

## **Haringey Leaseholders' Association Committee Meeting**

**Ad-hoc meeting held on Monday 16<sup>th</sup> September 2019 at Wood Green Social Club**

In attendance

**Committee:**

Sue Brown, Chair (SB)

Margaret Clapson, Treasurer (MC)

Nick Martin-Clark, Secretary (NMC) [by phone]

Michael Hardy, Committee Member (MH)

The meeting was opened at 20:30pm

Those present voted unanimously to adopt Arthur Taylor-Nottingham as a committee member.

## HLA/HfH Resident Engagement Meeting

Monday 16<sup>th</sup> September 2019, 6pm Commerce Rd, N22

HLA: MC, SB, NMC, Arthur Taylor-Nottingham (AT-N)

HfH: Cinyere Ugwu, Community & Customer Relations Director, Reda Khelladi, Community Engagement Manager

MC asked to be included in emails from HfH as Treasurer

CU explained that the Asset Mgt meeting had been arranged after the last HLA / HfH meeting. Although one person was sick the meeting was still going ahead. Health & Safety and Leasehold Services will also be present.

For this meeting CU confirmed that the recognition extension is granted. The Civic Centre has been booked for the AGM and the Community Centre is booked for committee meetings. CU will send an email.

NMC checked that this was being done under the Recognition Criteria. CU agreed that recognition was being extended beyond 29.12.19 when it would have normally expired. CU agreed that this was discretionary help.

RK said that flexibility was good and rigidity was not helpful. He preferred collaboration. RK said they had two sets of rules. One set of rules was for local residents' associations. The Borough-wide organisations are under the same rules as before as introduced in 2007. CU asked to be sent a copy of the RC.

CU forwarded an email from SB asking for confirmation of the RC to NMC. NMC said she had not confirmed that the RC applied in that email but had just forwarded the email received from SB. NMC said he was already aware of the email SB had sent. NMC asked CU to confirm that the RC applied in the email. CU refused. The meeting became heated and difficult on this point.

HLA raised the question of piggy-backing. CU asked if that had been dealt with in the letter from Puneet. NMC said that it was not the focus of that communication. RK said that PR had said that the Board had decided against piggy-backing and that the HLA should ask for clarity from PR. RK said that piggy-backing was not done for any other group but that PR had agreed to it as a one-off for the next HLA AGM. SB said there were no other groups like us. RK said there was the ATR. SB said the two groups had different needs.

RK said that his budget would pay for the piggy-backing but he didn't know the cost. CU said that PR was in control of this issue going forward. NMC said PR had refused a meeting. CU suggested that the HLA make a complaint about this refusal.

On data protection NMC said that the database had been given to the HLCG whatever the official position. CU said the rules were strict and that PR could deal with this.

Future committee meetings on 4.11.19, 3.2.20 and 6.4.20 confirmed. AGM confirmed for 9.5.20 10am-12. CU asked for issues raised at GM to be sent on to her.

## Haringey Leaseholders' Association and HfH Meeting

Meeting held on Monday 16<sup>th</sup> September 2019 at Commerce Rd, N22

In attendance

### HLA:

Sue Brown, Chair (SB)  
Margaret Clapson, Treasurer (MC)  
Michael Hardy, Committee member (MH)  
Peter Gilbert, Leaseholder (PG)  
Emilio Zorlakki, Leaseholder (EM)

Nick Martin-Clark, Committee mbr (NMC)  
Arthur Taylor-Nottingham, L'holder (ATN)  
Kevin Mann, Committee Member (KM)  
Martin Harley, Leaseholder (MaH)

### HfH:

Mike Bester, Leasehold Services Mgr (MB), Reda Khelladi, Resident & Community Engagement Mgr (RK), Sandra Williams, Asset Mgt Project Mgr (SW), Marek Sicak, Head of Health & Safety Compliance (MS)

The meeting began at 18:00. The topic for discussion was the doors & windows problem. SW said she was staning in for Manley Murray, Deputy Head of Services, who was off sick. She would take questions back.

MH said the feedback received by the HLA was mainly about the high per-unit cost of the proposed fire doors; also that quality was an issue. **Why was the cost so high?** The overall cost appeared to be £1.1m.

MB said that was the cost of package 4 but there were other packages.

MH said problem was variability in cost. The range was from £1,500 to £2,500. That was excessive. **Why was the variation so great?** He asked how the apportionment was done.

MB said it was done according to the terms of the lease.

MH asked how many packages there were.

SW said there were currently 6 packages. MB said there were 21,000 units in total. SW said phasing of works was linked to life-cycle of current doors.

MH said replacement was not necessarily the only solution to the problem of fire risk.

MS said that fire doors were sold as a package with a frame, side-light, panel or other furniture added in. The Fire Risk assessors check whether the current doors are compliant as well as whether they had reached the end of their life-span.

MH said one-size fits all approach should lead to economies of scale. **Why had this not happened?**

SW said not all packages were procured at the same time.

MH said some leaseholders had replaced their own doors.

SW said residents can replace their own doors providing they conform to the relevant technical specifications and subject to permission.

SB said that a windows policy had been agreed in 2008 along those lines.

MB said that the windows policy was currently being reviewed and that permission was not being given for leaseholders to replace either doors or windows until the review had concluded.

**NMC asked if there could be consultation on this point.**

MB said there was no consultation on this issue as it was a H&S issue.

KM asked how fire checks were done. MS said the assumption was non-compliance. Checks were done for excessive gaps, proper letter-boxes & door handles and certification was requested from the previous installer. Certification was not always easy to get. Fire doors now have to pass a 'burns' test. The door has to withstand 400° C for 30 minutes. These tests were costly and this contributes to the high cost of the doors.

MH said leaseholders could get compliant doors.

KM said he'd put in a door with exactly the same specification for half the price. MS said he did not know how overall cost was built up.

SW said she would take the question about economies of scale back. She said the aim was to get value for money. The pause for review was as a result of guidance from the Ministry of Housing. **SW asked who KM's contractor was.** SW said the cost would depend on the exact work done and might include scaffolding costs.

SW said timber doors had been chosen for aesthetic reasons and that consultation over preferred colour was anticipated.

SB said some people had been waiting for 2 years for answers and this was too long. One leaseholder had contacted the HLA because she was stuck with an unsafe door in an unsafe area that she was not allowed to replace. This was unreasonable.

**MB asked if that leaseholder had contacted the repairs team.** SB said she didn't know. NMC said it was probably not that the door was old just that it was not strong enough.

SB said the doors in her block were not uniform. **MB asked if SB had had a s20 notice.** SB did not know.

**MH asked how long the review would take.** SW to respond.

**MH asked about the asbestos survey charge.** Why is there a separate survey for each building? Wasn't there already a register in the possession of the Council?

MB said the asbestos removal item was an allowance in case it was necessary. He would come back with an answer on the survey cost.

MS said an asbestos register for communal areas was a regulatory requirement. Asbestos can be in the ceiling or the walls. The register is open subject to request. All contractors had to do a site-specific survey for refurbishment works. Some buildings have R & D (Refurb & Demolition) surveys but not all. Some had management surveys that were based on extrapolation.

MH said previous work should have involved looking at the asbestos risk / doing a survey. Was that taken into account? MS said checks were carried out & information was provided to the contractor about previous findings.

NMC asked what the procedure was for giving the previous information. MS said the pre-construction information was provided as part of the CDM for each project. Each project had a CDM (Construction Design & Management).

**MH asked about the replacement of electricity cupboard doors at £900 per door.** MS asked if other work was involved.

MH said that making good was a concern. SW said that clerks of works certify that work has been done. Sign-off prior to payment was a requirement and residents had an opportunity to point out mistakes.

PG said his s20 had come in November 17, then the door-measurements were done in April 18 and then in August 18 there had been a risk management survey. **Was this done as a result of Grenfell?** SW said it might have been that an additional survey was needed anyway.

**MH asked why waste removal was listed as a separate item and not included in the rest of the contract.**

**NMC asked if contracts were tendered.** SW said they were part of framework agreements. SW to come back on this.

MS said the situation had been blocked for two years after the Ministry of Housing identified a problem with door design post-Grenfell.

NMC asked if it was fair to charge leaseholders in advance if there was no clarity about the start of the work. MB said the work was due to be carried out this financial year so the advance charges were reasonable.

SB asked if doors could be treated the same as windows. MB said the review was likely to conclude, on the contrary, that windows could not be safely fitted except by HfH so that leaseholders would in future lose their right to install both windows and doors.

RK said that HfH should co-ordinate its responses and send them to MH in the first instance.

## HLA Committee Meeting at Commerce Road

Queries raised by the HLA Committee on Monday 16<sup>th</sup> September 2019

Q1. How was the contract procured?

Haringey Council's Major Works Frameworks

Q2. How did we arrive at the costs?

Contractors were invited to tender based on their prelims, profit and overheads based on the agreed schedule of rates of the Supply Chain Management Group

Q3. How did we determine how to separate the work?

Current workload of contractor and capacity to deliver

Q4. How was it determined which properties would go into package 4?

Geographic / location and capacity to deliver

Q5. What is the accreditation for the Fire Doors?

Tests undertaken to British Standard BS-476:223 in a UKAS accredited test house on complete door sets facing into and away from the furnace.

Q6. Can Leaseholders opt out of the programme for Doors or Windows? – No.

Q7. When will the works for Package 4 commence.

Final Health and Safety checks and updated tenders are currently being reviewed by the Project Team and we anticipate restarting the Programme in early 2020.

Q8. What is the timeline for the windows and doors to be replaced for package 4?

To be determined by answer to Q7

Q10. What is the timeline for the review of the Fire doors?

HFH have taken the decision to move forward with timber doors. Final Health and Safety checks and updated tenders are currently being reviewed by the Project Team and we anticipate restarting the programme in early 2020.

Q11. What process do we have to ensure that the contractor receives information on previous work undertaken?

Availability of HFH FRA reports – the H&S team formed part of the project team and work closely with the contractor. Any works to be undertaken are reviewed by the H&S team.

Q12. Are Asbestos surveys available for residents to view?

The H&S team can provide copies of surveys upon request

Q13. How do we monitor duplication of Asbestos surveys?

H&S team provide information about the presence of asbestos to principal contractor at the start of the project as part of the 'Pre-Construction Information'. Should the survey not cover the specific work locations, Principal Contractor is required to obtain/carry out the site-specific asbestos survey to ensure that asbestos is not disturbed during the course of the works. The duplication of surveys are managed by the quantity surveyor or whoever carries out this duty on behalf of HFH.

Q14. Who checks the quality of the works?

Consultants and HFH Clerk Of Works.

Q15. Are the contracts tendered?

The contracts have gone through a competitive process of tendering to comply with procurement rules and legislation

Q16. Are the doors on hold?

Yes

Q17. How long has the doors been on hold?

The programme has been on hold since October 2018.

Q18. Can leaseholders expect a refund if the works do not commence within this financial year?

The intention is for the works to be carried out in this financial year.

Q19. If a leaseholder is between jobs will the Council consider postponing the payments or offer a manageable payment plan?

Any leaseholder who is facing difficulty in keeping to a payment plan should contact the Leasehold Services Team as soon as possible. They will do their best to assist the leaseholder, subject to the Council's policy for repayment of service charges.

Q20. Two years ago Fire Doors were installed to 2 blocks in Vincent Square, the third block only had fire doors installed to one end of the block leaving some doors still to be fitted. Will the leaseholders that has not receive a new door be expected to contribute to the cost of the replacement of any non-compliant doors?

Charging of any works will be in accordance with the terms of the lease. The LH would not be expected to pay for works that has not been done or approved by the project delivery team.

Q21. Why was the remaining doors to the block in Vincent Square not replaced?

Decision made by the council at that time was to stop manufacturing and installing doors until it has been confirmed that they meet the required fire safety standard.

Q23. £900.00 was charged as a total cost for the door to the electrical intake cupboard in Kelland Close. Why is the cost of door £900.00 pounds?

The cost of the door to the intake cupboard is £913.39. Our Cost Consultant will confirm how the cost are built up.

Q24. The Leaseholder of 8 Norman Close had has had the door measured twice and a FRA done. Is there a need to undertake these surveys again?

HFH have taken the decision to move forward with timber doors. Final Health and Safety checks and updated tenders are currently being reviewed by the Project Team and we anticipate restarting the programme in early 2020, and as such it is likely that the doors will need to be re- measured.