

Meeting action minutes

Meeting	Leaseholder Action Group		
Attendees	Muriel Briault, Tony Worsfold, David Croydon, Simon Rogers, Keith Marsden, Graham Dawes, Rosemary Johnson, James Corbett Observers: Jane Thorp, Linda Shaw, Barry Hughes Staff: Keely McDonald, Dave Arthur, Glyn Huelin		
Apologies	None		
Meeting location	Hampshire Lodge	Produced by	Tony Worsfold +BHCC
Date Time	26/09/2016 6pm-8pm	Minutes completed on	30/10/2016

Section 1 – Update on actions from previous meeting-27/6/16

	Description
1	Leasehold Services Manager to look at legal advice on the 30-day consultation period - Complete
2	Organisation chart of Property & Investment, Mears and POD to be provided - Complete
3	Discuss how leaseholders can better deal with consultation documents – Future Meeting
4	Invite Asset Management Team to discuss how warranties are managed – Future Meeting
5	Invite Clerk of Works to discuss quality assurance of repairs – Future Meeting
6	Email AGM attendees to directly contact DC should they wish to be added to his mailing list - Complete
7	LAG members to review Terms of Reference further and give comments to KMD 4 weeks before next meeting - Complete

Section 2 – Items discussed, agreements and future action

Agenda item 2 Previous Minutes-27/6/16			
Action(s)	Invite Theresa Youngman to discuss quality assurance Invite John Currell to discuss identifying and planning major works projects	By Who KMD KMD	Deadline Nov 2016 Nov 2016
Agreement / Decision	1. DA confirmed the council has relied on the Leasehold Advisory Service comprehensive guide on 'Consultation for Council and other public sector landlords' to inform its consultation notices & procedures. Legal advice has been obtained that a few days can be added either side of the 30 days to cater for the postal service, but		

	<p>otherwise the council was not considering taking further advice on the 30-day consultation period which is the length of time defined as the 'relevant period' in the Statutory Instrument. DA confirmed the 30-day period would not be extended.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. TW reported that at the last Central Area Panel Meeting Martin Reid promised that BHCC would take on board residents requests for BHCC to provide more Major Works information to residents as early as possible. GH stated that documents related to major projects are available for leaseholders to review as part of the consultation process. 3. Regarding an Organisation chart showing the relationship between BHCC/Mears/POD, KMD tabled the latest hi-level BHCC structure (internal only). KMD confirmed that BHCC P&I group's org chart had previously been issued. (both attached). It was noted that Major Works definition was between BHCC/POD whilst during Works Mears liaised mainly with P&I personnel. 4. Warranty management-JC emphasised the need for more post-work inspections. Further discussion still outstanding. 5. Quality Assurance- it was reported that the council's Housing Programme Team do have staff who do Quality Assessments on Major and other works. 6. LAG Terms of Reference – See later 7. The committee agreed the minutes of the meeting on 8 August 2016 to be a true reflection of what was discussed at the meeting. (This was a member-only meeting which the council did not attend)
--	---

Agenda item 3 Terms Of Reference

Action(s)	By Who	Deadline
Make changes and provide copies of new Terms of Reference to LAG	KMD	Nov 2016
Agreement / Decision	<p>The committee's comments on the draft have been included. Two further changes were agreed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Item 2- title to read- Membership of the Group. 2. Item 4- Add statement that any committee meeting must have a quorum of 3 excluding the Chair. 3. The revised Terms were subsequently agreed. 	

Agenda item 4 Major Works Process

Action(s)	By Who	Deadline
Agreement / Decision	<p>GH tabled the attached statements--'Involving leaseholders in Major Works Process' and 'Changes to Major Works Consultation Process.'</p> <p>GH said he was prepared to further discuss at any time.</p>	

Agenda item 5 LAG Action Plan

Action(s)	By Who	Deadline

Agreement / Decision	<p>There was much discussion about what should be discussed at future meetings. The following list defines the agreed first 3 major items to be reviewed (one per meeting).</p> <p>Actions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Asset management and decision making around repair or replacement priorities. 2. Quality assurance and control for repairs. 3. Format of AGM. <p>Further topics shall be decided later and may include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Poor communication for major works and Section 20 process. 5. Review warranty and record management by BHCC. 6. LAG to meet with resident groups to discuss what the LAG do. 7. Find out more about the invitation to tender process and evaluation of tenders to ensure the selected offering represents good value. 8. Ask Mears representative to come and talk to us. 9. Ask councilors to attend LAG meetings. 10. Invite Asset Management Team to discuss how warranties are managed. (from section 1, item 4) 11. Invite John Currell to discuss identifying and planning major works projects. (from section 2, item 2) 		
Agenda item 6 Leaseholder Survey			
Action(s)		By Who	Deadline
Agreement / Decision	Deferred to next meeting.		
Agenda item 7 Partnership Group Report Discussion			
Action(s)		By Who	Deadline
Agreement / Decision	Deferred to next meeting.		
Agenda item 8 AOB			
Action(s)	<p>Post agreed previous minutes online</p> <p>Provide council IT Code of Conduct for review</p> <p>KM to lead on independent leaseholder Facebook group</p>	<p>KMD</p> <p>KMD</p> <p>KM</p>	<p>Nov 2016</p> <p>Nov 2016</p> <p>Ongoing</p>
Agreement / Decision	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. DC asked why all previous LAG minutes are not online. DA apologised for this, will ensure they are posted. 2. DC highlighted the Autumn "L/H Update" back page which directs people 		

	<p>who want to join an online email/social media group, to send their email address to rit@brighton-hove.gov.uk. DC asked who receives this email & who approves the sender (BHCC/LAG)? The Resident Involvement Team receives this email, this information will then be passed on to the chair of the LAG.</p> <p>There was much discussion about this & setting up such a group.</p> <p>LAG expressed concern about this group being independent from BHCC & having a free voice. Should BHCC have the right to moderate any leaseholder input? It would not seem logical to have one L/H group controlled by LAG & another controlled by BHCC.</p> <p>The group expressed a preference for a Facebook group with the group to decide whether this should be independent of the Council/LAG. GH agreed to provide details of the council's social media policy. Further discussions are needed to agree how will this move forward.</p> <p>Meeting agreed for KM to proceed to prepare an independent online group.</p>
--	---