



**Brighton & Hove  
City Council**

# Housing Management Panel

Title:	<b>Housing Management Panel: Central Area</b>
Date:	<b>17 October 2018</b>
Time:	<b>7.00pm</b>
Venue	<b>Hampshire Lodge</b>
Members:	<b>Councillors:</b> Gibson (Chair), ; <b>Ward Councillors for the Area, Delegates of Tenants Association in the area.</b>
Contact:	<b>Anoushka Clayton-Walshe</b> 01273 291214 anoushka.clayton@brighton-hove.gov.uk



**AGENDA**

<b>Part One</b>	<b>Page</b>
<b>32 WELCOME &amp; INTRODUCTIONS</b>	
<b>33 APOLOGIES</b>	
<b>34 CHAIR'S COMMUNICATIONS</b>	
<b>35 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING</b>	<b>5 - 14</b>
Minutes of the meeting held on 9 September 2018 (copy attached).	
<b>36 RESIDENTS QUESTION TIME</b>	<b>15 - 22</b>
<b>37 SEASIDE HOMES - FUTURE ELECTION OF COUNCIL TENANT REPRESENTATIVE</b>	
<b>38 FIELD OFFICER UPDATE</b>	
<b>39 A NEW DEAL FOR SOCIAL HOUSING - GOVERNMENT GREEN PAPER AND CONSULTATION</b>	<b>23 - 34</b>
<b>40 FIRE SAFETY UPDATE</b>	<b>35 - 36</b>
<b>41 FUTURE DELIVERY OF HOUSING REPAIRS, PLANNED MAINTENANCE AND CAPITAL WORKS</b>	
<b>42 2019/20 BUDGET DISCUSSION</b>	
<b>43 HOUSING MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE REPORT</b>	
<i>Q2's report will be available at the next Panel meeting. During this item residents will be invited to give their feedback on the format and content of the performance reports that are presented at Area Panel meetings, their suggestions for improvements and how they use them in their role as resident representatives.</i>	
<b>44 CITY WIDE REPORTS</b>	<b>37 - 46</b>
<b>45 ANY OTHER BUSINESS</b>	
<b>46 DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING</b>	

## HOUSING MANAGEMENT PANEL: CENTRAL AREA

**BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL**

**HOUSING MANAGEMENT PANEL: CENTRAL AREA**

**1.30pm 5 SEPTEMBER 2018**

**HAMPSHIRE LODGE - HAMPSHIRE LODGE**

**MINUTES**

**Present:** Councillors Gibson (Chair)

**Voting Representatives:** Eileen Stewart (Somerset Point), Tony McCoy (Rep Sloane Court), Tony Worsfold (LAG), Barry Hughes (Sylvan Hall RA), Martin Cunningham (Hampshire Court), Barry Kingston (Hampshire Court), Carl Boardman (Warwick Rep), David Spafford (Ardingly Court), Margaret Reynolds (Leach Court), Linda Shaw(Sylvian Hall)

**Officers:** Rebecca Mann (Resident Involvement Officer), Marcus Richardson (Surveyor & Contract Manager), Grant Ritchie (Lead Consultant - Health & Safety), Glynn Huelin (Business & Performance Manager), Delia Hills(Mears), James Crane (Service Improvement Manger – Housing Options), Mel Fraser (Performance & Improvement Officer, Tom Matthews(Housing Performance Analyst)

**17 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

**18 APOLOGIES**

18.1 Apologies were received from Tony Price, John Evans, Ododo Dafe and Eddie Wilson.

**19 CHAIR'S COMMUNICATIONS**

19.1 There were none.

**20 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

20.1 Barry Hughes noted that 12.1 should refer to the Tenancy Improvement Group.

20.2 Carl Boardman stated that 7.1 trailed should read trialled.

20.3 The Chair stated that at the last meeting the head of Income, Involvement & Improvement confirmed the Estate Development Budget could be used for projects not on housing land and this was not recorded in the minutes.

20.4 In response to the Chair, officers confirmed that Estate Development Budget could be used on non-housing projects.

20.5 **RESOLVED:** That the minutes of the previous meeting were agreed as a correct record.

**21 RESIDENTS' QUESTION TIME****21.1 1) Recycling problems**

- Residents said that they had agreed at the last meeting that Cityclean would send out informative leaflets and that there were still problems of not knowing what to recycle. Residents added further issues of bins failing to be emptied and the inability to contact Cityclean with concerns.
- The Chair noted that he had previously suggested that Cityclean should be invited as a guest to the Central Housing Panel. The Chair added that issues with Cityclean fill his inbox and that there is a general feeling that residents want Cityclean to attend the meeting in order to aid communication.
- An Officer responded that Cityclean would be attending the next Citywide Conference where environment was the theme.

**21.2 2) Visitors' car parking**

- Residents stated the ongoing problems regarding car parking spaces especially in Lavender Street in the area being used and added that there needed to be ethical car parking to improve matters. Residents indicated that it was very frustrating for paying people being unable to park.
- The Chair raised the question of whether this was due to insufficient enforcement.
- Officers responded by reminding residents that there is a resident task group at the end of September.
- Residents stated that a review had only past a few months ago.
- Officers responded that they knew what the problems were and will pick them up in the group.
- The Chair proposed to make a note of when the resident task group started and finished to then develop at a later date what could be improved.

**21.3 3) Drug use in the St James' Street area (1)**

- Residents raised concern of drug issues moving to residential areas that followed improvements in the prime problem areas. This was subsequent to the Police and Crime Commissioner attending the Local Action group Meeting. There was a great response to the report from the police and from having a discussion covering resources and deployment, there was an agreement to do a body of work together.
- A resident raised concern that they had recently found three needles in the South East corner of the estate. There has been collaboration with Police Community Support Officers (PCSO) where they had agreed to do more on the estate and encouraged other estates to do the same. He furtherly noted that PCSOs were overworked and involved in drug use simply moved on to

somewhere else when a particular area was focused on. This resident encouraged other residents to report all incidences to the PCSO.

- The Chair proposed the panel to possibility to work with PCSOs and whether it was worth inviting the police to the Central Area Housing Panel in the future.
- A resident responded that it was better to finish work with the police and crime commissioner to formulate a closer explanation and strategy in addition to the report previous report.
- The Chair agreed that it was best to wait for the results from further collaboration and revisit in the next meeting for residents liaise on findings.

#### 21.4 4) Drug use in the St James' Street area (2)

- One resident raised problems of being unable to contact Annabel Tate, the Housing Manager, and was still waiting for a reply. She added the frustration that residents needed to speak to officers regarding anti-social behaviour and being told that it was not the housing officers remit and redirected to a different department.
- Officers directed residents to contact the housing contact enquiries who would direct residents to the correct place and officers apologised for the previous negative experience. Officers raised that instead of directing queries at particular officers that residents should call the duty line to get a quicker response as it was monitored throughout the day unless a resident was assigned to a particular caseworker for a specific case.

21.5 **RESOLVED:** That the Panel noted the responses.

## 22 FIRE SAFETY UPDATE

- 22.1 Grant Ritchie, Lead Consultant - Health and Safety, introduced the report stating that Brighton & Hove City Council was continuing to work closely with East Sussex Fire & Rescue Service. In response to the latest government information on fire doors, the Council was temporarily halting its routine front door replacement programme in blocks of flats following a national agreement by manufacturers to suspend production of fire doors.
- 22.2 In response to concerns raised by Residents, Officers stated that a random sample of fire doors were tested across the Council's stock but focussing on high-rise blocks. If Residents had particular concerns about improperly fitted fire doors, Officers encouraged them to report these doors. Additionally Officers stated that the original timber doors were most likely fire proof. The fire doors that had already been fitted were generally safe for 30 minutes; however this was dependant on conditions and fit.
- 22.3 In response to Residents, Officers stated that automatic door closing devices needed to be fitted on all fire doors to ensure that they were closed to provide protection in the event of a fire. If Residents knew of any doors where the device had been removed or was broken they should report this so it be repaired. If the doors were

being closed to quickly or with excessive force this was probably a sign that the device was faulty and Residents should report it rather than attempt to remove it.

- 22.4 The Chair asked that further advice be published in the Homing In magazine.
- 22.5 Residents expressed concern that leaseholders may be liable for the cost of replacing doors which they purchased through packaged offered by the Council.
- 22.6 Officers responded that as the government had not published its conclusions regarding the efficacy of Masterdor and IG door fire doors that it was too early to make any comments about a potential replacement scheme.
- 22.7 The Chair acknowledged that this was a developing situation and process.
- 22.8 In response to Residents Officers stated that even fire door which had failed test still had a 15 minute safe period and it was felt that this was a reasonable amount of time for evacuation and emergency services to respond. Officers added that Grenfell was not a direct analogue for high-rise blocks in the city which were generally of a better design.
- 22.9 The Chair stated that the report would be going to the Housing % New Homes Committee with updated detail and for more information residents should contact their local Councillor. Officers were very mindful of Grenfell regarding fire safety and that Councillors would rightfully scrutinise the ongoing process to make sure residents were satisfied with the transparency of the investigation.
- 22.10 **RESOLVED:** That the Panel noted the report.

### **23 HOUSING ALLOCATIONS REVIEW**

- 23.1 Officers presented the report and outlined the new allocations policy. There were four queues within the allocations policy, each queue was allocated a given a percentage allocation of properties including: homeless (40%), transfers (30%), home-seekers (20%) and council's interests (10%). The replaced banding would allow the allocations process to work faster.
- 23.2 Residents raised they should have been able to move within the scheme and their communities without having to be re-entered into the allocation lists. Residents stated that it was important for the housing allocation policy to allow for residents moving within scheme as this would enable people to move within scheme meaning they could live in more suitable accommodation close to their established support networks
- 23.3 Officers responded that a resident whose needs became more severe would be a priority when shortlisted which was the purpose of the Band A which was proposed in the new policy. Residents could also agree to swap homes within schemes.
- 23.4 In response to residents, Officers stated that they would investigate any schemes where Residents felt age restrictions had previously applied and were being enforced. However Officers added that some historically over 55 blocks were no longer age restricted as equalities legislation had made this difficult to justify.



- 23.5 Residents raised concerns for tenants with changing situations. If a very elderly resident wanted to move downstairs, residents questioned if they would have to already be on the allocation list.
- 23.6 In response to Residents Officers confirmed if a block was subject to Right-to Buy there was no limit on the number of properties in the block that could become leasehold properties.
- 23.7 Resident stated that they were concerned that the Council was not doing enough to preserve good quality furniture and carpets from the homes of Residents that had passed away.
- 23.8 Officers responded that they did have re-use and recycling in place for furniture left in properties but that there was limited capacity to store item and when this store is full they may need to dispose of usable furniture. However Officers acknowledged that they support given to new Residents in terms of furniture provided could be improved.
- 23.9 The Chair stated that if Residents had concerns about the new policy that had not been addressed in the meeting they could contact him or any other member of the Housing & New Homes Committee.
- 23.10 **RESOLVED:** That the Panel noted the report.

#### **24 OPTIONS FOR FUTURE DELIVERY OF HOUSING REPAIRS, PLANNED MAINTENANCE AND CAPITAL WORKS**

- 24.1 Glyn Huelin, Business & Performance Manager, introduced the report and emphasised the importance of the feedback received through consultation with residents and other stakeholders.
- 24.2 The Chair noted that the housing repairs contract would be the subject of a special Housing & New Homes Committee on 26 September 2018.
- 24.3 In response to Residents, Officers stated that Mears were required by the existing contract to carry out quality insurance checks, although the Council did check any major works. The new contract would likely have a different system in place to scrutinise works done.
- 24.4 Delia Hills assured Residents that the feedback calls made after repairs were not merely looking for positive feedback and all issues or faults reported would be recorded.
- 24.5 Residents did state that their experience of Mears had not been entirely negative and Mears had definitely done good work during the contract.
- 24.6 In response to Residents, Delia Hills agreed at the situation regarding wet room puddling was not satisfactory and she would follow up outside of the meeting to ensure that repairs took place.
- 24.7 In response to Residents, Officers stated that they tried to align any work with decorating so that newly decorated areas would not be disturbed by new fittings or

similar. Thy apologised if this had happened and stated that the contractors carrying out the work should have returned the area in the stated that they had found it in.

- 24.8 Residents raised concern that communal areas were in an appalling state and some areas had not been re-decorated for nearly two decades. Estate Development Budget bids had been placed, however bids had been rejected due to estates no fitting specifications.
- 24.9 Officers responded they will be commissioning work on charter and seniors housing that would include a section on decoration which would feedback into reviews. Officers agreed that a lot of their stock did look tired and acknowledged that an important aspect for sheltered housing was to feel welcome in communal areas. This was an issue that would be raised going forward.
- 24.10 The Chair stated that the case would be flagged and that feedback for the wider environment and communal areas would be incorporated in to the report. The main areas that had been drawn to attention were less repeated monitoring, less wasteful use of scaffolding, getting jobs done right first time, improved coordination with decoration, shorter contracts and a report that draws together all the wider themes.
- 24.11 Residents stated that there should be some acknowledgement for the positive aspects of the Mears contract, such as the responsive help desk and their feedback mechanism. They raised the negative implications of long-term contracts such as historical problems with fraud and the difficulties for leaseholders. They noted that if the contract were to change in future that the help desk service should be replicated by other providers.
- 24.12 The Chair stated that it was important for Residents views to be heard at committee and he encouraged residents to contact him with concerns or issues that they felt had not been raised at the meeting or through the consultation process.
- 24.13 **RESOLVED:** That the Panel noted the report.

## **25 IMPROVE YOUR ESTATES PROGRAMME**

- 25.1 Mel Fraser, the Performance & Improvement Officer, presented the report on the actions that resulted from the Survey of Tenants and Residents (STAR) satisfaction survey. The update the focussed on the progress made of actions to improve Council housing public areas and the general quality of life on estates, including: Discretionary Decorating and Gardening Schemes, Review of Estate Inspections, Untidy Gardens and Grounds Maintenance.
- 25.2 Residents raised issue of the poor frequency of lawn maintenance and that is was a job the council was accountable for and that Residents have had to try to manage gardens independently.
- 25.3 Officers responded that there would be a remit about gardens and round maintenance and acknowledged there were many issues in this area that would go forward to review.

- 25.4 The Chair questioned Officers on how residents would be involved in this review.
- 25.5 Officers responded that this question would be forwarded. Officers stated that in terms of communal gardens, a garden project would be developed. This project would use volunteers, new resources and resident involvement that incorporated many online garden share and neighbourhood schemes. This project has been tricky and will be featured in the City Wide meeting.
- 25.6 Residents raised concerns that many people in sheltered housing were vulnerable so there must be safeguards in to who would be invited to the estates. Residents added their concerns of demarcation dispute between contractors.
- 25.7 Officers agreed to forward those points
- 25.8 The Chair recommended to re-visit these issues as they deserved more time and that after the City Wide conference there will be updated information to move forward.
- 25.9 **RESOLVED:** That the Panel noted the report.

## 26 HOME PURCHASE POLICY UPDATE

- 26.1 Officers outlined the Housing Management and Performance Report.
- 26.2 Residents questioned the total number of affordable homes there were in city and how many were allocated to each new building development.
- 26.3 Officers responded that the number of affordable homes required differed on each scheme and development.
- 26.4 The Chair said that the general policy was that 40% of all developments that have at least ten units were required to be affordable, however often developers said that they could not afford that rate. In that case, committees had to decide whether they were satisfied with the claim to go ahead which could be frustrating if the housing organisation simply did not want to manage affordable homes. The report supported managing these affordable homes.
- 26.5 Residents raised that capital works projects would cause financial stress for leaseholders.
- 26.6 Officers responded they would more feedback from leaseholders to take a managed approach.
- 26.7 The Chair noted the report should bring expansion for the affordable homes scheme.
- 26.8 **RESOLVED:** That the Panel noted the report.

## 27 HOUSING MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE

- 27.1 The Chair stated that he regretted the panel did not have more time to consider the item and directed them to contact Tom Matthews, Housing Performance Analyst, at [tom.matthews@brighton-hove.gov.uk](mailto:tom.matthews@brighton-hove.gov.uk).

27.2 **RESOLVED:** That the Panel noted the report.

**28 BUDGET PLANNING**

28.1 The Chair referred that the report that was released annually for new budget plans and stated that it did impinge on residents through the Estate Development Budget. He then questioned if residents would like to repeat this year's process of the successful working groups.

28.2 Residents responded that the working group had run better than previous years and gained detailed information on the shrunken budget.

28.3 The Chair noted there had been lots of discussion that had not involved tenants. He recommended that meeting working groups should in future be spread over the year and be independent of Area Housing Panels.

28.4 **RESOLVED:** That the Panel noted the report.

**29 CITY WIDE REPORTS**

29.1 The Chair noted this report.

**30 ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

30.1 A Resident stated that her local resident housing association had dissolved when last attending the panel and requested permission to attend the Central Area Housing Panel in future. She said due to this she felt that she had lost her local voice.

30.2 Rebecca Mann, the Resident Involvement Officer, responded that the Resident was welcome to attend, however she would not be allowed to vote.

30.3 The Chair added that that resident was encouraged to attend and that the panel rarely voted anyway and it was in everyone's best interest to expand the panel – not reduce.

30.4 Residents stated that it was very useful talking to other Residents on the estates adding that others should be reminded that they have meetings and without attendance they do not stand a chance for their voice to be heard.

**31 DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING**

31.1 The date of the next meeting would be 17 October 2018.

The meeting concluded at 16:10

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of

The meeting concluded at 15.35

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of



# Questions from Residents

## Items from the Central Residents Only meeting 21/9/18

### Question: Leaseholder charges

*Jane Thorp gave the background to the situation with major works and charges to leaseholders at Hanover RA (previously Highden, Westmount and Crownhill).*

- *In 2015 residents were told that they would be getting new roofs.*
- *There was then no further information about this for some time. When residents followed it up, they were told that the work had been delayed.*
- *In 2016 an individual resident made a Freedom of Information request, which they then made public. This said that the planned work was for new roofs, windows and cladding. When residents followed this up, they were told by Martin Reid that the only work planned was for new roofs.*
- *At a recent Residents Association meeting a leaseholder said that the sale of her flat had just collapsed, as it was discovered that there were major works scheduled which would cost each leaseholder £44,000. This is for roofs, windows and cladding.*
- *Geoff Gage, who was at the meeting, then told residents that this work would not happen until after 2020 and was under review.*

*Jane Thorp said this experience exemplified the disrespectful and unreasonable way that the Council treated their leaseholders and made the following points:*

- *Communication with leaseholders is practically non-existent and often contradictory. Jane has been trying for years, with no success, to get clear information on the situation with major works at Highden, Westmount and Crownhill.*
- *Leaseholders only found out about possible bills of £44,000 when someone tried to sell their flat. This is not acceptable.*
- *After years of neglect, all of the work is done at once. A responsible landlord would have ensured regular maintenance and replacement which would keep the properties in better condition and spread bills over a more manageable time scale. It is totally unreasonable to suddenly spring huge bills on leaseholders.*
- *For an unspecified period of time, leaseholders will be in a situation where they are unable to sell their flats, face the prospect of huge bills and have uncertainty over their futures. This is not acceptable.*

- *The bottom line responsibility of the Council must be to provide accurate, clear information well in advance to their leaseholders. Consultation must take place at an early stage and throughout the process.*

*It was agreed that these concerns need to be raised at Area Panel.*

## **Response**

The discussion at the Hanover Residents meeting concerned a request by a leaseholder prior to sale of their property as to whether there was future works planned for the blocks.

As requested, and in line with our agreed approach to transparency and early information sharing on prospective works costs, we responded with an estimate and brief details of possible works that may be considered within the next five years. As part of this response an estimated cost was placed on these works.

It was stressed that the costs were an estimate only and that the final schedule of works had not been agreed nor confirmed.

The leaseholder contribution is an estimate only at this time.

The full extent and specification for the works has not been agreed and will not be finalised until Spring 2019 with a view to tendering the project in 2020, but no firm start date is programmed.

The works to the blocks have been considered for a number of years and in various forms. However, there will be a complete review of the specifications received and works required for tender purposes.

Residents and leaseholders have been aware of the possibility of proposed works since 2014.

As part of our resident engagement we will offer the various options that are available for the works. The provision of external wall insulation will not be considered as an option following Planning considerations. However, this cannot be provided until we have reconsidered the works. We will be considering repointing, brickwork repairs and cavity wall insulation.

Until such time as we have budget costs for the works we cannot offer firm costings, anything at this stage is estimated.

With regard to several packages of works being carried out at once. This is one consideration but not firm, we will offer residents alternatives.



One of the high costs of any project is scaffold and access and therefore to split the works in stages does result in this being charged on each stage. Hence our suggestion that we encompass all works as one project.

From a leasehold point of view consideration should be given to these several phases of works as it is possible that the end cost over a period of say 15 years may exceed the 'one off' cost. We would offer these alternatives at engagement.

With regard to repairs, elements of the structure do have a useful life span and many elements do reach the end of this and hence replacement is the only option over further patch repairs. In particular, roofing and cavity wall insulation. It can of course be argued that major repair works would require access (scaffold) and costs would likely be high as a result and we do therefore consider as to whether such repairs are cost effective.

There is a question of how much notice do we give for future major works, this could be a number of years, but at all times budgets lead the works planned and advance notice of say five years may not mean the works will be carried out in that period of time.

To be able to advise residents of proposed works we need to have in place a firm specification and details of all elements of the works proposed and a reasonably accurate estimate of the costs involved. Ideally we would prefer to tender the works and have an accurate figure to present; hence long term advice is not always practical or appropriate.

We also offer a range of payment support options to residential leaseholders who may face charges for major works.

**Martin Reid, Head of Housing Strategy, Property & Investment, Telephone  
01273 293321**

## Items from the East Residents Only Meeting 6/9/18

### Question: Estate Development Budget – Main bids

#### **Deadline for bids**

*The deadline for submission of bids is usually November, for a decision the following April. However, in June this year Associations were told that the deadline would be the end of July. This left insufficient time for Associations to plan consultation with local residents, put information in newsletters or hold meetings. As a result, several Associations did not submit bids by the deadline and there are fewer bids this year. The meeting felt that Associations which hadn't yet submitted their bids should be allowed to do so.*

#### **Fencing**

*There seems to be some inequality in the process for submitting bids for fencing. Woodingdean submits bids for fencing each year, but some other Associations are told that they cannot submit fencing bids, even when there are issues of safety. There is now a proposal from the council to remove fencing from the EDB list of permitted items. This would lead to a further imbalance between areas where there are communal areas and facilities owned by Housing, and areas where these don't really exist (such as Woodingdean, Manor Farm and most of Whitehawk).*

#### **Action**

*The meeting agreed to submit a request to the Area Panel on the future of the Estate Development Budget and the inclusion of fencing in the budget.*

*It is requested that the proposal to remove fencing from the EDB list be reconsidered, taking into account:*

- *the significant impact this can have on an overall area*
- *the lack of other opportunities to improve an area where there aren't any Housing owned communal buildings or areas.*

## **Response**

#### **Deadline for bids**

The council's internal audit team carried out an audit of the Estates Development Budget in 2017. The audit identified that additional steps were needed in the procedure for processing and pricing bids to ensure there is contract compliance and value for money for the EDB as with other areas of work carried out within the repairs partnership. As a result of the audit the Property & Investment team now check a percentage of Mears' quotes for EDB work before the April voting panels.

To allow for this to take place, this year's application form for EDB main bids advised 'tenants associations should hold a general meeting to discuss potential bids before the third week in July...' and that 'draft bids should be sent to RIT@brighton-hove.gov.uk ..... by the end of July 2018 with final bids being submitted by Friday 16 November 2018.

By early September we had received over 90 bids from groups, which is no less than in previous years. However, in hindsight I can see that having two dates may have been confusing and it may have been simpler to have one earlier date, for example the end of September for bids to be submitted. We will make this change next year.

The current deadline remains mid November. However, to allow time for pricing and checking we do need to know what type of bid an association is considering before then. This allows officers to offer support, carry out checks and plan for pricing when the bid is submitted.

## **Fencing**

A task and finish group of residents is currently reviewing the EDB scheme. This group is working on a set of proposals to go forward for wider consultation, so that all residents have an opportunity to comment on changes that are being considered.

There has been discussion on whether fencing to individual properties should, or should not, be on the list of items that residents can bid for and the group's final decision on this will be included in recommendations that come to a future panel. No decision has yet been made on this issue.

Any changes that are agreed will come into effect for the 2020/21 round of bidding; there are no changes to the current guidelines, which permit fencing to individual properties, and so associations can still bid for funding for this in the 2019/20 programme.

**Hilary Edgar, Housing Service Operations Manager, Telephone 01273 293250**

## Items from the North Residents Only Meeting 13/9/18

### Question: Reports at Area Panel

*There was agreement that the Council's quarterly performance reports given at the Area Panel are not useful, despite the frequent changes to the format. There is still too much information on specifics, which are hard to follow and more detailed than needed quarterly.*

*The meeting asked for some constructive thinking – involving residents, officers and Councillors - about what information is necessary and useful for Area Panels, and in what format. One comment received was that this type of information is only necessary in one out of four Area Panels, or annually.*

### Response

I am sorry to hear that residents in the North Area do not find the performance report and summary overview, useful. These are intended to give residents information on how each part of the Housing service is performing through the use of a traffic light rating system and for this to inform discussion, questions and requests for further information.

In response to the North resident only meeting's suggestion an item has been included in the agenda for each of the four Area Panels on how residents would like to receive this information in future, if at all.

**Hilary Edgar, Housing Service Operations Manager, Telephone 01273 293250**

## Items from the West Resident Association Meeting 11/9/18

### Question: Blocked drains

*The group agreed there needs to be regular maintenance of drains in order to prevent blockages and to reduce risk of flooding and expensive, disruptive clean-ups. There was concern that blockages are already developing and that the situation will get worse as it gets colder. It was agreed to ask if drain clearance is happening as part of ongoing maintenance and if there's a schedule for this which could be shared with resident associations.*

### Response

We do not feel that a planned programmed of maintenance would be cost effective for this type of work across all of the housing stock. Where we are aware of specific issues in blocks or areas we will put in a programme of checks to ensure problems are addressed before they have a significant impact, where this can be anticipated. We aim to rectify the issues on drainage as soon as they arise, and residents should continue to report these to the repairs help desk on Freephone 0800 052 6140 or our local number 01273 294409, or email us at [BHCC.repairs@mearsgroup.co.uk](mailto:BHCC.repairs@mearsgroup.co.uk)

We will continue to review our approach to planned maintenance programmes alongside our contractors and where it is felt that this would be effective both in terms of cost and addressing potential issues we will pursue this as an option.

If residents have concerns about a specific drain or soakaway, please let me know as there may be an underlying issue that needs to be investigated.

**Miles Davidson, Housing Sustainability & Affordable Warmth Manager,  
Telephone 01273 293150**



**Area Panel:** 15, 16, 17 & 25 October 2018  
**Briefing Paper:** A new deal for social housing;  
Government Green Paper and  
consultation

**Introduction**

A briefing paper is attached about the government's green paper on social housing. It has been prepared by the council's corporate policy team and sets out the content of the green paper and areas where the government would like feedback.

Residents are asked to read this briefing before the Area Panel meetings and to prepare for discussion at the meetings on the consultation questions.

**Contact:**

Hilary Edgar, Housing Service Operations Manager

e: [Hilary.Edgar@brighton-hove.gov.uk](mailto:Hilary.Edgar@brighton-hove.gov.uk)

t: 01273 29 3250



# BHCC Policy Network Briefing

---

**Subject:** “A New Deal for Social Housing” Government Green Paper and Consultation

**Date:** August 2018

**Audience:** Corporate Policy Network

**Author:** Lauren Eagle, PPS Officer, [lauren.eagle@brighton-hove.gov.uk](mailto:lauren.eagle@brighton-hove.gov.uk)

## **Purpose of the briefing**

A concise summary of the Government Green Paper “A New Deal for Social Housing”

## **Recommendations**

To note the proposals contained within the report and to contribute to the government consultation as appropriate

## **What is the subject?**

### Context

- Social housing makes up around 1/5 of all households
- Social housing is housing to rent below market level rents or to buy through schemes such as shared ownership.
- It is made available to help those whose needs are not served by the market.
- Registered providers are financially regulated and funded by the government through the [Homes and Communities Agency](#)
- Guideline target rents are determined through the national rent regime. Social Rent levels take into account a measure of relative local earnings as well as relative property values. It is typically set at around 50-60 per cent of market rents. “Affordable Rent” was introduced in 2011 to support building more new homes below market rents. Affordable Rent levels are set at a maximum of 80 per cent of the market rent.
- Since the 1980s there has been a shift towards most of the provision of social homes being by housing associations, through a combination of homes transferred from local authorities, and housing associations mainly taking over the role of building new social homes.
- Around 14 per cent of social housing is supported housing (accommodation provided alongside support, to help people live independently) and intended to support the



most vulnerable in our society, (older people, people with mental ill health, learning disabilities, physical and sensory disabilities, autistic adults, care leavers, people fleeing domestic abuse, rough sleepers, those with drug and alcohol dependencies, vulnerable ex-service personnel and ex-offenders).

- Age makeup of social housing residents is similar to the general demographic.
- 43 per cent of all black households live in the social rented sector, compared to 16 per cent of white households and 25 per cent of all ethnic minority households.
- 43 per cent of social rented households are in full or part-time work. This is lower than the average for all households (60 per cent).
- Half of social households have at least one member with a long term illness or disability.
- There is very little movement into owner occupation. However 2/3 residents aspire to home ownership.

## **What are the solutions?**

### Stated Objectives of the Green Paper

- Improving fairness, quality and safety for residents living in social housing
- Rebalancing the relationship between tenants and landlords, strengthening protections for tenants
- Tackling stigma
- Ensuring that social housing can support people to achieve home ownership

### 5 Key priorities

- A safe and decent home (the government sees this is fundamental to a sense of security)
- Swift and effective resolution so that when residents have concerns about the safety or standard of their home they see results.
- Empowering residents and holding landlords to account.
- Tackling stigma
- Building the social homes that we need and ensuring that social homes can act as a springboard to home ownership.

## **Who does it affect and how?**

- BHCC Housing Development / Housing Management / Properties / Transport /

Planning / EEC

- Housing Associations
- Social Housing residents
- Social Housing Landlords
- Communities and community groups
- Existing tenants, residents on housing registers, and all residents seeking affordable homes to rent or buy

### Who supports it?

National government

### Responses to Social Housing Green Paper

Organisation	Response
<p>National Housing Federation (Represents social landlords to around 6m people)</p>	<p>Supports Government’s commitment to ensuring tenants get quality services and can hold their landlords to account if they don’t.</p> <p>However, Green Paper needs to address effects of recent welfare reforms that have caused real hardship for tenants.</p> <p>Supports building and investment in more social housing. To achieve the ambition of a future where everyone can access a quality home they can afford we need to build 90,000 new social rent homes every year.</p>
<p>LGA</p>	<p>Councils need freedoms and powers to invest in new and existing housing that is genuinely affordable. The loss of social housing means councils are currently spending more and more on housing benefit to supplement expensive rents instead of investing in genuinely affordable homes.</p> <p>Calls on Government to go further:</p> <p>Scrap the housing borrowing cap, and enable all councils, across the country, to borrow to build.</p> <p>Allow councils to set Right to Buy discounts locally and to keep 100 per cent of receipts from homes sold.</p> <p>Welcomes abandonment of plans to force the sale of council homes and recommends that decisions on council owned housing stock transfer are best made at local level by councils and residents.</p>

<p>Homeless Link (National charity for organisations working with homeless in England)</p>	<p>Expressed disappointment at lack of additional funding to build</p>
<p>Joseph Roundtree Foundation</p>	<p>Endorses view that the minimum the Green Paper needs to do is commit to an additional 30,000 homes per year, to bridge the gap between existing supply and newly arising need for affordable homes (of all types).</p> <p>Research for Crisis and the National Housing Federation suggests that if Government wants to meet current needs and address backlog needs amongst those on the lowest incomes, it needs to go further, to 90,000 a year.</p> <p>The 80% marker rent 'Affordable Rent' model is not realistically affordable to those on low incomes. This puts pressure on Housing Benefit. 'Affordable Rents' should mean Living Rents, which have a direct link to local earnings.</p> <p>Shared-ownership schemes remain out of reach for all but 3% of new social tenants. The government should focus on ensuring supply of homes to let at genuinely low social rents.</p>
<p>Women's aid (National charity working to end domestic abuse against women and children.)</p>	<p>Welcomes announcement that legislation to phase out lifetime tenancies will not be going ahead. But leaving decision to offer secure tenancies 'at discretion' of local authorities is not enough to protect domestic abuse survivors</p> <p>Calls on the government to urgently bring forward promised legislation to protect lifetime tenancies for survivors of domestic abuse. While awaiting legislation, the government needs to make it clear that all local authorities must ensure that survivors retain their lifetime tenancies after fleeing domestic abuse.</p>

**Is it already happening locally?**

N/a

**How does it fit with our Corporate Plan?**

Supports our purpose of:

## **A good life**

Ensuring a city for all ages, inclusive of everyone and protecting the most vulnerable.

Via providing housing at reduced rents to support the vulnerable and to help those whose needs are not served by the market.

## **A vibrant economy**

Promoting a world class economy with a local workforce to match.

Ensures the workforce needed to match job market demand can afford to live in the city.

- Supports our principle of increased equality and service priority of a A strong, sustainable economy that creates employment opportunity along with decent, affordable housing.

## **SWOT analysis**

A full SWOT analysis will be completed when consultation closes and government response is issued.

---

## **Options consideration**

Until Government response to the consultation is known there is no immediate action for the council to take.

However, CPN members are encouraged to note the proposals contained within the report and to contribute to the government consultation as appropriate

A grid containing a detailed breakdown of the Government's priorities, intended actions and consultation questions is included as a separate document below.

## Links to further information

[Consultation document](#)

## How to Respond

Enquiries:	During the consultation, if you have any enquiries, please contact: <a href="mailto:SocialHousingGreenPaper@communities.gsi.gov.uk">SocialHousingGreenPaper@communities.gsi.gov.uk</a>
How to respond:	Consultation responses should be submitted by online survey: <a href="https://www.surveymonkey.co.uk/r/A_new_deal_for_social_housing">https://www.surveymonkey.co.uk/r/A_new_deal_for_social_housing</a>

For further information on the Corporate Policy Network please contact  
Lead Officer for Policy, Partnerships & Scrutiny: **Simon Newell**  
Email: [Simon.Newell@brighton-hove.gov.uk](mailto:Simon.Newell@brighton-hove.gov.uk) Tel: 01273291128



Principle	Actions / intentions	Consultation questions
1- A safe and decent home	<p>Fire safety</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• £400 million funding for local authorities and housing associations to remove and replace unsafe aluminium composite material cladding on social residential buildings</li> <li>• Information for residents on safety, giving clear rights and responsibilities</li> </ul> <p>Decent Standards</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decent Homes Standard to be reviewed to consider whether it is demanding enough</li> <li>• Allowing councils to continue to have choice over their use of fixed term tenancies, enabling them to offer residents greater security in their homes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How can residents best be supported to work with landlords to ensure homes are safe?</li> <li>• Should new safety measures in the private rented sector also apply to social housing?</li> <li>• Are there any changes to what constitutes a Decent Home that we should consider?</li> <li>• Do we need additional measures to make sure social homes are safe and decent?</li> </ul>
2- Swift and effective resolution so that when residents have concerns about the safety or standard of their home they see results.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Speed up complaints process, improve access to effective dispute resolution, increase support and advocacy for tenants to seek redress</li> <li>• Considering bringing together redress schemes into a single housing ombudsman service</li> <li>• Strengthening mediation opportunities available for tenants and landlords</li> <li>• Review 'Democratic Filter' system for ombudsman complaints</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How to strengthen mediation opportunities for landlords and residents?</li> <li>• Should we improve/ remove the "democratic filter" for ombudsman complaints?</li> <li>• How can we ensure that residents understand how best to escalate a complaint and access the right advice and support?</li> <li>• How can we ensure that landlords' processes for dealing with complaints are fast and effective?</li> <li>• How can we best ensure safety concerns are handled swiftly and effectively?</li> </ul>

<p>3- Empowering residents and holding landlords to account.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strengthening the Regulator of Social Housing.</li> <li>• Reviewing objectives and standards to ensure landlords and residents have a shared understanding of good property management</li> <li>• Landlords to be assessed via KPIs, which will be published along with league tables</li> <li>• Exploring options for financial incentivisation and penalisation, linking funding eligibility to KPI performance</li> <li>• Improving landlord engagement with residents</li> <li>• National lobbying platform for residents</li> <li>• Considering a new stock transfer programme transferring local authority housing to community-based housing associations.</li> <li>• Considering how best to support residents to take on some of their own services/ and whether appetite is there</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comments on proposed KPI system</li> <li>• How could reporting outcomes of landlords' complaint handling be improved?</li> <li>• Could resident engagement and scrutiny measures be improved?</li> <li>• Is there a need for a stronger lobbying representation for residents at a national level?</li> <li>• Would there be interest in a programme to promote the transfer of local authority housing to community-based housing associations?</li> <li>• Are Tenant Management Organisations fit for purpose and delivering positive outcomes?</li> <li>• Are there benefits to models that support residents to take on some of their own services?</li> <li>• Should the Regulator have increased powers towards local authority landlords?</li> <li>• Should the Government take to make the Regulator more accountable to Parliament?</li> </ul>
<p>4- Tackling stigma</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considering ways to recognise creation of positive communities. Awards could include investment to support successful initiatives to grow, or funding for an event or a street</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How could we support or deliver a best neighbourhood competition?</li> <li>• What more could be done to tackle stigma?</li> <li>• How to encourage the professionalisation of</li> </ul>

	<p>party to bring people together.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Encourage the professionalisation of housing management and courteous and respectful customer service standards as norm</li> <li>• Promotion of good quality design, quality and energy efficient buildings and public spaces</li> <li>• The National Planning Policy Framework sets out policies that support this aim</li> </ul>	<p>housing management to high quality customer service standards?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How can planning guidance support good design in the social sector?</li> <li>• How can we involve social housing residents in the planning and design of new developments?</li> </ul>
5- (a) Building the social homes that we need	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ambition is to extend the opportunity of home ownership to as many social tenants as possible, with the responsibility to maintain and increase the stock of social housing for those who need it</li> <li>• Supporting Local Authorities to build more:</li> <li>• Raising the housing borrowing cap by up to £1 billion</li> <li>• New rent settlement of Consumer Price Index +1 per cent</li> <li>• Considering allowing local authorities to keep the Right to Buy receipts they already hold for longer than the current three years to ensure the receipts can be used alongside the borrowing cap increase. (Consultation open)</li> <li>• Repealing part of Housing and Planning Act 2016 that would compel councils to make a payment in respect of their vacant higher</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How can government support communities to deliver new build community-led homes?</li> <li>• What level of additional affordable housing, over existing investment plans, could be delivered by social housing providers if they were given longer term certainty over funding?</li> </ul>



	<p>value council homes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New £163 million Homes England programme of funding for community groups bringing housebuilding projects forward and capital funding for local authorities to provide local enabling infrastructure (such as access roads)</li> <li>• Decision not to implement Housing and Planning Act 2016 rules restricting use of lifetime tenancies by local authority landlords.</li> </ul>	
<p>(b) And ensuring that those homes can act as a springboard to home ownership.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• £200 million large-scale pilot (in the Midlands) of the Voluntary Right to Buy for housing association tenants this summer. (While monitoring housing associations' ability to keep pace in replacing the homes lost to Right To Buy</li> <li>• Remove barriers to shared ownership as a route to full home ownership</li> <li>• Rent to Buy scheme</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How can we best support providers to develop new shared ownership products that enable people to build up more equity in their homes?</li> </ul>



## **Sprinkler Installation in High Rise Blocks**

This briefing is to update Area panels on the works we have been doing on the proposed installation of residential sprinklers to high rise blocks and to explain the next steps.

We have included the responses to our consultation exercise from both Essex Place and St James's House.

Following the adoption of recommendations made to committee for a joint funded project with ESFRS at St James's House and Essex Place we have been going through a process of consultation and procurement.

The consultation has included:

- Letters to all residents at each block;
- A fact sheet including frequently asked questions;
- A public meeting attended by ESFRS and council representatives held at each block;
- A statutory consultation process with leaseholders in each block;
- A door to door survey of each block.

Having received feedback from the first round of consultation we have gone back to the potential supplier and made changes to improve the appearance of the pipework boxing in the common way and added in further control measures in the system to improve the identification of an activation.

Although meetings were well attended we are keen to ensure that we have provided as many residents as possible with the opportunity to comment and therefore we have undertaken a door to door survey to establish the opinion within the two blocks for our proposal. If residents were out when we called we left a form for them to complete and leave in ballot boxes placed in the entrances of each block.

The door to door survey provided the greatest number of responses of any of the methods of resident engagement. All flats were included in the door to door regardless of ownership. The survey asked if residents supported the proposal to install sprinklers in both flats and the common way. If residents indicated they did not we also asked if their lack of support was due to cost, appearance or concerns over leaks.

- In St James's House 61% (74 flats) of residents provided answers to our question of those 50% (37 flats) support the proposal to fit a complete system.
- At Essex Place 46% (59 flats) of residents responded to our question of those 38% (23 flats) support the proposal to fit a complete system.

The greatest concern expressed by residents was the appearance of the system in their flats closely followed by the fear of leaks. Cost was less of a concern but that was to be expected as only leaseholders would be asked for a financial contribution.

Although many residents did not support the instillation of a system in their flat they did support a system in the common ways.

In light of these results and recognising the Committees wish that residents support the scheme we have reviewed our proposal and intend to offer a hybrid instillation. This will be communicated to residents both by letter and at resident meetings to be held at each block.

- A full sprinkler instillation in the common parts and ancillary rooms such as bin stores laundry rooms etc.
- Each resident will be offered a full sprinkler instillation in their flat.
- Residents who do not wish to take up this offer will be asked to accept a single sprinkler head close to the flat entrance door. This is intended to protect the common escape routes and contain a fire within the flat of origin.

Once we have completed the consultation process with St James's House and Essex Place residents we propose to start engagement with residents at Theobald House, Nettleton Court and Dudeney Lodge.

The current scheme of co funding with East Sussex Fire and Rescue will not be extended past the installations at Essex Place and St James's House. The funding was provide to set up this pilot scheme and ESFR are keen to use their funding to influence other landlords and block owners to introduce schemes such as ours. They continue to support our aims for the instillation of sprinkler systems across our estate of High Rise residential accommodation and will continue to attend public meetings and consultations.

## Service Improvement Groups & City Wide Groups

### Update since last Area Housing Panel meetings

#### 1. Leaseholders Action Group

No meeting since the last Area Panels

#### 2. Home Service Improvement Group

Latest agreed minutes are attached.

#### 3. Business & Value for Money Service Improvement Group

August meeting; contributed to consultation on the future repairs contract, agreed draft of publication to encourage involvement and promote transport options, reviewed Welfare Reform Quarterly Report and document offering support to Universal Credit claimants and agreed guest speakers for CityWide Conference Breakout Group. Minutes to be agreed at November meeting.

#### 4. Tenancy & Neighbourhood Service Improvement Group

August meeting discussed; grounds maintenance, sensitive lettings, social isolation. Minutes to be agreed at November meeting.

#### 5. Involvement & Empowerment Service Improvement Group

Latest agreed minutes are attached.

#### 6. Tenant Disability Network

No meeting since the last Area Panels

#### 7. Seniors' Housing Action Group

#### 8. No meeting since the last Area Panels

<b>Meeting</b>	<b>Home Service Improvement Group</b>		
<b>Attendees</b>	<p><b>Residents:</b> Alison Gray (Chair &amp; West Area Panel Rep) Carl Boardman &amp; Jason Williams (Central Area (APR)) Terrence Hill (North APR), Dave Croydon (Leaseholders Action Group) Tomm Nyhuus (Seniors Housing Action Group) Lynn Bennett, Gary Jones, Muriel Briault, Emel Abdelmissih, Eddie Cope, Jane Thorp, Ian Beck (Recruited residents)</p> <p><b>Staff:</b> Glyn Huelin (Business &amp; Performance Manager) Hannah Barker (Resident Involvement Officer) Eddie Wilson (Mears General Manager) Sharon Davies (Business &amp; Performance Project Manager) Alex Fox (Home Energy Efficiency Project Manager)</p> <p><b>Observers:</b> David Spafford, Des Jones (residents)</p>		
<b>Apologies</b>	Chris El-Shabbah, Anne Glow, Mary Harding		
<b>Venue</b>	Conference Room	<b>Produced by</b>	Hannah Barker
<b>Date/ Time</b>	12 June 2018 11:00- 13:00	<b>Completed</b>	14.06.18

<b>1. Update on actions from previous Home meeting, DATE</b>
Corrections to attendance list.
<b>1.1 Re communal corridors policy on personal items:</b> The resident who raised the question has received a response from the Central Tenancy team, and it's been allocated to be reviewed. Other than that, if still unhappy, it needs to be raised elsewhere and not at the Home Group - which can only look at the work of the Property & Investment Team
<b>1.2 Re special sockets to prevent theft of electricity:</b> whenever a housing officer or tenancy team discover the issue in a property they raise the job to Mears straight away. There is no city wide programme for it as such so it would need to be dealt with case by case.
<b>5. Glyn remind Marcus to send Gary information about tenders on St Johns Mount. (ACTION 1)</b>
<b>Observation:</b> Windows replacement program circulated after last mtg only goes up to 2020.

<b>2. Subgroup report: Partnership Core Group, resident representatives</b>
<b>{ref Partnership Core Group report Covering meetings: 7 February and 17 April 2018}</b>
<p>First meeting of financial year, so some targets not met because waiting on invoices to come in. Some staff changeover, including Tamsin who supported reps. Janine Healey will be taking over support.</p> <p><b>Fencing discussed.</b> Current policy fencing = tenants responsibility. Housing will only replace where a shed is removed for health &amp; safety reasons which formed part of boundary. Very small budget (info via Housing customer Services) for use where risks to young children apparent. Estates Development Budget review potential suggestions that fencing would come out of EDB.</p>

### 3. Subgroup report: Resident Inspectors, resident representatives.

{ref Minutes 26.04.18, empty property inspection report 26.04.18 }

**Empty Property Inspections:** hoping more inspectors will assist to complete the group report sheet on visits. Mikila Beck at Mears has been added to the process of reporting.

#### Discussion:

- **Decoration assistance:** 2 types of help – (1) [Discretionary decorating Scheme](#) which tenants can apply for (2) support when tenants move into a new flat
- **Decoration Lettable Standard:** it will be left ready for decoration
- ...departing resident has responsibility to return property to this state
- **Carpets:** If a carpet left by an outgoing tenant is in a reasonable condition then Housing will leave it or remove if in a poor condition.
- **Kitchens:** tenants advised to get permission before installing a new kitchen
- **Decking in garden:** assessed for safety, has to comply with certain height from ground.
- **Laminate flooring:** assessed for suitability for noise disturbance and quality
- **A Housing Officer will advise** a departing resident on what they are responsible to put back or be recharged. If a tenant has died then the responsibility falls to the family/estate.

#### Leaseholders representation and involvement discussion:

- Differing views within Home individuals
- Some suggested discrimination had been occurring according to where any Leaseholder lives.

**City Council Housing's view:** Resident Involvement structure is to be accessible to all leaseholders and we would be seeking not to discriminate. There are 2 current questions that have been raised which we are working on to clarify for everyone.

1. There has been an issue raised about the Area Panels terms of reference which is old and perhaps now not fit for purpose. There is a Housing Committee report about Leaseholder engagement.
2. There have also been discussions about the work of the Resident Inspectors, which was not designed with any tenure in main, only stakeholders. Glyn has an action to discuss this with colleagues; clarification and guidance will be offered in due course to the Resident Inspectors.

### 4. Subgroup report: Estate Development Budget Panel, resident representatives.

#### Progress report:

- Concern about lack of communications with Community Payback
- EDB team working well since staff changeover and reporting working well
- Short term & long term changes/ review, new rules on number of bids groups can submit. Panel looking forward to start of EDB Review
- Structure of agenda of panel meeting altered to allow more time for Quick Bids
- 6 or 7 main bids outstanding from up to 4 years ago. Some concern these slip off the report, need to try to get them cleared.
- [EDB main bid work programme 2018-2019](#) progress Report is available on website.
- 2019-20 budget will be similar to this year £320K (after Mears overheads) 2020-21 we expect a significant drop over 50% to approx. £150K (which is why the EDB Review is very necessary)
- Suggestion EDB been used inappropriately to prop up actions that housing 'should' be

doing; need to refocus on beneficial community projects.

- EDB finance is ringfenced but not within area. E.g. if East Area does not allocate all its funding the underspend the following year is returned to the city pot and redistributed across all areas.(according to number of properties) this point, amongst others, will be discussed as part of the EDB Review.

**Q:** Why is maintenance of communal carpets or window cleaning not on a program? **Partial A:** typically we avoid installation of carpets because of ongoing costs. **(ACTION 4 – + possible future agenda item)**

## 5. Insulation and Energy Strategy - Alex Fox

{ref: *Briefing Note – Insulation and Energy Strategy*}

- The vast majority of our stock has wall and loft insulation installed in 1980's-90's

**Q:** Are Manor Farm walls done? **(ACTION 5.1)** (poor insulation experiences reported)

- Our next step is to check the stock Energy performance standards and plan for future measures, and it includes looking at what kind of windows & heating as well as insulation. There is historical data that can be accessed if residents wish for their own home.

**(ACTION 5.2 – AF to check data protection)**

- Suggestion that studying (not just *looking*) at the condition and thermal qualities of windows should be higher priority in the strategy. **(ACTION 5.3 – Alex to report back)**
- SHINE project is about behaviour change in the home. Scope is limited, EU funded. Residents asked how to resource advice/ get involved. **(ACTION 5.4 - on Agenda for next meeting)**
- Determining the “capital carbon costs”/footprint of proposed developments is difficult and expensive to do and we would need a business case to include considering that as part of this strategy.
- Currently Alex is the only employed staff member with appropriate skills to develop the Energy Plan, so capacity will be brought in as consultants. There will be a business case drawn up for that which will go to HLT for approval, and Housing Committee if needed.
- Sussex Tariff will be advertised as a cheaper energy deal for residents to switch to as the opportunity grows.
- Suggestion from resident that the strategy document is a bit 'light'. Alex said he had to weigh up getting this initial strategy through Housing Committee to set out a principle for Housing, this is all new and has been widely welcomed.

**Q:** Is Clarendon & Ellen Low rise being considered? (poor insulation experiences reported)

**(ACTION 5.5)** Glyn to check

**Info:** if residents experience extreme cold support/ help is provided.

**Q:** When will Hollingdean cavity wall and loft insulation be replaced and double glazed replaced rather than repaired?

**(ACTION 5.6: Alex to check insulation program)**

**ACTION 5.7: Glyn / P&I to check window replacement programme?)**

## 6. What Resident Engagement activities will there be around the procurement for



## Housing repairs, planned maintenance and capital works contract - Sharon Davies

{ref: Briefing note - Update on Options programme for future delivery of housing repairs and maintenance}

- March Housing committee first report went well and work is picking up a pace
- Glyn and Martin Reid (Head Property & Investment) attended the Leaseholders Action Group in April to get feedback to date.
- Drafting questionnaire for all tenants leaseholders stakeholders on what people feel about the currently delivery.
- This will be available online, in paper copies and be circulated and advertised through all channels as widely as possible, at Associations
- Face to face meetings and workshops in the late summer, run by independent will be organised through the different types of stock. Aim is for talking to 10% of stock residents. 20% of total stock is Leasehold.
- Updates will be shared on social media and Homing in too.
- No decision will be taken until after all this consultation, September/ October 2018 we should know how it will look going forward and after then begin formal procurement. There will be further opportunities to be engaged in this process too.

**Discussion about all types of tenure affected:** Such as Seaside Homes, non resident leaseholder who lets property to a social tenant and others. Perhaps helpful to consider the contractual relationship in effect.

**Suggestion** to use phrase 'stakeholders' to simplify all the different types of tenure people might reside in.

- Change of administration is an acknowledged risk that is being mitigated by engaging with Councillors at different committees; doing all we can to support Councillors
- Option to separate different types of work is being considered and we can tease this out at the workshops.

**Questions about Southern Gas Networks (SGN)** installation of ducting on outside of blocks after new cladding. Aesthetics criticized by residents and Property & investment alike. Gas pipes are nothing to do with the Housing Dept. Law allows SGN to instal without consulting owners of blocks. Their plans were unknown before cladding put on blocks. Some residents weren't consulted, others were (when SGN required access inside properties) **(ACTION 6 – Glyn to feedback/ pick up with Geof)**

**7. Resident Action Plan, call for items and anything from Area Panels? – officers and residents**

Request to **clarify purpose** of the Home Resident Action Plan: to record major items or questions residents raise to keep officers accountable, help to keep track and as a record if the issue is raised again.

**(ACTION 7 – update on Somerset point cladding item)**

## 8. Any Other Business

- Thank you to Alison for her strength & courage attending the first half of this meeting as chair despite the recent car accident injuries.
- Request for the chair to check at the end of each item " If the meeting feels this is something to come back to or if we are happy to close?"

Actions	Description	
1	Remind <b>Marcus</b> to send Gary information about tenders on St Johns Mount.	Glyn
4	Why is maintenance of communal carpets or window cleaning not on a program – <b>possible future agenda item</b>	Glyn
5.1	Are Manor Farm walls insulated done? (feedback to Lyn)	Alex
5.2	There is historical data that can be accessed if residents wish for their own home. - <b>check data protection</b>	Alex
5.3	Suggestion that looking at the condition and thermal qualities of windows should be higher priority in the strategy.– report back	Alex
5.4	SHINE project is about behavior change in the home. Scope is limited, EU funded. <b>(on Agenda for next meeting)</b>	Hannah/ Alison
5.5	Is Clarendon & Ellen Low rise being considered for roof / wall insulation	Alex
5.6	When will Hollingdean cavity wall and loft insulation be replaced, <b>check insulation program</b>	Alex
5.7	When will Hollingdean double glazing replaced rather than repaired? <b>check window replacement programme?</b>	Glyn
6	Feedback/ pick up with <b>Geof</b> re SGN installation s- does BHCC not have a say over how it looks? Do we have any control?	Glyn
7	update on Somerset point cladding item)	Glyn

**Future Meeting dates - Conference Room, Housing Centre - 11.00-13.30, 20<sup>th</sup> September, 5<sup>th</sup> December**

Meeting	<b>Involvement &amp; Empowerment Service Improvement Group</b>		
Attendees	Carl Boardman, Tony McCoy, Chris El Shabbah, Jason Williams, Jane Thorp, Diana Ward Davis, Terrence Hill, Trevor Jones (BHCC), Sharon Terry (BHCC) and Hilary Edgar (BHCC).		
Apologies	Anne Glow, Alison Gray, Muriel Briault, Satti Sivapragasam		
Meeting location	Training Room, Housing Centre	Produced by	Sharon Terry
Date	14/06/2018	Minutes completed on	19/06/2018
Time	11:30am to 1.30pm		

## Section 1 – Update on actions from previous meeting

Description	
1	TRA “Best Practise” Event postponed until the Autumn, pending publication date and RI Calendar of events for the Summer.
2	Minutes of last Meeting, 15 March 2018 were agreed.
3	RIO to support Diana Ward Davis to make travel claim.
4.	JT raised issue of representation for tenants living in Seaside Homes. JT to list key issues and send to Keely McDonald.

## Section 2 – Agenda items discussed, agreements and future actions

1.Budget			
Agreements/ Decisions	Update presented by TJ; Residents agreed to provide their own snacks at meetings.		
Actions 1.1	HE to explain to Diana how to claim for travel expenses and how to get taxi vouchers	By Who HE	Deadline asap

<b>2.Training</b>			
Agreement/2.1 Decisions	Group updated on plans for new learning opportunities, that include:  Representing your Community; Universal Credit; Using Social Media; Facebook; WhatsApp; Video Editing for Android Phones; How to stay safe online?; Better Communications; Planning an Event - all being offered by local trainers including Digital Brighton & Hove; The Resource Centre and Trust for Developing Communities		
2.2	Residents want to know how these opportunities are being publicised and asked that we do more to reach a wider audience and get the word out. Discussion was had around cost of postage; use of flyers; posters; Homing In; the Housing website, RI Facebook pages, Twitter.		
2.3	Residents asked if trainers would deliver learning at Senior Housing Schemes as many residents living in these schemes cannot get out and about. Diana said that Digital B&H are bringing social media training to Saunders House.		
Action(s) 2.4	Residents and RIT to consider other ways to get the word out that these learnings are available.	RIT	Ongoing
2.5	RIT to establish which learning opportunities would be of interest to Senior Housing tenants and then whether these learnings can be delivered at Schemes.	RIT	Ongoing
<b>3.Update on TRA Handbook</b>			
Agreement/3.1 Decisions	The handbook is being made ready for publishing electronically. Due to resource challenges within the Communications Team responsible for doing this piece of work, publishing the handbook has been delayed.		
Actions: 3.2	HE to confirm with TRAs when the handbook is available on line.	HE	Ongoing
<b>4.TRA “Best Practice” Event</b>			
Agreement/4.1	The group agreed to go ahead with the planning of this event for some time in the Autumn; to coincide with publishing of the handbook;		
Action: 4.2	RIT to keep residents informed	RIT	Ongoing
<b>5.Citywide Conference Update</b>			
5.1	The Citywide Conference is being held on 4 September from 130pm to 430pm at the Friends Meeting House in Ship Street;		
5.2	Citywide Conference Subgroup met to discuss the theme for the September event and agreed that the focus would be on Green Spaces, CityClean and Field Officers;		
5.3	Subgroup agreed format for the event and breakout group sessions x 3 with longer time for questions and answers		
5.4	Subgroup confirmed that Hawks Café are doing the catering.		
5.5	Subgroup agreed to include in the post-event evaluation something about alternative venues for the next event to gauge residents preferences e.g. Dorset Gardens Methodist church, Middle Street School.		
5.6	Agreed that elections for new Chair and Vice Chair would take place at the next Citywide Conference and to remember to include this on the agenda.		

5.7	Diana requested that she be sent a letter inviting her to these meetings. She does not always get her emails and her phone doesn't always work.		
Action: 5.8	Next meeting 19 July at 10am at Hereford Court	Subgroup	19/07
5.9	HE to invite a member of the CETS team to attend	HE	asap
5.10	Rebecca Mann to ensure Diana is invited to next meetings by letter.		
<b>6.SIG Terms of Reference</b>			
Agreement 6.1	Group feedback comments and suggestions for updating the Terms of Reference for Service Improvement Groups;		
6.2	There was not enough time in the meeting to consider the whole document. Residents agreed to include this on the agenda for the next meeting.		
6.3	The group agreed that all the other SIGs should be notified that this review is taking place and to share the proposed changes this group are considering with them for their feedback in time for the September meeting.		
Action: 6.4	To include on agenda for 13 September meeting;	RIT	13/09
6.5	To circulate to other SIGs for their feedback	HE	By 13/09
<b>7.Business Plan Update</b>			
Agreement 7.1	The group started to update their business plan and then ran out of time.		
7.2	The group requested that the initial amendments be made and the revised business plan brought to the next meeting in September for finalisation.		
Action: 7.3	HE to update Business Plan and bring to the next meeting	HE	Ongoing
7.4	HE to include I&E SIG Business Plan on next agenda	HE	June
<b>8. AOB</b>			
8.1	ST advised group of her 12 week secondment from 25 June to 17 September - and HE agreed to oversee the group until STs return	ST	Ongoing
8.2	Residents asked for SIG Elections to be added to the agenda for the September meeting	HE	Sept
8.3	Group to agree dates for the next 4 meetings	SIG	Sept
8.4	72 seconds silence was held in memory of the Grenfell disaster	All	
<b>8.Date and Time of Next Meetings</b>			
	Thursday, 13 September, 1130am to 130pm		

### Section 3 – Agenda for next meeting

1	Welcome and apologies
2	Minutes / update on actions from previous meeting
3	Resident Involvement Budget

<b>4</b>	Training Update
<b>5</b>	TRA Handbook and Best Practise Event
<b>6</b>	Citywide Conference Update
<b>7</b>	Terms of Reference Update
<b>8</b>	I&E SIG Business Plan
<b>9</b>	Elections
<b>10</b>	AOB