington November 2005 Consultation Papers</u></b></p> <p><b>Tenants Compact Review Meeting</b> - Consultation group needs representatives from each of the Borough's forums.  <b>AMG</b> will be representing the Partners Forum at forthcoming meeting.</p> <p><b>TOR for forums</b> - PFI Terms of reference will need to be different than other forums as the contract is such a different one. Other issues for approval are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amending the equal op's statements</li> <li>• Preventing HFI board members being chairs of other residents groups in the borough</li> <li>• Members of the public coming to meetings should not be allowed to sit at the table with the rest of the forum members</li> <li>• Electing a representative to sit on the CSSB every two years</li> <li>• Voting rights</li> </ul> <p><b>CR:</b> The prevention of the chairpersons being able to chair other residents groups is wrong. The various groups should be free to vote in whomever they choose. It is hard enough to find people with the commitment to do it without the choice being narrowed down even further. The candidate can simply declare their other interests and allow us to</p>	

	<p>make a choice.</p> <p><b>SI:</b> Are HFI asking for this amendment in the interests of the residents involved in the forums or for another reason?</p> <p><b>CR:</b> I'm sure that HFI are trying this because of the situation with Brian Potter.</p> <p><b>MD:</b> I hope the reason for this suggested change really is that if you have one person who chairs several different groups or meetings then the meetings would grow stale with only one person's view. The suggestion of prevention could maybe be used as a sub clause rather than a rule?</p> <p><b>GG:</b> The previous CSSB meetings that I have been to have been very cliquy.</p> <p><b>MD:</b> Need to improve presentations to people to give them the confidence to stand for the chair.</p>	
<b>7.</b>	<p><b><u>Homes For Islington January 2006 Consultation Papers</u></b> <b><u>Anthony Jonas</u></b></p>	
<b>7.1</b>	<p><b>Rent review</b></p> <p><b>AJ</b> took the forum through the proposed rent review for 2006-07 to take effect from 3<sup>rd</sup> April 2006.</p> <p><b>LN:</b> Do leaseholders pay the same as tenants?</p> <p><b>AJ:</b> Tenant service charges are averaged over the borough. Leaseholders pay for their own block/estate charges (share).</p>	
<b>7.2</b>	<p><b>Leasehold Association Recognition</b></p> <p><b>AJ</b> took the forum through the proposals regarding recognition of leaseholders associations.</p> <p><b>CR:</b> I think it is very important that leasehold associations are recognised by HFI so they can get funding and a place on the forum. Adding a new category would be an unnecessary complexity.</p> <p><b>CR:</b> We should keep the system as is but should make it easier for leaseholder association to get recognition and to get onto the leasehold forum. Partners leaseholders' bills are capped at £10,000 but some of the other HFI residents have bills totalling over £40,000.</p>	
<b>7.3</b>	<p><b>LN:</b> When will we get feedback from all of the above?</p> <p><b>AJ:</b> As soon as possible – will be being discussed at all of the other forum meetings throughout this month and next.</p> <p><b>CR:</b> Please can <b>AJ</b> take all of our comments forward.</p>	
<b>8.</b>	<p><b>AOB</b></p>	
<b>8.1</b>	<p><b>RH:</b> I received a letter this week stating that tenants have now got to bleed their own radiators. I am unable to do this. The letter was from HFI regarding changes to tenancy conditions. Does this still apply to Partners tenants?</p>	

	<p><b>SI:</b> I would also like to say the same problem will apply to fluorescent light tubes that are mainly in kitchens. These are also very hard to change and fit, especially for OAPs.</p> <p><b>TI:</b> Partners tenants' tenancy agreements are actually with Islington Council, as are HFI's tenants, and as such, they have the same tenancy agreement as HFI tenants. This consultation by HFI is therefore relevant to Partners tenants as well. The reality is that the tenancy agreement already stipulates certain responsibilities for the tenant and certain responsibilities for the landlord. In practice, if a resident is unable to fulfil their repair responsibilities, they should speak to us and we will try to find a way to resolve the problem together. I know that the repairs team has on several occasions helped residents with repairs which are strictly their own responsibility.</p> <p><b>SF:</b> We will come back to the forum with these issues as we need to have discussions with HFI – we understand that there may need to be special dispensation made for OAP's and people with special needs.</p>	
<p><b>8.2</b></p>	<p><b>GG:</b> Properties that are signed off – how long should be allowed to have the snagging completed? I know a lot of people who have had to wait a long time for small items to be completed.</p> <p><b>LW:</b> This issue is one we continue to work on and we have a dedicated team to follow up these problems. Will get details from <b>GG</b> on specific properties</p>	
<p><b>8.3</b></p>	<p><b>GG:</b> Is it possible for the forum to have pens and paper for the meetings?</p> <p><b>TI:</b> Yes – we will have some for the next meeting and then going forward.</p>	
<p><b>8.4</b></p>	<p><b>GG:</b> Any queries that forum members would like to make on the minutes, or anything said at the meetings, please contact TI before next meeting and then answers can be brought to the meeting and then not have to carry item over.</p>	
<p><b>8.5</b></p>	<p><b>GG:</b> A lot of the issues in the HFI consultation report do not concern us. Can Partners pick up and highlight issues that will need to be discussed and decisions made on the front cover of the report?</p> <p><b>TI:</b> All of the papers might be of interest and there is a contents page already in the pack to show whether each item is for information, consultation, or decision. Partners will in future highlight what the main items for consultation and decision at the meeting so that members can prepare accordingly.</p>	

<b>8.6</b>	<b>GG:</b> From now on the minutes will be sent out on the Friday following the meeting.	
	<b><i>Next residents Forum meeting – 16 March Colebrooke Place 6:45</i></b>	