

KENSINGTON & CHELSEA TENANT MANAGEMENT ORGANISATION

Programme Board - 19th December 2013

Present: Yvonne Birch
Sacha Jevans
Anthony Parkes

In attendance: Nick Rendle
Jane Clifton

Apologies: Robert Black

1. Introduction to development governance

Peter Maddison and David Burns attended for this and the following items. The position was that a clear steer was needed from the RBKC development group. The Council's development group included Nicholas Holgate, the Leader, Deputy Leader, and Cllr Coleridge. Peter Maddison and David Burns had met RBKC that morning, and needed to do the next piece of work, but there was some uncertainty with Corporate Property making a pitch to do some work, and we wanted to ensure that Laura Johnson was on side with us.

RBKC were setting up the local housing company, and our role was also not clear regarding this. It was queried how we could get involved and also manage the development group meeting in February, and position ourselves with Laura Johnson. It was anticipated that the RBKC development group would be taking forward development on the estates, and Laura Johnson would be attending rather than the TMO.

Peter Maddison and David Burns were doing more work on the estates, and looking at the development potential, and what would strengthen the NVP etc. Anthony Parkes/Robert Black were due to meet Laura Johnson on 20th December, and would see what support she would like from the TMO.

Following a meeting with Ruth Angel, David Burns was looking at the potential on the estates for development opportunities, and we were doing capacity studies on a range of options.

We could not approach Cllr Feilding-Mellen direct, as we worked

**Action
by**

with him through Laura Johnson, who was also keeping Cllr Coleridge, the former Cabinet Member, briefed. Initially Cllr Feilding-Mellen had been only interested in Lancaster West and Silchester Estates for regeneration, but the Council's vision was no longer clear although we could help with information from the capacity studies we had carried out on the estates.

Laura Johnson to be advised that we have carried out the studies, and would like to share them. Peter Maddison had already advised Cllr Feilding-Mellen that we had drawn up a list of development opportunities.

Regarding the governance arrangements, it was queried whether our best option was to feed in information through Laura Johnson to RBKC's development group. Ruth Angel had indicated that the report from us was not what was wanted for the development group in February. We wanted to present a broader plan than Michael Clark's 'cherry picking' approach. He was interested in high value estates such as Tor Court, Wandon Estate (out of borough), and Sheffield Terrace. It was agreed that Robert Black and Anthony Parkes raise our concerns on the way forward with Laura Johnson at a meeting on 20th December, which would then be followed up.

RB/AP

2. Capacity studies

David Burns made a presentation on the capacity studies:

Silchester Estate

Any works could be phased, and there was scope for another 14 story block. The proposed model would be like Wornington Green, and we would retain the existing tower, but increase the density. We would retain 240 units, and demolish 110 other units, resulting in an additional 200 units depending on the unit mix. Currently there were lots of studio units. Building a new 14 story tower could be a challenge, but it would be near the Westway, so there was potential for commercial lets on the ground floor. There would also be an option for more private sales.

It was anticipated that RBKC would be interested in a mixture of tenures, and increasing the number of larger units would facilitate private sales.

Construction costs and tender prices also to be taken into consideration, but it was thought that the proposals would work financially. A full cost model could be done, including advice on sales. It was thought that if we presented the options to Cllr

Feilding-Mellen, it would then be RBKC's decision on the way forward.

Lancaster West

The three finger blocks included a lot of studios, and it was an awkward site. It was queried whether it would be possible to improve pedestrian access. The best option was demolition of the finger blocks, and restoring the original street pattern although the railway line had to be taken into consideration. With the proximity of Latimer Road tube, more amenities could be provided in front of Grenfell Tower.

With the proposals, it would be possible to produce 192 additional units, including the towers. It was not possible to double the density. However, another consideration was that the area could become too built up with the re-developed Silchester Estate nearby. A more humane layout would provide 226 additional units.

Costs would be £24m because of the leaseholders. There would be demolition costs, and there was negative land values at present even with sales, so the proposals were not dense enough. An option would be to have less social housing than at present, and generate more sales. If work was done at Silchester first, it would be possible to decant residents to new units there.

It was thought that it was possible for the plans to be financially viable. RSL developments tended to break even further down the line i.e. year 8 onwards, but it was queried whether we could afford to do that. The redevelopment would be subsidised from existing surpluses initially.

Treverton/Raymede Towers

We were looking at the land around them, and some work could be done in order to achieve up to 100 additional units. Re-development would be straightforward, and we could contain decanting on site. This re-development would be an easy project to start with. Existing towers were low performing.

Convent Estate/Lowerwood Court

Re-development opportunities had been considered at the last meeting.

PM/DB

3. Capital programme 2014/15

We were ahead with works for 2014/15, and would be on site in

<p>April 2014. As the tenders were high, money could be moved from the kitchen and bathroom programme i.e. £6m for external works, and £1m for kitchens and bathrooms.</p>	<p>PM</p>
<p>4. <u>Grenfell Tower</u></p> <p>Planning permission had now been given, and we were out to tender, with tenders scheduled to be returned on 31st January. One of the tenderers had pulled out, and there was concern about the costs because it would be a difficult project. The tender market was currently unpredictable.</p>	<p>PM</p>
<p>5. <u>Other Asset Management issues</u></p> <p>There were concerns about RBKC trying to get inside Lowerwood Court without explaining why to residents. Although the Council were looking at it, any energy strategy work would feed into existing work. David Burns was meeting RBKC on their expectations. There could be an opportunity when carrying out any regeneration work.</p>	<p>DB</p>
<p>6. <u>Hidden Homes</u></p> <p>Holmefield House had been handed over.</p> <p>Whistler Walk was still at the planning application stage, and funding was being sorted out.</p> <p>Peter Maddison and David Burns left the meeting at this point.</p>	
<p>7. <u>Matters arising from the meeting held on 21 November</u></p> <p>7.1 <u>Development work</u> - it was queried whether legal advice was necessary on how development work fitted into the MMA.</p> <p>7.2 <u>Community Centre Review</u> - new member of staff for this area of work would be approved by Executive Team in the New Year.</p>	<p>YB/AP</p>
<p>8. <u>ICT project plan and Online Services</u></p> <p>Nural Miah attended for this item. The ICT project plan could be divided into two, with some unmovable items i.e. annual fixtures and upgrades. An important Capita upgrade would take place in January (18.2) which would take a few weeks, but would provide additional functions. This work would be done in line with the year end, and was also dependent on when the upgrade was released by Capita. Other areas were online services, changes for Home</p>	

Ownership, and the introduction of fixed term tenancies.

It was queried how work was resourced. The project management was done externally, and involved a lot of people at different stages. We were doing the 18.1 and 18.2 Capita upgrades at the same time as they were being released close together.

The other area was unplanned work, including upgrading of pcs. However, the major issues up to April 2014 were the Capita upgrades and the year end.

There were some registration problems in connection with the on-line service. We had 447 at different stages of registration, which was being monitored by W2. Capita had informed us that they were stopping maintenance of Hummingbird, so we had to migrate to Insight, which would create a lot of work, but we can still use Hummingbird.

We had a specification for mobile working for the ESAs, and Capita had informed us that another housing association were interested, and would make a decision when they have the development plan.

The specification for the sub-contractor web portal was circulated. Repairs Direct was the most important area for development work. Nural Miah confirmed that the work would be done, and there was some discussion on when it would be completed. It was thought that it would be March as Capita had confirmed that some work needed to be done on the development side. We also needed to identify the person in Repairs Direct who would train the sub-contractors (Laura Murphy), while Nural led on the development side. A report to be brought back to Programme Board on the project.

NM

Nural Miah was waiting to hear back from Capita following the work on the specification with Rupa Bhola and Andy Marshall. He felt that Gil Komur was the best person to do the work, but it was thought that we needed to have a permanent member of staff working on the project because of concerns about having the right level of input in-house. The number of sub-contractor jobs had been under-estimated, and there was a problem with sub-contractors varying the jobs so they could not be matched. It was agreed to give priority to the sub-contractor project, and defer the ESAs if necessary.

9. Call Centre workflows

Workflows were needed not just for repairs. Gil Komur was due to

finish by the end of December, but it was proposed that she stay on to do the workflow specifications in the call centre over the next 3 – 4 months. With regard to costs, we would save money with the workflows. It was thought that we had to do this work, as it encompassed our vision for the call centre i.e. development of scripts, and now the workflows. It was proposed that we go for a fixed term contract, and this would be discussed with Gil. Some of the costs could be capitalised as IT technology.

Gil Komur joined the meeting at this point. She was aiming to have information on a single front screen on W2, and the second part would be developing the script for transferring calls. Another big area was call logging i.e. tracking calls, e-mails and phone calls so we had the whole history of contacts with the organisation. At present there was no real ownership of calls in the CSC. Some of the processes were already in existence, but needed to be introduced for the CSAs. It was agreed that we go ahead, but it was probably a longer process for both development and testing than 3 – 4 months.

SJ

10 EDRMS

Clare Davis attended for this item. The introduction of fixed term tenancies was the main focus at present, and was being done in conjunction with Annabel Davidson. There was also an overlap with Gil Komur on CDM. The budget implications would be worked through, and the development of a front screen.

It was recognised that this was work which we had wanted to do two years' ago. There would be some consultant costs, and Lee Amos would be required to carry on beyond March 2015 as there were other projects in the pipeline.

It would be three months to do the scripting, and we needed a fully developed budget plan. Gil Komur was the best placed person to do the work.

Other priorities would have to be decided by Programme Board/ SMT. We were also waiting for Capita to come back on the ESA work which may be deferred because of other priorities.

11 Fixed term tenancies

Annabel Davidson attended for this item. Wendy Thomas, RBKC, would be presenting this to the Board in January. Fixed term tenancies would be implemented from 6th January 2014, and assurance was required that all procedures and policies were in place. The policy had been approved by the Cabinet at the end of

November, and would be amended if someone has had a secure tenancy with someone else. The Council have to inform us in advance of the viewing.

It was anticipated that there would be some teething problems as it is a major change. Voids were not being advertised as fixed term tenancies at present, and it would probably be the third week before they go live. An article would be included in the winter edition of the Link magazine.

Work still to be done included some Capita testing, work on W2, and leaflets about the changes for residents. It still had to go on the website, and work would be done on the tenants handbook.

On sign ups, Moira Macdonald would continue to do the viewing, and the neighbourhood officers would do the sign ups. The workflow would measure staff time etc., and Maria Needham/Kiran Singh would be monitoring closely.

It was queried when would be appropriate for Programme Board to review progress, in three or six months. We were one of the first authorities to introduce fixed term tenancies.

12 Community centre review

Work had commenced in advance of recruitment of a new member of staff. There had been a meeting with SPID that morning, and communications had been established with RBKC. It was hoped to recruit the community centre officer by March. There had been an expression of interest from Wandsworth, which would help us to get some income back.

13 Parking

Progress on commercial parking was slipping. The Walnut Tree House planning application had not gone in due to a Fortbox problem. Their directors were buying out their US partner, and establishing a new parent company, the Council's legal team advised that it would be preferable as an improved financial covenant. It would need Cabinet approval. Walnut Tree House residents would be updated on the revised terms. Report was due back from the bidders in early January so Holmeffield House could be let, and we had been meeting with a colleague of Ruth Angel. There was a possibility that we could re-locate artists' studios from Chelsea at Holmeffield House. Metrostore had now advised that they wanted break clauses at 3 and 5 years.

With reference to progress in the CSC on parking, there had been

<p>a good response from Vicky Gilbey and Carmella Davis. A marketing plan had also been produced, and Gil Komur would prepare a script for this.</p>	<p>NR</p>
<p>14 <u>Parking enforcement</u></p> <p>This project was progressing well, and an analysis would be made of returned surveys. Visitor parking would have to be considered, and it was hoped to report back a simpler option at the next meeting. Nick and Jacqui Picot would review all responses received. It was thought that we were on track for the introduction of the new arrangements in June 2014.</p>	<p>NR/JP</p>
<p>15 <u>Housing Regeneration Programme</u></p> <p>There had not been much progress, but we were still on track although there was zero spend. However, the start of the programme should not be this late, but the new Director of Housing was due to start in late February.</p>	
<p>16 <u>Date of next meeting</u></p> <p>The next meeting would be held on Friday, 17th January 2014.</p> <p>NR/JDC 31.1.14</p>	