

You are invited to attend

LB Southwark Resident Involvement Review Panel – Meeting 5 25th October 6pm

*Objective of meeting: To consider the funding of resident involvement in
LB Southwark*

AGENDA

1. Welcome, Introduction & Apologies
2. Summary note of last meeting and Decision Table
3. RIR Update
4. Ferenc Morath Submission
5. Chair Report Back on Meeting with TMOs
6. Tenant & Homeowner Funds
 - Background
 - Overview
 - Tenant Fund
 - Homeowner Fund
 - TRSIG
 - Kaizen Review
 - Other Grant Structures
7. Questions for Panel
8. Meeting 6

Chairs Briefing Meeting 5

Welcome to the Resident Involvement Review Panel's fifth meeting. Please note:

Apologies

Omalara Daniels Tenant

Please find attached the summary note of the last meeting (Paper 1) and Decision Table (Paper 2). Last meeting we set out what should be included in strategic engagement, how this could be supported and expectations around any strategic bodies that work alongside these approaches.

LB Southwark have also prepared an update for wider circulation about the work of the Panel to date (Paper 3).

I've also attached a short summary of points made by Ferenc Morath, LBS Investment Manager (Paper 4). I will be attending a meeting with TMOs on Monday and will reportback from that meeting.

Our main business tonight is around use and management of Tenant and Homeowner funds.

There are three main funds:

- Tenants Fund (£637,000), administered by the Tenants Fund Management Committee
- Homeowners Fund (£190,000) administered by the Homeowners Fund
- Tenants & Residents Social Improvements Grants (TRSIG) £184,000 administered through a Grants Panel

A background is attached at Paper 5 (including confirmation that this is part of the Housing Revenue Account and not a Levy), an overview is at Paper 6, a summary of the Tenant Fund is at Paper 7, a summary of the Homeowners Fund is at Paper 8, a summary of TRSIG is at Paper 9 and a summary of the challenges from Kaizen is at Paper 10. These include lack of awareness of these Funds, the need to emphasise communities and the need to focus on outcomes.

I'm grateful to Ina for sharing reports on CAB lessons learned and feedback from the February Homeowners Conference, as well as a budget breakdown which are all posted on the portal.

I've also included a table of other grant structures at Paper 11, not all of which are directly applicable, but do give an overview of how others conduct grant making. The four Housing Associations focus on communities have a clear emphasis on objectives, process including due diligence and wide eligibility. They are also extremely easy to find and encourage applications.

I struggled to find similar approaches in Local Authority housing. The two I have found have in place a Tenants Levy, which is not the case here. There is a strong emphasis on TRAs, whilst allowing estates to apply for funding even if there is no TRA. It is worth noting the emphasis on objectives, and ensuring previous bids have been completed, by Hackney and on outcomes from Lewisham. It's fair to say that these are exceptional and rarely replicated elsewhere.

Questions for the Panel to consider:

Principles

- What are your expectations for these funds going forward?

Objectives

- What should they be used for?

Eligibility

- Who should be able to bid for funding?

Communication

- How should these funds be advertised?

Decisions

- How should applications be decided and by whom?

Impact

- How should impact of the funding be captured?

Our next meeting is next week on Thursday. I'd like Panel members to think about one example to share about how they have engaged digitally. Mark Compton-James, Head of IT and Digital Services, will cover the following:

- What LBS does now in terms of relevant IT
- What the council's aim/vision, plans (and challenges) are going forward
- What can be possible in terms of resident involvement
- Caveats about what we will need to do/address to be able to deliver the IT support for the new resident involvement system.

He will be joined by Darryl Durno, Digital Change and Innovation Manager.

Our final meeting will be on Thursday week when we will consider the draft report.

Meeting Four:

Attendance

- Mark Morris (Home Owner)
- Frank Gyan (Tenant)
- Xolani Annakie (Tenant)
- Adebayo Daniels (Tenant)
- Liz Errington (attending on behalf of Ina Negotia, Home Owners Council)
- Sharron Smith (Officer)
- John McCormack (Officer)
- Stephen Douglass (Officer)
- Phil Morgan (Chair)

Apologies

Hilary Dawson MYSHOB
Omalara Daniels (Tenant)
Teresa Fritz (Home Owner)
Hayley Zoil (Tenant)

The Panel agreed the summary note of the last meeting and Decision Table. Phil Morgan had prepared an updated chairs briefing note for the meeting. The Panel noted the impact of the replacement of the Area Housing Forums on the structures of the Homeowners Council and Tenant Council if the second is adopted by the Council. Phil Morgan welcomed the intention shown by the Homeowners Council in considering holding elections in the future.

The Panel considered the current structure for strategic engagement and the challenges arising from the Kaizen Review about the failure of the Council to use the current structure effectively on strategic issues, its poor communication with and low satisfaction from tenants and Homeowners. The Panel also noted the challenge around the diversity, accessibility and effectiveness of that structure. The Panel received a submission from the body representing Tenant Management Organisations in Southwark.

The Panel noted that there was a Future Steering Board, made up of members of the Tenants Council, HomeOwners Council and two co-optees. This considers Asset Management, new build and investment plan. It receives reports, briefing notes and made a response to the Hackitt Review on fire safety. The Panel noted that there are also service standards in place around consultation for Homeowners.

The Panel received a short summary of current regulatory requirements on all social landlords and a table showing what other social landlords did on strategic engagement of tenants and homeowners. The Council currently do engage with residents on some policy making, but would want to do more. There has been a scrutiny type exercise on fire safety with residents last year and discussions with the Tenants Council and Homeowners Council in setting service standards for repairs. It would welcome wider consultation with residents and has done so with the Southwark Conversation and there are a significant number of meetings currently taking place within the current structure.

The Panel considered the following topics for engagement:

- The need to cover Value for Money

- The importance of Major Works Planning to Leaseholders, where project groups could be set up with local residents. The Council would welcome earlier engagement.
- The need for robust consultation approaches
- The currently low level of satisfaction with housing services, including in comparison with similar landlords and the importance of service standards
- The frustration shown at the Homeowners Conference about communication
- The need to ensure regulatory compliance and resident scrutiny
- The need to engage residents with producing effective and easily understood policies.

The Panel also discussed the issues with all of this being considered by one or two strategic groups alone. Instead Phil Morgan raised the idea of a “Ring of Involvement” with a range of mechanisms for involvement supporting and informing a strategic structure.

The Panel considered a menu of involvement¹ including:

- Codesign processes
- Fixed Groups
- Task and Finish groups² (which might cover the consultation process and Major Works planning)
- Conferences
- Digital involvement including use of MySouthwark Account, emails and social media (to be discussed in meeting 6)
- Resident inspectors
- Reading Groups
- Surveys

The Panel then considered how a strategic structure might work.

Phil Morgan had met with the Homeowners Council (including attending their Conference and last meeting) and held phone conversations with the Chair and nominated Panel representative from the MySouthwark Homeowners Board. He had also held a phone conversation with the lead for the MySouthwark Agency.

His view was that the MySouthwark Homeowners Agency was created to provide a focus on improving services to Homeowners following some particularly poor satisfaction results. The MySouthwark Homeowners Board was created to provide homeowners input into the work of the Agency. At that time the Homeowners Council was not well placed to play the role envisaged and the Board was created. The subsequent uplift in the governance in the Homeowners Council means that if the Agency was being set up today then it is debatable that the Board would be created. Thus we have a situation which is untenable to all involved who all agree that this needs resolving.

The Panel heard how the Homeowners Council was constituted of volunteers, had produced a strategy and held open meetings. There had been an uplift in how it operated and this was supported by the Council. There was an acknowledgement that the current structure had too many steps to gain election to the Homeowners Council which they were seeking to address.

¹ Proposed Value: *That the Council should develop a range of ways for residents to be involved.*

² A Task and Finish group is a group set up as a sub group of larger project group that specifically looks at one item that needs to be delivered... the 'Task'. Once that area of work has been completed, the group disbands... the 'Finish'... and the work is then assimilated back into the larger project group.

The Panel also heard concerns that the MySouthwark Homeowners Board was appointed, was not seen as independent, held closed meetings, had a high turnover and were also concerned about their remit and overlap with the Homeowners Council.

The Panel felt that there should only be one strategic body for Homeowners, but within the wider involvement approach proposed and set out expectations for how it should operate:

- That it should be accountable
- It should be clear who was a member of the body
- That it should represent homeowner views and concerns
- It would receive input from homeowners
- That there should be a code of conduct
- Members should seek out views of peers
- Members should be elected
- To ensure robust governance there should be an annual review

The Panel was aware of the role of LAS2000 as a group independent of the Council and welcomed that role continuing.

Phil Morgan explained that with the boycott by the Tenants Council of the Panel made it harder to engage about how a strategic body for tenants might work. The Panel felt the same principles for a Homeowners strategic body should apply to a tenants strategic group, again working within the wider involvement approach proposed.

It also discussed time limits for membership, which was common in other voluntary groups and would ensure that new people had the opportunity to be involved.

The Panel viewed these expectations as reasonable for the Council to apply to any groups fulfilling a strategic role and to discuss them with the existing bodies as part of the consultation following the Panel's report.

For our next meeting the Panel will consider use and management of all Tenant and Homeowner funds. The Council will provide a background note and terms of references for the two Fund Management Committees. The Panel requested the most recent annual reports, approved budgets and details of SGTO and CAB.

For the sixth meeting the Panel will consider digital involvement. The Head of IT has been invited to attend and explain how the Council can support this both corporately and specifically for resident involvement. TRAs will be invited to share their experiences as well. The Panel are invited to prepare for this meeting by sharing an experience at the meeting of where they have used IT effectively.

Additional Note: The Council will also report on the current digital hubs project. The Panel will also consider a report from the Council about residents in temporary accommodation, supported housing, out of borough and travellers.

Meeting Four Decision Table

Decision:
<p>1. That the Council commit itself to engaging on the following strategic areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Value for Money b. Major Works Planning c. Consultation approaches d. Communication e. Performance (including satisfaction) f. Resident scrutiny g. Creating new and renewal of housing policies. h. Regulatory compliance
<p>2. That the Council set up a menu of involvement to cover the above strategic areas including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Codesign processes b. Fixed Groups c. Task and Finish groups (which might cover the consultation process and Major Works planning) d. Conferences e. Digital involvement including use of MySouthwark Account, emails and social media (to be discussed in meeting 6) f. Resident inspectors g. Reading Groups h. Surveys i. Discussion Groups
<p>3. That the above be considered as a 'ring of involvement' supporting and informing strategic discussions between tenants, and homeowners, with the Council.</p>
<p>4. That the Council set out reasonable expectations for any strategic group. These should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. That it should be accountable b. It should be clear who was a member of the body c. That it should represent homeowner/tenant views and concerns d. It would receive input from homeowners/tenant e. That there should be a code of conduct f. Members should seek out views of peers g. Members should be elected h. To ensure robust governance there should be an annual review i. That time limits be set on membership
<p>5. The Panel viewed these expectations as reasonable for the Council to apply to any groups fulfilling a strategic role and to discuss them with the existing bodies as part of the consultation following the Panel's report.</p>
<p>6. That there not be more than one strategic body for homeowners</p>

The Resident Involvement Review: October Update

The council is undertaking a full review of its Resident Involvement structures i.e. how it engages with and supports Southwark's tenants and homeowners to scrutinise housing services, build local communities and have their say. Looking at how things can be done differently has raised some concerns about whether any changes will be for the better or for the worse, and there has also been some misinformation circulating about the Review. This note provides an update on the progress of the Review, sets out the ideas being discussed by the Co-Design Panel and explains how the council will work with residents and their representatives on possible changes in the months ahead.

Why review?

With the exception of special bodies for the growing number of homeowners living in LBS properties, the resident involvement structure of Tenants and Residents Associations (TRAs), Area Housing Forums (AHFs) and Tenants Council has changed little over the last 30 years. Yet, in that time, housing services have been centralised (no more neighbourhood offices) and great changes have taken place in society and in technology for connecting people and communicating information.

While our TRAs do a good job of bringing people together to improve the places they live in, many thousands of tenants and homeowners are excluded from the current structure as there is no functioning TRA where they live. There are a lot of evening meetings and many TRAs tell us how difficult it can be to get new residents involved. There is low awareness of what Area Housing Forums and Tenants and Homeowner councils do and very few people have even heard of the Tenants Fund.

In addition to enabling all residents to have their say, the council itself needs effective resident involvement. The Grenfell Tower disaster underlined how vital it is for Southwark, as the largest council landlord in London, to provide the right ways by which residents can raise their concerns about the housing service and have these addressed. The council also has to prove to the Social Housing Regulator that it allows residents to comment meaningfully on its performance. For all these reasons, the council is working with residents to develop the best system that allows the widest range of our residents to get involved and have their say.

What is the Review?

The Resident Involvement Review began back in 2017 when the council's Housing and Communities Scrutiny Sub Committee commissioned an independent study of the housing engagement structure. This was carried out by Kaizen Social Engine and included surveys, interviews and focus groups involving more than 1000 residents. On completion of the research, in February 2018, the Housing and Communities Scrutiny Sub Committee asked council staff to prepare proposals for the Cabinet on how residents would be involved in this important work. Following the local elections in May, the Cabinet agreed the establishment of a Co-design Panel to take forward a manifesto commitment to 'Work with tenants, residents and homeowner groups to find new ways to engage so that more people can have their say'.

The Co-design Panel was set up in August this year. The Panel is chaired by an independent expert and composed of 3 council officers, a nominee each from Tenants Council, Homeowners Council, the MySouthwark Homeowners Board and Youth Council. In addition, there are 7 non-affiliated tenants and homeowners who were selected following an application process. TRA Chairs and Secretaries and Area Housing Forum delegates were invited to apply, as well as over 5000 tenants and homeowners contacted through MySouthwark. The Panel members were chosen based on their applications, availability and representativeness in terms of age, gender, ethnicity and where they live in the borough. As such, the Panel combines both experience and fresh eyes so that it can make recommendations that work for all residents. The 90 applicants who were not selected are taking part in the process as a Sounding Board, reviewing and commenting on the Panel's discussions and draft recommendations.

The Panel operates in an open and inclusive way. It considers evidence papers, which are published on the Review's webpage, as well as verbal evidence from those who want to contribute to its work. All TRAs and AHFs have been invited to provide information about their experiences of resident involvement. The minutes of each Panel meeting are published online and the Review's webpage has a Contact Us button to

allow any resident to send in their thoughts.

What has the Co-design Panel been looking at?

The Co-design Panel will hold seven meetings. The first of these agreed its operating methods and agenda, and considered the research about how the resident involvement structure works. The second meeting discussed the purpose of resident involvement and the values that should underpin its structure. The Panel agreed the aim of Southwark's resident involvement:

To create empowered communities and treat residents with respect and as customers and that the values guiding its structures and processes should include:

- A range of different ways for residents to be involved
- That the council should be transparent, honest and show integrity when working with residents, empower residents and put people first
- Accountability for all in positions of responsibility
- Reflecting the diversity of the resident population, reaching out to all residents
- That the council should ensure value for money, communicate successfully and collaborate with residents to find positive solutions
- That the impact of involvement should be measured and reported openly

At its third meeting, the Co-design Panel looked at TRAs and Area Housing Forums. It acknowledged the great work TRAs can do and recommended that the model TRA constitution be made easier to use. It thought that while TRAs are very valuable and important, there should also be a wider base especially in areas where TRAs don't exist. The Panel has proposed that the council organise an annual meeting in areas with no TRA so that those residents can also have their say about how their homes are managed and maintained.

The Panel felt that the Area Housing Forums were based around areas for housing management that no longer exist and should be replaced by a smaller number of housing networks aligned with actual housing management areas. These Forums would be open to all council tenants and homeowners in their respective area. They should have a clearly defined role and agenda, allow for local level resident scrutiny of the housing service, community networking and information sharing, as well as provide a mechanism by which residents can escalate systemic concerns.

The fourth meeting considered resident involvement at the borough-wide level. The Panel identified a number of areas for strategic resident involvement: Value for Money, Major Works planning, Consultation, Communication, Performance (including Satisfaction), Resident scrutiny Regulatory compliance and Revising and creating new housing policies. Furthermore, these matters should be addressed through a wider range of ways to be involved including: Co-design processes, Task and Finish groups, Conference planning, Digital involvement, Resident inspectors, Surveys and Consultation.

The Panel considered that, alongside the above approaches, there could be a strategic body for tenants and one for homeowners, while ensuring that there is: accountability, elections, clarity of membership, time

limits on membership, an effective code of conduct, robust governance, annual reviews and that tenants and homeowners views are included in discussion and decision making.

Next Steps

The next two Panel meetings will look at the best use of the money allocated to support resident involvement. The Panel will no longer consider the use and management of TRA halls. Instead it will hold a session dedicated to looking at how modern technology can be used to better connect residents with both the council and with resident organisations. All tenants and homeowners and their representatives are welcome to contribute their thoughts to these discussions.

The Panel will produce its final report in mid November. This will be published online and sent to all TRAs, AHFs, Tenants Council, Homeowner Council, the MySouthwark Homeowners Board and SGTO for comment. The feedback will inform a report scheduled to be considered by the Cabinet in February 2019.

Following the Cabinet's decision, the council will consult with residents and resident organisations across the borough about the best way to implement the recommendations so that there can be as wide as possible, informed discussion of options before any final decisions are made.

<https://www.southwark.gov.uk/housing/housing-community-involvement/resident-involvement-review-co-design-project>

Feedback from Ferenc Morath, Investment Manager

- The whole current structure of TRA's and then Neighbourhood Forums and Tenants Council and HOC is very outdated and doesn't work. It has led to a structure of a few residents having to do all the work and the whole structure inhibits wider involvement.
- The consultation structure needs both trimming and being more flexible.
- For major works projects, a Resident Project Team is set up for each project and residents attend as they want to, with no need to attend any other meetings. Residents are interested where they feel it affects them directly and they have a say. This allows a wider representation than just TRA's and we would hope and expect TRA reps on the RPT to report back to the TRA.
- More use of on line surveys would encourage more young residents in particular. Most people don't want to attend a monthly meeting in an old hall or room, they just want to put their views forward.
- A large group of volunteer residents could be used, say 500-1000 for on line surveys which matched the make up of our residents in terms of gender, race, age etc. This would enable very quick and representative views to be obtained on a range of issues. For the minority of residents who don't use computers, training could be arranged (as every library has free computers) or they could choose to do by post.
- Three forums would be plenty for discussion issues, matching existing resident services structures.

Tenant and Leaseholder (Home Owner) Funds – background and legal basis

Establishment

Housing Committee considered a report on 31 January 1990 entitled “***Funding Tenants Associations***”. The report drew on the findings of a working party previously established to consider this area

The report recommended that an element of rent equivalent to eleven pence per week be earmarked from tenant rents from the rent year 1990-91 onward. For that rent year, the top-sliced amount was estimated to generate £286,000.

At the time, Southwark had few leaseholders and the above figure was based on the total stock of 55,000 dwellings.

A variety of possible applications of this earmarked amount were considered and there was a further ‘operational’ report on 5 September 1990 which considered the most likely allocation as:

£90,000 – Southwark Group of Tenant Organisations (SGTO)
£15,000 – LBS administrative support
£20,000 – tenants resource centre
balance to Tenant and Resident Associations

The 5 April 1990 HRA budget allocations included a slightly reduced sum of £260,000 (equivalent to ten pence per week, as opposed to eleven) specifically as a “*Tenant’s Levy*”. The appendices to that report both give a figure of £262,000, rather than the £260,000, quoted in the main text. This report also contains the following ‘Housing Policy Decision’:

(13.) A levy of £0.10 per week be agreed for all tenants to fund tenants movement.

However the minutes of this meeting (item 141) record that £200,000 of this was reallocated to supporting the pest control budget.

That decision was rescinded at the Housing Committee’s 5 September meeting, and remitted to full Council for confirmation (on 31 October 1990). The final funding allocation was as set out above.

In reply to a question from Cllr Toby Eckersley, the Director of Legal Services advised that the tenants levy is part of the mainstream rent and the Council is making decisions to allocate part of its expenditure which happens to come to the equivalent of a notional 10p element of rent as set out in the report which is entirely lawful’.

Operational Arrangements

The September report, entitled “***Funding Tenants Associations – Operational Arrangements***” reversed the April committee decision regarding pest control and established the mechanisms by which the Fund would be managed and how monies would be distributed to Tenant and Resident Associations. A management committee was established comprising three council members, six tenants and one representative of SGTO. Officers were instructed to recruit an administrative officer (the £15,000 noted above) to support the Tenant Community Officer in the day-to-day management of the Fund.

Currently, there is not any council member involvement in the management committee, which is chaired by the vice-chair of Tenant Council (who was also the author of the original committee reports in 1990). The management committee describes itself as “***a maximum of 12 tenants nominated by Tenant Council***”. It is unclear when this change in governance took place.

In order to assist with financial planning, both funds are now allowed to hold small earmarked reserves within the HRA’s overall reserve position. At 31 March 2018, these stood at £105,139 for the Tenant Fund

and £402,273 for the Home Owner Fund; they form part of the “Financial Risk” category of HRA reserves within the council’s Statement of Accounts.

Home Owner Fund

In September 2004, the then Divisional Leasehold Manager presented a report to Leaseholder Council recommending that an equivalent process relating to earmarking service charge income be established in order to reflect the significant expansion in leaseholder numbers at Southwark. The sum concerned would equate to £10.00 for every service charge payer, and that the expanded Tenant Fund be renamed the ‘Resident Fund’.

Disagreements between leaseholders and tenants over the management of the proposed Resident Fund, particularly allocation of voting rights between the two groups resulted in the proposal being rejected. Instead, Leaseholder Council resolved in August 2007 that it wanted a separate Leaseholder Fund controlled by its own management committee to run in parallel to the Tenant Fund, and that it would contribute an “*equitable proportion*” of each grant paid by the Tenant Fund to TRAs, which reflected support for home owners/home ownership activities.

Whilst budgets for the new fund were established in 2007-08, further disputes between Leaseholder Council and Tenant Council over the amount of contributions to be paid delayed the finalisation of any formal agreement on the management of the new fund. This was settled in 2010, and the contribution from (the now renamed) Home Owner Fund to Tenant Fund reflecting the work of TRAs across the residential base continues to this day (see ‘Current Position’ below).

Legal Basis

The funds have no automatic right to exist as ring-fenced elements within the HRA. The Tenant Fund’s establishment as an earmarking of pre-existing rental income was originally justified under s.24 of the Housing Act 1985 as [part of] a reasonable charge to tenants:

24. Rents.

- (1) A local housing authority may make such reasonable charges as they may determine for the tenancy or occupation of their houses.

s.8 of the same Act was also cited at the time. However, the current general provision of resident services to LB Southwark tenants would also meet these criteria with or without the existence of the earmarked funds.

8. Periodical review of housing needs.

- (1) Every local housing authority shall consider housing conditions in their district and the needs of the district with respect to the provision of further housing accommodation.

It is reasonable to assume that this is why the fund contributions should not normally be described as a “levy” (notwithstanding the April 1990 committee report) since this would imply an additional contribution over and above the rent required for a given property within the council’s dwelling stock.

If the council was minded to abolish the Fund, then rents or service charges themselves would remain unaltered, since each fund is an allocation (or ‘top-slice’) of income, not an additional levy.

Budget Decision Call-in 2014

The then Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Housing Management’s IDM agreeing the Tenant Fund budget for 2014-15 was called-in to the council’s Overview and Scrutiny committee, due to disagreements over the status of SGTO as a grant recipient. After due consideration on 6 May 2014 OSC reaffirmed the decision to agree the proposed budget.

In their defence of the current arrangements during the 2014 call-in procedure (see below), Tenant Council representatives were keen to stress the unique nature of Southwark's funding mechanism and praised the independence that this granted residents.

The council's statutory requirements (and policy objectives) regarding resident consultation are covered through a variety of means, including the establishment and operation of the two autonomous funds.

Current Position

The amounts set-aside for the funds have been inflated in line with the annual rent increase and adjusted in line with changes to the stock profile: 2018-19 budgets on SAP for the two funds are set out in the table below:

			2018-19 Budget
GG704	60101	Salaries and Wages	£96,918
GG704	60201	Employer's National Insurance	£9,887
GG704	60202	Employer's Superannuation	£14,053
GG704	60603	Training Expenses	£5,000
GG704	64402	Cab Fares	£500
GG704	66103	Operating Lease/Hire Charges	£7,000
GG704	66202	Refreshments for Meetings Marketing and Publicity	£1,200
GG704	66405	Services	£10,000
GG704	66521	Telephones – Land Lines	£500
GG704	66602	Stationery	£5,000
GG704	66701	Grants	£187,240
GG704	68202	External Agencies and Bodies	£232,195
GG704	99100	General Recharges	(£53,717)
GG704		Tenant Fund	£515,776
GG587	68202	External Agencies and Bodies	£152,440
GG587		Home Owner Fund*	£152,440

**Home Owner Fund Management Committee papers give a more detailed breakdown of this budget over broadly similar headings as the Tenant Fund above, however, this is not led into SAP, though actual spend is recorded over specific categories.*

For comparison, the top-slice of tenant rent is now 27p per week, against a stock number of 37,424. The contribution between funds now stands at £45,000 from the Home Owner Fund to the Tenant Fund, and represents 27% of all grant payments made by the Tenant Fund to TRAs.

An annual report on each fund is provided to the cabinet member with responsibility for housing management (currently Councillor Stephanie Cryan) by the Housing SMT member with management responsibility for the successor post to that of Tenant Community Officer identified in the original committee report. Currently, this lies within the Communities Division of Housing and Modernisation. The cabinet member is requested to approve the two annual fund budgets via the Individual Decision by a Member (IDM) process. This ensures that the relevant reports are published to agreed timescales on the Council's website.

Overview

The Council pays for the current involvement structure by setting aside a portion of the rent collected by tenants (£13.78/year) and Home Owners (£10/year). These in turn provide income for the [Tenants Fund](#) and [Home Owners Fund](#). The Tenant and Homeowner Fund have working groups (Tenant Fund Management Committee and Homeowner Fund Management Committee) that make recommendations on how the funds are allocated. There is also a [Home Owners Council Strategy](#).

The [Tenants Fund budget](#) for this year is £637,000 and was approved by the Lead Member for Housing. It includes a contribution from the Homeowners Fund to cover 27% of grants paid to TRAs. It covers three main areas of expenditure:

- Southwark Group of Tenants Organisations £232,000
- Grants to TRAs £178K
- Two dedicated training officers and one tenant grants officer in the Council's Tenant and Homeowner Involvement Team Officer

In addition there are other grants covering:

- TRA community based events £30,000
- Digital Inclusion programme £47,000
- Externally commissioned training £30,000
- Livesey Exchange community resource £50,000
- Safe as House research into Universal Credit £20,000
- Youth Council £10,000

[Southwark Group of Tenant Organisations \(SGTO\)](#) "is an independent voluntary organisation representing and promoting the rights of tenants and residents groups within the London Borough of Southwark. We are a non-political organisation and do not align to any political viewpoint, our aim is to promote the interest of Tenants and Residents Associations in Southwark, by working with all stakeholders to achieve common goals". SGTO employ 5 staff and have a Board. They are boycotting the Review.

SGTO outputs include the following:

- Support and advice to 65 TRAs
- Account verification service to 45 TRAs
- Building engagement with young people
- Computer courses for 147 people
- Job search for 539 people
- Home search for 601 people

There are [set KPIs and outcomes](#) for SGTO. These are weak and unspecific (which doesn't mean to say that SGTO don't do a good job – just that there are no measures in place assessing their worth).

There are currently 158 recognised TRAs, with 20 of these in sheltered schemes and 17 in Tenant Management Organisations. Grants are issued to 78 TRAs (although TRAs also have income from tenant halls) with £1,300 for up to 240 residents and an extra £5.50/resident. There are six other grants that TRAs can apply for including the Tenants and Residents Social Improvement Grants (TRSIG).

The Home Owners Fund for this year is £152,440 with a further contribution from reserves (which are £402,273) making a total of £189,900. The Home Owners fund supports the following:

- [Citizens Advice Bureau](#) who provides a [dedicated leaseholder advice](#) specialist. (Lessons Learnt has been downloaded onto the portal)
- Conference(s) (a report from the one earlier this year has been downloaded on the portal)
- Payment to the Tenants Fund
- Website and communications

Both the Fund Management Committees have set Terms of Reference. Attached is a background note, providing more background and context.

There is also the Tenants & Residents Social Improvements Grants (TRSIG) budget of £184K this year. This is administered through a Grants Panel of 6 people elected by Area Housing Forums³. Officers apply agreed criteria and ensure no duplication. There are set activities around children, tackling isolation, supporting skills for volunteering and employment and reducing crime and ASB. TRAs and TMOs are eligible and can bid for up to £10K subject to having current safeguarding procedures and DBS checks in place. 31 applications were successful and the attached report at Paper 9 shows outputs in terms of numbers involved (but no outcomes).

³ This would have to change if the proposal to replace with five Neighbourhood Forums was adopted

Item No. 6	Classification: Open	Date: 19 February 2018	Meeting Name: Tenant Council
Report title:		Tenant Fund Budget 2018/19	
Ward(s) or groups affected:		All	
Cabinet Member:		Councillor Stephanie Cryan, Cabinet Member for Housing	

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That Tenant Council notes and comments on the the proposed Tenant Fund budget for 2018/19 of £657k.
2. Notes that the budget and other recommendations have been developed and approved by Tenant Fund Management Committee (TFMC) with officers, and approval for these is now sought by Tenant Council.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

3. The budget set out below includes the main budget headings. These are:
 - Annual grants for Tenants and Residents Associations
 - The grant to Southwark Group of Tenants Organisations (SGTO)
 - Officer staffing costs – the grants officer and two training officers
 - The training budget, the cost of Tenants Conference and resource centre costs
 - Tenant Fund projects – including Digital Inclusion through Thames Reach and Citizens Advice and welfare benefits support through Southwark Law Centre
4. The base budget is calculated annually and derived from the current number of tenanted properties linked to the annual rent level and rent collection rate. This year there is a slight increase in the number of properties.
5. Further contributions to the Tenant Fund budget are made on a quarterly basis from the Home Owners Fund calculated at 27% of the amount actually paid to TRAs in grants (not including small grants for community events).

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

6. That Tenant Council notes that the TRA grant payable in 2018/19 remains at the level set in 2017/18 when it was increased to £1300 for estates where the property count is less than 240, with an additional amount allowed of £5.50 for each tenanted property if there are more than 240.
7. The grant proposed for SGTO is £232k a reduction of 2.5% from this year's £239k. The budget includes staff costs for an outreach officer to work with TRAs in the north of the borough.
8. That Tenant Council approves proposed additional estimated expenditure to be drawn from the Tenant Fund carry forward budget to support specific projects.
9. The Tenant Fund budget for 2018/19 is £657k. The budget is set according to the number of secure tenanted properties in management and any rent decrease/increase. The number for 2018/19 is 37,424 compared to 37,349 for 2017/18. The precept on rents stands at £0.27 per week per property for 2018/19.
10. The base budget is £517k and there is an estimated carry forward of £140k which makes an estimated total budget of £657 set out in Table 1 below.

11. The budget for TRA grants is estimated as it is dependent on the number of applications made. There has always been enough money in the budget to cover the number of grant applications made.
12. The proposed maximum budget for project based elements of the Tenant Fund for 2018/19 is set out below:
 - Digital Inclusion services to include training, provision and access to equipment
 - £42k Thames Reach (project continuation, year 3)
 - 5k for Communities Division
 - Commissioned training additional to the in-house accredited training programme - maximum £30k (expenditure of £15k in year to date)
 - Small grants scheme for community events £30k with the option for this to be increased up to £50k if the threshold is reached (expenditure of £27k in year to date 29 grants awarded)
 - Other engagement maximum total of £15k consisting of:
 - Youth Council activity covering knife crime, bullying and employment identified by young people as three priority issues in Southwark £10k;
 - Independent advice and support for TRAs £5k (no expenditure in year to date)
13. SGTO's Monitoring Reports have evidenced service delivery in the following areas:
 - Support and advice to 65 TRAs
 - Account verification service to 45 TRAs
 - Building engagement with young people
 - Computer courses for 147 people
 - Job search for 539 people
 - Home search for 601 people
14. SGTO have taken an active role in disseminating information to TRAs about changes to housing, planning and welfare benefits. Regular group meetings held by SGTO are well attended by TRAs from across the borough and provide a forum for representation and voice as well as networking and support on housing related issues.
15. Projects that started in 17/18 including Citizens Advice Digital Inclusion and Southwark Law Centre welfare rights advocacy for tenants and residents are being monitored and evaluated. The Thames Reach Digital Inclusion project is into its third year and continues to develop services for residents with council officers working with Thames Reach to increase the number of digital inclusion hubs with Wi-Fi and computer access being provided in a number of Sheltered Housing Units.
16. There have also been Tenant Fund applications from a significant number of associations in Sheltered Housing Units as officers and partner organisations have supported setting up associations that are then able to apply for grants and to hold community events that bring residents together.
17. As well as the impact of Universal Credit and the services supported by the tenant fund to support tenants and residents the impact of the transition from Disability Living Allowance to Personal Independence Payment is significant. The agencies involved in supporting residents can support residents with facing the challenges of these changes.
18. Use of the resource centres at Taplow and Albrighton has been decreasing. TFMC and officers will review current provision.

Table 1 Tenant Fund Budget 2018/19

Budget elements	Cost elements	2018/19 Budget	2017/18 Budget	% Budget Change
A	Salaries	120,858	116,338	2%
B	Training	30,000	60,000	-50%
C	Cab fares	500	500	0%
D	Equipment leasing & Printing	7,000	7,000	0%
E	Refreshments for meetings	0	500	-100%
F	Marketing & publicity (Tenants conference)	8,000	8,000	0%
G	Telephones	500	500	0%
H	Printing & Stationery	0	5,000	-100%
I	Grants	228,148	238,248	-4%
K	General recharges (Home Owners' Levy)	-61,600	-64,327	-4%
L	Projects	92,000	107,500	-14%
J	External agencies and bodies (S.G.T.O)	232,000	238,650	-3%
	Tenant Fund reserve	0	50,000	-100%
	Funds Available	657,406	767,909	-14%
	Budget	517,406	518,299	
	Carry Forward	140,000	249,610	
	Total	657,406	767,909	

19. The next step will be approval of the budget by Cabinet lead member in March.

Item No. 6	Classification: Open	Date:	Meeting Name: IDM Cabinet Member for Housing
Report title:		Home Owner Fund Budget 2018/2019 and Strategy 2018-2020	
Wards or groups affected:		All	
From:		Director of Communities	

RECOMMENDATIONS

20. That the Cabinet member for housing notes the proposed Home Owners Council two year strategy and work plan (2018/19 and 2019/20) and approves the proposed 2018/19 Home Owners Fund budget of £189,900 as summarised in appendix 2.
21. That this approval is further subject to the requirement that expenditure involving the procurement of external services is subject to compliance with current internal governance requirements and procurement and financial practices as set out in paragraph 21.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

22. The Homeowner Council is an advisory body established by Southwark Council to:
- Represent the views of Southwark Council homeowners on issues relating to housing services, the management of housing, and new housing management proposals, and
 - Form part of the framework for Southwark Council to consult its homeowners on matters relating to housing management, housing services and policies.
23. The HOC is made up of representatives from local Area Housing Forums (who are in turn nominated via Tenants and Residents Associations or TRAs) in addition to representatives from Street properties, Freeholders and Non resident leaseholders.
24. Over the last few months and for the first time, HOC has been focusing on developing a programme of work covering the next two years in order to have a strategic approach to delivering positive outcomes for leaseholders across the borough in partnership with the council
25. The Home Owners Council has funds allocated through the Home Owners' Fund which was established in 2004 (then under the name Leaseholders' Fund). The then Leaseholder Council agreed to ring fencing a precept of £10 per service charge account from each leaseholder's management fee and to placing the monies in a leaseholder fund budget. The purpose was to establish a fund similar to the Tenant Fund which supports Tenant and Resident Associations (T&RAs) because T&RAs also represent homeowners.
26. In March 2008 the Leaseholder Council agreed that their fund would be administered separately to the Tenants Fund but with an undertaking that the leasehold fund would transfer a lump sum annually which reflects support for homeowners/homeowner activities by T&RAs. This lump sum currently stands at 27% of all grant payments made to TRAs.
27. The HOCF 2018/19 budget has been set by the HOFMC which is a sub-group of HOC with the aspiration to deliver the priorities set in their proposed strategy.

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

28. The HOC proposed two year strategy and work plan can be found in appendix 1. This work plan has been shaped by HOC members based on feedback from their constituents and feedback received at

the most recent Leaseholders Conference held in February 2018 and which was attended by over 200 people. The priorities identified were:

- Leaseholder Engagement
- Stakeholder Management
- Transparency
- Value for Money
- Council Policy and Consultation
- Customer Experience

29. The strategy has been authored by the HOC Chair with input from delegates and sets specific outcomes and deliverables that HOC aspires to focus on in the next two years by working constructively with officers in various service areas and alongside the MSHAB.

30. A breakdown of each priority area alongside their expected actions, deliverables and outcomes for each of them can be found in the document.

31. The budgeted income for 2018/19 is likely to increase in line with the number of RTBs. In order to continue to deliver current projects and the new proposed strategy deliver this strategy the proposed expenditure is as follows:

32. The rationale for budget lines allocation are as follows:

- *a) Staff cost*

This reflects a contribution to the cost of a member of staff within the Communities Division who supports the work of HOC, a tenant and homeowner support officer. The amount has been increased by 2% to reflect salary cost increases.

- *b) Refreshments for meetings*

In 2017/18 only light refreshments were offered at meetings instead of the full catering previously provided, following a request from the Cabinet Member for Housing to reduce the spend. The budget set was £500 in order to reflect the need to make savings across the council. The cost of providing light refreshments in 2017/18 proved slightly higher than £500 and therefore for 2018/19 a slightly increased allocation of £700 is proposed

- *c) Conferences/Seminars*

In 2017/18 HOC organised one conference which took place in February 2018 for 260 delegates at a cost of £15,934. The conference proved highly successful and over subscribed with very positive feedback from attendees. This year HOC is proposing to organise two conferences and with a total allocation of £36,000.

- *d) Home Owners Information Centre (HOIC)*

In Oct 2013 Cabinet agreed the setting up of a Home Owners Information Centre. Cabinet was asked to note that the information centre would be effected by the creation of a service delivery contract between LAS2000 and Leathermarket JMB, in line with the business plan prepared by an external consultant, and would be funded from the existing homeowner involvement budget (the homeowners fund).

A number of years lapsed since and the approach and the context and in 2017/18 the need for this service was reassessed by HOC members. As a result the 2017/18 allocation was not spent and HOC has agreed that at present there isn't a need for this service in its previously proposed form.

In its place HOC have proposed a strategy setting out a number of priorities for 2018/19 and request to spend their reserves on funding this projects and work streams.

- *e) Payment to Tenants Fund*

This figure is based on the agreement with the Home Owners' Fund to contribute 27% of a particular year's actual grant payments by the Tenants fund to T&RAs. It simply represents 27% of the budgeted amount for Grants to T&RAs. It is paid quarterly based on the actual TRA spend figure for the quarter. The Tenant Fund base budget is set every year. The figure is derived from the current number of secure tenanted properties within housing management and is linked to the annual rent setting and rent collection rate so that the notional amount is adjusted upwards or downwards accordingly. The number of properties on which the budget is based for 2018/19 is 37,424 compared to 37,349 for 2017/18.

- *f) Independent Leaseholder support and advice*

For the last two years, the Home Owner Fund has contributed to the council's existing service level agreement with Citizens Advice Bureau in order to cover the cost of a dedicated leaseholder advice specialist. This is a two year agreement whereby CAB is funded to provide advice to leaseholders. HOC would like to continue to fund this service in 2018/19. CAB produces quarterly performance reports which show that the service is performing well and delivering positive outcomes.

- *g) Election Cost*

This allocation has been brought down to zero as there are no elections due this year.

- *h) Meeting room hire*

This allocation was set at zero in 2017/18 on the basis that all meetings would take place at Tooley Street free of charge. However on one occasion there was no availability and the meeting took place in Queens road which has some additional cost attached linked to extra security needed to keep the building open late in the evening. On that basis a small amount has been allocated in 2018/19.

- *i) Travel expenses*

This allocation remains unchanged compared to the previous year. Expenditure is limited to use of cabs booked through the council's appointed provider. Cab expenditure is for attendance by vulnerable residents and residents with disabilities at HOC, HOCF and attendance at working parties.

- *j) Website/Marketing*

This allocation remains unchanged compared to the previous year. Members of the Homeowners Council approved a budget in 2017/18 and plan to have a dedicated web site. Based on recent information from the Homeowners Seminar about the lack of visibility of the HOC, and the need for HOC need to inform and engage homeowners in a more consistent manner, the £15,000 of which £3,500 will be for Website Development and Installation and £11,500 for Communications System Development, Installation and Maintenance. It is envisaged that the HOC will have a communications strategy with clear plan on how it will engage with Homeowners and report periodically on progress, expenditure against budget and key successes and improvements. There may be a need to set up a communications/marketing working group to progress this.

- *k) Contingency*

This allocation has been doubled compared to last year.

- *Expert Advice*

HOC has stated that a number of the projects in their proposed strategy would benefit from the input of independent experts as they lack the technical knowledge and expertise to review and make recommendations in certain areas. HOC expects a supplementary budget from its reserve to deal with these costs.

- *l) Reserves*

33. The Home Owners Fund carry forward from the 2017/18 budget was £402,273 on 1 April 2018. The carry forward at the start of 2017/18 was £369,915. HOC has been informed of the need to allocate and spend this resource by the end of the current financial year.

34. An independent review of the framework for tenant and resident engagement requested by the housing and community safety scrutiny sub committee was completed in 2017. This included the engagement structures of which HFMC is a part. A report is being prepared for Cabinet with proposals on how to take this work forward

Policy Implications

35. The council's Housing Strategy to 2043 sets out a long term plan of action for housing in the borough. It is a housing strategy that learns from the past, tackles the issues of the present and puts in place clear plans for the future.

36. One of the principles in said strategy is "Empowering Residents" and it sets out that we will support and encourage all residents to take pride and responsibility in their homes and local area. It also states that new relationships, based on pride and responsibility, will enable residents to take greater control over their local housing services.

37. The strategy also outlines that there will be options to help all residents to participate in decisions about the management of their housing.

38. The proposed Home Owners Council work plan and fund budget will contribute to the delivery of the above mentioned council priorities.

Home Owners Fund management committee

39. HFMC is a sub-committee of HOC. The Home Owners Fund budget is presented to HOC after HFMC has finalised its recommendations.

Community impact statement

40. The Home Owners Fund supports tenant and resident associations and related support services for leaseholders including CAB advice, Home Owners Information Centre and Home Owner conferences.

41. An independent in depth engagement exercise is took place in 2016 and gathered the views from council tenants, homeowners and private sector tenants on council estates. This study explored in depth how we engage with tenants and homeowners as a housing provider and identify areas for improvement. The findings of the study will be used to inform council decisions on improving resident engagement in the future.

Consultation

42. Consultation has been carried out in the usual way as in previous years with HFMC and HOC. HFMC and HOC have put forward the budget proposals based on last year's budget and expenditure and what resources should be allocated to which priorities.
43. The budget was prepared by HOFM working group with information provided by officers based on the previous year and accounting for any known changes. This was presented to and approved by HOC at their meeting on 09 May 2018.
44. The HOC proposed two year strategy has been shaped by HOC members based on feedback from their constituents and feedback received at the most recent Leaseholders Conference held in February 2018 and which was attended by over 200 people. The strategy was presented and discussed at HOC over a number of meetings and finally agreed at their meeting on 20 June 2018.

SUPPLEMENTARY ADVICE FROM OTHER OFFICERS

Director of Law and Democracy

45. The Director Law and Democracy notes the content of this report. With regard to the recommendation contained in paragraph 3 concerning the proposed procurement of external services, the Council's Contract Standing Orders state that, where the estimated contract value is from £25,000 to below £100,000, there is a requirement to take all reasonable steps to obtain at least three written quotes unless the Lead Contract Officer decides that this will not secure value for money. In such cases, a Gateway 1 report must be completed to explain what alternative action is being taken and why.
46. The recommendations set out in paragraph 1 relate to matters which are expressly reserved to the Cabinet Member for decision under Part 3D of the Council Constitution.

Strategic Director of Finance and Governance

47. TBC

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
HO fund IDM report 2016/17	Communities Division, 160 Tooley Street, SE1P 5LQ 020 7525 7648	

APPENDICES

Appendices	
Appendix 1	HOC 2018-20 Strategy
Appendix 2	HOC Budget 2018/19

Lead Officer	Stephen Douglass, Director of Communities	
Report Author	Eva Gomez, Resident Involvement Manager	
Version	Draft	
Dated		
Key Decision	Yes	
CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / CABINET MEMBER		
Officer Title	Comments Sought	Comments included
Director of Legal Services	Yes	Yes
Strategic Director of Finance	Yes	Yes

and Corporate Services		
Head of Procurement	No	No
Cabinet Member	Yes	Yes
Date final report sent to Constitutional Support Services		

Appendix 1

Please see separate document

Appendix 2

Homeowners Fund

Income & Expenditure Account

Budget 18-19	2017-2018	2018-2019
--------------	-----------	-----------

Income		
Home Owners Contribution	£152,440	£152,440
Total Income	£152,440	£152,440

Expenditure	Budget 2017/2018	Actuals at End of March 18	Budget 2018/2019	Actuals
Staff Costs	20,000	20,000	20,400	
Refreshments for meetings	500	682	700	
Conferences/Seminars	15,000	15,934	36,000	
Home Owners Information Centre	103,250	-	2,000	
Payment to Tenants Fund	57,000	43,157	45,000	
Independent LH support and advice	38,333	38,333	60,000	
Election costs	5,000	1,628	-	
Meeting Room Hire	-	123	300	
Travel Expenses	500	223	500	
Communications working group	15,000	-	15,000	
Contingency	5,000	-	10,000	
Expert Advice*	-	-	-	
Total Expenditure	£ 259,583	£ 120,082	£ 189,900	-

Reserves 1 April 16	£ 356,312
---------------------	-----------

Financial Year	Budget GG587	Actuals GG587	Actuals GS120	Balance
16-17	£ 150,090	£ 79,663	£ 56,823	£ 13,603

Reserves 1 April 17	£ 369,915
---------------------	-----------

Financial Year	Budget GG587	Actuals GG587	Actuals GS120	Balance
17-18	£ 152,440	£ 76,925	£ 43,158	£ 32,358

Reserves 1 April 18	£ 402,273
----------------------------	------------------

* HOFM expects a supplementary budget from its reserve to deal with these cost going forward

Item No. 6	Classification: Open	Date: 18 June 2018	Meeting Name: Cabinet Member for Housing Management & Modernisation
Report title:		Approval of the 2018-19 Tenants & Residents Social Improvements Grants (TRSIG)	
Ward(s) or groups affected:		All wards and Southwark estate residents	
From:		Strategic director of housing and modernisation	

RECOMMENDATION

1. That the cabinet member for housing management & modernisation approves the Tenants & Residents Social Improvements Grant (TRSIG) programme recommendations for 2018-19 for a total sum of £183,747 to the 31 organisations detailed in Appendix 1.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

2. The Tenants & Residents Social Improvements Grant is an annual grants programme specifically for the provision of services and activities on council estates for the benefit of tenants and residents and to contribute to social regeneration.
3. The programme was established following Southwark's Tenants Conference held in 1999. The TRSIG budget is associated with the Housing Revenue Account (HRA). This means it can only be allocated for schemes run or run on behalf of the Tenants & Residents Associations (TRAs) and Tenant Management Organisations (TMOs) for the benefit of the tenants and residents of council estates.
4. A grants Panel is responsible for the assessment of the applications submitted to this programme and for making recommendations for funding. This year 6 residents who were nominated at Area Housing Forums were on this Panel.
 -
5. Officers administer the programme and ensure criteria are complied with and that there is no duplication with other grants programmes. This year's application form now includes a question as to whether the TRA / TMO had applied to the council's Neighbourhoods Fund or Cleaner Greener Safer fund for the same scheme. Following the Panel meeting, officers made further checks to ensure there would be no duplication of funding with these schemes.
6. Following a consultation exercise in 2015 the priorities of the programme were simplified and made more specific, enabling applicants to design schemes with particular beneficiaries in mind. Therefore an applicant is able to provide activities targeting children, young people, people who are economically inactive or older people.
7. TRSIG programme eligible activities are broad and enabling. They are:
 - After-school activities for children
 - Activities to alleviate isolation and loneliness among older people
 - Activities to equip tenants and residents for volunteering and employment
 - Activities to reduce crime and anti-social behaviour, particularly among young people.
8. Eligibility requirements are that applicants must be from:
 - Tenants & Residents Associations
 - Tenant Management Organisations
 - TRAs / TMOs can apply in partnership with service provider organisations, but the application must come from the TRA / TMO, who have overall responsibility for the scheme.

9. In addition, applications:

- Must be for revenue funding only. The maximum amount that can be applied for is £10,000.
- Must have at least two committee member signatures and one must be the chair's.
- Must include the minutes of the Management Committee meeting when their TRSIG application was discussed and agreed.
- Must also include a copy of the TRA's / TMO's safeguarding policy and confirm that they, and any proposed Service Provider, are compliant with disclosure and barring service (DBS) legislation.

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

The 2018-19 TRSIG programme

10. The programme was advertised directly to TRA/TMOs on 26 January 2018 as well as via the Southwark Group of Tenants' Organisations (SGTO). Information about this opportunity was provided upon request to others eg potential service providers. The deadline for the submission of completed applications was 12 March 2018. Links to SGTO will be further developed next year with a planned joint event with Community Southwark to help match interested third party service providers with interested TRATMOs.

11. A workshop on the TRSIG programme was held on 20 February 2018 attended by a number of TRAs and potential service providers. The purpose of the workshop was to:

- Explain the programme criteria
- Offer advice on completing applications
- Offer presentations by TRAs and service providers who currently run TRSIG schemes
- Answer questions from attendees about the programme.

TRSIG Panel Recommendations

12. A total of 48 applications were received totalling £324,982. Four organisations made more than one application for funding different schemes. The Panel recommended 31 applications for funding and the total amount recommended for funding is £183,747.

13. In making its recommendations the Panel considered each application and whether the grant criteria were met. In order to avoid any potential conflicts of interest Panel members are required to declare any interest in a scheme and subsequently take no part in the discussions relating to that application. Officers keep a record of Panel discussions, conflicts of interest and where further clarification of information is required. Checks were also made against any Neighbourhood Fund applications to ensure the council was not double funding the same schemes.

14. In assessing the applications the Panel took the following into account:

- Ensuring that there is a mixture of awards to new applications, as well as awards to organisations that have previously delivered schemes successfully. 16 of the 31 awards recommended are for new schemes.
- Whether the costs submitted were reasonable and provided Value for Money.
- The number of stated beneficiaries of the scheme.
- Subject to the criteria being met, ensuring that there is a good geographical spread of awards across the borough.
- Whether there was evidence that previously funded schemes making a new application had delivered expected outcomes and complied with the monitoring requirements.

15. The application by Oomph! is to deliver engaging, fun and adaptable physical activity sessions for older people across the borough includes the use of Sheltered Housing Units from which to deliver this service. Officers were approached by the council's Parks and Leisure Team who were keen to support this project that has also secured funding from Sport England's "Active Ageing" fund.

16. Where the Panel recommended a lower amount of funding than the amount applied for this was due to costs such as hall hire, insurance, publicity, printing and management costs being considered costs that the TRA or service provider would already be able to cover from other sources including Tenant Fund grants. In addition some budget items were unclear e.g. no hourly rates or session fees provided or offering poor Value for Money.

17. The Panel did not recommend 17 applications for funding for a variety of reasons. See Appendix 2 for the complete list. Reasons for declining to fund include:

- Application not stating clearly enough what the proposal is and/or budget hard to comprehend
- Budget being mainly for equipment not service costs i.e. capital not revenue
- Concerns about the TRA/TMO and/or the proposed service provider having adequate safeguarding and DBS measures in place
- TRA no longer considered “active” i.e. no recent AGM held
- Failure to provide correct signatures, minutes of meeting supporting application and safeguarding information despite officer requests
- Application having too great a focus on food, drink and/or excursions without enough of a focus on eligible TRSIG activities.

18. Unsuccessful applicants will be written to and given reasons why their applications do not meet the grant criteria. Feedback is offered with a view to building knowledge and awareness of the criteria and to enable other organisations to be funded in the future.

19. A comparison of applications submitted and applications recommended for funded is below.

Year	Applications submitted	Applications recommended for funding
2014/15	28	20
2015/16	50 (via x 2 TRSIG rounds)	28
2016/17	41	27
2017/18	30	27
2018/19	48	31

20. The table below provides an overview of the number of awards broken down by Area Housing Forum. The number of awards per area is broadly speaking similar to last year.

Area Housing Forum	Number of awards			
	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Bermondsey East	2	0	1	2
Bermondsey West	2	1	1	1
Borough & Bankside	4	2	2	2
Camberwell East	6	5	3	2
Camberwell West	3	1	3	1
Dulwich	2	1	1	1
Nunhead & Peckham	4	4	4	3
Peckham	3	5	5	6
Rotherhithe	2	2	3	4
Aylesbury	0	0	0	0
Walworth East	0	2	0	1
Walworth West	1	3	3	4
Borough wide	2	1	1	1
Total	31	27	27	28

Monitoring, outcomes and impact

21. Impacts of the 2017-18 programmes have been identified through provision of monitoring information.
22. Midway monitoring reports provided in November 2017 set out the impacts the schemes were already having. As there was a wide variety of schemes, like for like comparisons cannot be made but it can be shown that half way through the schemes:
- - Over 200 older people became less isolated and more connected, are more active and learning new things eg by taking part in dance lessons, basic IT classes or gardening workshops.
 - Over 600 children and young people have been involved in positive activities. Providers report: increased respect, improved time-keeping and commitment; mutual support; care for younger children; less conflict; greater willingness to take on challenges; constructive questioning; raised aspirations. TRAs have reported reduced complaints of anti-social behaviour on estates during the period of the scheme.
 - Out of these, around 280 children and young people have benefited from physical activity ranging from football to circus skills leading to increased fitness, co-ordination and balance. About 200 children and young people have taken part in arts / creative activities, which have increased the use of their imaginations as well as their confidence.
 - Around 600 adults have improved their skills. This includes skills and basic qualifications in IT (including applying for benefits or a job on-line), ESOL and customer care and many have gained gardening skills. Some have also improved their fitness and wellbeing through gardening or keep fit classes.
 - All estate residents may benefit from reduced anti-social behaviour and the increased greening of their estates.
 - 4 estates are greener, more cared for in appearance, more wildlife-friendly and with fresh seasonal fruit and vegetables available to residents.
 -
23. Examples of comments on schemes:
- "I have been a community mediator for 31 years in Southwark dealing with issues of ASB. I can say without doubt the Drumming project is one of many ways the Canada Estate TRA work with young people on their estate. They show that by giving young people a chance to be involved with positive creative projects such as the Drumming project, they reduce ASB and build real communities." Director of Southwark Mediation Centre on the Canada Estate Music Project
 - Two comments from parents on Cossall TRA's circus skills project:
"He loves the class so much, now I know how to get him to do what I ask. I say if you don't come now, you won't go to Circus class"
"It's really good to have the class here, I wanted the girls to have sport activities for ages but I couldn't afford it, they really love it."
24. For the 2018/19 programme, key outcomes from the councils new Common Outcomes Framework (COF) have been identified for successful applicants and they will be expected to report on progress made in meeting them. These include:
- Safer Communities
 - (A3) Children & young people feel safer in their neighbourhoods & in Southwark
 - (A5) Residents feel treated with respect & listened to through ongoing engagement & collaboration
 - Healthier Communities
 - (B1) Residents have improved access to community services
 - (B3) Residents feel that they have access to services to improve their wellbeing
 - (B6) Children, young people & families feel more supported & able to access appropriate health & wellbeing services for the best start in life

- Engaged Communities
 - (C2) Residents have increased opportunities & support to volunteer
 - (C3) Residents have the skills & confidence to increase their use of online services & there is less digital exclusion
 - (C7) Residents & organisations have greater access to community spaces & premises
- Greener Communities
 - (D1) Residents are more able & willing to access community spaces especially local green spaces
 - (D2) Residents & organisations are more able to look after designated green spaces
 - (D4) Residents & organisations feel more able to use green spaces to support social action & health & wellbeing activities
 - (D5) Increasing numbers of residents & organisations support initiatives to make Southwark greener
- Vibrant Communities
 - (E1) More young people feel ready to engage with their education
 - (E7) Residents across communities have access to a broad range of cultural activities & organisations in the creative economy are more able to access support

See Appendix 1 for further details.

25. The TRSIG programme was part of an internal audit of the Commissioning of Community Grants last year. No areas of concern were identified.

Policy implications

26. TRSIG schemes principally target interventions and resources to improve social problems linked to quality of life indicators such as anti-social behaviour, poor social and environmental wellbeing and inequality for tenants and residents.

Community impact statement

27. The Panel consists of representatives from across the borough. The involvement of the Panel strengthens the level of community participation in the assessment process and provides a level of community challenge and insight. Representatives are drawn from Southwark's tenants' movement and reflect the diversity of the borough.

28. The scheme brings a number of service providers who have a high profile in the borough to work in partnership with the TRAs to provide services to estate residents who may be marginalised and isolated. For 2018-19 these include: Blue Elephant Theatre, Inspire, Millwall for All Trust, South London Gallery and Westminster House Youth Club.

29. It is anticipated that the outcomes of TRSIG schemes will prove beneficial to tenants and residents of the estates and surrounding areas, particularly those from marginalised, disadvantaged and vulnerable groups. The majority of proposed schemes in 2018-19 target children and young people, isolated and lonely older residents particularly those in sheltered housing units, and the unemployed.

30. One of the main objectives of the programme is to promote inclusion and cohesive communities. The programme seeks to advance equality of opportunity and help to foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not. The monitoring of the programme includes data on the scheme beneficiaries.

- **Resource implications**

31. TRSIG is managed by the Communities division of the council's Housing and Modernisation department.

Financial implications

32. The recommendations in this report are funded by way of a dedicated 2018-19 grants budget of £190,000.

Consultation

33. There is communication with the TRSIG Panel before any significant changes are made. The application form was recently re-designed in consultation with the current providers of schemes. The simplified priorities of the programme were consulted on before implementation.

SUPPLEMENTARY ADVICE FROM OTHER OFFICERS

Director of Law and Democracy

34. The Localism Act 2011 enables the council to do anything that individuals generally may do, which would include incurring expenditure, giving financial or other assistance to any person or entering into arrangements or agreements with any person. This power can be used even if legislation already exists that allows the council to do the same thing. However the council cannot to do anything which it was restricted or prevented from doing under that previous legislation.

35. The provision of grants from within the funds identified for the TRSIG programme falls within the scope of the activities the council can undertake under the Localism Act 2011.

36. Under the decision making arrangements set out in Part 3 of the council's constitution, the decision on the recommendation in paragraph one of this report is one that the cabinet member is able to take.

37. The council is under an on-going duty, in exercising all of its functions, to have regard to the public sector equality duty (PSED) in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010.

38. The duty requires the council to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation or other prohibited conduct, and advance of equality of opportunity and foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic (such as age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation, marriage and civil partnership) and those who do not.

39. When making a decision on the recommendations in this report the cabinet member must actively consider the PSED including considerations of the potential benefits of the proposed grants to particular groups in relation to the duty and community impact.

Strategic Director of Finance and Governance (FIN1048)

40. The recommendations and funding arrangements set out in this report are noted.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Summary of TRSIG Panel recommendations	Communities division, Housing & Modernisation, 160 Tooley Street, London SE1 2QH	Angus Lyon x54069

APPENDICES

No.	Title
Appendix 1	TRSIG – Funding recommendations
Appendix 2	TRSIG – Recommendations not to fund

AUDIT TRAIL

Lead Officer	Stephen Douglass, Director of Communities	
Report Author	Angus Lyon, Commissioning Officer	
Version	Final	
Dated	13 June 2018	
Key Decision?	Yes	
CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / CABINET MEMBER		
Officer Title	Comments Sought	Comments Included
Director of Law and Democracy	Yes	Yes
Strategic Director of Finance and Governance	Yes	Yes
List other officers here		
Cabinet Member	Yes	Yes/No
Date final report sent to Constitutional Team / Community Council / Scrutiny Team		

Kaizen Report

Executive Summary extract:

- Almost two-thirds of survey respondents said they knew nothing at all about the Tenants Fund and Homeowners Fund.
- Respondents expressed a preference for spending to be allocated to activity which directly and demonstrably benefited their communities: improvements to the area, social and community events and support for local projects. Indeed, increasing the emphasis on local and community benefit may well be a significant motivator for encouraging engagement.
- These preferences appear to be somewhat disconnected with the current allocation of funds, which places considerable emphasis on training and support for residents and TRAs, with much less emphasis on funding local improvements, community events and local projects.
- A review of Tenant and Homeowner Funds monitoring reports suggests an over-emphasis on outputs, internal controls and financial management rather than delivering outcomes and opportunities that benefit local communities⁴.

In addition Kaizen proposes:

- A greater emphasis on outcomes rather than outputs
- Better communication of information about the Tenants and Homeowners Funds
- Align spending with local priorities.
- There is a need to reassess the training and support offered to tenants and TRAs in light of the priorities for spending identified in this (Kaizen) review.

⁴ This is supported by the rather sparse reply in response to a request for information on training

Examples of other funds

	Great Places	London and Quadrant Place Makers Local	Riverside Community Grants	Sanctuary Housing	Lewisham Tenants Fund	Hackney Community Development Fund
Minimum	£100		£1,000			
Maximum	No limit	£10,000	£5,000	£1,000		£2,000
Amount		£10 million		£1 million +	£0.10p/week	£0.10p/week
Constraints	At least two years since last application Must have completed paperwork from last grant	Strategy in place Outcomes	Due diligence including policies, Equality and Diversity At least 12 months since last grant and met conditions of last grant	Bank account, equal opportunities policy and constitution	Grants to TRAs of £3.60/property Not paid if TRAs have sufficient funds	Financial Checks Not exclude anybody Reconciliation of any previous bids
Frequency	3 times per year		Annual	Monthly	Within 5 days	Annual
Decision	Customer Funding Panel (customers)	Neighbourhood Committee	Groundwork Trust	Unclear	Tenant Fund (residents)	Unclear
Eligibility	Resident or Community Group or Charity working in community		Community, voluntary or charitable group	Community or residents group Voluntary group Social enterprise Registered charity School Statutory organisation or parish/town council	TRAs	All estates (with or without TRAs)
Activities	Support employment Promote healthy lifestyles Young People Benefit community ideas and activities that bring people together and improve the	Young people Happy and Healthy Stronger communities	Community Support residents	Employment, education, skills and training Health and well-being Community safety and infrastructure	“Admin” grants Computer grants Equipment grants Event grants Venue grants Special grants	Social engagement and community development

	neighbourhood			Environment Financial inclusion	My Community grant where no TRAs Training and Consultancy	
Monitoring and evaluation		Yes			Yes	

HOC Working Groups Summary

1. Homeowner Fund Management Committee

Representative	Description	No of reps as per ToR	Frequency of meetings	Lead Officer	Update
	Sub-committee managing the Home Owner Fund/ Terms of reference funding/grant application form.	6	Quarterly	Eva Gomez	

2. Homeowners Information Centre Working Group

Representative	Description	No of reps	Frequency of meetings	Lead Officer	Update
	Initially set up to ensure that Homeowners have a dedicate service to answer or assist with their homeownership issues. Now reviewing the business case for the service.	8	TBC	Eva Gomez	

3. Future Steering Board Working Group

Representative	Description	No of reps	Frequency of meetings	Lead Officer	Update
		5	Meets 3 weekly	Jessica Leech	

4. Asset Management Core Group (Formerly Repairs and Maintenance Working Group)

Representative	Description	No of reps	Frequency of meetings	Lead Officer	Update
	The Core Group focuses on strategic issues in the	2	Monthly	Maria Ikrouberkane	

	repairs service including contractor performance, information technology and service innovations.				
--	---	--	--	--	--

5. Contact Centre Working Group

Representative	Description	No of reps	Frequency of meetings	Lead Officer	Update
	The oversight of the implementation and operation of the telephone Contact Centre at Queens Road. They also provide a 'critical friend' challenge of Contact Centre performance.	TBC	Quarterly	Sean Conway	

6. Tenant Hall Review Implementation Working Groups

Representative	Description	No of reps	Frequency of meetings	Lead Officer	Update
	Joint working party with Tenant Council delegates for implementation of Tenant Hall.	3	Ad hoc	Ian Brinley	

7. Homeowner Conference Working Group

Representative	Description	No of reps	Frequency of meetings	Lead Officer	Update
	This group oversees the organisation of the annual HOC conference	Currently 5	As and when needed	Louis Rotsos	

8. Homeowner Observer to Tenant Council

Representative	Description	No of reps	Frequency of meetings	Lead Officer	Update
		1	6-8 weeks	John McCormack	

9. Comms/Website Working Group

Representative	Description	No of reps	Frequency of meetings	Lead Officer	Update
	This group oversees the set up of the HOC website and other publicity and marketing activity		This group conducts its work virtually	This is a HOC rep led group	

10. Constitution Working Group

Representative	Description	No of reps	Frequency of meetings	Lead Officer	Update
	This is an ad hoc group which convenes when the HOC constitution is due for review	6	As and when needed every three year cycle	Eva Gomez	

11. Scrutiny Working Group

Representative	Description	No of reps	Frequency of meetings	Lead Officer	Update
	This is an ad hoc group which convenes when the HOC constitution is due for review	6	As and when needed every three year cycle	Eva Gomez	

REPORT IN REPOSE TO TRAINING INFORMATION REQUEST

2017-18

NO. OF FACE-TO-FACE COURSES PROVIDED:	17
NO. OF ATTENDEES:	122 (HAROLD: 34; PAULETTE: 8; EXTERNAL: 80)
PROVIDER (HAROLD/PAULETTE/OTHER):	HAROLD (5) PAULETTE (4) EXTERNAL (8)
NO. OF DIFFERENT TRAs ATTENDING:	21 (HAROLD); EXACT DETAILS NOT PROVIDED BY PAULETTE, BUT AN AVERAGE OF 3.8 DIFFERENT TRAs ATTEND EACH TRAINING SESSION
NO. OF E-COURSES PROVIDED:	HAROLD DOES NOT DELIVER TRAINING ONLINE. PAULETTE FACILITATES ACCESS TO VIRTUAL COLLEGE AND OTHER ONLINE TRAINING. ⁵
NO. OF INDIVIDUALS ATTENDING E-COURSES:	145 (121 VIRTUAL COLLEGE; 24 THAMESREACH)
OTHER ACTIVITIES FUNDED OUT OF THE TRAINING BUDGET:	
LIST OF COURSES AVAILABLE UNDER THE PROGRAMME:	
Face-to-face:	
HAROLD:	PAULETTE:
How To Organise a Funday/Event	Charing - Leading your team to success
Treasurer Skills	Making your meetings effective
Public Speaking Part 1	Duties of a secretary
How To Apply For Funding	Health and Safety at work
Public Speaking Part 2	Essential Fire Extinguisher safety
AGM Skills	Level 2 Food Safety in catering
The Law and your TRA Hall	Level 2 Risk Assessment
Hall Management	Level 2 First Aid at work
	Digital Champion induction training
	Producing minutes in 3 easy steps
Online:	
HAROLD:	PAULETTE:
None	Various

APRIL 2018- SEPT. 2019

NO. OF FACE-TO-FACE COURSES PROVIDED:	24
NO. OF ATTENDEES:	169 (HAROLD: 68; PAULETTE: 0; EXTERNAL: 101)
PROVIDER (HAROLD/PAULETTE/OTHER):	HAROLD (11) PAULETTE (0) EXTERNAL (13)
NO. OF DIFFERENT TRAs ATTENDING:	24 (HAROLD); EXACT DETAILS NOT PROVIDED BY PAULETTE, BUT AN AVERAGE OF 4.8 DIFFERENT TRAs ATTEND EACH TRAINING SESSION
NO. OF E-COURSES PROVIDED:	(See footnote 1)
NO. OF INDIVIDUALS ATTENDING E-COURSES:	215
NO. OF COURSES PLANNED FOR THE REST OF THE YEAR:	HAROLD: 10 ⁶ ; PAULETTE: 7; EXTERNAL FACE-TO-FACE): 11

⁵ Residents register with the Virtual College and access any of a wide number of courses provided online by the Open College. LBS acts as facilitator of the Open College for residents.

⁶ This figure refers to the number of courses planned to be given by Harold between October 2018 and March 2019. There is also the potential for more courses to be provided on a reactive basis.

OTHER ACTIVITIES FUNDED OUT OF THE
TRAINING BUDGET:

TRA HALL LEARN AND SHARE EVENT;
PRESENTATION EVENING

Tenant Fund Management Committee Terms of Reference

1. The Tenant Fund Management Committee shall be composed of a maximum of 12 tenants nominated by Tenant Council. Tenant Council should endeavor to ensure that the composition of the Tenant Fund Management Committee adequately reflects the composition of Tenant Council.

Tenant Fund Management Committee Members to:

- (a) Be elected annually
 - (b) Hold a post for no more than 2 years consecutively
 - (c) Stand down for at least one year.
2. The Tenant Fund Management Committee shall meet as necessary but at least once in every quarter for the purpose of T&RA transacting such business as is set out in the Terms of Reference.
 3. The Tenant Fund Management Committee shall, once in each municipal year, elect a person to serve in the office of Chair, and elect a person to serve in the office of Vice Chair. The person elected as Chair shall chair all meetings. In the absence of the Chair the meeting shall be chaired by the Vice Chair. In the absence of both the Chair and Vice Chair a person shall be elected from amongst the members present to preside for that meeting only.

TFMC delegates who are not present at the meeting to elect the Chair and Vice-chair, must signal their interest in being proposed and seconded for these roles, in writing to the lead officer before the meeting.

4. The Tenant Fund Management Committee shall be responsible for:-
 - (a) Reviewing the detailed working arrangements of the scheme and reviewing the criteria for recognition and funding on an annual basis, recommending to Tenant Council and the Cabinet, such changes as it considers from time to time shall be necessary for the good and efficient management of the scheme.
 - (b) Receiving reports, statements and balance sheets on the overall running of the scheme and on the amounts of grant made payable to each individual organization, and make recommendations to Tenant Council and the Cabinet thereon.
 - (c) To recommend for approval, to Tenant Council and the Cabinet the disposal of any funds which have accrued within the scheme following the payment of all outgoings and changes to the scheme.
 - (d) The Tenant Fund Management Committee shall, once in each municipal year be required to report upon the operation of the scheme to the Tenant Council and the Cabinet. Such report shall include a balance sheet and details of the disposal of all monies within the scheme together with recommendations on the amount of monies to be paid to each eligible organisation in the next following municipal year.

5. Any member of the Committee must declare an interest, where a grant which will benefit their organization, is being debated and taken. The member must leave the meeting when the decision is being debated and taken.

6. All matters considered at Tenant Fund Management Committee meetings are confidential and may not be discussed by TFMC members outside the meetings

7. The quorum for any meeting of the Tenant Fund Management Committee shall be four.

8. Where a group feels that it has been unfairly dealt with there is a right of appeal, in the first instance to the Tenant Fund Management Committee, then to Tenant Council and then to the Cabinet.

9. The Tenant Fund Management Committee will be serviced and supported by officers from Southward's Resident Involvement Section. The Management Committee will seek to appoint an equalities advisor from officers within Southwark Council.
10. The Terms of Reference of the Tenant Fund Management Committee can only be amended following consideration by Tenant Council and with the agreement of the Cabinet