

HACKNEY HOMES Ltd
Resident Liaison Group Meeting
Thursday, 29th April 2010 at 6.00pm to 8.00pm
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)
Tom Price (Joint Chair)
Danny Neeson
Denise Bingham
Ehsan Uddin
Erdal Doganduzel
George McGee
Gordon M Guthrie
Jean – Paul Lawrence Tampu-eya
Joyce Brown
Lionel Fairweather
Mavis McGee
Muriel Gordon
Michael Gills
Susan Fajana-Thomas
Terry J. Edwards
Tony Goodchild
Walter Hare

Officers:

Charlotte Graves

Neil Isaac

Neehara Wijeyesekera

Judith Morrison

Jim Paterson

Jonathan Oxlade

Clive Taber

Alex Jarosy

Chris Tabi

Curtis Taylor

Housing Partner Representatives:

Mouchel: David Saxon

Pinnacle: Elliot Brooks

Pathmeads: John Ferman

Contact:

Governance Team

020 8356 3432/2264/4225.

Governance.team@Hackneyhomes.org.uk

HACKNEY HOMES Ltd
Resident Liaison Group Meeting

Thursday, 29th April 2010 at 6:00pm to 8:00 pm,
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	2 mins	6:05-6:07
3.	Chair	a) Minutes of 3rd March 2010 and Matters arising	1-11	Decision	5 mins	6:07-6:12
		b) Rolling Register	12-13			
4.	C. Graves/Exec team	What's happening at Hackney Homes Update?		Information	10 mins	6:12-6:22
5.	C. Edwards	TSA Standards		Presentation	15 mins	6:22-6:37
6.	Panel Chairs	What's happening in the neighbourhoods?		Verbal Update	10 mins	6:37-6:47
7.	M. Brewer	Management Contracts update		Presentation	15 mins	6:47-7:02
8.	N Wijeyesekera/ C. Taber	RLG-the way forward including a what works/what doesn't work exercise	14-18	Discussion	30 mins	7:02-7:32

9.	J. Paterson/C. Taber	184 Communal Repairs Budget and EIB update	19-23	Information	10 mins	7:32-7:42
10.	N. Isaac	Review of Communal Heating Charges	24-28	Information	10 mins	7:42-7:52
11.	C. Taylor	Update on Garage Review	29-34	Discussion	5 mins	7:52-7:57
12.	Chair	Any Other Business		Information	3 mins	7:57-8:00

Future RLG meetings.

- Thursday, 3rd June 2010
- Thursday, 29th July 2010
- Thursday, 30th September 2010



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 3 March 2010 at 6.00PM

Present	<p>Rupert Tyson (Joint Chair) Tom Price (Part) Muriel Gordon Terry Edwards Danny Neeson May McGee David White Shirley Bogan David Larkin</p> <p>Housing Partner Representatives Elliot Brooks David Saxon John Ferman</p>	<p>Officers Charlotte Graves (Part) Christophe Tabi Clive Taber Judith Morrison Joanna Evans Sharan Sewa Sunil Desai Jim Paterson (Part) Carla Ferrarello Malcolm Brewer</p> <p>In attendance Walter Hare Peter Naughton</p>
---------	--	--

Item	Open to the Public	Action	Date
1. Welcome & Introduction	Tom Price welcomed everyone to the meeting and all those in attendance introduced themselves.		
2. Apologies	<p>Apologies were received from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Joyce Brown Denise Bingham <p>Tom Price gave advance apologies from himself, Charlotte Graves and Jim Paterson for having to leave the meeting early to attend another meeting.</p>		
Declarations of interest	Terry Edwards and Rupert Tyson declared they were Board Members of Hackney Homes.		



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 3 March 2010 at 6.00PM

Item	Open to the Public	Action	Date
<p>3(a) Minutes of 12 November 2009</p> <p>Matters arising</p> <p>3(b) Rolling Register</p>	<p>The minutes of the meeting held on 12 November 2009 were agreed as a true record and signed accordingly.</p> <p>4. What's happening at Hackney Homes? Judith Morrison confirmed that leaseholder service charges would apply to works undertaken in the hard to insulate programme.</p> <p>Energy Costs The Group queried why this item was programmed for April. Sunil Desai said that data on all costs incurred was currently being compiled which would be taken to the Audit & Finance Committee. Charlotte Graves said that the review was a comprehensive piece of work and that April was a realistic date. The concerns of the Group were noted however.</p> <p>Role of Councillors on TRA/ETRA The Group queried why this had been listed as a separate item. Clive Taber said that it whilst it could have been included in the ETRA review report, officers considered that a separate review would assist in clarification.</p> <p>Estate Walkabouts Muriel Gordon asked why her name had been assigned to this item. Tess Merrett said that this was an error and apologised.</p> <p>The Group asked that Tenant Compact Review be included for a future meeting.</p>	<p>C Taber</p>	<p>29 July 10</p>
<p>4. Update on Woodberry Down</p>	<p>Peter Naughton gave a verbal update on the Woodberry Down regeneration and explained how the project was now being dealt with by Hackney Homes and the London Borough of Hackney.</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 3 March 2010 at 6.00PM

<p>5. What's happening at Hackney Homes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interim repairs had now started so that blocks were being made reasonably decent • Berkeley Homes had made considerable progress and had secured £27m for regeneration for Woodberry Grove North. • Views among residents across the estate were still mixed. <p>Charlotte Graves said that Hackney Homes and the Council were trying a new approach and it was hoped that this would lead to improved working arrangements.</p> <p>The Group suggested that following on from the success of the question time sessions held in Homerton and Shoreditch, a question time be arranged at Woodberry Down.</p> <p>Tom Price thanked Peter Naughton.</p> <p>Charlotte Graves said that the Residents' Open Day had been extremely successful with over 1200 residents attending. The feedback from the day suggested that residents would like the next event to run on later into the evening as this would give residents who were working the opportunity to attend.</p> <p>Charlotte Graves updated the Group on the recent changes to the Executive Management Team namely, Robin Smith had now left Hackney Homes and Gary Penticost was shortly to retire. Jim Paterson and Jonathan Oxlade would then report directly to her.</p>	<p>Comms/R PT</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 3 March 2010 at 6.00PM

<p>Update from the Partners</p>	<p><u>Repairs & Maintenance</u> Jim Paterson said that this winter had been a particularly difficult time for repairs & maintenance but that all the teams had pulled together to ensure a good service had been maintained. There had been a serious emergency earlier in the week as a result of a gas explosion and he was pleased to report that the emergency planning processes had worked well. All in the entire outlook in repairs & maintenance was positive.</p> <p><u>Finance</u> Sunil Desai said that the budgets had now been set for 2010/11 and staff were now working hard in preparation for closing the accounts for 2009/2010 and to manage the HRA.</p> <p><u>Estate Environment</u> Christophe Tabi said that during the extreme weather spell, his teams had used 100 tons of grit and salt. The Estate Environment Stand at the Residents' Open Day proved very popular with over 500 Residents visiting it. There were 20 new fruit and vegetable projects now underway and the teams were increasing their visibility across the estates.</p> <p><u>Housing Services</u> Clive Taber said that there had been a significant reduction in rent arrears and Hackney Homes was on target to meet the end of year target. The Housing Benefit promotion campaign had resulted in 300 tenants now claiming their entitlements.</p> <p><u>Leasehold Services</u> Judith Morrison said that a gas safety check service was now being provided to leaseholders on request.</p> <p><u>Pinnacle</u> Elliot Brooks said that officers were working hard to achieve end of year performance targets in respect of rent arrears. A centralised ASB Team would be operational from April. All the risk assessments for staff making visits were being reviewed.</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 3 March 2010 at 6.00PM

Pathmeads John Ferman said that officers were working hard towards meeting the end of year key performance indicators. As a decision had now been made about the Housing Management Contracts, management were working with staff on ensuring a smooth transition.

Mouchel David Saxon said that the end of year target on rent arrears should be met. Officers were investigating why housing benefit take up was lower in the Mouchel contract area. Tenancy agreements were being enforced in respect of ASB and work was being undertaken on subletting and tenancy fraud in Homerton. Officers had also made more visits to check on vulnerable residents in the De Beauvoir area during the winter period.

The Group commended Estate Environment on the hard work undertaken during the cold period and the care given to checking on vulnerable residents.

The Group asked how the gas servicing checks to leaseholders were being publicised. Judith Morrison said that Hackney Homes had run articles in newsletters asking for interested leaseholders to put their names forward. These leaseholders would then be put in direct contact with the gas servicing company. There was a range of service options on offer and it was up to the individual leaseholder to decide on which, if any, they wanted.

Jim Paterson said that operatives were now installing CO2 meters in all tenants' homes after every gas service. Charlotte Graves said that this good practice was however highlighting issues with tenants' own appliances.

<p>7. EIB/Planned Maintenance</p>	<p>The Group agreed to take item 7 before item 6. Jim Paterson updated the Group on the current position and he apologised on behalf of Hackney Homes for the poor communication in this matter. However, £100k had been identified which could now be released back into the EIB to be spent before 31 March 2010. This had been identified from the overall repairs & maintenance budget.</p> <p>The Group said that the early part of the EIB process for 2009/10 had been handled well but that this performance had not been maintained. The Group also expressed its disappointment with the poor communication over this. The Stamford Hill Panel said that it had now ceased its walkabouts as there was little point in undertaking these if the works identified could not be done.</p> <p>Charlotte Graves said that the day to day repairs budget had been the root of the difficulty and virtually all repairs reported to the call centre, legally had to be acted upon and the volume of calls to the call centre had increased substantially in part owing to a change in the repairs policy. 70,000 plus repairs a year were undertaken.</p> <p>The Group asked how this £100k would be allocated. Jim Paterson said that officers would ask the Panels for a list of works and would then identify what could be done. Panels would be informed of this.</p>		
<p>6. Housing Management Contracts</p>	<p>Tom Price, Charlotte Graves and Jim Paterson left the meeting.</p> <p>Malcolm Brewer set out the feedback from the consultation process. The Group asked when the arrangement with Pinnacle would be terminated. Malcolm Brewer said that discussions on this had yet to take place.</p> <p>The Group noted the Report.</p>		

7. What's Happening in the Neighbourhoods.

Central Danny Neeson said that a training programme was being arranged on

- Security of Tenure
- Disrepair
- Benefits
- Leaseholders' Rights

Details would be circulated and all were welcome to attend.

Stoke Newington David Larkin said that the Howard Road Resource Centre was a very well used community facility and gave the following examples of the Groups which made use of it

- Disability Hackney
- African Arts
- Turkish Drama Group
- Toddlers Music Group

The neighbourhood was using the TRA worker very successfully and the Yorkshire Grove TRA had been re-established as a result. Youth engagement in the neighbourhood had also improved.

Clapton David White said that

- following a very successful fun day in Millfields Park last August, 2 or 3 new TRAs had been formed.
- An ASB weekend training course would take place shortly.
- The Clapton Neighbourhood had been instrumental in formulating the Clapton Area Action Plan which formed the basis for local area campaigns

- The Clapton Panel and the Stamford Hill Panel met regularly.

Homerton Terry Edwards said

- Joyce Brown and Tony Osborne had both been unwell for much of the year which had made Panel work more difficult
- Managers' walkabouts around the estates was working well
- The panel had contacted lots of street properties and had now got them included in the Decent Homes programme
- The Panel had been talking to LBH about regeneration across the estates and estate plus had now been dropped
- The under 5 group was very successful
- The panel was seeking funding for youth initiatives

Rupert Tyson asked that the Group's best wishes for a speedy recovery be sent to Joyce Brown and Tony Osborne.

Stamford Hill Muriel Gordon said

- Stamford Hill had been challenging Hackney Homes about the Management Contracts
- There appeared to be communication difficulties between Property Services and Leasehold Services
- Quarterly Inspections were not working well.
- The Panel had undertaken a leasehold survey and no improvements in services had been found
- Most leaseholders wanted a detailed independent audit
- Resident participation was very good

	<p>The TRA had conducted a survey which found that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ASB • Cleaning issues • Lack of Community <p>Were the main reasons for resident non-involvement.</p>		
<p>9. Hackney Homes Single Equality Scheme</p>	<p>Sharan Sewa introduced the report. The Group felt that the language in the report could be improved upon as it was not written in plain English. The Group asked why translation was included in this document. Sharan Sewa said that officers were looking at drawing up a policy setting out what should be translated. However, as this document was a Strategy document, then it included a translation. Sharan Sewa said the document was going out to wider consultation and that if any members of the group had any comments, they could contact her or Tom Hogan.</p> <p>The Group noted the report.</p>		
<p>10. Estate Plans Project – Phase 1 Update</p>	<p>Carla Ferrarello introduced the report. The Group considered the report interesting but felt that it was raising Residents’ expectations as many of the proposals relied on the 184 budget... Carla Ferrarello said that alternative methods of funding needed to be considered such as applying for Lottery Funding. The Group asked how the works were currently co-ordinated as sometimes works which could be carried out all at the same time were undertaken separately. Carla Ferrarello said that individual staff co-ordinated the works.</p> <p>The Group noted the report.</p>		

<p>11. Deputations to the Hackney Homes Board</p>	<p>Rupert Tyson said that a paper on deputations had been agreed electronically by the Hackney Homes Board as the December meeting had not taken place owing to inclement weather. It was agreed that this would be taken back to the Board for discussion.</p>	<p>T Merrett</p>	<p>14 June 10</p>
<p>12. Estate Cleaning & Grounds Maintenance</p>	<p>The Group were disappointed that it had not been involved in the consultation and asked what had happened to the Estate Service Level Agreements. Christophe Tabi said that the exercise had been a patch adjustment rather than a patch review which meant that operatives were matched to areas more efficiently which enhanced the service. Christophe Tabi said that he would look into the Estate Service Level Agreements.</p>	<p>C Tabi</p>	<p>29 July 10</p>
<p>13. Enhanced TRA Meetings Review</p>	<p>Clive Taber introduced the report and said that this was the final draft. There were some concerns about setting the dates around Council dates and members were asked to submit these concerns and any others to Clive Taber so that they could be submitted as an addendum to the Report going to Board</p> <p>Whilst the Group had concerns that the recommendations in the Report would not be acted upon, the Report itself was very well put together.</p> <p>The Group noted the report. .</p>		
<p>14. Tenants' Levy Review</p>	<p>The Group were asked to direct any comments to Clive Taber.</p>		
<p>13.AOB</p>	<p>Terry Edwards said that the digital aerial programme was being forced upon Tenants and that Tenants were not being given any choice. There was no need to install special aerials as digital programmes could be received via boxes and ordinary aerials. Malcolm Brewer said that the systems being installed were integrated systems not just digital aerials. The Panel asked that the booklets on the digital aerial programme be circulated to the panel chairs. The Group asked for clarification on how the Board representation worked.</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 3 March 2010 at 6.00PM

	<p>Rupert Tyson said that whilst all Resident Board Members were elected directly by their neighbourhoods, once they became Board members, they were not representing individual areas.</p> <p>The meeting closed at 8.30 pm.</p>		
	<p>Date of Next meeting Thursday 29 April 6.00 pm.</p>		

Signed as a true record of this meeting _____Chair Dated _____

Item

3b)

Rolling Register Resident Liaison Group

1. Energy Costs	A report on Energy Costs	N Isaac/J Paterson/ J Oxlade	29 April 2010
2. Estate Service Level Agreements	Review of the Estate SLA	C Tabi	3 June 2010
3. Role of Councillors on TRA/ETRA	Clarification of what Councillors' roles are	C Taber	3 June 2010
4. Resident Liaison Group	Discussion paper setting out possible options on ways to take this group forward	N Wijeyesekera/ C Taber	29 April 2010
5. Woodberry Down question time sessions	Arrange question time sessions at Woodberry Down	Comms/RPT	TBC



Item

3b)

Rolling Register Resident Liaison Group

6. Garages	Update on Garage Review	Jonathan Oxlade	29 April 2010
7. Tenant Compact	Review	Clive Taber	29 July 2010
3. Enhanced Tenant and Resident Association Meetings	<p>The Roles of all participants in ETRAs Job Descriptions of Estate Managers Councillors' roles Communications protocol on meeting arrangements.</p> <p><i>Item 5 26.4.10 Board meeting mins pp2-4</i></p>	C Taber	3 June 2010

Title of Report: RLG-the way forward	
Decision Making Body: Resident Liaison Group	Date: 29 April 2010
Classification: FOR DISCUSSION	Report of: Head of Resident Services
Item Previously considered at: N/A	On Which Date: N/A
Report Author: - Clive Taber, Resident Services	Appendices: Appendix 1 – Terms of Reference of RLG

Report Outline:

- **Paragraph: 1.0 - Summary of Report**
- **Paragraph: 2.0 - Recommendation(s) to Resident Liaison Group**
- **Paragraph: 3.0 – Background**
- **Paragraph: 4.0 - Outline proposals for the future of the Resident Liaison Group**
- **Paragraph: 5.0 – Relationship with Council and Board**
- **Paragraph: 6.0 - Consultation**

If you have any questions about this report, please contact Clive Taber on 0208 356 2058 or email clive.taber@hackneyhomes.org.uk

1.0 SUMMARY OF REPORT

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to introduce a discussion on the future role of the RLG and seek the views of the RLG as part of an ongoing discussion and consultation.
- 1.2 Residents have raised questions as to whether the RLG serves the purpose it was intended to achieve and the possible options for discussion in this report are aimed at offering an alternative set of arrangements that would achieve the original objectives.
- 1.3 The possible options also set out to establish arrangements that create engagement structures that are in line with the Tenants Services Authority (TSA) requirements.

2.0 RECOMMENDATION

- 2.1 The Resident Liaison Group (RLG) is asked to express its views on the future of the RLG.

3.0 BACKGROUND

- 3.1 This report was requested by members of the RLG to enhance the effectiveness of arrangements.
- 3.2 In addition the Tenant Services Authority (TSA) requires social housing organisations to form a Tenants Scrutiny Panel. There is also a growing divergence of views and subject areas of interest between tenants and leaseholders.
- 3.3 Previously representation from different sections of the Hackney Homes resident community has been under-represented. The RLG mechanism has not addressed this and Hackney Homes considers that this needs to be corrected in any new proposals.

4.0 SOME POSSIBLE OPTIONS FOR DISCUSSION

- 4.1 To take account of the TSA's requirements, Hackney Homes does need to set up a Borough wide group of tenants specifically to discuss the TSA Standards.
- 4.2 It is necessary to consider how to effectively get representation for residents not involved through established routes into the RLG process.
- 4.3 Given the above points, one possible discussion option is to set up 3 new groups – a Tenants Advisory Group, Leaseholder Advisory Group and an advisory group representing the various alternative forms of engagement forums. In addition there could be a quarterly meeting for Panel chairs with the Hackney Homes Chief Executive, Charlotte Graves.
- 4.4 **The Tenants Advisory Group** – this group could comprise 8 to 12 tenants from the wider body of tenants. Preference will be given to someone who does not normally get involved and is unlikely to be the Panel Chair. This would enable the discussion of issues specifically of concern to tenants. This group would also scrutinise performance in line with TSA requirements. We would make an open invitation and we would select the membership from tenants who have expressed an interest.
- 4.5 **The Leasehold Advisory Group** – the same set up as the Tenant Advisory Group but with leaseholders instead of tenants. Leaseholders have specific issues relating to their tenure and this would enable thorough discussions of these issues.
- 4.6 **Alternative Forms of Engagement Advisory Group** – this would be made up of representatives from each of the alternative engagement forums. This

would enhance the contribution to the decision making process from sections of the Hackney Homes resident community that have specific issues for their representative group e.g. people with disabilities, Black and Minority Ethnic groups, street property residents etc.

- 4.7 **Panel Chairs Meeting** – this would be for the Chairs of the Panels to meet directly with the Chief Executive; for reasons of continuity there would be no provision for substitutes in place of the Chair.

5 RELATIONSHIP WITH BOARD AND COUNCIL

- 5.1 All meetings would be quarterly, the nominated representatives would be the only person entitled to attend i.e. no substitutes,
- 5.2 The agenda for these meetings would be restricted to important strategic and major service delivery issues. The views expressed by these groups would be reported the Hackney Homes Service Improvement Committee and from there to the Board.
- 5.3 Officers will consult the Council in this process to ensure appropriate opportunities for Council representation and involvement and also to ensure that the Council, as registered provider, meets the TSA requirements.

6.0 CONSULTATION

- 6.1 Following comments from the Resident Liaison Group it is proposed to take this option to as wide a group of residents as possible. This report will be consulted upon through our various alternative forms of engagement. The aim being to maximise the extent and breadth of residents views on this matter and the outcomes of these consultations will be reported back to the RLG.

Appendix 1

HACKNEY HOMES

Resident Liaison Group

Terms of Reference

1. Membership

- a) The Membership is as follows:
- Two representatives from each Neighbourhood Panel including the Clapton and Stamford Hill sub-Panels
 - One representative from each of the three established BME Groups
 - One representative from the Disability Group
 - One representative from the Leaseholders' Forum
 - One TMO Representative
 - 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 Governance section 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.

Title of Report: 184 Communal Repairs Budget and Environmental Improvement Budget (EIB) Update	
Decision Making Body: Resident Liaison Group	Date: 29 April 2010
Classification: FOR INFORMATION	Report of: Head of Resident Services
Item Previously considered at: N/A	On Which Date: N/A
Report Author: - Clive Taber, Resident Services	Appendices: N/A

Report Outline:

- **Paragraph: 1.0 - Summary of Report**
- **Paragraph: 2.0 - Recommendation(s) to Resident Liaison Group**
- **Paragraph: 3.0 – Background**
- **Paragraph: 4.0 - Update on 184 Communal Repairs Budget and EIB**

If you have any questions about this report, please contact Clive Taber on 0208 356 2058 or email clive.taber@hackneyhomes.org.uk

1.0 SUMMARY OF REPORT

1.1 The purpose of this report is to provide the RLG with an update on both the 184 Communal Repairs and the EIB budget spend for 2009/10 and the types of works that can be undertaken against these budgets..

2.0 RECOMMENDATION

2.1 The Resident Liaison Group is asked to note the report.

3.0 BACKGROUND

3.1 EIB budget and use

Total budget allocation for EIB in 2009/2010: £ 489,600.

The Environmental Improvement Budget (EIB) is a fund available to Tenant and Resident Associations who hold Enhanced TRA Meetings. The EIB allocation available to each TRA is based upon the number of

properties in the TRA's catchments area. The figure is worked out by the number of properties multiplied by the sum £25.25.

The EIB can be used to pursue a wide variety of projects. The two main criteria required of EIB proposals are: 1) the item must serve to improve the communal area, and 2) Hackney Homes have the requisite in-house capacity to carry out the request.

TRAs are encouraged to decide on EIB submissions as soon as possible in the year, ideally at the first round of Enhanced TRA Meeting (i.e. May–July). If the TRA do not submit any project proposals by the second cycle meeting, their unspent EIB allocation will be transferred to the 184 budget to allow other communal works to be carried out in the neighbourhood.

The decision on what to spend the EIB on is taken at the estate's ETRA meeting and the money available is ring fenced to the estate. The budget is held by Property Services and was originally created through top slicing monies from the communal repairs budget. Property Services are responsible for costing, ordering and processing these requests, although grounds maintenance work is handled by Estate Environment. Resident Services are responsible for the coordination, tracking and clienting of the process.

Types of works requested under the EIB:

The following is an indication of the type of works that TRAs can request through their EIB allocation. This is not an exhaustive list.

Planned Maintenance; works such as painting, minor structural works and repairs, fencing, paving, tarmacing, tiling, and flooring.

Sign Services; the supply and fitting of noticeboards (wall-mounted or free-standing) and signs that can be tailored to specific functions (e.g. 'No Dog Fouling,' 'No Ball Games,' etc.).

Grounds Maintenance; works such as the planting of flowers, shrubs and trees, the pruning of trees, and the fitting of planters.

Specialist Works; in particular works associated with playgrounds: the installation of play equipment, the laying of safe-surfacing or tarmac, and upgrade works to gates and fencing of playgrounds.

Electrical Work; works such as internal and external lighting, and the installation of wall-pack lighting.

3.2 The 184 budget and use

Total budget allocation for 2009/2010: £ 1,400,000. Allocation based on property numbers in each of the five neighbourhood area.

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, resolving long standing maintenance and anti social issues on our estates.

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.

Whilst Hackney Home’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.

The process is that a walkabout is held in each neighbourhood during April-June with Panel representatives and Property Services staff to identify potential 184 works. The list of works identified are then specified and costed by Property Services and the details submitted to the neighbourhood Panel for selection of the works to be proceeded with (as usually the total cost of the work identified exceeds the budget available). The final decision on choice of works from the list rests with the Panels.

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.

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 is applied in all site assessments.

4.0 Update on 184 Communal Repairs Budget and EIB

Environmental Improvement Budget (EIB)

- 4.1 In 2009/10 we have undertaken works to the value of approximately £350,000 of the total budget of £489,600 with a 155 EIB requests being completed.
- 4.2 The EIB budget was temporarily suspended for a period in the latter part of 2009/10 due to budgetary pressures on statutory repair work. Following the lifting of this suspension a further £85,155.14 was committed.
- 4.3 Issues causing delays in committing EIB expenditure have been identified and Property Services have committed designated staffing resources to progress this budget in the first half of the financial year. In order to assist Hackney Homes with achieving this objective ETRAs are encouraged to ensure that at their first ETRA meeting of the new financial year they select their 3 EIB requests in priority order. In the second round of ETRA meetings we would be looking to pick up on further requests resulting from the original requests not being appropriate e.g. due to costing to much for the estates EIB.

- 4.4 We will also be asking TRA's who had uncompleted jobs in 2009/10 if they would like us to proceed directly with completing these jobs. We have to stress that this work would have to come out of this years EIB allocation but it would mean the TRA would get the work done quickly.

184 Communal Repairs Budget

- 4.5 In 2009/10 most 184 works were completed, we have undertaken works to the value of approximately £1.2 million out of a budget of £1.4 million being spent.
- 4.6 Resulting from last year's programme (2009/10) there are works that could be carried over to the next year. On this basis we are looking at developing a two year programme. This would streamline the process and save resident volunteers time in reducing the number of 184 walkabouts they are involved with as these are very time consuming. Again we have to stress that any works carried forward would have to come out of this year's allocation.
- 4.7 We are considering changing the name of the 184 budget to something a bit more appropriate. Any suggestions would be welcomed.

Title of Report: Review of Communal Heating Charges	
Decision Making Body: Resident Liaison Group Meeting	Date: Thursday 29th April 2010
Classification: For Information	Report of: Director of Finance & Resources
Item Previously considered at:	On Which Date:
Report Author: - Sunil Desai, Head of Finance	Appendices: None
<p>Report Outline:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paragraph: 1 – Summary of Report; • Paragraph: 2 – Recommendations; • Paragraph: 3 – Background; • Paragraph: 4 – Communal Heating Costs and Charges • Paragraph: 5 – Conclusion 	

If you have any questions about this report, please contact Sunil Desai on telephone number 0208 356 3429 or email sunil.desai@hackneyhomes.org.uk.

1 SUMMARY

- 1.1 This report provides a summary on the energy costs of communal heating systems and also the background on how charges are calculated for both tenants and leaseholder.
- 1.2 It costs approximately £3m for the running (fuel costs) and maintaining the boilers for these systems.
- 1.3 Some of this cost is recovered by the charges to the tenants and leaseholders benefiting from this service. Across the country it is common for communal heating charges to be recovered in full from service users.

2 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 That this meeting notes this report.

3 BACKGROUND

- 3.1 Hackney Council and Hackney Homes has operated the communal heating systems for several years. Currently there are approximately 2,185 tenants and 390 leaseholders benefiting from this service.
- 3.2 Due to doubling in supply prices during the financial year 2008/09 there was a significant overspend of on the overall HRA utility costs (i.e. cost electricity / gas and oil) budget. A decision was taken by the Council's cabinet committee (26th January 2009) to increase the energy charges for 2009/10 to tenants to recover the higher energy costs incurred by the Council. This has meant that the charge to tenants who are on communal heating systems has increased by approximately 100%. Leaseholders were charged a proportion of the actual costs incurred for their block in their actual bill for 2008/09. The charge has not been changed for 2010/11.

4 COMMUNAL HEATING COSTS AND CHARGES

- 4.1 The current budgeted cost of fuel for running the District / Communal Heating boilers is approximately £2.6m.
- 4.2 In addition there are costs for maintenance for District / Communal Heating boilers which is forecasted to be approximately £600k. This is composed of £300k for repairs and £300k for servicing costs.
- 4.3 The budgeted total amount to be recovered from tenants for fuel by way of a service charge is £1.3m. This equates to an average annual charge of £595 per tenant. How it is acknowledged that there is a wide range of actual charges.
- 4.4 The total amount charged to leaseholders for fuel costs by way of a service charge was £300k for 2008/09. This equates to an average annual charge of £769 per leaseholder.
- 4.5 Therefore in summary the total budgeted cost of fuel £2.6m compares to the total budgeted amount to be recovered of £1.5m. This means that potentially 42% of the cost is not recovered and that it is cross subsidised from all tenant's rents.
- 4.6 Currently there is no separate recharge to tenants for the maintenance costs of District / Communal Heating boilers. For leaseholder the approximately £45k is recovered for maintenance. There is no charge for tenants for individual heating maintenance.

4.7 The table below give a summary of the costs and charges –

TOTAL GAS AND HEATING OIL COSTS AND CHARGES (£000's)

Description	2007 - 08		2008 - 09		2009 - 10		2010-11
	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Forecast	Budget
Gas	1,046	945	801	1,571	1,374	1,548	1,121
Heating Oil	1,095	976	1,103	978	1,081	1,100	978
Total Expenditure	2,141	1,921	1,904	2,549	2,455	2,648	2,099
Tenant Service Charge for Heating and Hot Water	-819	-866	-883	-792	-1,227	-1,292	-1,257
Leaseholders Service Charges	-199	-178	-190	-299	-200	-200	-230
Total Income	-1,018	-1,044	-1,073	-1,091	-1,427	-1,492	-1,487
Net Expenditure Total	1,123	877	831	1,458	1,028	1,156	612

It should be noted –

- The utility costs incurred by the Council are based on a mixture of estimated and actual meter readings.
- The basis of charging tenants and leaseholders differs.
- Those blocks that are served by Communal Heating systems differ in respects of block make up i.e. –
 - number of units in the block;
 - the blocks age;
 - the number of bedrooms for each unit in the block;
 - the mixture in the number of tenants / leaseholders;
 - the heating systems used and
 - the fuel used.

4.8 The statutory rules on charging tenants and leaseholders for service charges are different. For tenant the annual charge is related like all other service charge where by they are increased by RPI + ½ %. There may be occasions where an authority has to increase its service charge by more than RPI + ½ % due to increases in costs outside its control, such as increases in fuel costs. Whereas leaseholders have to be charged the actual charges incurred.

4.9 The current two methods used by the Council are described below

Tenant charges -

Tenants on Communal Heating incur a charge for the heating and hot water. The charge is based on historical figures, whereby points were initially attributed to reflect the number of rooms that

have direct heating and those that do not have direct heating but that benefit from the heating from other rooms. In the case for hot water, points were allocated for the number of rooms in the property. For properties with under-floor heating, the heating points are reduced by 50%. Therefore each property was allocated a total number of points. These points were then multiplied by a cost for each point. Prior to 2009/10 the charge for Heating and Hot water per property had not been increased. Therefore current charges do not reflect the true cost of fuel used by the tenant. In general, the charge to tenants is below true cost incurred by the Council.

Leaseholder Charges –

Leaseholders are charged the cost incurred for fuel plus maintenance for the communal heating systems within their service charge account. The cost of the fuel is calculated for each block and allocated by reference to living space factor i.e. the number of bedrooms in the property.

- 4.10 Consideration needs to be given so that tenants and leaseholders are charged in the same way for the true cost of fuel and maintenance. The Council may also want to consider the operation of a ring fenced Communal Heating account to capture all the income and expenditure in one place therefore being easily able to whether or not the account is balanced.
- 4.11 Major investment in the provision of heating and hot water is essential in a number of locations within the housing stock. The Carbon reduction benefits can only fully be realised if the systems are operated as designed. However this is currently not possible as there are limited Capital resources available.
- 4.12 Investment is needed regardless of the type of fuel used, as residents in the worst cases have no effective control over their use of the energy provided. Temperature control may only be exercised by opening windows in some cases. This must be addressed as part of any investment programme.
- 4.13 At present there is no economic incentive for residents in this position to save fuel, given that the charging process described above does not allow residents to pay for what is used, as they do with individual heating systems. It is this situation that needs to be addressed if the real Carbon reduction benefits from centralised systems are to be realised.
- 4.14 A system of heat metering, which allows payment to be based upon usage, is already in place at 355 Queensbridge Road and it is intended to install a similar system at Cranston estate as an essential part of the Combined Heat and Power proposal.

5 CONCLUSION

- 5.1 It is acknowledged that there are differences in the basis of charging tenants and leaseholders; not all the fuel costs are recovered by charges and that there are variations in the level of actual meter readings. The Council and Hackney Homes is working to resolve these issues.
- 5.2 This meeting may want to contribute by expressing it's views on the principles for a new charging methodology –
- Should the charge fully fund the costs incurred?
 - Should the charge be on a scheme by scheme approach?
 - Should there be a ring fenced account where al the costs and income are charged?
 - Basis of charging within the existing scheme?
 - Should any agreed changes be implemented with effect from 1/4/11?

Title of Report: Update on Garage Review	
Decision Making Body: Resident Liaison Group	Date: 29th April 2010
Classification: For Information	Report of: Director of Property Services, Hackney Homes.
Item Previously considered at: (1) List the <u>Hackney Homes</u> Committees / Board Meetings which have previously considered the item; (2) List the <u>Hackney Council</u> Committees / Cabinet Meetings which have previously considered the item.	On Which Date: RLG 10.09.09 HHET 25.11.09 CLM 15.12.09 A&F 8.2.10 Cabinet 27.07.09
Report Author: Bob Snowsill x2902	Appendices: N/A

Report Outline:

- **Paragraph: 1.0 - Summary of Report;**
- **Paragraph: 2.0 - Recommendation to the RLG;**
- **Paragraph: 3.0 – Background;**
- **Paragraph: 4.0 - Impact Upon The Hackney Homes Strategic Plan;**
- **Paragraph: 5.0 - Impact Upon The Hackney Homes Risk Register;**
- **Paragraph: 6.0 - Consideration of the Hackney Homes Equality & Diversity Strategy 2006 and Action Plan 2007 - 2010;**
- **Paragraph: 7.0 - Consultation Process & Findings;**
- **Paragraph: 8.0 - ICT Implications;**
- **Paragraph: 9.0 - Human Resources Implications;**
- **Paragraph: 10 – Financial Implications;**
- **Paragraph: 11 - Legal Implications / Advice;**
- **Paragraph: 12 - Other Related Decisions / Guidance.**

If you have any questions about this report, please contact Bob Snowsill on 020 8356 2902 or email bob.snowsill@hackneyhomes.org.uk

1.0 SUMMARY

- 1.1 This report outlines the progress made on the delivery of the garage and associated assets review approved by Hackney Council Cabinet on 27th July 2009.
- 1.2 The report updates members on the next steps for commencing a second phase of the project in 2010/11.

2.0 RECOMMENDATION

- 2.1 **That this report is noted.**

3.0 BACKGROUND/NEXT STEPS

- 3.1 Hackney Homes manage the Council's stock of garages which totals some 4,200 units. A significant proportion of the stock is dilapidated and insecure. Garage rent arrears are currently £91,260.
- 3.2 The HRA budgets for an income of £1 million p.a from the garage stock. Current rent levels are £13.40 a week for tenants of council housing and £13.40 plus vat a week for leaseholders and private tenants. This represents a potential income of £2,633,904 p.a. based on a 90% occupancy rate.
- 3.3 The pilot refurbishment project has concentrated on estates which meet one or more of the following criteria:
1. Dangerous structures and/or legal action pending.
 2. Regeneration estates with funding committed.
 3. Proximity to The City or major transport links.
- 3.4 So far the pilot project has:
- 3.4.1 Established a garage standard, which is:
 - Secure.
 - Weather tight
 - Structurally sound
 - Safely accessible
 - Visible to passers by
 - 3.4.2 Surveyed 276 garages across 12 estates and recorded GIS mapping and photographs on Codeman and Project Excellence.
 - 3.4.3 Re-possessed 122 garages recorded as void but illegally occupied.
 - 3.4.4 Refurbished 193 garages to meet the new garage standard.

- 3.4.5 Generated new income to the HRA in the sum of £219,000 p.a.
 - 3.4.6 Cleared some 40 Tonnes of fly tipping and general rubbish dumped in void or illegally occupied garages.
 - 3.4.6 Worked with partners to develop a letting strategy.
 - 3.4.7 Visited and assessed the “Hidden Homes” project run by L. B. Wandsworth as a potential use for some of our sub-ground level garages and identified two blocks where this has potential.
 - 3.4.8 Identified one block of garages with re-development potential.
 - 3.4.9 Demolished 13 garages that were beyond economic repair.
 - 3.4.10 Demolished 8 abandoned drying sheds which were the subject of legal action.
 - 3.4.11 Demolished 7 derelict pram stores and one former caretaker’s store.
- 3.5 Next steps
- 3.5.1 Client Liaison Meeting on 15th December welcomed this report and decided that the Council’s Director of Finance seek capital funding for the next phase of this project. Hackney Homes were invited to bid for £250,000 from the 2010/11 Capital programme and this was approved by cabinet in March. We are presently awaiting the Council’s final release of the delegated budget.
 - 3.5.3 A survey of all sub-ground level garages will be commissioned to establish their suitability for conversion to affordable housing, based on the successful ‘Hidden Homes’ model developed by L. B. Wandsworth.
 - 3.5.4 Officers will commence a second phase of a 3 year programme of garage renewal.
 - 3.5.5 Officers will explore the possibility of increasing garage rents versus affordability, including differential pricing in high demand locations.
 - 3.5.6 Officers will continue to develop their Business Case/Demand Analysis to be applied in order to plan priorities for the next phases of refurbishments and demolitions.
 - 3.5.7 There are various commercial opportunities for raising income to the HRA, ring-fenced to the wider garage renewal programme. Officers will carry out feasibility and market testing for:
 - vacant garages in high demand locations close to the City let in bulk on medium term, full repairing and insuring leases, payable annually in advance.

- sub-ground level garages not suitable for conversion to housing considered for letting to commercial organisations with an initial rent free period to enable the user to refurbish and repair them.
 - the feasibility of letting vacant garage spaces to visitors to the Olympic games in the summer of 2012.
- 3.5.8 Officers will work with the Council on a funding model for a programme of conversion of some sub-ground level garages to affordable housing.
- 3.5.9 Officers will work with the Council to identify opportunities to provide new affordable housing where redundant garages are to be demolished.

4.0 IMPACT UPON THE HACKNEY HOMES STRATEGIC PLAN

- 4.1 The pilot project has produced an average clearance and refurbishment cost of £912 per garage. Projecting this average across the whole stock it is estimated that £3.8 million is required over 3 years to refurbish all the stock.
- 4.2 Demand for refurbished units has strengthened as the project has progressed with residents and non residents alike observing the improvement in the visual amenity and security of the garage courts and wider estate environment. Resident feedback has been strongly in favour of the project. Refurbished garages have been let quickly, demonstrating a healthy demand on these estates.
- 4.3 Should it be necessary (see 3.5.2) the proposed ring fencing of rental income in excess of £1m pa, for a four year period, will fund the roll out of the project across the borough without the need for capital contributions. With potential rent increases in high demand areas, the project will produce an income stream to the HRA in the order of £3M p.a. on completion.
- 4.4 If proved viable, bulk letting of units in high demand locations, with annual rent payable in advance, will provide monies to accelerate the programme.
- 4.5 Taking forward the 'Hidden Homes' model at two sites may be possible with prudential borrowing outside the HRA. The costs of creating new family-sized flats are estimated at £30,000 per unit in these locations. The capital cost could be funded by prudential borrowing to be funded from the future rent income of the new dwellings.

5.0 IMPACT UPON THE HACKNEY HOMES RISK REGISTER

RISK	PROBABILITY	IMPACT	CONTROLS
Resident objections	Low	Medium	Full consultation
s.20 implications for leaseholders	Low	Low	Consultation with Leasehold Income Services
Low demand for garages	Medium	Low	Demolition is proposed for low demand units.
Lack of funding	Low	Severe	Ring fencing of rent stream and capital receipts for 3 years

6.0 THE HACKNEY HOMES EQUALITY & DIVERSITY STRATEGY 2006 / ACTION PLAN 2007 – 2010

N/A

7.0 CONSULTATION PROCESS & FINDINGS

- 7.1 Consultation has taken place with stakeholder officers at Neighbourhood Offices, Estate Safety and the Police to identify the pilot exemplar project for 09/10.
- 7.2 Consultation has taken place with stakeholder officers in the Council's Neighbourhoods & Regeneration Housing Renewal Team to both share information gathered on garages as part of the Estates Plus project and also to identify certain garages on regeneration estates for the 09/10 pilot project.

8.0 ICT IMPLICATIONS

- 8.1 A Project Excellence work stream is being established and both Saffron and Codeman will be updated as the project progresses including GIS mapping and pictures.

9.0 HUMAN RESOURCES IMPLICATIONS

- 9.1 The ongoing project will be resourced from within the existing establishment in the Estate Renewal Team.

10.0 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 10.1 The ongoing project may have to be financed by the ring fencing proposed at 3.5.2 above with management and maintenance costs offset against the rent stream. By re-investing the growing rental income into refurbishment of sound units in areas of demand and demolition of other non performing assets a strong and sustainable contribution to the overall financial position of the HRA will be developed.

11.0 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS / ADVICE

N/A

12.0 OTHER RELATED DECISIONS / GUIDANCE

N/A