

**HACKNEY HOMES Ltd
Resident Liaison Group Meeting**

Thursday 7 May 2009 at 6.00pm to 7.50pm

**The Chief Executive's Conference Room, 1st Floor,
Christopher Addison House, 72 Wilton Way, Hackney E8 1BJ**

Part A Meeting (Open to the Public)

Distributed to:

Resident Liaison Group Members:

Rupert Tyson (Joint Chair)
Karen Alcock (Joint Chair)
Tom Price
Audrey Villas
Danny Neeson
David Larkin
Brian Marsh
Joyce Brown
Feryat Demirci
Terry J Edwards
Muriel Gordon
Mavis MacGee
Alice Burke
Rhonda Dewsnap
David White
Erdal Doganduzel
Jean – Paul Lawrence Tampu-eya
Denise Bingham
Tony Goodchild
Michael Gills
Susan Fajana-Thomas
Gordon Guthrie

Officers:

Charlotte Graves

Neil Isaac

Robin Smith

Gary Penticost

Neehara Wijeyesekera

Judith Morrison

Tom Hunt

Clive Taber

Alex Jarosy

Alan Turner

Tom Hogan

Carla Ferrarello

Housing Partner Representatives:

Mouchel: John Newbury

David Saxon

Nii-Amon Nikoi

Pinnacle: Elliot Brooks

Pathmeads: John Ferman

Sarah Chapman

Fergal Ward

Contact:

Governance Team

020 8356 3432/2264/4225.

Governance.team@Hackneyhomes.org.uk

HACKNEY HOMES Ltd
Resident Liaison Group Meeting
Thursday 7 May 2009 at 6:00pm to 7.50pm,
The Chief Executive's Conference Room, 1st Floor,
Christopher Addison House, 72 Wilton Way, Hackney E8 1BJ

A Part A AGENDA (Open to the Public)

Item	Presenter	Subject	Pages	Status	Duration	Time
1.	Chair	Welcome and Introduction		Information	5 mins	6.00-6.05
2.	Chair	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apologies • Declarations of Interest including HH Board Members declaring they are Board Members 		Information Information	2 mins	6.05-6.07
3.	Chair	a) Minutes of 12 March 2009 and Matters arising b) Rolling Register	1-7 8-10	Decision	10 mins	6.07-6.17
4.	G Penticost	184 Budget – Planned Walkabout Programme	11-17	Decision	15 mins	6.17-6.32
5.	N Wijeyesekera	Resident Liaison Group discussion	18-25	Discussion	60 mins	6.32-7.32
6.	C Ferrarello	The Estate Plans Project	26-32	Information	10 mins	7.32-7.42
7.	Chair	Any Other Business Alternative Venues for the Meeting		Information	5 mins	7.42-7.47
8.	Chair	Date of next meeting: 2 July 2009 (Christopher Addison House)		Information	1 min	7.47-7.48



Hackney Homes Ltd

ITEM 3a

Part A Minutes of Resident Liaison Group Meeting, held at Christopher Addison house, 72 Wilton Way Hackney E8 1BJ

On 12 March 2009 at 6.00PM

Present	<p>Rupert Tyson (Joint Chair) Cllr Tom Price (Joint Chair)</p> <p>David Larkin Terry J Edwards Alice Burke Brian Marsh (part) Muriel Gordon Danny Neeson Mavis MacGee David White Susan Fajana-Thomas Joyce Brown Douglas Mitchell Gordon McGuthrie Tony Goodchild Walter Hare (observer)</p> <p>Housing Partner Representatives Elliot Brooks- Pinnacle John Ferman- Pathmeads</p>	<p>Officers Charlotte Graves Gary Penticost Alan Turner Neil Isaac Judith Morrison Malcolm Brewer Christophe Tabi Neehara Wijeyesekera</p>
---------	--	---

Item	Open to the Public	Action	Date
1. Welcome & Introduction	The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and introduced Mavis MacGee who was the new Chair of the Clapton Panel		
2. Apologies	<p>Apologies were received from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rhonda Dewsnap • Jean-Paul Lawrence Tampu-Eya • Karen Alcock 		

Item	Open to the Public	Action	Date
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Declarations of interest</i> 	None		
<p>3.a Minutes of 8 January 2009</p> <p>Matters arising</p>	<p>The minutes were agreed as a true record and signed accordingly.</p> <p><u>3(a) Matters Arising Kitchen & Bathroom arrears policy</u> The policy was being reviewed following an EIA which showed some negative impact on certain parts of the community. Officers were in discussion with the Council and this would be brought to Hackney Homes Board in April.</p> <p><u>3(a) Matters Arising – Repairs on Garages</u> Christophe Tabi to ensure the previously commissioned report was circulated to the Group Members.</p> <p><u>7 EIB</u> The Group asked whether any monies not spent had been transferred to the 184 Budget. Gary Penticost said that this matter was being picked up in the review of the 184 Budget.</p> <p><u>10.1 Performance Monitoring</u> Neil Isaac had met with Gary Penticost to look at communal repairs monitoring information and this should be incorporated into the performance monitoring report shortly.</p> <p><u>10.2 Repairs Performance</u> Gary Penticost said that the improving trend in repairs performance was continuing following the introduction of three new contractors.</p> <p><u>11.2 Decent Homes</u> Alan Turner said that he had written to Rhonda Dewsnap concerning water pressure. Gary Penticost said that there was an agreed procedure for adding booster pumps and these were installed as and when necessary funded from the capital installation works budget.</p>	<p>N Wijeyesekera</p> <p>C Tabi</p> <p>G Penticost/T Hunt</p> <p>N Isaac/G Penticost</p>	<p>May 09</p> <p>May 09</p>



Hackney Homes Ltd

ITEM 3a

Part A Minutes of Resident Liaison Group Meeting, held at Christopher Addison house, 72 Wilton Way Hackney E8 1BJ

On 12 March 2009 at 6.00PM

Item	Open to the Public	Action	Date
<p>3(b) Rolling Register</p>	<p>3 (b).1 David Larkin said that there had been a ground-breaking ceremony at Woodberry Down and that the selected RSL partner was Genesis.</p> <p>3 (b) .2 There were some items missing from the Rolling Register.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provision of a meeting space at Clockhouse • A presentation from EPAG <p>3 (b).3 Clive Taber said that if there were no funds available in this financial year for providing a meeting space at Clockhouse. This would be reviewed in the next financial year.</p> <p>3 (b) .4 The Group agreed that EPAG could be invited to give a presentation to RLG on the same basis as WDCO later in the year.</p> <p>3 (b) .5 The Group asked that conflict of interest between Chairs of Panels also being Board members be added to the Rolling Register</p> <p>3(b) .7The Group suggested obtaining a legal definition of a conflict of interest and circulating this to the Group.</p> <p>The Group noted the Rolling Register.</p>	<p>Governance Team</p>	<p>July 09</p> <p>May 09</p>
<p>4.What's Happening at Hackney Homes.</p>	<p>4.1 The Chief Executive introduced the report.</p> <p><u>Inspection</u> Hackney Homes would be subject to another full Inspection within the next 3 years as well as the possibility of a Short Notice Inspection. As a result, it was essential that Hackney Homes were prepared for both possibilities. The Chief Executive wanted to ensure that engagement with Residents remained at the high</p>		

Hackney Homes Ltd

ITEM 3a

Part A Minutes of Resident Liaison Group Meeting, held at Christopher Addison house, 72 Wilton Way Hackney E8 1BJ

On 12 March 2009 at 6.00PM

Item	Open to the Public	Action	Date
	<p>level it was during Inspection and asked the Group to report back if this was not the case.</p> <p>The Group noted the report.</p>		
5.Presentation from Sharon Haywood from the London Tenants' Federation	<p>5.1 Sharon Haywood from the London Tenants' Federation (LTF) gave a presentation on the role of the LTF and how Hackney Homes' Tenants could get involved. The Group asked how much influence the LTF had on key issues which affected London Tenants. Sharon Haywood said that changes to London plans and policies had been made as a result of suggestions from the LTF. The Group expressed its disappointment that the TSA was led more by professionals than Tenants. Sharon Haywood said that this was not the case with the LTF and its voice was heard by the Mayor. Sharon Haywood invited members of the Group to attend the next LTF meeting.</p> <p>The Group thanked Sharon Haywood for attending the RLG and noted her presentation.</p>		
6.Presentation on the HRA	<p>6.1 Neil Isaac gave a presentation on the HRA. The Group asked whether, given the announcement from the Government on rent increases, could Hackney Homes ask for a moratorium on the increase. Neil Isaac said that although a moratorium may be possible, it was optimistic. Officers were in discussion with the Council on the best way forward in this matter. The Group asked whether RTB sales formed part of the HRA receipts. Neil Isaac said that funds from RTB sales formed part of the Capital Receipt which was to be spent on Capital Works. The Group asked what was the level of debt across Hackney's estates. Neil Isaac said that whilst we knew the aggregate amount of debt, it could not be ascribed on an estate by estate basis.</p> <p>The Group noted the presentation.</p>		
7 Alternative Forms of Engagement	<p>7.1 Clive Taber introduced the report.</p> <p>The Group asked how many people attended the focus groups. Clive Taber said that</p>		



Hackney Homes Ltd

ITEM 3a

Part A Minutes of Resident Liaison Group Meeting, held at Christopher Addison house, 72 Wilton Way Hackney E8 1BJ

On 12 March 2009 at 6.00PM

Item	Open to the Public	Action	Date
	<p>the focus groups usually had 10-15 attendees. It was suggested that the RLG receive feedback from these focus groups at every other meeting. The Group asked if there was engagement with the youth of Hackney through the Youth Parliament. Clive Taber said there was. The Group congratulated officers on the success of alternative forms of engagement but noted that not all resident inspectors had been utilised. The Group also noted that individual youth groups were successful but that it would be useful if they could mix with each other. Clive Taber agreed that officers needed to encourage the separate groups to get to know each other.</p> <p>7.2 Cllr Tom Price asked how people were recruited to the focus groups. Clive Taber said that officers used a tenant participation tracker system on the computer</p> <p>7.3 The Group said that it was important to disseminate the outcomes from these focus groups to the wider communities. It was also noted that certain communities didn't know of the existence of the focus groups. Clive Taber said that officers were trying hard to integrate and engage these groups with the wider communities.</p> <p>The Group noted the report.</p>	C Taber	July 09
8. Enhanced Tenants' and Residents' Association Meetings Review	8.1 Clive Taber introduced the report. The Group were asked to contact Clive Taber with any suggestions on the proposals for undertaking the ETRA review.	All RLG Members	ASAP
9 Concierge Service	9.1 The Group were dissatisfied with the length of time it had taken to bring the report to the Group. Elliot Brooks said that a considerable amount of work had been undertaken in the background in order to prepare the report. For example, regular meetings were now held between the Partners and Carlyse. Overlapping shifts had now been arranged so that there should no longer be any gaps in the service provision. Once all the changes had become embedded in the service, a report would	N	September

Hackney Homes Ltd

ITEM 3a

Part A Minutes of Resident Liaison Group Meeting, held at Christopher Addison house, 72 Wilton Way Hackney E8 1BJ

On 12 March 2009 at 6.00PM

Item	Open to the Public	Action	Date
	be brought back to the Group in about six months' time. However, in the meantime, Alice Burke would receive progress reports.	Wijeyesekera	09
10. Tenants' Services Authority	10.1 This report was for information only and was noted. The group asked if these information reports could be circulated outside the formal Agenda. Charlotte Graves said they could.		
11 AOB	<p><u>District Heating Charges</u> There was concern at the level of increase in these charges and Joyce Brown asked for further information about this. Neil Isaac said as the contract for energy provision between the Council and the provider was commercial in confidence, he would investigate what could be released to the wider public.</p> <p><u>Conflict of Interest – Chair of Cabinet Finance/HH Audit & Finance Committee</u> There was concern about a possible conflict of interest for the Chair of Cabinet Finance and the Chair of Hackney Homes' Audit & Finance Committee as it was one and the same person. The Chair of the RLG agreed to bring this matter to Hackney Homes' Board</p> <p><u>Service Improvement Committee</u> Muriel Gordon asked for further information on the Service Improvement Committee. Tess Merrett said she would contact Muriel Gordon to discuss this.</p> <p><u>Increase in Panel Budgets</u> Muriel Gordon asked if there would be an increase in the Panel Budgets. Clive Taber said that the budgets increased with inflation. An information item on the Special Projects Budget would be prepared for the Group after year end.</p> <p><u>Emails</u> Muriel Gordon asked if officers could be encouraged to open their emails in a timely fashion.</p> <p><u>Purpose of the Resident Liaison Group</u> The Group asked if most of the meeting scheduled for 7 May 2009 could be devoted to discussing the role of the RLG.</p>	<p>R Tyson</p> <p>T Merrett</p> <p>C Taber</p> <p>C Graves</p>	<p>July</p> <p>March 2009</p> <p>July 2009</p> <p>ASAP</p>



Hackney Homes Ltd

ITEM 3a

Part A Minutes of Resident Liaison Group Meeting, held at Christopher Addison house, 72 Wilton Way Hackney E8 1BJ

On 12 March 2009 at 6.00PM

Item	Open to the Public	Action	Date
	<p><u>Hackney Homes' Estate Board</u> There was some discussion about the existence of the Hackney Homes' Estate Board. It was agreed that Clive Taber and Alice Burke would speak about this outside of the meeting.</p> <p>The Group congratulated officers on the 2* achievement</p>	<p>Clive Taber</p>	<p>7 May 09</p>
<p>15. Meeting Closed</p>	<p>The Meeting Closed at 8.15</p> <p>The next meeting would take place on Thursday 7 May at 6.00 pm at Christopher Addison House</p>		

Signed as a true record of this meeting _____ Chair Dated _____

Item 3b)

Rolling Register Resident Liaison Group

<p>1. Repairs-184/EIB 8.1.09</p>	<p>Final report on EIB to be prepared</p> <p>Final Report on 184 to be prepared..</p>	<p>Tom Hunt/ N Wijeyesekera G Penticost</p>	<p>2 July</p> <p>7 May</p>
<p>2. What's happening at Hackney Homes Update? 11.09.08</p>	<p>Alice Burke requested a schedule of all TRA meetings.</p>	<p>C Taber/N Wijeyesekera</p>	<p>2009</p>
<p>3. Central Diary</p>	<p>Muriel Gordon suggested the creation of a central diary for reference in arranging meetings to ensure that meetings do not clash.</p>	<p>N Wijeyesekera / C Taber</p>	<p>2009</p>
<p>4. Garages Update 30.10.08</p>	<p>Garages update</p> <p>Report and Strategy on Garages to consider</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demand • Condition • Future finance • Viability • Whether to demolish 	<p>A Turner</p>	<p>From 09/10 budget year</p>
<p>5. Update on Decent Homes</p>	<p>8.2 Equalities Impact Assessment report on kitchens and bathrooms and arrears policy in respect of kitchens</p>	<p>T Hogan</p>	<p>2 July</p>



Item 3b)

Rolling Register Resident Liaison Group

Programme	and bathrooms to be brought back to the RLG following discussion at Service Improvement Committee		
7. Woodberry Down	Representatives of WDCO to be invited to give a presentation to RLG on what was happening	R Smith	July 09
8. Resident Participation Strategy	Report on outcomes of ETRA Review	C Taber	July 09

Title of Report: 184 Budget – Planned Walkabout Programme	
Decision Making Body: Resident Liaison Group	Date: Thursday, 7th May 2009
Classification: For Approval	Report of: Director of Property Services
Item Previously considered at: Resident Liaison Group	On Which Date: 26 June 2008
Report Author: Gary Penticost/Martin Weaver	Appendices: Non Urgent Communal Area Repairs and Improvements Procedure Note

If you have any questions about this report, please contact Gary Penticost on 0208 356 2735 or email gary.penticost@hackneyhomes.org.uk

1.0 SUMMARY

- 1.1 Commonly know as the “184 planned walk about programme”, the Non Urgent Communal Area Repairs and Improvements programme, has been in place now for several years. It has been well received by residents successfully resolving long standing maintenance and anti social issues on our estates.
- 1.2 The budget is resident led and deals with “**non urgent planned communal repairs and improvement works**”. All other emergency or urgent repairs are dealt with via reactive repairs budgets.
- 1.3 To clarify; the “184” reference relates to the old and previously used budget code for this work.

2.0 RECOMMENDATION(S)

- 2.1 **That the Resident Liaison Group approves the Non Urgent Communal Area repairs and Improvements procedure note as attached [Version 3/09].**

3.0 BACKGROUND

- 3.1 At the RLG meeting in September it was agreed that Property Services would prepare and circulate a document clarifying “184 Planned Walkabout Programme”.

4.0 CONSULTATION PROCESS & FINDINGS

- 4.1 Consultation has taken place through Resident Liaison Group and also at a separate meeting with Neighbourhood Panel Chairs held on 11 September 2008. The procedure was circulated for comment on 12 February 2009 and a further meeting with Panel Chairs held on 12 March 2009 where a revised document was issued. Comments received from the meeting and later from Central Panel on 6 March resulted in further changes.
- 4.2 One clear message was the need for a nominated lead officer from Property Services and for consistent and accurate reporting back to panels.
- 4.3 Involvement of TRAs and TMOs was seen as vital and the procedure proposes that Neighbourhood Panels ensure that they are involved and informed.
- 4.4 Some comments were received regarding the lists of works that could be considered. The list has not been edited, since it is a matter for the residents to decide what should and what should not be included. It is accepted that some items may well be undertaken via different funding streams/programmes.
- 4.5 It was suggested that the draft programmes of work are taken to the TRA for comment, but it is felt that this would build in delays. It is suggested that it will be for the Neighbourhood Panel to provide the information back to the TRAs and that the Neighbourhood Panel gives the final decision on the work that will go ahead.

Procedure Note: Non urgent Planned Communal Area Repairs and Improvements. [Version 3/09]

Introduction

1. This programme is commonly known as “the 184 planned walk about programme” and has been in place now for several years. It has been well received by residents, successfully resolving long standing maintenance and anti social issues on our estates.
2. The programme deals with “**non urgent planned communal repairs and minor improvement works on estates identified and prioritised by residents**”. It is not intended to deal with emergency or urgent repairs which are dealt with via reactive repairs budgets.
3. Whilst H H’s desire is to complete all non urgent repairs, the ability to achieve this is always constricted by available funds. However, this programme allows residents the opportunity to decide their own priorities on non urgent works.
4. Identified works that are beyond the scope of the current budget will be rolled forward to become the first call on the following year allocation or, where appropriate, to put into planned maintenance programmes
5. In the future, it is intended that a plan be developed, in consultation with residents for each estate that defines a desired condition and layout (timescale to be agreed). Works from various programmes including this one, can then be judged against the plan to ensure they contribute to its achievement.
6. All neighbourhood inspections will take place at the start of each year between April and July. The order of the inspections will be rotated so that the same neighbourhoods are not left until last each year. Representative residents identify works/ issues for resolution and officers prepare proposals and cost estimates. Resident panels then assess and prioritise works proposals for the financial year.
7. Available budgets will be made known as soon as possible to enable forward planning. As mentioned above, works requested in previous years but not completed can be rolled forward and undertaken early in the year.

8. The aim of this planned works programme is to improve the communal environment on our estates, promote the “good place to live theme” and assist in reducing crime and the fear of crime.
9. Working in partnership with residents a significant number of improvements can be implemented and general planned repairs actioned. Residents are empowered to be actively involved with the decision making process from the works identification through to the approval of spend against a budget. The process is therefore fair, open and accountable.
10. Panels will receive their plan of works approximately six weeks after the last date of their walkabout.
11. A lead officer for this programme will be allocated [Gary Lane] to ensure that this commitment is met and that updates are provided throughout the year for neighbourhoods.
12. It is important that these walkabouts include the smaller estates and infill block locations within the neighbourhood.
13. Works identified that are considered to be of a Health and Safety nature are reported directly to the repairs call centre and actioned under the reactive repairs works budgets.
14. These will be made safe within agreed and required response times, i.e. within 2 hours, 24 hours or 5 days dependant on issue. Follow on repairs or replacement works could be undertaken under this programme or where appropriate and affordable under a future planned maintenance programme.

The Procedure

15. Before starting any neighbourhood walkabout, agreements on the timetable of specific dates must be made between Property Services, Housing Management and the Neighbourhood Residents panels. Neighbourhood Panels are responsible for identifying who will represent the area on the “walkabouts” and will be expected to contact TRAs and TMOs in order to arrange suitable representation and to notify them of the agreed dates. It is important that residents are happy with whoever is attending to undertake the initial identification works. Councillors will be notified of the dates agreed and expected time that each particular estate is going to be visited by the PS lead officer. Neighbourhood Housing officers are tasked with leading this part of the process.
16. Where a Neighbourhood Panel requests an alternative method for the production of the works programme e.g. postal survey to residents/TRAs Property Services and Neighbourhood Housing Officers will work with the Panel to produce the works programme.

Whilst it is impractical for all residents to be directly involved in the decision making the TRA may wish to ask all residents for suggestions that can be taken into account on the inspection.

17. Following the completion of each neighbourhood walkabout Property Services officers will be responsible for providing a description of works agreed on each estate which will include an estimated cost. A detailed spreadsheet of locations/works description and budget estimates will then be presented to the next available Neighbourhood Panel for approval. Works may total more than the available budget, therefore, Property Services officers will present proposals that are achievable within the budget with reserve lists. Removed works will be held on a reserve list for inclusion in subsequent years or recommended for future planned works programmes. Neighbourhood Panels can consider and change if they want to.
18. Lists of proposed works will be provided to be placed on notice boards allowing a further opportunity for residents to comment. This will be undertaken by the TRAs where they exist and Estate Managers elsewhere.
19. Planned improvements to the service 2009/10:
 - Satisfaction surveys to cover all stages of the process
 - Partnering approach to working practices with new Partnering Contractors, to improve turn round and quality of estimates and works process
 - Reporting to Panels of local KPIs (quality/time/budget)
20. **Works Programmes will only be implemented following Panel approval – the only exception to this approval process would be if officers deemed works as essential or if Panels delay approval impacting on budget spends.**
21. Following Panel approval, the works programme must be checked for any works that require notification to leaseholders. Where necessary Section 20 notices will be issued before any works orders are issued.
22. The lead officer will ensure that regular progress reports will be provided to each Neighbourhood Panel meetings.
23. **Works that would/could be considered appropriate:**
 - Road tarmac repair, up to 50 sq.m
 - Footpath repair, up to 40 sq.m
 - Upgrading external wall pack lighting units
 - Upgrading of stairwell and balcony bulkhead lights
 - Re-painting of existing fencing
 - Replacement of damaged boundary fencing (not property dividing fencing)

- Installation of new security fencing
- Installation of steel bollards (black)
- Replacement of damaged concrete bollards with steel type
- Boundary wall brickwork repairs
- Demolition of pram sheds, up to 15 units,
- Demolition of brick built bin chambers
- The provision of decorative bin enclosures and bulk waste area
- Re-glazing of communal windows and fire doors
- Installation of anti-vandal polycarbonate security glazing within communal areas
- The installation of decorative steel panels as a replacement for glazed communal area windows on open balconies
- Re-painting of garage doors
- Replacement of garage doors and frames
- Guttering and rainwater pipe repairs/renewal
- Redecoration of staircases
- Redecoration on specific areas of balcony soffits
- Redecoration of communal entrance doors/canopy
- Redecoration of external bin chamber doors
- Redecoration of internal communal doors
- Reglazing balcony panels
- Apply parking restrictions, double/yellow lining
- Marking out and numbering of parking bays
- Installing new Marley H/D floor covering to communal area walkways
- Replacement of damaged wall tiles in communal areas
- Installation of Gerda barrier gates
- General guttering repairs and maintenance on low rise blocks, maximum 3 floors
- Installation of speed ramps on estate roads
- Small landscaping projects up to a value of £10k.

The above work type should be considered a broad selection of works that can be undertaken using the Planned Communal area budget.

24. Works that should not be considered:

- Installing new or repairing CCTV equipment
- Installing new or repairing Playground equipment
- Installing new or repairing controlled door entry systems
- Large estate road resurface schemes
- Large estate footpath renewal schemes
- Major roof repairs

The above lists are not exhaustive; however a flexible and commonsense approach should be applied in all site assessments.

Other Funding Streams

25. Where appropriate, Neighbourhood Panels can and do utilise other funding streams such as telephone mast budget allocations and EIB budgets.

Panels have successfully actioned works from a reserve list of projects using these funding streams and improving our estates.

Estate Environment Budget (EIB)

26. This budget is allocated to TRAs to deal with local estate based small improvement works. Unfortunately this budget has proven extremely difficult to effectively commit. It has therefore been agreed that should EIB remain uncommitted by October of each financial year those uncommitted budgets will be reallocated to the 184 works programme.

Property Services Directorate

Hackney Homes. 12th February 2009.

Title of Report: RLG Discussion	
Decision Making Body: Resident Liaison Group	Date: 7th May 2009
Classification: For discussion	Report of: Head of Resident Services
Item Previously considered at: N/A	On Which Date: N/A
Report Author: - Neehara Wijeyesekera Ext 4219	Appendices: App 1- RLG Terms of Reference App 2-Stamford Hill Discussion Paper

Report Outline:

- | |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paragraph: 1.0 - Summary of Report; • Paragraph: 2.0 - Recommendation(s) to RLG • Paragraph: 3.0 – Background; • Paragraph: 4.0 – Discussion of Issues • Paragraph: 5.0 - Conclusion |
|--|

1.0 SUMMARY

To provide guidance and support to members of the RLG that may help to facilitate discussions about the role and purpose of the residents' liaison group. Appended to this paper, are papers and comments received directly from residents along with the original terms of reference.

2.0 RECOMMENDATION(S)

Members of resident liaison group to consider when discussing RLG at the meeting.

3.0 BACKGROUND

The RLG are preparing to review the aims and objectives of the group. The group have been in session for over 18 months. The RLG was established as a new body which would allow Hackney Homes to have access to a strategic consultative and decision making body of residents which fairly and effectively represents Hackney Homes' tenants and leaseholders.

There is a wider group of residents with which Hackney Homes management team and Board must ensure that it has effective and constructive dialogue.

The RLG could review the original terms and consider whether the group is meeting its established aims. The last 12 months have focussed heavily on issues relating to inspection and therefore agendas may have been influenced in a similar manner to the agendas of HH Board and Committees.

The construction and make up of the group must also reflect a fair and representative proportion of the tenants and leaseholders within and across Hackney Homes' estates, streets and properties. It is suggested that the RLG consider how best to serve the views of residents.

Members of the group who wished to contribute towards this discussion are attached and were actively sought so that these could be provided and considered by the RLG before the meeting.

4.0 Discussion and thoughts

The following questions may help to stimulate some discussion for the group and give some general structure to how the group may wish to take forward some issues.

Members of the RLG are asked therefore to use this only to aid the process.

4.1 How can we ensure that the make up of the RLG fairly represent Hackney Homes residents?

The engagement and review of resident participation successfully allowed for a mixed participation structure which was spread across TRA structure and also across wider community groups, such as BME, Youth and Disabilities groups.

The audit commission, and representative groups acknowledge that the traditional TRA, TA, and RA is complimented by residents whose engagement is not necessarily catered for through TRA structures.

It may be possible to appoint a place at a youth membership from Citizen, or from one of the local areas. However, the total number of places appointed onto RLG should be considered as mentioned below.

4.2 Is the current structure balanced sufficiently to allow for a mixed representation of alternative forms of engagement and traditional forms of engagement?

The current representation of Panels provides for 12 places on the group where the RLG comprises over 50% of the representation by Panels. There is not a specific place for the planned maintenance steering group or the street property sounding board.

There is strong engagement already with the Panels and a number of meetings already exist and set up locally for Hackney Homes Executive to engage with Panels at their own request. Is a single place for each group represented on RLG sufficient?

The strategic purpose of the group is to provide a consultative and strategic engagement between residents and Hackney Homes.

4.3 Does the frequency of meetings suit members of the group?

The strategic value of the RLG may be influenced by the size of the group which perhaps should be limited to no more than 15 members even though wider representation may be necessary.

If there are time constraints within the RLG meetings there are other routes for addressing service issues, and for local matters to be raised.

4.4 Does the group wish to amend the terms of reference of the RLG?

Some of the issues raised at RLG need to be considered by Hackney Homes Executive Team and others will naturally feed into Board decisions, or occasionally into one of the committee topics. This presents a great opportunity for Hackney Homes to ensure that the issues discussed are influenced by residents. Members may wish for the RLG to provide a different direction to that originally stated in the terms of reference.

5.0 Conclusion

There is a role for the resident liaison group to contribute to the strategic direction of Hackney Homes and provide insight to the Board and this can be improved. The report is intended to allow the members of the group to consider how best to approach the discussion at the RLG.

Members of the group should be aware that Hackney Homes' intention was to support an inclusive and reflective resident participation structure including that of the RLG. Outcomes will be evident from the discussion at the meeting.

Item 5 Appendix 1

HACKNEY HOMES

Resident Liaison Group

Terms of Reference

1. Membership

- a) The Membership is as follows:
 - Two representatives from each of the five Neighbourhood Panels
 - One representative from each of the three established BME Groups
 - One representative from the Disability Group
 - One representative from the Leaseholders' Forum
 - The Council's Cabinet member for Neighbourhoods and Regeneration
 - The Chair or nominated deputy of Hackney Homes Board.
- b) Each Panel and Group has the right to nominate a deputy to represent their Panel or Group in the absence of their normal representatives. Some flexibility in attendance may be considered on occasions when issues being discussed merit this.
- c) With regard to resident representatives, an appropriate balance should be sought between tenants and leaseholders - but no compulsory limit is set.
- d) The membership can be extended by the Hackney Homes Board.
- e) Senior Managers from Hackney Homes will attend as required.
- f) Subject to practicalities, it may be that observers from Panels and other Groups may attend to understand how the Group operates.
- g) The Chairing of the meeting to be shared on rota basis between the Cabinet member for Neighbourhoods and Regeneration and the Chair of Hackney Homes.
- h) The RLG can set up sub-groups to look into specific issues including a residents-only sub-group if required.

2. Remit

- a) The RLG will have a Borough-wide remit to consider and to advise on issues of housing strategy and policy.
- b) Service issues will only be considered where they affect the whole or a large part of the Borough. Service improvements should be discussed on a service-wide basis.
- c) In addition, the RLG will consider matters referred by the Neighbourhood Panels if they are considered to be of sufficient importance.

- d) The results of consultations will be reported to the RLG.
- e) The minutes of the RLG will be reported to the Hackney Homes Board and Hackney Homes Management Team for consideration in their decision making.
- f) Resident members of the RLG to report back to their Panels, Forums etc.

3. Organisational Matters

- a) Meetings will be held bi-monthly.
- b) A designated Hackney Homes officer will service the group and undertake all meetings arrangements.
- c) All participants can put forward items for the agenda - to be sent to Hackney Homes at least 15 days before the date of the meeting.
- d) The agenda and papers will be despatched at least 10 days in advance of the meeting.

STAMFORD HILL NEIGHBOURHOOD SUB PANEL

Resident Liaison Group – does it serve our needs?

As the Neighbourhood Sub Panel which has raised concerns about whether the Resident Liaison Group and associated issues best serve residents, this paper has been prepared for circulation in advance of the meeting to help the discussion and debate.

Current remit under terms of reference

- The RLG will have a Borough-wide remit to consider and to advise on issues of housing strategy and policy.
- Service issues will only be considered where they affect the whole or a large part of the Borough. Service improvements should be discussed on a service-wide basis.
- In addition, the RLG will consider matters referred by the Neighbourhood Panels if they are considered to be of sufficient importance.
- The results of consultations will be reported to the RLG

Whilst there is a remit to consider and advise on issues of housing strategy and policy, in the main there is little input we have as a group as in a majority of cases the decisions have been made and therefore appear for information purposes only.

There is a service improvement group who meet we presume regularly but we have no feedback from the information discussed or improvements/changes made and yet there is a remit to consider service wide improvements in the terms of reference.

There is no slot within the agenda to allow items to be referred from Panels or what is in fact deemed as considered 'sufficiently important'?

Consultations are carried out in many forms within Hackney Homes but the content of them rarely come to the Resident Liaison Group for input prior to them taking place. Feedback on different forms of resident involvement does not automatically take place, e.g. the sounding boards being an example where we had to ask for the information that was provided at the last meeting, rather than it being given voluntarily.

Input from the Resident Liaison Group on the community hall management agreement and the ETRA review survey would have been useful before being put out to the wider community.

Cont/d....2

Cont/d....2

Missed Opportunities

There is no place on the agenda for information on what is taking place in the Neighbourhoods which may be of importance, concern or purely information from either the Panel Chairs or the Partners who are the local conduit to the Resident Liaison Group.

What does Stamford Hill want from the Resident Liaison Group?

- To be in on the ground floor when strategies and policies are developed so we have a voice at the start of the process and not when it is virtually finished or agreed.
- More information on service improvements – as panels we know or should know the requirements needed and we need to be able to provide views on services at the start of the process.
- We want to hear what other Neighbourhoods are doing – whether there are common threads of good practices or bad. This is the only Forum where all the Panels come together with the Partners they work with.

Related issues

It has become apparent when speaking to Hackney Homes and Neighbourhood staff that they do not understand that the Panels were set up to monitor services and act as a consultative forum - further education on the role is needed.

There is obviously a need for Board Members to know what is happening in their Neighbourhood but their first priority has to be their position as a Board Member and the strategic planning for the Borough. Is there conflict when attempting to wear two hats, i.e. Neighbourhood Panel Chair and Board Member?

It might be useful to have a Champion Executive Member (excluding Partners) for each Neighbourhood Panel to attend on a bi-monthly basis to hear what is happening locally and on an annual basis rotate to different Panels.

Finally, it might be beneficial for an independent Board Member to be involved with the Resident Liaison Group as they appear not to have too much exposure to residents.

We hope this gives some food for thought.

Muriel Gordon MBE
Chairman

Rhonda Dewsnap
Deputy Chairman

2.4.09

Title of Report: THE ESTATE PLANS PROJECT	
Decision Making Body: Resident Liaison Group	Date: 7 May 2009
Classification: FOR INFORMATION	Report of Director of Property Services
Item Previously considered at: N/A	On Which Date: N/A
Report Author: Carla Ferrarello - Ext.2360	Appendices: 1. Funding Flowchart

If you have any questions about this report, please contact Carla Ferrarello on 0208 356 2360 or email carla.ferrarello@hackneyhomes.org.uk.

1. SUMMARY

- 1.1 This briefing set out the details of the Estate Plans (EPs) project. This is an innovative system which will enable Hackney Homes to hold a database of residents' priorities for their estates and use them to inform the planning of asset and service management.
- 1.2 This paper also highlights how the Estate Plans are integral part of Hackney Homes' wider agenda and identify key issues which will be reviewed regularly as the EPs are rolled out borough wide.

2. RECOMMENDATION(S)

- That the report is noted.

3. INTRODUCTION

- 3.1 The Estate Plans project was developed to mark the transition from Decent Homes to Decent Estates. Decent Homes was designed to tackle the backlog of repairs and concentrate in making homes warm, wind and weather tight; the Estate Plans project aims at moving the

concept to a broader perspective by taking a holistic approach to the issues that impact on the estate quality of life.

- 3.2 The purpose behind the preparation of Estate Plans is to achieve a consensus between stakeholders about what it should be like to live on an estate. Each plan will define what the needs of the stock are and define investment priorities. These strategic aims for the estate will be set alongside and coordinated with resident aspirations to ensure that existing and potential resources are directed towards the achievement of a commonly agreed plan.
- 3.3 This is an innovative way of bringing residents views together with the long term financial planning of investments and can generate a number of benefits for Hackney Homes and their residents such as:
- The implementation of the project will give residents more input into the future of their estates as their views will be used to review financial planning of asset management and services;
 - The Plans will promote a more coordinated use of resources, generate potential savings and contribute to the achievement of best value by providing an avenue for reviewing the resources available for investment;
 - The project will provide a formal framework for residents lead budgets (184 and EIB);
 - The database of needs created via the estate plans will also enable officers and residents to apply for additional sources of funding (e.g. S106, Lottery, Sponsorship, etc.).

4. BACKGROUND – THE PILOTS

- 4.1 In 2006/07, Hackney Homes draw up 6 Estate Plans Pilots in order to test the process before rolling them out borough wide. As well as establishing the estate plans methodology, the pilots highlighted the following key findings:
- The residents welcomed the initiative, participation rates were good – e.g. 0% to 20% return rates for the postal survey - and the EPs has the ability to involve residents who do not traditionally get involved;
 - The estate plans can have an immediate positive impact on the estates, e.g. the pilots saw immediate improvements on the ground such as: adjustments to Decent Homes Programmes, replacement of damaged flooring and brought forward the Paladin Replacement programme in one of the estates.
 - The data collected contributed to a more effective use of resources, for instance, instead of incurring further costs carrying out

responsive repairs to windows at the end of their life span, officers decided to bring forward the Decent Homes programme.

5. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

- 5.1 The first stage of the project will focus on finalizing the pilots Estate Plans. This will involve the agreement of the actions points before handing each plan over to the local residents for sign off and monitoring. Each service area will nominate an officer who will take responsibility for liaising with the project coordinator and reporting back on specific action points.
- 5.2 The implementation of the Estate Plans borough wide will be phased out in batches of approximately 20 estates at a time and initial focus will be on estates with 25 or more units. The first phase will cover the estates originally nominated by the Neighbourhood Panels and/or their Chairs for the pilots. All other estates will be prioritized using the Economic Sustainability Matrix – which takes into account a range of asset management data – alongside with an officers scoring system. It should be noted that, estates undergoing regeneration and TMOs have been excluded from this project.
- 5.3 Once the Estate Plans are completed, they will be handed over to the local Tenants and Residents Association. In estates were there is no formal representation, the Plan will be copied to those residents who took part in the consultation process. Once the Estate Plans have been handed over, they will be reviewed at six monthly intervals.

6. PROJECT TIMETABLE

Phase 1		Target date
Task 1	Launch in newsletter and website	May 09 – Web site June 09 - Newsletter
Task 2	Sign off Pilots	July 09
Task 3	Implementation in first group of estates	Start May 09 – Finish November 09
Task 4	Review Phase 1	December 09

7. KEY ISSUES/CHALLENGES

- 7.1 Raising Expectations
Many officers were concerned about raising residents' expectations and a possible negative effect on residents' satisfaction. The pilots have shown that residents' ideas were realistic and practical. We will build upon this experience to ensure clear communication channels are established at all times throughout the consultation exercise.

7.2 Accountability

Once the Estate Plan consultation is completed, officers should proactively discuss the local priorities and take ownership of agreed action. This is a crucial challenge requiring officer' commitment, strong internal procedures and advocacy from the Chief Executive and the Executive Team.

7.3 Delivery

It is envisaged that by completing approximately 20 Estate Plans every 6 months, with the current level of resources, it will take three years to complete the project. There are concerns that a speedier delivery could affect the quality of the work, however, as officers become more familiar with the process, it might be possible to proceed at a faster pace.

8. IMPACT UPON THE HACKNEY HOMES STRATEGIC PLAN 2008 - 2013

8.1 The Strategic Plan 2008-2013 'Improving Neighbourhoods' section includes a commitment to "*contribute to physical, social and economic regeneration by involving and working with local communities through Estate Plans and otherwise*".

8.2 In addition, the Estate Plans contribute to the other key strategic objective 'Delivering modern Homes' "*by improving key items of the estate environment and by working with residents and partners to deliver investment which meet the local priorities*".

8.3 The estate plans are also integral part of Hackney Homes Asset Management Strategy and the Asset Management Service Plan.

9 IMPACT UPON THE HACKNEY HOMES RISK REGISTER

N/A

10. THE HACKNEY HOMES EQUALITY & DIVERSITY STRATEGY 2006 ACTION PLAN 2007 – 2010

10.1 The initial Equality Impact Assessment has shown that the project can be adjusted to mitigate negative impact. The action plan puts measures in place to ensure any adverse impact is eliminated and the consultation process is inclusive, fair and equitable for all residents

11. CONSULTATION PROCESS & FINDINGS

11.1 In 2006/07 Estate Plans Pilot project was presented to the Neighbourhood Panels who nominated a pool of estates where the project could be piloted, leaving the final selection to the officers.

11.2 The pilots involved extensive consultation in the following estates:

- Shoreditch Geffrye, Harman and York Row
- Stoke Newington Milton Gardens and Downs TMO
- Homerton Banister House
- Queensbridge Broadway and Alden House
- North-East Wrens Park

11.3 One of the key findings highlighted by the pilots was that the EPs consultation process uses varied formats and has the ability to reach out to formally established Residents Association as well as those residents who do not want a long term commitment, do not want to attend regular meetings and/or where no formal Resident Association is in place (as at October 2008, of the 328 estates only 86 have formally recognised RAs).

12. ICT IMPLICATIONS

N/A

13. HUMAN RESOURCES IMPLICATIONS

N/A

14. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

14.1 The cost of producing the estate plans can be met via existing resources. The new Project Co-ordinator post is funded via savings made as a result of other vacant positions. The Estate Plans Co-ordinator, Carla Ferrarello, is on a secondment from Pinnacle. In 2006-07, Carla set up and run the Estate Plans Pilots. It should be noted that changes in the current workloads would require further re-assessment and could have budget implications.

14.2 The other cost associated with the project is funding for the local improvements. The project aspires to increase effective use of existing resources rather than seeking additional funding. The local plans will be the link between local vision and the exiting projected expenditure

and where a strategy can be put in place to address the local needs in the short, medium or long term.

- 14.3 The EPs will also have a substantial impact on the ability to access new sources of funding, such as the S 106, as it will provide a database of unfunded local needs which can be referred to as and when new funding becomes available. This will in turn empower residents to directly apply for funding streams such as local Trusts/Sponsorships or the Lottery.
- 14.4 The flowchart in Appendix 1 shows how funding for the estate plans can be identified and monitored.

15. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS / ADVICE

N/A

16 OTHER RELATED DECISIONS / GUIDANCE

N/A

APPENDIX 1

Flowchart 1 – Estate plans: Funding the Residents Vision

