

| | | | |
|-------------------------|--|--|---------------------|
| Subject: | Future of the Housing Management Consultative Sub-Committee (discussed under Chair's Communications - Extract from the Proceedings of the Housing Management Consultative Sub-Committee Meeting held on the 1st April 2014 | | |
| Date of Meeting: | 1 May 2014 | | |
| Report of: | The Monitoring Officer | | |
| Contact Officer: | Name: | Caroline DeMarco | Tel: 29-1063 |
| | E-mail: | caroline.demarco@brighton-hove.gcsx.gov.uk | |
| Wards Affected: | All | | |

FOR GENERAL RELEASE

Action Required of the Policy & Resources Committee:

To receive the item referred from the Housing Management Consultative Sub-Committee for information:

Recommendation:

- (1) That the allocation of funding as shown in Appendices 2 and 3 to the report be agreed for inclusion within the Council's Capital Investment Programme 2014/15.

HOUSING MANAGEMENT SUB-COMMITTEE

3.00 pm 1 April 2014

COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL

DRAFT MINUTES

Present: Councillor Randall (Chair); Councillor Peltzer Dunn (Opposition Spokesperson), Councillor Farrow (Opposition Spokesperson), Councillors Mears, West and Wilson

Tenant Representatives Heather Hayes (Brighton East Area Housing Management Panel), Jason Williams (Central Area Housing Management Panel), Alison Gray (Central Area Housing Management Panel), J Barry Hughes (North & East Area Housing Management Panel), Roy Crowhurst (West Hove & Portslade Area Housing Management Panel), John Melson (High Rise Action Group), Tony Worsfold (Leaseholder Action Group), Charles Penrose (Sheltered Housing Action Group) and Ann Packham (Tenant Disability Network)

PART ONE

Future of the Housing Management Consultative Sub-Committee (discussed under Chair's Communications)

- 49.6 Councillor Farrow asked the Chair if there could be a discussion on the future of the Sub-Committee. The Housing Management Area Panels had become aware of the administration's proposal to abolish the HMCSC.
- 49.7 The Chair explained that this was not solely the administration's proposal. The matter had been discussed at both the Constitution Review Working Group and Leaders' Group and a decision had not yet been taken. A report on the future of the Sub-Committee would be submitted to the Policy and Resources Committee on 1 May. In the meanwhile, the matter had been discussed at the Area Panels. The East Area Panel had been well attended and there was a split view on the subject. Some people had felt that there was too much politics in the Sub-Committee. 85% of those present favoured having four area panels that reflected ward boundaries.
- 49.8 Councillor Mears expressed concern that tenants were not given the opportunity to vote on this matter or give their views. This was possibly the last meeting of the Housing Management Consultative Sub-Committee.
- 49.9 The Chair replied that the proposal was not a secret. Political group leaders would have known about the proposal since July 2013.
- 49.10 Councillor Peltzer Dunn accepted that this matter had been raised at the Constitution Review Working Group of which he was a member. He felt it would be a retrograde step to disband the Sub-Committee. The West Area Housing Management Panel had called for a vote but had been told by officers that tenants did not have the right to vote on this matter. 100% of the tenants had been against the abolition of the Sub-Committee. He suggested that an indicative vote was taken on this issue.
- 49.11 Councillor West noted that it appeared that consideration of this proposal had been going on for some time. He was surprised that councillors had not raised their objections before. If councillors were unhappy with the proposal they would have an opportunity to change the recommendations at the Policy & Resources Committee, where the administration did not have a majority. The proposal had to be decided by mutual agreement.
- 49.12 The Chair stated that there were two City Assembly meetings a year and a Tenants Scrutiny Panel. He considered that the Housing Management Area Panel meetings were more useful than the Sub-Committee. The proposals would not affect the various action groups such as the Hi Rise Action Group.
- 49.13 John Melson considered that the action groups would be affected as they did not have representatives on the Area Panels. He questioned which area panel, would be appropriate for members of the Hi Rise Action Group to attend.
- 49.14 The Chair noted that Mr Melson had been in attendance at the Central Area Panel.

- 49.15 Mr Melson stated that there had been consultation with councillors but not with tenants' groups. Tenants had made it clear at a meeting with the Head of Income, Involvement & Improvement that they did not accept the proposal to disband the Sub-Committee. Mr Melson stated that tenants should be allowed to vote on the issue.
- 49.16 Heather Hayes stressed that there was currently an opportunity for tenants to speak to councillors and senior officers at the Sub-Committee meeting. She expressed concern that this would not be the case at the Area Panel meetings.
- 49.17 The Chair agreed that it was important that senior staff should attend the Area Panels. It was also important that there was good tenant attendance at the meetings.
- 49.18 Tony Worsfold queried where the views of the Leaseholder Action Group would be considered. Mr Melson agreed that leaseholders had a genuine concern as they would not have a voice in future.
- 49.19 The Chair agreed for an indicative vote from tenants at the meeting. There was a unanimous vote in favour of retaining the Housing Management Consultative Sub-Committee.