

## **Appendix C: Comments from Leaseholder Council**

### **Leaseholder Council Comments on Report going to Executive on Tuesday 22<sup>nd</sup> June**

The Following are comments in relation to the Item 09, which is being presented to the Executive Committee on 22<sup>nd</sup> June 2004. **Please ensure that these comments are circulated to All the Committee Members & are discussed & considered when tabling the said report.**

1. No consultation was ever extended to L/C the first indication of the I.C.C was at W/P meeting, where we were informed of a large increase in Estate Cleaning and Grounds Maintenance Service Charges.  
Leaseholders have been seeking details of these charges ever since, to which Council Officers have failed miserably to supply. The cost Tables supplied in Nov 2003 & Jan 2004 to L/C proved to be totally inadequate & unjustifiable, and to date the position remains unchanged.  
Specification was only available when given in Feb 2004, when it was agreed by the FIVE Officers present at L/C to afford inspection of the I.C.C only to be told no contract exists.
  
15. The presentation to L/C was mainly verbal on what they were planning there was plenty of optimism, but very little detail.  
L/C reserved its position until more detail was available, plus feedback from those who received these services.  
At the current time the position is that the report does not reflect Tenants & Leaseholders position that the services have improved by any considerable difference now.

#### **DELIVERING THE CHANGE**

It is interesting that contract reviews are conducted only with internal departments, and not with the customers who actually receive the services.  
At meetings with Ian Smith when asked about staffing levels, he stated that staff would increase to 600, however, from the table that total has now grown to 727, also the management & supervisory has now reached the grand total of 85.

49. The cost of the elements which form part of the Leaseholder Service Charge are at best vague, so far officers have only supplied minimum overall figures, mainly for the reasons for increase costs.  
The changes from the poor 2002/3 contract, which costs have now risen by a massive 64%, does not reflect on improvements now, as it's not difficult to achieve that when the state was so bad to begin with.  
The cost situation is not all clear cut as this reports suggests, we've had various meeting with Finance & are far from being satisfied with only verbal explanations. L/C demand that these costs & % splits should be subject to detailed scrutiny.  
For instance no mention is made in this report of exactly what is included in the Leaseholders Service Charge that was found in the specification i.e.
  - a) Cleaning of all Neighbourhood Offices, their yards & surrounding areas.

- b) Cleaning of all Sheltered Housing Units
- c) There are many others, which are not listed or given details of. Only by studying the specification do these anomalies become apparent.

When the Senior Officers were questioned on the contents in the Spec, not one had actually studied the document in detail, yet these are the very Officers who are making decisions on costs, is THIS MANAGEMENT?

30. This suggests a very limited survey, only informally through Community Councils, plus a vague residential satisfaction one, whatever that is, details PLEASE.

### **AGREED VARIATIONS**

**L/C would like to see the necessary papers presented to justify another £2.3 Million, making the new total to £18 Million as per data received from Michael Connor.**

**No explanation or details have been received or offered. Further more why has the original split of costs for Ground Maintenance, which was 66% H.R.A & 34% G.F, which is re-enforced by the management charges. This changed when papers were received in Feb 2004 to 87% H.R.A. & 13% G.F. L/C would like to audit how these charges were constructed.**

**This report Glosses over the real problems, and paints a picture Officers would like you to believe. But the fact is that the truth will be found among the detail, which needs to be supplied to the Leaseholder W/P to audit, as from experience, the Officers only drip feed information after long, long delays & very much pressure.**

**Having checked the previous cleaning contract schedules Doc Ref CLE A25, Issue 2 there appears to be very little difference in the tasks, the only difference is the number of personnel employed.**

**Through various changes that have occurred with computers and the combining of codes in the accounting system, it was found that some elements of refuse collections a G/F cost have been transferred into the H.R.A. very subtly. Which when figures produced by the Officers means an extra 20% charge to Leaseholders, even though this creates further problems in actual charges, which can be proved from data provided. As always the Officers say to justify this tenants are not charged as it is in the rent, this is because they cannot break this down in detail.**