

## **ITEM 7: BVR HOUSING MANAGEMENT: SUPPORT FOR RESIDENT INVOLVEMENT & THE TENANT FUND [SESSION TWO]**

### **Issues arising during discussion at first session:-**

- Possible danger of political appointments to any new federation;
- Did the proposals in the Draft Vision really increase inclusivity ?;
- Concern was expressed about the proposed loss of a dedicated organisation for black and minority ethnic groups under the new structure;
- Any new structure must be representative of tenants – officers advised Members this would be addressed in more detail in the Implementation Plan;
- How might success be measured in respect of this BVR ?
- The mechanisms for leaseholder contribution to funding was not outlined. Members acknowledged noted the current lack of leaseholder consultation framework and were advised that Leaseholder Council would shortly receive a report framing proposals for a voluntary contributions fund. Neither was it the intention to exclude freeholders, officers stated;
- Concern was expressed in relation to whether the authority – as landlord – should be simultaneously engaging in discussions on proposed new tenant management structures.

### **Concerns/interim recommendations at first session:-**

The following points of Member concern in respect of the draft vision were noted as interim recommendations for further discussion during the scrutiny, i.e.

- a) Members were concerned about where and how funding decisions would be taken under the proposed new structures. Members asked officers to bring back further information on this;
- b) Members were concerned about what mechanisms would be in place for allocation of funding to the various elements of the new structure, i.e. for tenant participation, supporting the federated body and for paid workers;

*Officers confirmed that no final detail had been drawn up in respect of these arrangements and that opportunity for scrutiny input/recommendations to the Executive remained.*

- c) Members noted the comments made in respect of possible disempowerment of the Tenants Movement should the proposals be agreed.

*Members to further discuss whether proposed new structures might need to be fully independent of the Council.*

- d) Members were minded to recommend that the Tenants Fund budget remain ringfenced;
- e) Members were concerned about whether a conflict of interest might arise from the appointment of workers with responsibility for working in tenant community development whilst reporting to Housing Management. Members asked for

further clarification of these proposed new roles/posts when available, to inform discussion on this matter;

- f) Members were minded to recommend that Resident Officers should be appointed on a permanent basis, to provide continuity of function for the community development role in particular;
- g) Members were minded to recommend the development of relevant and measurable Performance Indicators to facilitate assessment of the inclusiveness of the new resident involvement structures.