

Appendix 3. Summary of Responses from Area Forums

Area Forum	Feedback received	Action taken / outcome
Aylesbury	<p>Aylesbury Area Housing Forum July 2011</p> <p>Housing Investment Programme & Revised Strategy</p> <p>EE - presented report delegates had not been sent revised report therefore these will be sent out by end of the week.</p> <p>EE - explained no plans for upgrades to heating plant rooms</p> <p>JB - expressed concerns relating to time scale of programme, i.e why is Brandon Estate ahead of Aylesbury?</p> <p>JB - asked for clarification as to what works in these areas would be carried out. Would it be a complete refurbishment or minor adjustments?</p> <p>JB - Raised concerns relating to Gaitskell House roof on schedule, and no renewal of gas boilers had been included, felt these should be replaced due to age. Concerned the works were not specific and Aylesbury should also be a priority on the time scale as estate has previously been neglected.</p>	<p>No change to programme.</p> <p>EE - explained the stock had been reviewed borough wide and it was felt windows, bath rooms etc would be a priority.</p> <p>EE - advised the dates of the programme were indicative dates and could be reviewed, any comments made by delegates and residents would be taken back to the investment team for reviewing. Also advised the exact details of works had not been specified, but once agreed a consultant would be appointment to review completed a detailed survey to establish extent of works required.</p> <p>EE - requested delegates consult with TRA as to programme schedule of planned works, and to feed back to Council. Advised delegates the options of feeding their consultations back.</p> <p>EE - advised the programme was a view based upon stock survey but could be revised.</p> <p>SH - summarised consultations do need to be feed back to cabinet but clarified concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) time scales of programme b) criteria being applied was a disadvantage for Aylesbury

Appendix 3. Summary of Responses from Area Forums

Area Forum	Feedback received	Action taken / outcome
Aylesbury (cont'd)	SS- commented that she did not want to see money wasted by blocks being repaired and then scheduled for demolition.	SH – advised Sarah Waller was working with Shaun Holdcroft on a demolition plan and PPM works to prevent this from happening. EE – confirmed programme was under a consultation period to confirm PPM was correct SH – added it was acknowledged and agreed a different approach must be made in relation to Aylesbury
Bermondsey East Councillor Michael Bukola Longfield TRA Astley Cooper TRA	(Longfield T&RA) Stansfield House to have windows and electrics in 5 year programme. Most blocks have had an internal rewire. Bermondsey East Area Forum 1. Lots of constituents complaining about old kitchens. 2. No estates in Ward with investment planned before next election. Goes against objective of fairness. 1. Stansfield House has multiple staircases listed, with different elements ticked eg. windows. Electrics: most have had internal rewire. 2. Dhonau House – some doors and windows replaced on 1 off basis. Most are in need of attention. 3. Residents would prefer works to kitchens rather than bathrooms. 1.1-31 Fortune Place isn't LBS property (Peabody Trust)	Position re electrics will be assessed prior to any works been undertaken. No changes required to planned programme. Resources v DH modern facilities criteria Action: Note sent to Cllr Bukola with summary of rationale for no kitchens. (MS) Draft programme based on SCS analysis of element life against Decent Homes criteria. Some properties in whole block will need element attended to, not necessarily all. Action: Clarification of this point needed as part of round up – general issue. Will be inspected. Ditto first response Will check data base

Appendix 3. Summary of Responses from Area Forums

Area Forum	Feedback received	Action taken / outcome
Bermondsey East (cont'd)	<p>2. Unity Court not mentioned. 2-10 Mawbey Place and 2-8 Fortune Place are and they're part of the same block. Also, they're only 5 years old</p> <p>3. TRA covers blocks in 4 places on schedule - Coopers Rd Est / Astley Estate / Mawbey Estate / Wessex House. Can they all be shown on schedules as Astley Cooper Estate?</p> <p>4. Lanark and Mawbey, older and in much worse condition than other blocks on estate. Eg roofs</p> <p>5. Astley House missing.</p> <p>6. Wessex House – electrics ok.</p> <p>7 Brodie House - one entrance has entryphone, one doesn't.</p>	<p>Will check data base. They're 2015/16 so something may have failed by then.</p> <p>Management info held by block / estate in pre-ordained format, some to do with development phasing.</p> <p>Action: suggest a general explanation as for Stansfield Hse.</p> <p>Will be inspected</p> <p>Doesn't need attention in 5 years.</p> <p>Will check database</p> <p>No funding in prog. Only if specific funding becomes available.</p>
Cllr Graham Neale	Rennie Estate does not have a TRA at present. Will they have the opportunity to feed in?	Check Area Team / Resident Involvement to see if some named contacts or meetings of any form taking place.
Cllr Michael Bukola	Rouel Rd – Ditto	Ditto
	Will communal decorations be included?	Generally not. V small ppm programme.
Bermondsey West	<p>1. Tupman House - can we check why it is not included.</p> <p>2. 65 -91 Hazel Way - the only block missing from the Setchel Estate. Again please check.</p>	<p>Quick chat with Kevin suggested that there may have been previous work by United House.</p> <p>These properties are not missing. There is a possible miscategorisation. They are labeled as estate houses and hence are not listed as a block but come under the 'estate houses or street properties' of satchel estate. Correct classification to be ascertained.</p> <p>No change to programme.</p>

Appendix 3. Summary of Responses from Area Forums

Area Forum	Feedback received	Action taken / outcome
Borough and Bankside	<p>Borough & Bankside Area Housing Forum</p> <p>Housing Investment Programme</p> <p>Maurice Soden presented the council's plan to make all council homes warm, dry & safe by 2016 with projected expenditure estimated at £326 million.</p> <p>PD asked for source of funding.</p> <p>FO asked where the fund from sales of housing assets go to, as it could be included in funding the housing investment programme.</p> <p>FO asked to find out the total capital receipts from the sale of the housing assets.</p> <p>FO asked why the stock condition survey only focussed on 10% of the Council properties.</p> <p>SS asked to find out how the stock condition survey of a tower block like Albert Barnes House was done.</p> <p>CH asked if there is provision for TMO's in the housing investment programme.</p> <p>DR suggested that the stock condition survey report of</p>	<p>Maurice Soden said the bulk of the fund will come from the major repairs allowance.</p> <p>Maurice informed the meeting that proceeds from the sale of housing assets goes into the general funds.</p> <p>Maurice said the information is usually captured in the reports that goes out to cabinet but would be happy to furnish the forum with such information.</p> <p>Maurice explained that other stock condition survey have been done in the past in addition to the recent one. This gives an appropriate outlook. 10% is a standard number and a snapshot as it is a daunting task to do a one-off stock condition survey of all council properties.</p> <p>Maurice said the survey was done with binoculars from the ground floor, consideration was given to the repairs and investment history of the block to give an appropriate outlook.</p> <p>Maurice said except for Leathermarket that runs their own capital investment programme, all other TMO's will get funding from the housing investment programme.</p> <p>Maurice said this would be looked into and rechecked to get</p>

Appendix 3. Summary of Responses from Area Forums

Area Forum	Feedback received	Action taken / outcome
Borough and Bankside (cont'd)	<p>Applegarth house may not present an accurate reflection of the situation in the block, because the five dwellings surveyed had benefitted from substantial investment by their occupants and requested for a re-assessment.</p> <p>DR is also worried with the timetable for implementation which is not favourable to some properties.</p> <p>PD said some residents in Kellow house are asking for cavity wall Insulation.</p> <p>FO said the schedule of housing investment programme sent to residents did not capture some important information such as the age of the property which will be useful for residents to be able to contribute more meaningfully to the proposal.</p> <p>JB asked why electrics are included in the housing investment programme since the annual maintenance budget is already being accommodated for this.</p> <p>LM said the investment proposals do not cover the whole of Albury Buildings as some door numbers are omitted.</p> <p>SS asked to find out if the faulty front and back doors of Albert Barnes House will be replaced under the programme.</p> <p>PD said since the issue of safety is central to the programme; security issues like effective communal front door system should have been included in the programme.</p> <p>PC asked if entry phones are included in the programme.</p>	<p>the real picture of things. He explained that if resources to the council increase, most of the investment plans could be pushed forward and accelerated.</p> <p>Maurice said this can be accommodated but will check.</p> <p>Maurice Soden said the age of the property is a factor but not an isolated element in the lifecycle of the property as the new properties appear to be giving more challenges. He will take this back and produce the information as requested for reference purpose.</p> <p>Maurice explained the difference between the repairs and maintenance budget and the investment budget which is periodic and handled by different contactors who have different terms of references.</p> <p>Maurice said he will look at this and amend as appropriate.</p> <p>Maurice said this is not accommodated with the current programme. but would report this to the investment team to see if any minor investment plan can accommodate this.</p> <p>Maurice Soden explained that front door and lifts are not included under this programme.</p> <p>Maurice said this is not included for now but maybe included if more resources are available as this is a key landlord obligation.</p>

Appendix 3. Summary of Responses from Area Forums

Area Forum	Feedback received	Action taken / outcome
Borough and Bankside (cont'd)	<p>JB asked if homeowners would be charged if entry phones are installed.</p> <p>JB asked for a review of the sanctions clause in the investment contracts to protect quality as past contracts had been compromised by poor quality jobs with contractors getting paid.</p> <p>LM asked if the Housing Investment programme will accommodate internal decoration.</p> <p>NS asked for the stock condition survey of Hayles Buildings to be done again because of many defective windows with some tenants being vulnerable.</p> <p>FO asked about the scope of work to be done on electrics as this should come under the repairs and maintenance budget rather than the housing investment budget.</p> <p>CH asked what the criteria would be for distributing funds in the event of more money being available for the programme.</p> <p>MP asked why leaseholders living on the ground floor including the disabled are asked to pay service charges for lifts as this is unfair and unjustified.</p>	<p>Maurice said homeowners have their contributions to make for all capital projects.</p> <p>CH explained that the housing committee in Cabinet is currently looking at leaseholders charges and would soon advise on this.</p> <p>Maurice Soden said there are sanctions/penalties in these contracts to protect quality and service delivery.</p> <p>Maurice said this is not provided for except in cases where there are building/structural defect resulting to damp and mould growth.</p> <p>Maurice said this would be taken back and reassessed.</p> <p>Maurice Soden said electrics was identified as a general issue and this was why it was included in the housing investment programme since it would have gone beyond the standard old age requirement.</p> <p>Maurice Soden said the stock condition survey will be a factor as it would be dependent on continuous assessment and survey of what significantly bad and funding is allocated based on these assessments.</p> <p>Maurice said this is leaseholders' management policy and not Investment policy but the common explanation for this over the years is that those on the ground floor may not use the lifts to get to their flat but they need it to get to their neighbours.</p>
Camberwell East	<p>Minutes received, no agenda item for investment programme.</p>	<p>N/A</p>

Appendix 3. Summary of Responses from Area Forums

Area Forum	Feedback received	Action taken / outcome
Camberwell West	<p>General comments on funding/Specific Property Queries: Glebe Estate - Bentley, Longleigh and Mayward also need new roofs.Flats 1-6, 83 Tower Mill Road are very new so shouldn't need any work.</p> <p>Brandon Estate</p> <p>Comber/Wyndham</p> <p>Crawford Estate</p> <p>Denmark Hill (Blanchedown)</p> <p>72 Grove Lane</p> <p>83 Grove Lane</p>	<p>Bentley, Longleigh and Mayward House, roof renewal not required within the 5 year programme. Catch up maintenance works required to these roofs under R&M contract. Tower Mill road, no work required within 5 year programme.</p> <p>Glenfinlas Way, electrics removed from 5 year programme.</p> <p>9-50 Laxley Close, bathrooms not in programme as they do not fail Modern facilities under Decent Homes. Laing House, electrics removed from programme. Bathrooms to Crossmount House not included in programme as they do not fail Modern facilities. Otterburn, Coniston, Kevan and Laird are only in for bathrooms to specific properties where the dwelling fails Modern Facilities.</p> <p>Baldock House electrics, roofs and windows only, Widecombe House only in programme for electrical work. Hereford House, boiler renewal removed. Crawford Road, with the exception of electrical work and windows, there are no failures requiring work either internally or externally within the 5 year programme.</p> <p>Internal surveys carried out, does not fail Modern Facilities, no dwellings requiring work within the 5 year programme.</p> <p>Works to windows to now be included in 5 year programme.</p> <p>Surveys carried out, no failures on Modern facilities, electrical works and works to chimney included within 5 year programme.</p>
Dulwich	Lycott Grove	No work required to FED's, survey information puts life beyond 5 year programme. All bathroom except no. 9 pass Modern facilities. Number 9 is the only failure and will have the bathroom renewed.

Appendix 3. Summary of Responses from Area Forums

Area Forum	Feedback received	Action taken / outcome
Dulwich (cont'd)	<p>Byron Court, Lordship Lane Estate</p> <p>Croxted Road Estate – Boiler/Insulation works needs explanation. If roof insulation this cannot be done as there is no access to loft space.</p> <p>Glazebrook Court – damp there caused by water coming through wet brickwork, and problem with soil stacks.</p> <p>Shackleton & Welldon Court – should be in same condition.</p>	<p>Melbourne Grove (part of Lytcott Grove) Doors included in 5 year programme together with electrics. No failures on Modern Facilities, bathrooms do not require renewal within current programme.</p> <p>Byron Court: No works in 5 year programme.</p> <p>System suggested that some properties may fail thermal comfort, through either inadequate heating system or lack of insulation. This will require further investigation to determine if works are needed.</p> <p>Surveyor visited and noted evidence of water penetration in the area of private balconies on the rear elevation – where the rain water pipe passes through the balcony slab. To be determined if this can be dealt with under responsive maintenance or as part of programme works.</p> <p>Both blocks have been re-surveyed and the data is now consistent. Both are in the programme for the same scope of works (Doors, Roof, Chimney Repairs)</p>
Nunhead & Peckham Rye	<p>Nunhead and Peckham Rye Forum. Gary Uren (GU) presented the council's plan to make all council homes warm, dry & safe.</p>	
Brenchley Gdns T&RA	<p>Will rising or falling costs, e.g. material and labour costs, have an impact upon the 5 Year Programme.</p> <p>What was the reason behind the change of name from "Decent Homes" to "Warm, Dry and Safe"</p>	<p>Allowance has been made within the programme to allow for cost fluctuations.</p> <p>"Warm, Dry and Safe" is more descriptive, focuses on the investment plans core objectives.</p>
Consort T&RA	<p>New windows and doors are not required on the Consort estate. The Consort estates communal heating system causes the properties to become extremely hot during the summer months</p> <p>The consultation time frame is far too short. Not enough time given to analyse the plans contents, canvass residents and</p>	<p>GU advised that the T&RA seek advice from the Engineering and Compliance communal heating team. Possibly invite an officer to attend a T&RA meeting to discuss the resident's issues.</p> <p>GU accepted the comment but advised the meeting that all parties (forums, T&RA's and individual residents) had until</p>

Appendix 3. Summary of Responses from Area Forums

Area Forum	Feedback received	Action taken / outcome
<p>Nunhead & Peckham Rye (cont'd) Bucham T&RA (Barsett estate)</p>	<p>provide comment</p> <p>How was the stock condition survey carried out.</p> <p>When re-wiring individual properties, why do the council install surface mounted mini-trunking and not utilise the existing, concealed electrical conduits. Mini-trunking can have a very unattractive appearance</p> <p>The consultation time frame is far too short. Not enough time given to analyse the plans contents, canvass residents and provide comment</p> <p>Will internal electrical work be carried out within leaseholder's properties</p> <p>The consultation time frame is far too short. Not enough time given to analyse the plans contents, canvass residents and provide comment</p>	<p>the 10th August 2011 to comment on the draft programme. GU advised the forum of the various means available for forums, T&RA's and individual residents to provide their comments to the council.</p> <p>GU stated that a % of properties across the borough were surveyed to ascertain their condition, the remaining properties were then cloned from these results on a like-for-like basis.</p> <p>GU accepted the comment but advised the meeting that all parties (forums, T&RA's and individual residents) had until the 10th August 2011 to comment on the draft programme. GU advised the forum of the various means available for forums, T&RA's and individual residents to provide their comments to the council.</p> <p>GU commented that electrical works will not generally be undertaken within leasehold properties. One exception to this would be where new communal electrical cables are being installed within a block, requiring electrical connections to be made to leaseholders electrical consumer units</p> <p>GU accepted the comment but advised the meeting that all parties (forums, T&RA's and individual residents) had until the 10th August 2011 to comment on the draft programme. GU advised the forum of the various means available for forums, T&RA's and individual residents to provide their comments to the council.</p>

Appendix 3. Summary of Responses from Area Forums

Area Forum	Feedback received	Action taken / outcome
Rye Hill Park T&RA	<p>A number of estates (including Rye Hill Park) have had a certain amount of Decent Homes work undertaken, e.g. doors and windows but were told that there was not enough money left to complete works internally. These estates (including Rye Hill Park) are not contained within the draft 5 year plan</p> <p>The consultation time frame is far too short. Not enough time given to analyse the plans contents, canvass residents and provide comment</p>	As above
Peckham Peckham (cont'd)	<p>David Lewis (DL) summarised the report.</p> <p>DL said now is not the time to comment on the report. Everyone should take it back to their TRA's and get their views and comments.</p> <p>RM said that a note of the TRA's that did attend needs to be made so that they can be sent the Housing Investment Plan.</p> <p>BA said her TRA thinks its just "lip service" and the council will ignore their comments and suggestions.</p> <p>BA asked what is the last date for their comments?</p>	<p>DL said every comment will be looked at. Any suggestion that is not taken on board will have an explanation.</p> <p>DL said end of August latest.</p>
Rotherhithe	<p>(HIP Consultation presented by Sabina Martin AMIP Investment Design Manager)</p> <p>Peter Suthers is sceptical of the basis on which the program is based. Peter goes through a copy of an apex of his own estate carried out in Dec and highlights health and safety works for Matson and Moreton that does not appear to need doing. Feels that the survey is either inaccurate or is a very cynical attempt</p>	<p>The Health and Safety works in question relate to flats 17 and 28 Matson House where inadequate kitchen space has been identified. The layout and profile of some blocks does not always allow for adequate spacing and layout to be achieved as the structure/kitchen space cannot be altered</p>

Appendix 3. Summary of Responses from Area Forums

Area Forum	Feedback received	Action taken / outcome
<p>Rotherhithe (cont'd).</p>	<p>to make the program achievable. Sabina informs that the stock condition survey may not be wholly accurate and that there are 4 stock condition and surveyors to clarify some works.</p> <p>Peter highlights that over approx last 7 years £27k of the repairs budget has been spent on Arica House windows, yet they are not down as works.</p> <p>Kiri Pieri feels that approx 75% of the Bonamy estate is not on the program. Belfry does not have street properties only blocks, Bramcote Grove contains mainly leaseholders. At the Decent Homes working party Cllr Wingfield has said no new boilers, now there are plans to replace in some blocks. All properties are of the same age yet only St Davids are listed for new windows</p> <p>Kiri also highlights no external works are in the program, however cracks are appearing on Holywell close and the cracks are just filled in. feels that the program is a disgrace. Would like surveyors to contact TRAs before visiting estates again, so that tenants can attend and highlight works.</p> <p>Melanie Devall queries as to why Maydew House, which appeared on the report on 31st may under an allowance, no longer appears. The works considered were previously based on 2 void flats. External decs are not included, the previous stock condition survey had said that they were needed, but the tenants had disagreed. The works were based on incorrect information.</p> <p>Gary Parker wants Maydew to be listed on the program of works but would also like to know why they were taken off.</p>	<p>without major structural works taking place. In these circumstances a note is recorded against such blocks and where alterations are not possible, these kitchens no longer fail Decent Homes/HHSRS.</p> <p>Arica House windows have recently been inspected/surveyed and are proposed to be part of the next 5 year planned housing investment programme.</p> <p>St Davids does not require new windows, windows removed from programme.</p> <p>Surveys undertaken do not identify any works to Holywell Close in this programme. Further inspection has identified settlement cracks that would be covered under the repairs and maintenance contract. Stock condition survey team would welcome contact with TRA's before visiting estates again.</p> <p>Maydew House due for special consideration outside of 5 year planned housing investment programme. External decs are not part of Decent Homes/WDS works and are not therefore included in the programme.</p> <p>As previously stated for Maydew House and as noted by Sabina, Four Squares are also to be given special</p>

Appendix 3. Summary of Responses from Area Forums

Area Forum	Feedback received	Action taken / outcome
<p>Rotherhithe (cont'd).</p>	<p>Also notes that on the report presented on 31st May, Four Squares were not mentioned. Sabina notes that it was a special consideration.</p> <p>Barry Duckett feels that this is a joke and is not happy to present to his tenants, it is below expectations. He would like council officers to attend TRA meeting to explain the works. Feels that the stock condition survey is a waste of money. Notes that the electrics in Columbia & Regina points were rewired 3 years ago. Sabina informs that if they have been replaced recently they will not be done. Barry feels that the more a tenant takes care of their property, the less they get back.</p> <p>Pamela Douglas – Adams Garden Estate. Kitchen and boilers are from around 1978 and so need to be done. Feels that her estate has been overlooked. Would like to know why on 2 blocks have bathrooms listed. Sabina replies that kitchens will only be done if absolutely necessary. Will report back concerns to stock condition surveyors.</p> <p>Jerry Hewitt wishes to address issue raised by Gary Parker and Melanie Devall with regard to the Four Squares. There are options for all 3 estates under review. Feels that the document is incomplete. The May 31 report had an investment overview and feels that it should have been included as it contained Maydew and Hawkstone.</p> <p>Jerry Hewitt lists estates that need to be added 1-96 John Kennedy House. Sabina notes that it is under the 2 year program which is current 1-32 Canute 1-32 Jarman 1-51 Canute 22-28 Rotherhithe Old Road.</p>	<p>consideration outside of the 5 year planned housing investment programme.</p> <p>David Lewis has attended TRA meeting as requested by Barry Duckett. Electrical works relates to CCU/fuse boards to 5 dwellings only. In line with the rewire works to both Regina and Columbia Point, this work is no longer required and will be removed from the programme.</p> <p>Kitchens are not being renewed in the current programme. Where kitchens and bathrooms contributes towards the failing of Modern facilities, only the bathroom components will be renewed as this is sufficient to enable the passing of Decent Homes. Boilers will now only be renewed where the yearly inspection states that the boiler is no longer fit for purpose.</p> <p>These blocks are included in the "current programme" (remainder of previous 2 year programme of work).</p>

Appendix 3. Summary of Responses from Area Forums

Area Forum	Feedback received	Action taken / outcome
<p>Rotherhithe (cont'd).</p>	<p>Harbord House needs to be added as external surfaces are falling off. Westfield House needs to be resurveyed to meet landlord obligations, previous tenancy agreements to be upheld. Feels that 6 Westfield would highlight level of works needed. Comments from Hawkstone Low Rise RSG; "Dear Jerry, We [Hawkstone Low Rise RSG] would like you to ask for all landlord obligations be to the Hawkstone Low Rise without further delay (so we do not prejudice any rights we have in law by saying otherwise) and we maintain that Low Rise works start without delay in the event the decision is made to refurbish in October 2011. We might specify start municipal financial year 2011/12 for completion 2012/13. We are currently meeting with the options appraisal team but to date are failing to agree with their proposals. Thank you for your help in the matter. Regards, Valerie Hodson. Chair. Hawkstone Low Rise RSG."</p> <p>Doreen Dower would like to note that St Helena & Oldfield are not part of the same estate as Hawkstone. Also 1-45 St Helena Grove is missing. Jerry notes this is a repeated issue.</p> <p>New electrics will not be needed in St Helena & Oldfield as they were done as part of the Lewisham regeneration. Asks why 92-99 are listed for new boilers but not the rest. Sabina notes that not all may need new boilers.</p> <p>Mary O'Riordan – Addy House. During the refurbishment 6 years ago, residents were told the bathrooms were to be done, however the kitchens were instead, would like to know why to ensure it does not happen again.</p> <p>Peter Suthers feels that they are all suffering from the previous council who implemented decent homes plus even though the forums told them that it was not affordable. Highlights Decent Homes standard.</p> <p>Bathrooms that are over 30 years and disrepair</p>	<p>Harbord and Westfield House inspected and require works to external surfaces.</p> <p>1-45 St Helena Grove, surveys undertaken and all dwellings are currently passing Decent Homes.</p> <p>Electrical work to be removed from programme. Boilers will now only be renewed where the yearly inspection states that the boiler is no longer fit for purpose</p>

Appendix 3. Summary of Responses from Area Forums

Area Forum	Feedback received	Action taken / outcome
<p>Rotherhithe (cont'd).</p>	<p>Kitchens that over 20 years and in disrepair.</p> <p>Jerry Hewitt notes that Southwark is worse than the law as it will only replace items that need replacing.</p> <p>Kathy Hennessey Hawkstone Estate feels that not all Decent Homes are warm dry and safe. Brydale has previously had new boilers. Is unhappy that some tenants are using boilers that are older than 30 years and the boilers are getting replaced using the repairs budget. Would like to know how prices can be estimated if they do not go into every property and assess what is needed. Feels that the repairs budget is continually reducing whilst the costs of repairs are going up through neglect.</p> <p>Kathy is also concerned that as residents Westfield and Harbord are made up primarily of leaseholders, they will end up paying for the majority of works on those blocks. Is also unhappy that blocks on her estate have waited over 19 years and seen works happen elsewhere. Would like the low rises clarified. Also notes that John Kennedy House have had electrics and doors work under Fire Safety works.</p> <p>Pauline Richards Osprey Estate. Would like the position of leaseholder clarified. Pauline also shows concern for lack of external and communal works to Osprey.</p> <p>Kadiatu Bangura Osprey Estate notes that 1-14 Raven House is missing and that Egret have no bathroom work planned, would like the surveyors to reassess this. Is also unhappy about the lack of communal works.</p> <p>Pauline Richards notes that electrical works have been ticked for all of Osprey. Paula Allen notes that some of the properties on the estates which have been recent voids have had</p>	<p>Sabina Martin (Design and Delivery Manager) notes that previous commitments to JKH will be kept to.</p> <p>Sabina informs that the works will not go into their properties but they will pay for external works.</p> <p>Raven House is in the programme for electrical works but not to all dwellings. Egret House, flat 2 is in the programme for bathroom as this is the only dwelling failing on kitchen and bathroom. Communal works are not included in this programme.</p> <p>Confirmed, electrical works will take place for some but not all dwellings.</p>

Appendix 3. Summary of Responses from Area Forums

Area Forum	Feedback received	Action taken / outcome
<p>Rotherhithe (cont'd).</p>	<p>electrical work. Paula queries as to why much of the work is held back to 2015/2016. Sabina informs that it is due to when the funding is expected. The 2 year program is currently in year 2; the 5 year will start in 2012/2013 with end date 2016.</p> <p>Paula Allen also notes issue with venting in some properties. Peter Suthers comments that it may come under Fire Safety work and recommends that the TRA check their FRA.</p> <p>Kiri Pieri would like all information to come back to forum.</p> <p>The changes regarding Four Squares, Hawkstone and Maydew have been highlighted in an email sent by Jerry Hewitt, who would like to ensure the he will receive a response.</p> <p>Kathy Hennessey would like all works to be included on the program, regardless of which plan they are on.</p> <p>Jerry Hewitt would like the money to be in place if it decided in Oct for the works to go ahead, would not like the reliance to be on money expected in 2015/2016. Would also like provisional costs.</p> <p>Jerry would also like to note that if one block was used as a clone of another, this could allow for very different standard of works.</p> <p>Pamela Douglas is concerned that with the timescale outlined, this would leave Adams Gardens with kitchens and boilers nearing 40 years old.</p> <p>Kathy Hennessey notes that the decent homes working party as asked what people expect over the next 5 years, so that if more money is received they know what people would like.</p> <p>Paula Allen is concerned that she has heard that the water tanks that were recently replaced may have to be done so</p>	

Appendix 3. Summary of Responses from Area Forums

Area Forum	Feedback received	Action taken / outcome
<p>Rotherhithe (cont'd).</p>	<p>again. Is concerned about cost to leaseholders. Barry advises that they look into what the problem may be as this could outline what would happen next.</p> <p>John Nosworthy is concerned about lack of lighting works as feels this could be a security issue. Peter Suthers notes that there is a new Section 20 for emergency lighting which may cover lighting work. John is also concerned about no external works and a few estates not present such as Mayflower and Albion. Would like AMIP to contact them</p> <p>Motion Passed at Rotherhithe Area Forum, 21st July 2011.</p> <p>Rotherhithe Forum does not accept the 5 year Investment Program as presented tonight.</p> <p>The accuracy of the records held by the Council, eg APEX Asset Register, leave a great deal to be desired.</p> <p>There are many errors in the Investment Program regarding the names of estates.</p> <p>There are many errors in the make up of estates listed; a number of properties are listed under the wrong estate. And many blocks are not listed at all</p> <p>On many estates with identical blocks of identical age, have different works listed for the blocks, when they are in an identical state of disrepair.</p> <p>Many works listed are not required. eg: Electrics, are listed for blocks that have been completely re-wired & had the rising/lateral mains replaced within the last 6 years. Heating Carcass replacement for district heating systems less than 15 years old. HHSRS works listed for blocks which the APEX Asset Register states that only 4 flats out of 102 fail and</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Appendix 3. Summary of Responses from Area Forums

Area Forum	Feedback received	Action taken / outcome
Rotherhithe (cont'd).	<p>then on only one HHSRS item.</p> <p>Delegates report many cases of extreme disrepair and need, that are not listed for repairs.</p> <p>All evidence presented tonight indicates that the so-called Stock Condition Survey, carried out recently, appears to be, not worth the paper it was written on.</p> <p>We require that DH (WDS) reports from APEX are provided to all TRAs listing the current status of all blocks on their estates.</p> <p>Please clarify the actual date which the final year of the 5 year investment program ends. ie does 2015/16 end on the 31st March 2016?</p> <p>We require that you provide us with evidence that you know what works are needed on our estates, that are not included in the 5 year plan and when you expect to carry out these works.</p> <p>Finally we require that an updated accurate Investment Program is brought back to Rotherhithe Forum.</p> <p>Proposed: Barry Duckett Seconded: Jerry Hewitt</p> <p>Adopted unanimously.</p>	<p>Individual TRA's can receive summaries of Apex reports for their estates by contacting Bunmi.bakare@southwark.gov.uk</p> <p>31st March 2016</p>
Walworth East	<p>AS felt electrics in kitchens as well as bathrooms needed touching up in the whole of Salisbury Estate and not just in selected blocks</p> <p>OT was concerned as Mason Street was back to back with Darwin Street yet the windows were in bad condition and were</p>	<p>Electrical works based on survey information and electrical periodic testing. Age and condition can vary greatly according to use which is why some dwellings require electric work and others do not even when in the same block. Local electrical repairs ie to only bathroom or kitchen</p>

Appendix 3. Summary of Responses from Area Forums

[illegible]

Appendix 3. Summary of Responses from Area Forums

Area Forum	Feedback received	Action taken / outcome
<p>Walworth West (cont'd).</p>	<p>is very good for Southwark.</p> <p>JH noted that too little time has been allocated to consider the Housing Investment Programme and the allocated budget is too tight to meet the competing major investment works needed on the estates.</p> <p>FW asked for the meaning of decent homes standard to be explained/clarified.</p> <p>JB explained the meaning of decent homes to include making all southwark homes safe, warm and dry. JB further explained that this entails carrying out works which are absolutely necessary. JB further noted that in view of the current budgetary constraints, investment works will be prioritised and the blocks that are in a very bad condition will be given top priority.</p> <p>FW – asked whether Southwark had given some thought to where the money for decent homes will come from.</p> <p>JB added that the tenancy conditions sets out the repair responsibilities of the local authority as a landlord and the repair responsibilities of tenants. JB further advised that the budgetary constraints mean that major works programme will be prioritised.</p> <p>LB observed that the kitchens and bathrooms were not included in the investment programme.</p>	<p>TH – responded that careful thought has been given to the investment programme and the ongoing consultation exercise is part of the process to ensure that the views of residents are fully incorporated into the investment strategy. TH further explained that because of the budgetary constraints, the council is not in a position to make 3000 homes decent at the same time.</p> <p>TH – responded that kitchens and bathrooms will not be done if they are not a health and safety issue.</p>

Appendix 3. Summary of Responses from Area Forums

Area Forum	Feedback received	Action taken / outcome
<p>Walworth West (cont'd).</p>	<p>LB further noted that residents are paying their rents and deserve a decent home and the council, as a landlord, should provide a decent standard of accommodation and if the kitchens and bathrooms need to be replaced as part of the decent homes standard, they should be done.</p> <p>GC noted that numbers 1 – 5 Borrett Close have had no decent homes work done to the bathroom. GC expressed concern that the external painting was done in January and he had to pay £3,500.00 in service charge contribution towards the works which, in his view, were not done properly.</p> <p>JH stated that in her view, the consultation period is too short for residents and suggested that more time should have been given to residents to comment on the Housing Investment Programme.</p> <p>JB noted that canvassing the TRA members is required to get a fair view of what residents consider as a priority for the Housing Investment Programme. JB further commented that more thought is required and that residents need to be properly consulted in order to get a fair view of what the priorities of residents are.</p> <p>CH informed the forum members that there are 15 areas on the Pasley estate that need new windows and that the windows will fall out if they have to wait for another four years for a replacement.</p> <p>JB recommended that forum representatives take turns to give their views on the Housing Investment Programme consultation document.</p> <p>EM & HL – both stated that lifts are a priority for them in Brandon 1.</p>	<p>TH responded that leaseholders are required by law to pay service charges and if they are dissatisfied with the standard and quality of the works, they need to feed this back as part of the consultation exercise. TH informed residents that they have until the 10th of August 2011 to return the feedback forms.</p> <p>Survey information confirms no bathroom works required within 5 year programme.</p> <p>Windows now included in 5 year programme. Water penetration into properties from external walkways, not part Decent Homes, work to be carried out under repairs contract.</p> <p>TH responded that lifts are part of the investment programme managed by the engineering services</p>

Appendix 3. Summary of Responses from Area Forums

Area Forum	Feedback received	Action taken / outcome
<p>Walworth West (cont'd).</p>	<p>FW asked the meaning of the HHSRS to be clearly explained to all residents.</p> <p>HL reported that some bits of the Molesworth House roofing are missing.</p> <p>PW wanted to find out what TRV stood and why no communal television aerials have been mentioned in the Housing Investment Programme. PW further stated that apart from these issues, he was generally happy with the Housing Investment Programme.</p> <p>NS informed the forum that the digital switch over team is looking at communal aerials.</p> <p>ME asked whether the dampness in the properties will be addressed as part of the Housing Investment Programme. TH responded that residents need to ring the call centre to report rising damp in their properties</p> <p>JH felt that the consultation process was too short. Not enough time was allocated to the consultation process. JH observed that a number defects in Rutley Close were not included such as, cracks in the buildings, defective lintels, leaking roofs and poor thermal insulation.</p> <p>FW observed that block rewiring is required in Conant House.</p>	<p>department.</p> <p>TH explained the meaning of HHSRS and promised to send a further documentation to all residents setting out all the criteria.</p> <p>TH advised that day to day maintenance issues should be referred to the repairs call centre and residents can contact the call centre on 0800 952 4444 or contact their Housing Officer.</p> <p>TH responded that TRV stood for Thermostatic Radiator Valve. TV aerials do not form part of the WDS programme, as they do not contribute to the achievement of the Decent Homes Standard.</p> <p>Survey undertaken, information confirms outside of electrical works which are included in the programme there are no Decent Homes failures within the next 5 years.</p> <p>TH responded that electrical rewiring works have been included for Conant House in the housing investment programme. Electrical work now included in 5 year programme.</p>

Appendix 3. Summary of Responses from Area Forums

Area Forum	Feedback received	Action taken / outcome
<p>Walworth West (cont'd).</p>	<p>FW further noted that residents would very much like new kitchens and that a previous commitment was made that all residents will get new kitchens by 2012.</p> <p>JB responded that things have changed since those commitments were made and budgetary constraints mean that those priorities have been overhauled and we now need to work within the existing budgets.</p> <p>PW further highlighted that the lack of preventative maintenance leads to a rapid deterioration of the buildings. PW noted that the remedial/replacement of the windows at Marlborough house has been left out although everything else is being done. PW further observed that there were no electrical works in the investment programme for 61 – 71 Winchester.</p> <p>JB made a note of the observations made by PW.</p> <p>GC pointed out that there was water settlement in the walk ways on Pasley and felt that he was being charged again to pay for bad workmanship.</p> <p>CH felt that the drainage should be looked at regularly on the Pasley estate and that the windows are always painted with the wrong paint and they peel off quickly.</p> <p>CH recommended that all the windows on the Pasley should be replaced.</p> <p>CH also noted that there appears to be a problem with the electrical installations and that on average, about 2 to 3 bedrooms were serviced by a single fuse but believe that there is a law which requires that each bedroom is served by a separate fuse.</p>	<p>Winchester Close: surveys undertaken, works identified for current 5 year programme are windows and electrics. Marlborough Close: surveys undertaken, works identified for next 5 year programme are roof covering, electrics and bathrooms.</p> <p>TH responded that planned preventative maintenance is carried out regularly.</p> <p>TH responded that if electrical rewiring is required, it would be done to the current standard. However, electrical installations will not be carried out in leasehold flats. TH further noted that if the landlord's mains were to be changed, the local authority will carry out checks to leasehold flats and if an upgrade is required, the local authority will require the leaseholder to carry out the necessary improvement and upgrades in their flats if this are deemed necessary.</p>

Appendix 3. Summary of Responses from Area Forums

Area Forum	Feedback received	Action taken / outcome
<p>Walworth West (cont'd).</p>	<p>GC reported that there are issues with three broken tiles and moss on the roof on the pasley estate.</p> <p>GC requested that the council must make sure that the housing investment programme works are done properly</p> <p>Heads of T&RA did not receive the Presentation package. Will the 5 year programme adversely impact upon the partnering agreement.</p> <p>Consultation period far to short. Not enough time to given to canvas residents</p> <p>External brickwork at Rutley House is cracked in places, leading to internal water penetration. Insulation required to external walls and roof at Rutley House Roof covering to Rutley House is very poor.</p> <p>New kitchens are a necessity. Resident previously promised that she would receive a new kitchen.</p> <p>Will the council come and repair kitchen units</p> <p>Connant House needs to be rewired.</p> <p>What does HHSRS stand for.</p>	<p>TH responded that planned preventative maintenance is carried out to prevent the growth of moss.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>TH Apologised</p> <p>TH accepted the comment but advised the meeting that all parties (forums, T&RA's and individual residents) had until the 10th August 2011 to comment on the draft programme. TH suggested that each T&RA letter drop residents informing them that details of the programme can be viewed at the Area Housing Office.</p> <p>TH confirmed that Kitchen replacement would only be considered for exceptional circumstances, e.g. Health and Safety issues. TH explained that each complaint would be dealt with on its merits. However, residents have a responsibility to look after and maintain the kitchen units provided by the council.</p> <p>TH provided the meeting with a copy of the document which explained all abbreviations contained within the report. TH explained that the abbreviation related to a long list of basic internal Health and Safety standards.</p>

Appendix 3. Summary of Responses from Area Forums

Area Forum	Feedback received	Action taken / outcome
<p>Walworth West (cont'd).</p>	<p>Resident has suffered for 6 years with damp problems within her property</p> <p>Kitchens are important and should be updated/replaced to accommodate acceptable wear and tear.</p> <p>Bathrooms are listed within a column heading but Kitchens are not.</p> <p>Marlborough Crt is not receiving new windows but all other blocks are</p> <p>61-71 Winchester Close is not identified for electrical works but all other blocks are.</p> <p>Omitting all Ex Decs works will lead to further deterioration of the exterior building fabric and increase repair costs</p> <p>Consultation period far to short. Not enough time to given to canvas residents</p> <p>No mention of T.V aerials and digital changeover</p> <p>Water is penetrating into properties on the Pasley estate via the external walkways.</p>	<p>TH advised that he would note the residents details at the end of the meeting take the issue up with the Repairs and Maintenance Manager</p> <p>TH reiterated that Kitchen replacement would only be considered for exceptional circumstances, e.g. Health and Safety issues.</p> <p>TH explained that whole bathroom replacements are not being undertaken</p> <p>TH accepted the comment but advised the meeting that all parties (forums, T&RA's and individual residents) had until the 10th August 2011 to comment on the draft programme. TH suggested that each T&RA letter drop residents informing them that details of the programme can be viewed at the Area Housing Office.</p> <p>TH explained that the digital changeover was part of a separate contract not contained within the 5 year programme.</p>

Appendix 3. Summary of Responses from Area Forums

<i>Area Forum</i>	<i>Feedback received</i>	<i>Action taken / outcome</i>
	<p>Will leaseholders be billed for works undertaken internally within properties</p> <p>Cannot understand the meaning of the roofing elements (column headings).</p>	<p>TH confirmed that leaseholders will not be charged for any works undertaken internally within tenants' properties.</p> <p>The column headings 'roof structure' and 'roof covering' relate to major repair or replacement to the roof and its structural elements (joists, etc). In the revised version of the five year programme these two headings will be amalgamated into a single heading ('roofs').</p>