

Northwards Housing – Riverways Panel meeting

Minutes of meeting held on 5th October 2006

Harpurhey Day Centre, Church Street

Chair: Vera Salvatore

Present:

Vera Salvatore (VS)	Panel Member
Alice Needham (AN)	Panel Member
Sue Abbott (SA)	Panel Member (Vice Chair)
Marlene Garnett (MG)	Panel Member
Raymond Eaton (RE)	Panel Member
Ann McBride (AM)	Panel Member
Barbara Gray (BG)	Panel Member
Pat Glazebrook (PG)	Panel Member
Michelle Blakeley (MB)	Board Member
• Richard Lockwood (RCL)	Board Member
June Hitchen (JH)	Panel Member
Kevin Morrison (KM)	Principal Local Service Manager
Mike Stevens (MS)	Director of Neighbourhood Services
Diane Roberts (DR)	Governance Officer
Siaran Coleman (SC)	Resident Involvement Officer

ITEM	SUBJECT	ACTION
1	Welcome and introductions	
1.1	Chair welcomed all attendees to meeting and introductions were made. Meeting was quorate.	
2	Apologies for Absences	
2.1	Ivy Graham, Kath Hope and Rob Doherty sent their apologies.	
3	Declaration of Interests	
3.1	None	
4	Minutes of Last Meeting – 06/09/06	
4.2	Minutes agreed	Agreed

ITEM	SUBJECT	ACTION
5	Matters Arising	
5.1	MG asked that MS pass on her thanks to a member of the call centre staff who had provided excellent service	
5.2	No other matters arising	
6	Minutes of Board Meeting – 15/08/06	
6.1	Minutes noted	Noted
7	Minutes of Other Panel Meetings	
7.1	Minutes noted	Noted
8	Major Works Update	
8.1	PM went through the major works report. VS stated that she had heard of two properties that have not been done on Amos Avenue. PM replied that not every property was earmarked for the work. VS said that she had heard that in one of the properties fumes there were problems with the boiler. PM replied that obsolete boilers will be replaced when the kitchens are put in, but if the resident has concerns about her boiler she can book a surveyor inspection.	
8.2	JH asked about the statement in the report indicating dissatisfaction with the boiler used. PM replied that people were sometimes unhappy when they didn't receive combi-boilers as different systems were put into different properties depending upon the needs of each property.	
8.3	JH asked about Northwards' policy on the type of boiler used in improvement schemes. PM replied that building regulations dictate that it was now more likely that combi-boilers would be installed. RE asked whether boilers will be replaced when the kitchens are put in and PM replied that replacement would only take place if necessary.	
8.5	AN asked if Anita Street improvements were being put back a year with the Victoria Square improvements. PM replied that Anita Street improvements were not being delayed. JH asked PM if his team had notified Councillors of the delay at Victoria Square. PM replied that Councillors will be notified.	PM
8.6	JH asked why an under spend had occurred at Lathbury Road and PM replied that this was due to the residents choosing fewer kitchens than anticipated.	

ITEM	SUBJECT	ACTION
8.7	<p>JH asked why only 19 satisfaction surveys had been sent out and PM replied that this was due to the figures relating to the previous month at which time only 19 properties would have been completed. MB asked if staff were going to revisit residents who hadn't returned their surveys. PM replied that this was not possible as the survey is confidential. He added however that his team was looking at ways of increasing survey returns.</p>	
8.8	<p>AM asked why the Baths Estate was getting more work done. PM replied that previous work was to correct the potentially dangerous problem with the brickwork. He explained that as some estates, such as the Winston Road estate, were not as old as the Baths estate and so they were earmarked for work at a later date. AM asked if environmental improvements included improving the quality of the fencing. PM replied that where fencing was replaced it was on a like for like basis.</p>	
9	Government Review of ALMO's	
9.1	<p>JH asked for clarification of 3.7. MS stated that the report was proposing to give councils the option to delegate responsibility for taking ASB action to ALMO's. JH mentioned that this would have budgetary implications on Northwards and MS replied that the budget would need negotiating were Northwards to take on additional responsibilities.</p>	
9.2	<p>JH asked if Northwards were to get three stars, whether it was likely to take up option 4.3. MS replied that Northwards would need the consent of the Council to do so. JH noted that were this to happen, the area panels would need more information on this option. MS stated that the availability of the options proposed was at least a couple of years away and even then it was up to the council to initiate.</p>	Noted
9.3	<p>The contents of the report were noted</p>	
10	Inspection Update	
10.1	<p>MS gave an update about discussions with the inspectors in relation to the report. He reiterated that the result would be publicised as soon as possible. In the meantime he stressed that the report was positive and would release the £131m ALMO funding</p>	
12	PLSM Update & Performance Management Report	

ITEM	SUBJECT	ACTION
12.1	KM went through the report. MS noted that the ASB figures provided only identified a small number of the cases being dealt with. He added that the content of the PLSM update was being looked at.	
12.2	RE asked how garden enforcement takes place where the property belongs to another social landlord. SC stated that the EO would forward the details of the garden to the relevant landlord. AN mentioned that a private tenant in her area had left furniture outside for two months and it hadn't been collected. AN to provide details of this address.	AN
12.3	JH asked about the reasons for the remaining voids, which had not been listed. MS replied that some will be with contracting services and some will be ready to let. He added that he realised that the information provided was not totally clear and that this would be improved.	
12.4	JH recommended breaking down the data by whether the void was a 3 day let, 7 day let etc. MS replied that he was not sure whether this would be practicable or helpful but KM and MS would look into it.	KM/MS
12.5	The contents of the report were noted	Noted
13	HIP Environmental Works	
13.1	PM distributed the report to Area Panel Members. JH commented that the panel only put forward a project for defensible space for 4 blocks, not the whole estate. PM promised to check the number of properties.	PM
13.2	JH stated that she understood that Manchester Leisure doesn't have the cash for the boundary fence proposed. MS stated that even if this were the case it made sense for Northwards to take the decision on the boundary fence in conjunction with the review being undertaken.	
13.3	RE asked what had happened to the project suggested for Monsall. MS replied that he was happy to go back and look at the project. MB noted that only two areas in Harpurhey were being considered and asked if Northwards/panel members could look again for more schemes. MS replied that if panel members thought of additional schemes they could let Michael Vickers know (tel no – 0161 227 3076).	
13.4	JH asked if it were possible to make some of the money available for fencing. MS replied that the criteria for allocating the environmental budget include not spending on individual properties.	
13.5	MG asked that Northwards extend the project for Thaxmead to defensible space. MS agreed to arrange for this to be looked into.	MS

ITEM	SUBJECT	ACTION
13.6	The area panel agreed to look at the Thaxmead project, the Moston Pub play space project and Southgate/Dorking Avenue. MS agreed to include pictures of Southgate/Dorking Avenue being brought back to the panel.	MS
13.7	JH mentioned that she had heard that there was a shortfall of funds for a project on Queensferry. MS stated that a member of the TA could ring Michael Vickers with the details to be considered if they fit within the criteria.	
14	Community Sponsorship Strategy	
14.1	Deferred to next meeting	
15	Customer Satisfaction Survey	
15.1	Deferred to next meeting	
16	AOB	
16.1	None	
	Date of Next Meeting 2 nd November 2006 at 6.30pm. Venue to be confirmed.	