

	<p><u>Upper Street South Area Housing Panel Meeting</u></p> <p>13th September 2007</p>	
	<p>Present: Pritpal Chhoker – Boleyn Road Area Housing Manager (PC) Stephen White – Community and Service Development Officer(SW) Jenny Greenfield – Area Programme Manager (JG) John Phillips – Direct of Property Services (JP) Stan Goulding – Estate Services Coordinator (SG) Pat Krouse – Hathersage Court (PK) M. Lea – 1 in 100 rep (ML) Carol Johnson –Burder Close TRA (CJ) Jessie White – Hawthorne Close TRA (JW) Lorna Reid – Highbury Estate TRA (LR) Christian Clark – Western Isles TRA (CC)</p> <p>Apologies: Doreen Fishlock – Mayville TRA, Steve Alexander – Seaforth Crescent TRA, Hazel Slark – Aberdeen Park & Fieldview Court TRA & Virginia Young – John Kennedy Court TRA</p> <p>Guest: Roger Elderton & Jane Simmonds – Canonbury Project/Rosebowl Youth Project</p> <p>Observers: Stuart Children & Chai Hong Lim – Residents of Mayville Estate</p>	
Item		Action
1	<p><u>Opening comments of the chair</u></p> <p>LR – Raised concerns regarding addendums and comments at the end of the central reports which invite comments from outside of the panels. Raised this issue at last panel meeting as there is concern in regards to remote views being expressed in regards to these reports. Would expressly like to know what weighting is placed on such comments. Request made that JP takes these comments back to his colleagues.</p> <p>JP – Noted these comments and agreed to take them back accordingly.</p>	JP

	<p>LR – Recommending that item 2 in the central reports not be discussed pending the outcomes of meeting next week Monday.</p> <p>Members agreed with this recommendation</p> <p>Pages 94 to 100 and 107 to 113 highlighted as difficult to read due to small font setting that is used. Concern expressed in the context of equal opportunities in the context of people with sight problems having to read these reports. In regards to item 4, concern expressed in regards to the use of black font on yellow paper, which is acknowledged as bad practice.</p> <p>Guests from the Rosebowl Project were welcomed to the meeting along with the observers from the Mayville. Introductions were also individually made.</p>	<p>Mike Sims</p>
<p>2</p>	<p><u>Cannonbury Project/Rosebowl Project</u></p> <p>LR – Invited guest to address the panel and make their presentation regards to securing funding for this project.</p> <p>JS – Made an address to panel highlighting main reason for attendance i.e. provided a background to the project and the reason why continued funding was needed. Project is an acknowledged success and there is also match funding that is secured based upon the funding secured from panels.</p> <p>A DVD presentation was made at this point in regards to the Rosebowl Project.</p> <p>JW – Has knowledge of this project and has visited. Accepts that the project is very good but thinks there other ways that the funding can be secured as traditionally the budget is used for physical improvements.</p> <p>CC – Praised the project and the work done in his area and believes that a request for funding should be made directly to the board.</p> <p>LR – Highly unlikely that 32k will come from this panel. We may be able to contribute but cannot provide that level of funding.</p> <p>JS – Very concerned if HFI cease their funding and also concerned regarding residents reaction if project ceases.</p> <p>LR – Situation depends very much on how much funding we get for next year (2008/2009).</p>	

3	<p><u>Minutes of last meeting</u></p> <p>JW – Requested that the issue of kitchens is taken forward i.e. incoming residents are asked about their plans for kitchen in advance of take up of the tenancy to ensure new kitchens are not subsequently ripped out.</p> <p>Minutes agreed</p>	
3	<p>Main Reports</p> <p><u>Islington Under-Occupation Scheme</u> – information item</p> <p>JP – Introduced report to panel</p> <p>JW – Concerned regarding the conditions specified. Would like the system to be more flexible.</p> <p>LR – There are no real incentives for residents to do this. Current incentives need to be reviewed.</p>	
4	<p><u>New Build Development</u> – consultation item</p> <p>JP – Presented report to panel</p> <p>JW – Concerned regarding lack of consultation with Mildmay Co-op. There are also proposed road changes by Hackney in the immediate vicinity/area. Mildmay Community Partnership will be having a meeting about this and the relevant paperwork has been passed to HFI.</p> <p>JP – Architects are aware of the situation and Mildmay Co-op will be part of the formal consultation process. Movement on this issue hinges very much on the outcomes of a meeting that is taking place tonight in the Town Hall.</p> <p>SW – Brought to panel’s attention the fact that a copy of plans for this development can be viewed in the public area at the Upper Street AHO.</p> <p>LR – Can we ensure that when such documents as these become available that panel members are informed.</p>	
5	<p><u>Digital TV</u> – consultation item</p> <p>JP – Presented report to panel</p>	

	<p>ML – Why is HFI doing this and not individual tenants.</p> <p>JP – This relates to blocks that have communal aerials where we will need to upgrade.</p> <p>LR – Fantastic idea but sad there has been a re-think and you now want residents to pay for it.</p> <p>Recommendation of panel is that residents should not be charged for this.</p> <p>LR – Are planned start dates set in stone?</p> <p>JP – No, these are best estimates, which can be changed.</p> <p>JW – Raised an issue regarding block figures used.</p> <p>JP – Acknowledged but report is for information and the main content is correct.</p> <p>LR – Agreed with JP's observations and congratulated him on ease with which the report could read.</p>	
6	<p><u>Estate Services Improvement Group</u> – information item</p> <p>JP – Presented report to panel</p> <p>LR – Can we please have the figures for how many questionnaires were sent out and how many were returned.</p> <p>JP – Sure these figures are available and we try to arrange feedback to the panel on this.</p>	JP
7	<p><u>HFI and consultative panel update</u> – information item</p> <p>No comments</p>	
8	<p><u>Decision Items at last Board & Sub and Sub – Boards</u> – information item</p> <p>No comments</p>	

<p>9</p>	<p><u>Forward Plan</u></p> <p>LR – Requesting that page 51 of this report be re-distributed in a manner, which can be read and is re-distributed within the next 10 days.</p>	<p>Mike Sims</p>
<p>10</p>	<p><u>Capital Programme Monitoring 2007/08 – 1st Quarter – Information item</u></p> <p>JP – Introduced report highlighting JG's attendance at meeting in respect of any questions.</p> <p>LR – Concerned re: lack of consultation/TRA involvement in regards to proposed works on Highbury Estate.</p> <p>JP – Suggesting that the Project Officer liases with LR in regards to resident involvement in this project.</p> <p>JG – Will arrange for Colette Clail to contact LR.</p> <p>CC – Highlighted outstanding light work on Caldly Walk as referred to at the top of page 111.</p> <p>JW –Raised the issue of outstanding light improvement works requested for Hawthorne Close.</p> <p>SG – Works to Hawthorne Close were put forward under the tenants compact as a priority 2. Works are presently at the tender stage and when this is concluded priority 2's will be looked at accordingly.</p> <p>CJ – Had a Section 20, four years ago in regards to redecorations on Burder Close. TRA has met and decided that they have had enough and will not pay any service charges until the works are done.</p> <p>LR – Would like a response given to CJ within the next 10 days, which provides an apology, a reason for the delay and confirms when the works will be done. Would like panel members to be cc'd into this response/letter to CJ.</p>	<p>JG</p> <p>JG</p>
<p>11</p>	<p><u>Local Report</u> – information & consultation item</p> <p>LR – Presented report to the panel and invited comments</p> <p>JW – Highlighted concerns re: lack of feedback to victims/complainants in cases/instances of ASB.</p>	

	<p>PC – Managers are aware of this and are addressing this issue.</p> <p>LR – Highbury Estate TRA are now due feedback/update in regards to ASB on their estate.</p> <p>Chair relayed the appreciation of the panel for the feedback provided in the local report in response to question/queries raised at the last panel meeting.</p> <p>LR – Specifically requesting an invitation to the residents conference as a resident.</p> <p><u>Estate Security Budget</u></p> <p>SG – Referred panel members to list of proposed schemes distributed at the outset of the meeting. Highlighted that the list is for consultation and that if there any schemes that members would like to add or have considered, could they please submit them to him.</p> <p>LR – Suggested that these are submitted to Stan within the next three weeks.</p> <p>JW – Re: Neptune House and the proposed bike security, has this been discussed with the TRA.</p> <p>SW – Confirmed that the TRA are aware.</p> <p>SG – There was a letter drop to the residents of Neptune House.</p> <p>LR – Would like officers to go back and have a look at the 10k community safety budget in the context of the proposed bike security works at Neptune House. Also thinks that present estimate of 7k is a bit high.</p>	<p>PC</p> <p>Paul Davey</p> <p>SG</p>
	<p>Details of next meeting: Thursday 15th November 2007 in Committee Room 1 at the Town Hall</p>	