

## HOC Minutes July 2015

Action from March meeting with the feedback from the details of the work done on the Setchell estate and the other three outstanding actions from Tony Hunter were all completed.

Update of the website proposal. The working party have still not managed to meet. As soon as they have the first meeting they will be feeding back to HOC.

MO: The next proposal that was accepted by HOC was on the arrears and a compensation scheme which was previously mentioned on page four. There is no paper as yet.

DE: Investigations showed the main reasons why SGTO and the Tenants Council will not sit down around the table with us. I suggested that we look at that but there was also a unanimous no by the Home Owners Council.

It is pointless trying to compromise when there is only one person trying to compromise, so I was not going to do anymore work on that particular exercise until everyone decided to work together and compromise.

My position remains until everyone comes to an agreement, it makes no point me asking them to work with me instead of working with the Home Owners Council

BO'B: I am not sure I got your email, I would be in no way anti a compromise. I am not fully clear on what you are saying but I would be interested. It would look better on us as there are certain groups that affect us.

MO: David I appreciate you have probably sent an email and probably I may have missed the key point you are trying to raise here. The proposal on the table which I share with you SGTO, Tenant Council and Home Owners Council to agree on how they would work together.

The understanding I had was that members would see a paper, a proposal to see what the issues are, so if a meeting needs to be facilitated and for that meeting to have clear things we need to be looking at.

Subsequent to that we have been contacted by the resident engagement team on a different matter and everyone should be aware of the fact that you have been invited to a joint meeting of the Home Owner council and the Tenants council. I am not entirely sure if that is as a result of that as well.

It would be good for us, as this meeting is short, to have a paper to look at and then we vote on it and nominate someone to follow them up in terms of setting up meetings and what we are trying to achieve from those meetings that is just one part of it.

What you mentioned here is equality and voting rights for all residents, which I am sure all members of this council would be interested to know. For example something that is laid out quite clearly for us so we know the issues we are facing.

The Arrears and Compensation scheme.

DE: Well if you let me finish Chair. The piece of work is a lot larger than we first anticipated and it is in two parts.

I have six usable working models to presents and that has taken me a long time to investigate the six. I have had to pick extreme ones. There are a lot of allegations and little substance so this is on-going. Both the pieces are related and on going.

MO: Thank you. On the compensation scheme will we be seeing something later on?

DE: I will start again both pieces of work are extensive and taking a lot longer to get the proper evidence.

MO: Is there and estimated time?

DE: not really I will carry on.

MO: we could have it as a standing item on the agenda

LT: Chair rather than having it as a standing item and continually deferring it, may I suggest that once it is complete the report be presented to the chair and then it can go onto an agenda as an item.

DE: That's a good idea.

MO: Thank you that's noted. Last Item on page nine about councillors attending our meeting. That item has already been actioned. In fact councillor Livingstone was due to attend HOC tonight but due to a speaking engagement was not able to, so the item on the agenda for tonight will be deferred. However, I can confirm that he will be at the next meeting.

The councillors have been invited to the meeting except when they have council meetings or any other commitments. They will be here but for some reason tonight's events meant that they could not be here.

BO'B: What events were they?

MO:; The cabinet member for community safety was supposed to be here, but he texted me at the last minute to say he is actually at an event tonight and he might still come depending on the time the event finishes. Councillor Livingstone is definitely not coming even though he was down to come. I was confident that at least one of them would be here tonight.

I am doing a timetable to see who would actually confirm their attendance as long as they don't clash with the Council Assembly. Where they do clash we will make note of that and avoid it.

### **Putting Residents First Presented by Sean Backhurst**

JA: I have lived in my property for twenty five years and if this works I will be happy. . I represent the Street Properties and find your statistics interesting to say the least. The stats are pretty detailed. They seem to be based on some notion of an archetype that no one can give you a definition of and they seem to be based on something that evolves during the work in terms of mind boggling jargon. I would really love to have a process map so you can see how decisions are made, when they are made and who you can contact if there is a problem around a particular decision.

Trying to dig through all the documents and process it becomes impossible but if you can see how it is initiated, how it gets to the finance team, because the finance department do the best they can but when you try to go back up the chain you find somebody at some point decided to co-list them

with some kind of estate and so they share the cost amongst them rather than looking at the actual cost for each building.

That is wrong because many buildings do not have things done to them and the ones that do benefitted. One of my neighbours has been billed for work that has been done to my property I could go on but the thing is the process map, the authority the decision making points and responsible contractors

SB: There are a few things in terms of satisfaction rate, I completely understand your scepticism about the statistics I share the scepticism often. We did eight and half thousand major work projects last year and at the end of every project we surveyed residents. More than half responded last year which we thought was quite a high response rate.

JA: I sent mine back and did not get a response.

SB: Ok, well we can follow that up. I am sure we speak to more than half. We do not know how many are tenants or homeowners but more than likely satisfaction rates are higher from tenants than from leaseholders.

In terms of decision making points we make clear in the new standards, if you are not happy about anything that is happening on the estate the first point of contact is the resident liaison officer, If you do not get a satisfactory response from them it is the contract manager and if you're problem is still unresolved then I am pretty sure Ferenc would be happy to hear from you.

There is a process and if we can make that clearer and put it into a graphical format, that's a good suggestion, but what we want to make clear to you that we know not everyone is happy. It doesn't always go completely to plan and this is why we have this. We want you, if we are not meeting these standards, to come back to us and let us know.

One of the standards in here is before we finalise the specification for the works we will be asking the residents to be part of the project team and making sure that you are happy with the specification? And if not there is again a process to follow.

I am sorry you have had poor experiences in the past, but the reason we have these standards is because we want residents to be more happy and satisfied with the works.

Finally about arrogance and things like that with the contractors we heard about things like that, we want the residents to have the ability to set their own rules about behaviour. One of the reasons we gave residents the ability to set rules about behaviour etc. and we will act on it if we know about it.

LT: Chair may I make a point? One of the problems I think James has got is that he lives in a street property. We have something like seven thousand street properties, converted houses, scattered across the borough.

James' property has been put into one large programme of properties that's what he means about putting him into an estate. A lot of these standards are when you have compact projects and street properties are not compact. Therefore it is far more difficult to get a residents board and far more difficult to arrange meetings.

We are trying to set up a meeting for the street property working group as we have street property delegates here who wanted their own working group. We were also talking to tenants council to see if they were setting up their own group.

It would be worth having a separate meeting with them about specific issues with street properties.

We need to look at ways we can resolve those because there are a number of different issues affecting street properties, including consultation.

I know from James and other street property representatives that there have been other difficulties. This process does not necessarily work for street properties.

SB: I think it's a great point I completely take it on board what you have said. I think we can go ahead and have a discussion about that, I am not sure what can be agreed, but I can speak to the relevant people about this issue.

I appreciate that some of these standards work better for estates than other blocks. Anything in here whether you are part of a residents project team or not you are entitled to hold us to account. If we are not meeting these standards you can raise it with us.

LT: What I was saying is there are specific issues with street properties because of the different nature of them and I think it would be a good idea if we could manage to get this working party set up and in particular if we can get the tenants involved as well, because no doubt they have the same kind of issues.

It might be worthwhile you coming along and looking at doing an addendum that relates to street properties which is more specific to them.

I quite understand that street properties can hold the council to account and all the rest of this it works quite well for estates but not necessarily for street properties

SB:; That's a vey good point and by all means I would be happy to get involved in that.

FM: One of the things we will be doing in 2016/17 is packaging street properties area by area each year as well, so they will be much closer geographically. The actual residents involved in the schemes will be closer together so it may be easier to set up meetings and invite residents onto the project team.

MO: Thank you for the comment. I think a point of observation, point 12 of the promises of one size fits all, you could take it back and see we have looked at everything as a whole and special attention needs to be taken into account when looking at street properties.

SB: We could certainly look into that.

JL: Will you be enforcing these standards as pointed out before they have never been met before?

Also not sure if it different at Perronet house, we are having the warm safe dry and kitchen and bathrooms replacement. This is a huge major work, but the council has only ever engaged with the residents and never engaged with the tenants or anybody else and would not even attend the TRA and given they are on our doorstep.

SB: This came into place on the first of April

JL: This was in May

SB: Sorry to hear that. We did have standards before that these are an enhanced version of those standards. What I would say is the process here now if you do not feel they are being followed, we want to know if they are not being followed.

JL: What are they going to do differently to ensure the contractors do actually follow them?

FM: This message will be strongly be put forward to the contractors but the other thing is to include in our literature so that residents are aware this is our standard. And then you will be putting pressure on my staff to make sure they deliver it. Most residents do not recognise this is the standard.

We want to make clear putting residents first is a standard. With regards to TRA's the whole point of putting residents first is so we can meet all the residents on the estates.

TRA's can pull some of the residents in but we want to have it a much wider consultation process. So even if you are not involved in the TRA you can just turn up on major works issues. We are trying to reach out to a wider audience.

JL: What I was referring to with the TRA was the contractors in the building should come to a TRA to talk to everybody.

MO: Well that is something that needs to be taken away.

FM: Not sure why that happened the only reason that would usually happen is if no-one volunteered.. Sometimes we cannot get people to volunteer. I will have to check what happened.

JL: They were welcome to come several times, they said yes they would come and then at the last minute they were busy.

RB:; What does not appear on this list is how you are going to make residents know about what guarantees are in place for the major works for example if something happens to the roof the residents know its on their guarantee and they can look out for charges appearing on their service charge bills.

SB: What we are getting at in this document is people will know what team to contact for the different areas in the property.

And within terms of making sure you are aware of the standards and that we are following them one of the things as Ferenc was saying we will be writing to everyone about major works by the end of January for that year coming.

We want to be including the standards in that letter, they will be on the website, instruction booklets sent out by the contractors, resident's project board meetings.

I understand your point and maybe we could go back and work out more clearly about the standards.

RB: Yes the main point is how will residents know there is a guarantee on the roof for example, if I have just brought my property and five years down the line there is a problem with the roof which

was covered by major works five years ago how will a new comer know what is covered and what is not covered?

MO: I just wanted to add that was part of the SIG group that was part of the recommendation, but it should go in there as well.

BO'B: Is there a way to present by email.

SB: That's a good point I do not see why if you are part of the resident project team we could not correspond via email.

FM: That's not a problem at all.

LB: (observer) How can you ensure that everything you say is going to happen? And will everything be going in writing because a lot of contractors do not want to put anything in writing, but how can you ensure if you ask for it in writing that will happen?

SB;; That's a good point

FM: I have got to say I have never heard a complaint before about someone not getting a response back in writing because the vast majority of complaints we get are via email these days which requires an automatic response. What sort of answer do you want in writing?

LB: In terms of major works an example of myself where I had written a complaint, a freedom of information request, you take your matter to the tribunal and only to get told you have not got the information. So what I am saying is rather than having to go to the tribunal if you're going to set a standard it also has to be in writing the council or the contractor can't just come in and say this will happen on this particular date. You also need to put that in writing so that that person has some guarantee that if they are not happy to respond to that person in writing rather than oral.

SB: What we have said is you have the instruction booklet with why we are doing it? What we are doing? When we are doing it how much it is going to cost, what hours we expect to work? How we have viewed your suggestions. Then we are going to have monthly site meeting with the residents project team and we said that at the site meetings we will expect the contractors to produce an up to date timetable for the works and an updated summary of costs.

LB: Not everyone is going to be able to go to the meetings so rather than an oral it should be here in or in a follow up in writing.

FM: We could not promise to respond to every question you ask in writing neither could the contractor. If you ring up any member of my staff and you have a complaint or you have a complaint with the contractor and they say they will come round that won't be in writing. But if you put a request in and the Council say there is no information then the information does not exist.

LB: No but they should keep it for a particular length of time

FM: But they have not

LT: The information that has to be provided in a freedom of information request is that which is in writing. If you are requesting details of a telephone conversation then it is likely that there is no written record to provide.

LB;; I am not talking about that I am talking about to make sure things are sorted out in terms of the defects, you don't have to keep going on.

MO: I think in terms of putting residents first which is what we are discussing, what would be easier is to make note of the recommendation/comments people have made and if there are specific individual issues that can be taken outside of the meeting you may want to have a conversation outside of the meeting.

LT: Chair points 8 to 10, 8 points out that we will always consult you with a section 20 notice. That is a requirement of the law and point ten is also a statutory requirement. Can I recommend that they come out of the standards are put in an introductory paragraph as they are statutory requirements.

SB: Just want to make it clear we do write to everyone two weeks beforehand to ask if there are any outstanding works or defects issue is in writing. We do have the defects issue is in writing.

### **Examining Major Works Partnering Schemes - Ferenc Morath**

MO: The first recommendation is there anyone against knowing about major works beforehand?

FM: That's actually going to cabinet in October now.

LT: Chair, if I can say there was actually an executive decision that the council would write to leaseholders once a year to inform them where they were in the programme.

That fell away because there was no long term programme and then we had a two year programme and then a five year programme, but we haven't had a rolling five year programme. What I would suggest that you may want to recommend resurrecting that process.

MO: That's a recommendation for us to consider

LE: Does that mean we will know about major works five years in advance?

MO: If according to what Louise was saying if we resurrect the previous one the answer would be yes.

LT: What we used to do was write once a year to say where you appeared in the programme, but that's not guaranteeing that things will not move in the programme because you can't say in year five you're going to have this work carried out for certain. If the funding is available yours might be brought forward, if there is no funding the project maybe put back.

The intention was to inform you on an annual basis of where you were in the programme. .But it would only be basic information.

JA: One Of the things with that is if it is too specific and you're selling your property someone could use it in a way to start deducting the proposed work from the value.

LT: Until you get to the section 20 stage you won't get the specifics as that is when you really know the cost. The, best you can get at an earlier stage is a budget estimate.

MO: What we should recommend to replace the 2016/17 to a five rolling programme and members written to annually.

DM: That is more superior than 2016/17, particularly with the new legislation Mr Pickles has passed. I think consequent to these meetings Ferenc, it may assist in understanding that a five year programme would be capped at that five year level.

LT: I would not go down that route.

DM: Why would you not go down that route Louise?

LT: Because the mandatory reduction is not based on everything within the programme. It refers to the decent home backlog funding and is not a programme of work but a programme of funding. The last application round was 2015/16 and as far as we are aware that was the last government funding for the decent homes backlog, so there won't be any further applications.

DM: So there will be no more government funding to assist in major works ever after this?

LT: Not necessarily for ever after this. I am saying as far as we are aware, there are no plans to implement any further central government funding to assist local authorities in assisting major works.

DM: And you have supported the government in not providing any funding?

LT: We have not been asked whether or not we support further government funding.

DM: And you wouldn't ask for it?

LT: I don't know if we would.

DM: It's quite surprising that you would not ask from the central government.

FM: The government sets aside funding and ask if we want to bid for it

DM: Well usually you don't want to bid or you do want to bid?

LT: We have bid for funding on the current round.

DM: Oh excellent we both agree you will be bidding for this major funding?

FM: There is not any at the moment 15/16 is the last block of funding.

LT: The 13/16 spending round had an amount of funding from central government that we could bid for. We made a bid and we were awarded monies, but that does not mean that every single major works scheme is funded by that money.

DM: We leaseholders should make sure we are aware of any caps that are put in, we should pursue the council to make sure that any caps are applied. And if this assists others that we represent of being aware of caps should they be implemented.  
For future funding all the better

LT: If I may chair we do that automatically already.

DM: Excellent so you will be supporting the capping policy?

LT: I am just saying the mandatory caps are in place. At the moment the only thing they are in place for is the decent homes backlog funding. We have already brought a report to this forum to explain when and how the cap will be applied. It will only apply when the decent homes backlog funding is used to fund a scheme of major works.

Not all of the scheme of major works that we have on-going has decent homes backlog funding applied to them because the application was made for a specific purpose for non-decent tenanted properties.

Therefore it won't necessarily mean that someone with a service charge of more than £15,000 will have a cap applied.

If this funding is applied to a scheme and there are service charges of more than £15,000 and the leaseholders are resident then we will automatically apply the cap. But in a vast majority of cases the cap is not going to apply because the schemes will not be funded by the decent homes funding.

DM: Thank you for your response Louise. You have made a point that you are against the caps and I think the delegates can quite clearly understand your position.

LT: That is not what I have said. It has been incorrectly reported in the press and by a number of other people about what the cap is.

The Mandatory reductions in service charge apply in certain circumstances where certain government funding is being used. With most of the schemes of work we are not going to be using the decent homes backlog funding.

DM: I think all delegates here will urge all leaseholders to pursue caps whether they are available or unavailable they should be encouraged to explore if they are covered by them.

MO: The recommendation a where it has 16/17 to replace that by the five year rolling programme

FM: It start from 16/17 and is intended to be along term programme, in fact it could be up to seven years so it is intended to be a long term programme.

MO: If members are happy for that adjustment to take place I need people to show whether they accept the recommendation or not, can I see a show of hands please.

Seven years is on offer it's even better.

MO: Can I see a show of hands please?

DE: No sorry, you have to first say whether you accept this one or reject this one as it is written and then make the counter - proposal with the amendment

MO: Let me backtrack. The recommendation says from 16/17, Louise has previously pointed out this is already a process in place.

LT: Chair I think we are getting slightly confused here. What I am saying we are getting a new rolling programme which will be presented to Tenants Council and Homeowners Council for acceptance so you will be shown what we are proposing for each year.

In addition to that we can go back to the old Executive decision where we write to all leaseholders on an annual basis so it is not an either/or decision. You don't have to reject this recommendation.

Can I suggest that you ask for comments on any of the recommendations, as rather than voting on each individual recommendation you need to vote on the report as a whole.

MO: Are there any items that people want to reject as a recommendation?

JA: Chair I reiterate that I have serious misgivings about point A because of the potential impact it will have on someone selling their property. If there is a five year rolling plan then somewhere you should be accruing money during that five years to cover that scheme. It will cause a lot of difficulty for those who want to sell their properties and they have to go through a process where its part of the negotiations.

MO: May I suggest if people make an adjustment or comment as to what can happen in the place of what we already have.

JA: My suggestion chair would be we should have a high level plan that does not include details.

ZP: I would just like to raise a point if you are a resident leaseholder you have to budget, the more detail the better I think.

MO: Point taken but from the information so far details are not given when they are planning, details become more available when they know the finance available. The whole point of this is giving advance notice of work that is going to be carried out, because one of the things that people were complaining about was that the council would do work and all of a sudden they have a big bill they were not expecting. People want to be informed ahead of time

ZP: With as much detail as possible

LT: It would not be possible to get that level of detail at that time.

ZP: Well I am not setting level of detail I am saying we would not want details omitted just so people can sell their houses.

LT: It will be high level details like external decorations, roof renewals if the roof is coming to the end of its life. But that will not necessarily mean the roof will need renewal at that time because it will subject for further surveys.

I can understand what you are saying, but our recommendation to all leaseholders is it is well worth putting some money aside which would go towards major work when they are required.

MO: May I suggest that member's look at items E to item M The recommendation comes from the fact that complaints that whenever major works takes place there are already historic issues which are probably repairs issues then it comes to major works and it looks like you are paying again. If there is anyone against any of the recommendations it's easier to vote for or against. We can accept some and carry some forward for the next meeting.

FM: I am happy to come back in September if people need more time.

MO: I just need to know are there any items that people are against Items E to item M is provisionally accepted by this council.

DE: I think there is a little bit of confusion with Helen Hayes. What she intended, because it is not quite what was written, because it's about the content of the letter not the procedure. So I would actually say reserve rather than accept can I say a third one reserve?

MO: That's fine.

All items were agreed with a reserve by DE seconded by MO. Item M has already been done as the council can not do this.

Item A ,C,D,E we have not said anything on them, we could actually roll forward some of these till September but if members are happy to vote on item C and Item D

Members were happy with the recommendations

Judgement was reserved on A and D. I think officers can take that away and work together to come up wit the new ones for September

LT: These come for the SIG themselves I am not sure its right for officers to go away and change them.

MO: Let me re-word that Officers have given us their advice that we already had given their opinions/advice on recommendations that were already standing. I am trying to see if combining the recommendations and what we already have.

LT: That's for A. The recommended actions are from the SIG, and the follow up actions and comments are from officers saying what can and cannot be done.. So if you are going to change the recommendations then you need to put it back to SIG.

MO: Thank you. Ok the one we reserve judgement on lets put it back to the SIG.

### **Proposal to send deputation to Cabinet**

JA: Made the proposal

BO'B: seconded

HOC decided that the agreed deputation be presented to the cabinet meeting scheduled for July 21<sup>st</sup>.

LT: Back in November Chris Owen did a report on the energy procurement contract. This is now coming up for renewal, and we will be going out to tender for the procurement element of it.

We have written to the FTT and we have asked their permission to go for dispensation of section 20 or to confirm that section 20 is not required. They have given us permission to advertise this via the local newspaper to all leaseholders who have energy as part of their service charges, rather than writing to everyone individually.

All the documentation is available on the website.

DM: How can a leaseholder find out what price is being paid by the council to the consortium it goes through?

LT: This is part of the overall service charge. When you get your actuals you can get a breakdown of the fuel bills and if you want further details you can write in and we can make arrangements for you to come in and view that.

MO: What is the council asking HOC?

LT: It's just for information and any comments that I can take back.

MO: To give all members the opportunity to view the documents and be told when this is taking place, and if there are any members here who wish to appear at the hearing and make observation and the tribunal is willing to listen, it's an invitation. And can you give us update on the dispensation application when it is complete.

LT: We could ask Chris Owen to come and give you an update. Any dispensation application we are required to let all leaseholders know.

BO'B: Do you ever look at bench marking to see how LASER do it?

LT: Yes Chris Owen did the report last November that went through how the prices we get through LASER measure against the standard consumer price. LASER provides a significantly reduced cost because they buy in bulk for the public sector.

MO: Noted if this is possible can the link of the site be sent to all delegates please.

## **Report Backs**

HOIC feedback from RB

BO'B: Is there anything we can do?

RB: The best way someone can be engaged is if you are committed in the long term and come and contribute ideas to the meeting time and energy into getting this project off the ground.

HOIC working group member from HOC are MO,JA, BO'B. two more members were voted in JM and CMW to equal the five members of LAS2000.

MO: In terms of appointing the project manager what time scale are we looking at? I would like us to leave this meeting today with a direction of who is going to do it. Also a clear road map by September would be good.

RB: Graham Collins is producing a skeleton outline in conjunction with Deborah Hayman of CAS they have put forward to me suggestions of dates when we can meet with the HOIC working party and CAS to look at the outline flesh it out and look at the budget.

MO: Will that be circulated to members of the group.

RB: Yes I will be sending out an email to the members.

MO: I would like to make a proposal for HOC to consider that we appoint a homeowners friend from current partners that we work with to advise the HOC on implementation of the project and other matters. It is also proposed that the homeowners fund enter into an agreement with LAS 2000 to ensure that HOC interest is protected in the HOIC as well.

DE: Excuse me chair shouldn't you ask LASS first before you bring this to the meeting?

MO: This is for Home Owners Council to consider.

DE: I have got to make two things quite clear the Homeowners Council Working Group terms of reference are quite specific. You are now asking that there be additional governance?

MO: It is not an additional governance. It is an agreement between two parties entering into partnership.

MO: The proposal is that a friend gives advice to this council (HOC)

DE: But you mentioned LAS are you changing the subject?

MO: No it is to have expertise advice given to HOC

DE: You are talking about something else

MO: We have moved on. The proposal is for the Home owners council have a friend to advise HOC on all issues that we are responsible for, it was agreed last year but we never formally carried it out.

RB: I don't understand what is meant by a friend. Are you talking about a lawyer or housing expert or what?

MO: Yes something along those lines

RB: An external body.

MO: Correct . It was discussed last year and at this particular point I think the HOC need someone to advise us. I would like this council to consider that.

JA: Could we have written proposal so we can consider?

Also there is a bit of animosity between LAS2000 and HOC and I would like to set a stage where HOC is actually a customer or a client to LAS 2000 and we have that kind of relationship where the client has input to what the supplier provides but there is that clarity on the way people are working.

JA: Proposed

Seconded by MO

1 abstention proposal was carried by a majority.

Decision: HOC to appoint a Homeowner friend to advise it on current projects.

MO: An issue has come up on the FSB. Unfortunately, we have not got all parties involved her tonight I have to deal with this as I have received a formal complaint.

Under the code of conduct, I have correspondence from all parties but I am not sure if I can show it but it's all here.

LT: Chair I think you should be very careful about how you deal with personal information I do not think it should be available.

BO'B: At the AGM myself and Bill Mullins were nominated to the FSB, I did not get to the first meeting as the invitation went to my spam. I was away for the second one at very short notice, I sent my apologies. I turned up for the meeting last Tuesday when I introduced myself to the delegates. It's so restrictive I will allow the Chair to explain.

MO: I got a call from Brendan the morning of the meeting, he was asked to leave the meeting, I went to see and I was present when it happened. I spoke to the council officer they explained the delegates did not want Brendan to attend the meeting because he was non resident landlord. It was a little bit more than that judging from the content of the emails.

DE: Can I just advise you that there would be a direct conflict if you were actually involved you should give it to the vice chair or someone else.

MO: Can I finish? The reason I attended was because I had a call from one of my delegates who was also stopped from attending the meeting so I went to see what it was about. I spoke to the council officer and they confirmed that they stopped him from attending the meeting and while I was there the three delegates of homeowners council came out and confirmed that they all do not want him in the meeting.

I told them he was duly elected delegate representing the homeowners council, and that did not go far. To make things easy Brendan had to leave though I did say to the officer I would be making a formal complaint and I have asked for a full explanation. As far as I am concerned there has been a breach.

LT: Send the details to me as the Officer responsible for this meeting and I will check the constitution take advice and come back to you to take it forward.

BO'B: One of the charges was the FSB would not deal with absentee landlord. There are fifteen thousand leaseholders there's about six thousand leaseholders that are not represented by the view of FSB and I would like it brought to Cabinets attention that our views are not being represented by the FSB. It was pretty full on and shocking.

There was a proposal to change the terms of reference in July. There was a charge that I had been sent to say I had gone to the meeting to purposely disrupt it. It's bizarre. It would be purely for constructive contribution

MO: What I wanted the council to look at tonight on our constitution is how this affects what has happened.

LT: Chair may I make a recommendation you send the complaint onto me as the council officer responsible for HOC. I will compare the complaint to the constitution and seek advice if necessary and I will report back to this meeting on where you stand if necessary at the next meeting.

There is a separate issue here which I think Brendan has raised which is about the FSB its self and the make up of the FSB and what is going into the report and what is going to Cabinet. That is a slightly separate issue that you can discuss and you can vote on here as maybe something you want to raise with the council department in charge of the FSB.

As for as the make up of the FSB I think you can take that forward as a separate issue with the council officer and their manager to see what is happening there and how Homeowners Council comments are going to be included incorporated in that the reports.

MO: We need to understand if there has been a breach by the delegates and what recommended action needs to be taken.

DE: I just wanted to make sure I was not trying to degrade or deride you, I thought you were going to step in as the Chair. I did not realise there was two complaints.

BO'B: I just want to make it clear I actually called Michael as the chair. It was quite bizzare being asked by your own group to leave the meeting. Secondly, the complaint is not specifically about three members of HOC the complaint is about the whole exclusion of certain people. It is wider than HOC. It is about not being able to participate in FSB.

CMW: The point is he attended the meeting and he was being bullied they should write an apology.

MO: Ok the complaint has been taken on board, and we are going to hand this to the responsible officers. I know the next meeting is in September I would like an outcome before then.

I want to make it absolutely clear the delegates of the Home Owner Council abide by the code of conduct of the Home Owners Council. From what I have seen, as chair of this council I will not condone this behaviour.

I was present and I witnessed it and it is nothing that should be tolerated. They should not make people feel intimidated that they cannot participate in meetings, we should be open and clear on how we conduct the affairs of Home Owners Council and the constitution makes it very clear on what we need to do and I am expecting a quick response on this matter.

MO: A joint meeting for Home Owners Council and Tenants Council has been scheduled for the 20<sup>th</sup> where all of us are going to be in one room. I would suggest that people make an effort to attend. I was hoping to address the issue tonight.

LB: I also think you need to send the constitution to all those members who are not here because they can not be excluded from something they have been delegated to. They need to be totally aware of it or to get them to sign something.

MO: Ok thank you for that comment. I have just been notified, looking at the HOFMC delegates, that Christine Tan's name is missing from the fund management committee and could we have this brought to every meeting so they can be updated as an when.

LT: Chair we do not normally update it they are agreed at the AGM.

MO: Ok. We need to also need to look at the gaps we have. I know for the non resident landlords we do not have deputies.

LT: We will be doing an election for the freeholders this year, the area forums is another thing.

MO: Please we need to look to fill the empty posts.

### **AOB**

BO'B: I would like to propose that the HOC does not put its name to any recommendations from the FSB until the HOC delegates to the FSB report back the work that they have done.

MO: That's a proposal

BO'B: On behalf of non resident that we feel our view has not been represented.

MO: That can be noted. Any other things you want noted please send to my self. The joint meeting is on the 20<sup>th</sup> I would encourage everyone to read the report and make comments I am quite happy to take all the comments.

BO'B requested that a vote be cast on his proposal that the HOC reserve judgement on the work of FSB until it is fully communicated to the HOC.