

## Haringey Leaseholders' Association Committee Meeting

**Meeting held on Monday 08 February online by Zoom (hosted by LG)**

In attendance

Margaret Clapson, Treasurer (MC)	Nick Martin-Clark, Committee Member (NMC)
Melanie Scagliarini, Chair (MS)	Barbara Tierney, Committee Member (BT)
Lloyd Grandson, Secretary (LG)	Hristo Ivanov, Committee Member (HI)
Kevin Mann, Observer (KM)	Linda Royals, Observer, (LR)

Meeting started at 19:06

### Apologies

Barbara Fenning, Michael Hardy, Michael Blaesbalk, Peter Gilbert

### Minutes of 18 January 2021

Agreed

### Windows and Doors

[KM joins 19:13] [HI joins 19:14] [MC joins 19:15]

- NMC - We are not going ahead with our JR.
- MS acknowledges the hard work, time and effort put in to this.
- MS asks for responses
  - LG – wanted to understand the original legal reason behind Haringey Council's decision allowing us to fit our own windows/doors. NMC – it was never a legal right but a concession. We are not in a position of strength.
  - LG – reiterates his problem with how Haringey Council went about the whole process of removing our rights, their power over us etc.
  - BT – asks about the former leasehold panel and whether it'd be worthwhile re-introducing.
  - NMC – Wouldn't overstate the leasehold panel, however it was resident-led and not all bad. Perhaps we could explore getting back to this.

Leasehold panel ended very badly, abruptly during a heated meeting and row about allowing a vote on who should chair the meeting.

- KM – asks if anybody follows Haringey Council twitter or FB. How many residents put their views on there. MS says not many leaseholders use twitter or FB to correspond with them. LG says main reason – Haringey Council ignored us.
- KM – raises the prospect of setting up a CIC, we could get funding, it may make Haringey Council take us more seriously.

- MS – worth exploring this but perhaps we should take a step back and look at the HLA: who we are, what do we want to do, what kind of change do we want to make, then apply that to CIC. Important to build up leaseholder base.
- KM – discusses service charges and other surplus charges throughout the year and the importance of questioning these, politely asking for an invoice. He's had an invoice reduced from £1000 to approx. £100 due to Council errors. Some jobs they do come under the heading 'insurance'. Important to dig and query everything.
- MS asks – where do we want to go as an organisation re gaining more presence, more power, what key achievements do we want to gain.

### **HfH being taken back in-house**

- MS – this may be a good opportunity to improve our consultation with the Council.
- LG – One key achievement would be to build up better communications with Haringey Council.
- LR – Still a lot of uncertainty. Bringing ALMO back in house still has to be consulted on. We don't know the timescale. We are bound, gagged and tied by our contract with the HfH. Asks whether it would be possible to get any leverage from the scrutiny panel for Housing.
- NMC – We haven't had much to do with the Housing scrutiny panel. Our focus has been HfH.
- LR – HfH recognise that their communication and satisfactory levels are appalling. LR is waiting 5 months for a response from Tracy Downie, the person who's the Director of one of the panels. LR ran a CIC for 10 years and says it won't frighten anybody. However, acknowledges it could be used as a barrier or means to protect leaseholders. From legal perspective – the fire safety bill (which Council are basing their win/door decision on) is still being bounced around Commons. We still don't know what leaseholder responsibility is on historical neglect. Lots of uncertainty underpinning the legal framework for major works and with what they're going to do with the entity (ALMO) responsible for managing the housing.
- BT – asks if representatives from HfH or Council every attended the HLA in-person meetings.
- NMC – not to committee meetings to AGMs back in 2008/9 when we were doing well with 100 people turning up to in-person meetings.
- MS – Probably worthwhile lobbying our councillors, MP not on specific issues but on better engagement, with a focus on the human side. It'll be granular but another avenue we can explore. MS says she'll have a think about this and come back with ideas.
- NMC – would like to see the HLA having much more involvement and responsibility, have our own premises, get funded through a levy (*small amount on the management fee through service charges*). We could be in control of the consultation budget paid for by our service charges. We could be a part of their system, a hybrid, with access to their database allowing us to consult properly and not be seen as a 3<sup>rd</sup> party. We are the recognised leasehold representative group, and should be trusted.

- LG – Something similar was suggested in the past during mediation with a couple of councillors, them suggesting that the HLA would have the means to listen to leaseholders. This never got off the ground, again down to poor communication.
- KM – suggest looking in to rent-free premises using council-owned empty locations for example. Having an office, a presence. LG says there'd still be 10% rent to pay and HLA doesn't have the funds.
- KM – having an office would look good. Back to CIC. LG says he'd look in to this.
- LG - HfH going back in house – will this improve things? Will it be the same employees?
- KM says it's inevitable. Same staff with same attitudes.

### **Treasurer's Report**

- Balance as at end Jan is £7769.61
- Standing order anomaly with Rosie Bennet has been stopped. She will receive a refund of £500.

### **Update on Noel Park**

Nobody present, no update.

### **Management agreement challenge to service charge**

To discuss at next meeting.

### **AOB**

Present for Sue. It was agreed – a kindle, cinema voucher, flowers and card.

Meeting closed at 20:38