

**Northwards Housing – Asset Management Sub Committee Meeting**

**Board Room, Hexagon Tower**

**24<sup>th</sup> March 2010 at 5.00pm**

**Chair: Pat Glazebrook**

**Present:**

Pat Glazebrook (PG)	Co-Optee
Michelle Carmichael (MC)	Board Member
Sue Ratchford (SR)	Board Member
David Leah (DL)	Board Member
Mark Hackett (MH)	Board Member
Anna Trotman (AT)	Board Member
Luke Barnett (LB)	Co-Optee

**In Attendance:**

Larry Patrick (LP)	Director of Property Services
Greig Lees (GL)	Head of Regeneration
Gary Walsh (GW)	Repairs Service Manager
David Heys (DH)	Head of Home Improvements (Fourways)
Claire Hopkins (CH)	Head of Programme Planning and Asset Management
Diane Roberts (DR)	Governance Support Manager (Minutes)

ITEM	SUBJECT	ACTION
1.	<b>Welcome and Introductions, Confirm Quorum</b> Quorum Confirmed	
2.	<b>Apologies</b> Apologies were received from Marjan Bazargan and Andy Wood	
3.	<b>This item number was omitted from the agenda</b>	
4.	<b>Declaration of Interests/Confidential Matters/Equality &amp; Diversity Matters Arising</b> Items 5b, 7b and 10b were confidential items. Item 13a was 'un-starred' following a request from LB Item 14a was 'un-starred' following a request from AT. There were no declarations of interest. Equality and Diversity matters arising will be covered .	
5a	<b>Minutes of Previous Meeting – 24<sup>th</sup> February 2010</b> The minutes were approved as a correct record, however an addendum is required following the decision to change the next meeting date from 31 <sup>st</sup> March to 24 <sup>th</sup> March.	
5b	<b>Confidential Minutes of Previous Meeting – 24<sup>th</sup> February 2010</b>	

	The minutes were approved as a correct record.	
<b>6a</b>	<p><b>Matters Arising</b></p> <p><b>8a</b> – LB confirmed that LA has added his name to the circulation list.</p> <p><b>13a</b> – LP reported that due to lack of funds the Regeneration Post has not been approved. LB queried whether the post could be incorporated. LP reported that it had been deferred by the Board. GL to pick up at item 10a.</p> <p><b>14a Community Energy Saving Programme (CESP)</b> – CH confirmed quotes are awaited. A similar scheme is being carried out at Parkway Green. A further report will be presented to next meeting.</p>	<b>CH</b>
<b>6b</b>	<p><b>Matters Arising from the Confidential Minutes</b></p> <p>None.</p>	
<b>7</b>	<b>Capital Programme</b>	
	<p><b>7a. Home Improvements Programme – Monthly Progress Report</b></p> <p>DH presented the report. DH reported that there are no areas of concern, and a few with slight concern. There is slight concern around three schemes.</p> <p><b>34083 – Charlestown; Deepdale/Rusland &amp; Kentmere Courts</b> – Same reasons as last month, however garden damage has now been rectified.</p> <p><b>40070 – Riverways; Misc &amp; 40085 – Riverways; Annie Derby Court</b> – Sub Committee were reassured that standards had improved after the cold snap disruption.</p> <p><b>40086 – Riverways; Jolly Miller Estate</b> – Boiler repositioning – AT queried if this is the only scheme where this is a problem. CH indicated that it was not included in the original budget for this scheme, but was in others.</p> <p><b>Asset Management Sub Committee noted report.</b></p>	
	<p><b>7b. Home Improvements Programme Financial Monitoring Report (Confidential)</b></p> <p>See confidential minutes</p>	
	<b>7c. Home Improvements Programme KPIs</b>	

	<p>CH presented the report. CH reported an increase in performance overall. Proposed targets. DL indicated that the January figures are distorted as discussed at the last meeting. Pleas community benefit has increased.</p> <p>AT asked to discuss new targets;</p> <p><b>KPI17</b> – 9.2 suggested 9.6 has been achieved. LB asked why this? Target is set lower than actual performance. CH indicated that she has met with contractors. LP explained contractual targets were set with contractors at start of contract for 5 years – so need to do this by negotiation.</p> <p><b>KPI17 &amp; KPI18</b> - AT proposed 9.4 for these two KPIs. DH will take back for negotiation with Contractors and report back to S-C.</p> <p><b>KPI19</b> – MWL have suggested 30 – Sub Committee agreed this target.</p> <p><b>Asset Management Sub Committee noted report and agreed the proposed targets for 2010/11 with the exception of KPI17 &amp; KPI18</b></p>	<p><b>DH</b></p>
<p><b>8</b></p>	<p><b>Responsive Maintenance</b></p>	
	<p><b>8a. KPI Performance Data – Responsive Repairs</b></p> <p>GW presented the report. GW informed Sub Committee that the report has improved overall since the bad weather, however we are still awaiting some data. The number of emergencies have improved.</p> <p>AT asked for further information regarding NHL814. GW explained it is a mix of issues still under investigation which would be reported to next meeting.</p> <p><b>NHL813</b> – DL queried whether we actually get tenants that claim an emergency when it's not. GW confirmed that we do and he is leading a working group to reduce this by reviewing the policy and procedure. This links to NHL824. AT noted that Sub Committee had agreed to charge for abuse. GW – if this can be proved this will be charged. MH – Definition of emergency can be difficult, particularly in circumstances of ill health. Concern that in genuine cases this should not be penalised. LP clarified it is cost of the premium of doing the work that would be recharged, not the cost of the job. DL asked if vulnerable households will be considered. LP confirmed that this is reflected in the policy. MH requested that the operative gives consideration to circumstances. GW reported this has not been charged to date.</p> <p><b>NHL814</b> – this is still being investigated. Mix of issues – report to</p>	<p><b>GW</b></p>

	<p>next meeting. DL queried the variance of 154 – GW confirmed that this is being investigated. DL queried what percentage of tenants break appointments. LP reported that the rate of no access is around 13% of appointable repairs which is lower than Greater Manchester average due to a number of initiatives we have taken.</p> <p><b>Asset Management Sub Committee noted report</b></p>	<b>GW</b>
	<p><b>8b. 2010/11 KPI Targets –Responsive Repairs &amp; Voids</b></p> <p>GW presented the report which included two new KPIs. Average to secure, clear out and Inspect and Repair Voids and Success Rate.</p> <p><b>NHL801</b> – LB – asked if the wording should be consistent wording as previous report. AW to change</p> <p><b>NHL824</b> - LB asked why increase? GW – unable to achieve target this year at 23%. GW – Audit Commission are looking for 10%. LP – AC target 10% at first inspection key on emergencies at time 16%, down to 12%. Other 3* ALMOs – 23% with no recommendation. LP - if increase target the satisfaction would decrease, but savings made. LP considers 18% is achievable.</p> <p><b>NHL817</b> – LB – 86 to 89 – mostly in the last year have over achieved this so see us as soft target. LP – Moved from 12% to--36% data collection rate with use of PDAs – again would need to negotiate with partner. LB asked what would like to negotiate? Suggest 92% as average – to report back to SC.</p> <p><b>Voids Working Party</b> – DL – External factors – 903/BV212/NHL902 do we need to report. LP next meeting produce an end of year report with targets for next year.</p> <p><b>Asset Management Sub Committee approved the report.</b></p>	<p><b>AW</b></p> <p><b>GW</b></p> <p><b>LP</b></p>
<b>9</b>	<b>Servicing</b>	
	<p><b>9a. Gas Servicing Report</b></p> <p>GW presented the report.</p> <p>Performance has decreased, however performance is improving and should be back to target in March.</p> <p><b>Asset Management Sub Committee noted report</b></p>	
	<p><b>9b. New Asbestos Survey Guidance</b></p> <p>LP presented the report</p> <p>LP indicated that it is important that NHL remain in control of</p>	

	<p>asbestos. Full ACOP report is available by request. There are two main changes – key is that caveats are now not acceptable in asbestos surveys. Also now specific advice when managing large numbers of stock.</p> <p>AT queried costs, indicative budget £200k. MWL £105 – supply difference £20k-45k. Average £97,500 plus difference on voids. DL asked if MWL are accredited, could we get it for £105k – LP indicated that MWL only test and remove –will still need surveys. LB stated that £100,000 is a high number of asbestos inspections. LP indicated he is confident with the figure. He said that item 6 potential financial impact could be clearer in the report. AT accepted this explanation.</p> <p>DL asked CH &amp; LP that budget covers this increase - LP confirmed. LB raised concern that will add one day on void process – can't it be done when others are in the building? LP – it is done this way to minimise the process so work can continue. LB queried how long one survey will take? LP indicated on average 2 ½ hours. LB asked how long our survey takes? LP - anywhere between 30mins and 7 hours. LB if scheduled not need to add – but need to get report.</p> <p>MH - Higher Blackley properties have been surveyed in the old district heating system. When these past surveys were done how do they relate to current surveys and requirements. Do they need to be re-surveyed (and to other properties). Have we considered financial implications of removal. LP – H&amp;S advice clear in that asbestos does exist and as long as encapsulated is safe. Lagging underfloor in old district heating scheme is safe if not crawling under floor. Management survey cannot be relied upon – replaced by refurbishment surveys. MH accepts not significant issue on this. Tower blocks may be bigger issue.</p> <p>LB asked about changed regulations and what if any implication for work specifications – LP all contracts state “to current standards”.</p> <p>LB asked if changes don't include caveats how will this increase costs?</p> <p>LP – Management surveys presumed was asbestos so should not increase.</p> <p>DL requested a copy of the report – LP to send.</p> <p><b>Asset Management Sub Committee noted the report</b></p>	<b>LP</b>
<b>10</b>	<b>Regeneration</b>	
	<b>10a. Community Regeneration Strategy Refresh</b> GL presented the report and outlined the key issues.  Mapping data due to be presented to SC next month. GL	

	<p>indicated that this will be reflected in 2010/11 Improvement Plan.</p> <p>LB asked how much local grant funding has been achieved. GL indicated 8 or 9 groups supported at approximately £10k. LB queried if this is a specific role and if there is a target. GL – within TIP more measurable target. LB – and some info about where funding was from. GL – part of Regeneration Officer role. DL – Upload to governance website GL to DR</p> <p><b>Asset Management Sub Committee noted the report</b></p>	<p><b>GL</b></p> <p><b>GL / DR</b></p>
<b>11</b>	<b>Training</b>	
	<b>11a. Training Update.</b> No report	
<b>12</b>	<p><b>Governance</b></p> <p>Following a review with our new Solicitors it has been confirmed that Sub-Committee Co-optees cannot count towards the quorum or have voting rights. This is to comply with our rules and for their own protection. DR had previously contacted PG to explain this and in the circumstances it was not appropriate for a Co-optee to Chair meetings. PG understood this arrangement. The Sub-Committee were asked to consider electing a new Chair at their next meeting.</p>	
<b>13</b>	<b>Equality and Diversity</b>	
	<b>13a Equality Actions 2009/10 – Quarter 3 Update Report</b>	
	<p>DR reported that the full reports were now available on the website. Item 3.3 of the report should read Asset Management and not Customers and Communiites. She confirmed that outstanding actions will be transferred to the current action plan.</p> <p><b>Asset Management Sub Committee noted the report</b></p>	
<b>14</b>	<b>Team Improvement Plans</b>	
	<b>14a. Home Improvements Team Improvement Plan</b> AT – 100%! DH one item moved forward to 2010/11	
	<b>Asset Management Sub Committee noted the report</b>	
	<b>14b. Programme Planning and Asset Management Team Improvement Plan</b>	
	<b>Asset Management Sub Committee noted the report</b>	

<b>15</b>	<p><b>Any Other Business</b></p> <p><b>15a Regeneration Tour – 24<sup>th</sup> April 2010</b> DR asked if anyone would like to book on the tour.</p> <p>SR &amp; MC confirmed that they would like to attend.</p>	
<b>16</b>	<p><b>Date and Time of Next Meeting</b> Wednesday 28<sup>th</sup> April 2010 6pm in the Boardroom, Hexagon Tower.</p>	
	<p><b>End of Meeting</b> The meeting closed at 7.45pm</p>	