**Roupell Park Resident Management Organisation**

**Minutes of Board Meeting Tuesday 29 May 2018, at 6pm at Roupell Park Community Centre**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Action |
| **1** | **Members Present:**  Mary Simpson: Chair (MS1), Oni Idigu: Treasurer (OI), Molly Sinclair (MS), Alieu Corneh(AC), Chris Weathers(CW), Alex Ekumah Secretary (AE), Tom Parker (TP), Marcia Jones (MJ), Eddie Andrews (EA)  **Apologies** - None  **Staff in Attendance**  Simon Oelman, Estate Director (SO), Rosaleen Jones (RJ), Customer Services Manager, Colin Carnegie (CC), Maintenance Manager, Joy Miles (JM) Finance Manager  Consultant: Ron Huston (RH), Consultant |  |
| **2** | **Declaration of Interest, Fraud, Gifts & Hospitalities; New Shareholder Certificates**  There were no declarations of interest, fraud, gifts, hospitality or any new share certificates. |  |
| **3**  **3.1** | **Matters Arising from Minutes of Meeting held on 27 March 2018**  Action Points   1. Training re ASB. SO to discuss with MS(1) 2. Board Appraisals – dates being arranged 3. Report re planned Maintenance – June 2018 4. Resident Survey – Final draft agreed. To be sent out beginning of June. 5. Community Spring Clean – deferred until 9 June. All members urged to attend.   The Minutes were agreed as a true record | **SO**  **MS(1)**  **CC**  **SO/EC**  **ALL** |
| **4**  **4.1**  **4.2**  **4.3**  **4.4** | **Chair’s Action and Chair’s Update**  There are no staff birthdays in June.  Board Birthdays MS1  MS (1) reminded the meeting that the NFTMO conference was being held in Blackpool on weekend of 30 June. Travel would be by minibus from office on 28 June. SO would confirm time  MS (1) had attended an event at City Hall around resident engagement. It has been disappointing as feedback from others was negative. |  |
| **5**  **5.1**  **5.2**  **5.3**  **5.4**  **5.5**  **5.6**  **5.7**  **5.8**  **5.9**  **5.10**  **5.11**  **5.12**  **5.13**  **5.14**  **5.15**  **5.16**  **5.17**  **5.18**  **5.19**  **5.20**  **5.21**  **5.22**  **5.23**  **5.24**  **5.25**  **5.26**  **5.27** | **Consideration for options of the management of Roupell Park**  RH presented the outcome of his study in relation to the future options for the management of Roupell Park and its relationship with the Council.  He had explored the following options   * Do nothing * Self-financing paying interest only * Self-financing with debt repayment * Stock transfer to a stand alone Housing Association * Stock transfer to an Existing HA   With each of the transfer options he had also looked at two possible development options.  In each case he had made assumptions about likely rates of inflation, increases in rent and service charges, anticipated repair and maintenance costs including planned maintenance and major repairs. He had used existing data on stock condition provided by the Council and other data provided by RPRMO.  RH explained that in relation to development options he had assumed that all properties were let at social rents although it would be usual to build some units for sale or to be let at higher rents.  All options showed a positive financial outcome except for the larger development option, although subject to the proviso set out above.  Financially the self-financing model with interest only payments was the most positive financially.  RH also explained that whilst the self-financing model would require a test of opinion a stock transfer would require a tenant ballot which would accrue significant political risks.  Members asked about the likely attitude of the Council. SO explained that initial discussions had been held and that their attitude would depend on the level of support from residents and the financial viability of the organisation going forward.  RH also added that there would be impacts on the Council’s Housing Revenue Account from self-financing and transfer. Experience from Leather Market in Southwark showed that there were work arounds to minimise the impact of self-financing.  However the Council would benefit by transferring all future repairs and maintenance costs to the TMO.  It was also noted that for stock transfer the Council would need to cover the costs of the process.  Members asked about resident rights in each option. RH explained that with self-financing because the Council would retain ownership of the freehold then there would be no change in tenure. In relation to stock transfer residents would become assured tenants. For existing tenants these would come with protected rights. However new tenants would move onto the new form of tenancy without protected rights.  Members asked about the difference between setting up a stand-alone HA or becoming part of a group. SO explained that the set up costs for a stand alone HA would be higher and the process more complex. As part of a group the parent would take on most of the costs and give support in terms of legal and administrative arrangements. Redevelopment options would also be easier to pursue through an existing HA.  However being part of a group would mean that RP would be swapping one controlling body for another and long term independence would be difficult to guarantee.  Members asked about the fall back positions for the various options should something go wrong with the various options.  RH explained that with the self-financing option the Council would remain the freeholder so could take the estate back into management. SO added that as part of a group the parent HA would under write the organisation but that problems would almost certainly mean the estate being absorbed into direct management. With a stand alone HA then the regulator would intervene and likely instruct a takeover by a larger HA.  Members asked what risk analysis had been done on each option. SO explained that the main focus had been financial to ensure that whichever option chosen was viable. Further risk analysis would need to be carried out once an option was selected.  Members enquired about the Governance implications of the various options. SO explained that in any change of management there would be a need to enhance the role of the Board and this would probably mean the need to bring independent members onto the Board to offer expertise.  SO said that whichever option members took they would need to explain the underlying motivation. There was consensus that the underlying driver was to gain more independence to allow the Board to deliver their own priorities, particularly in relation to the development of the Roupell Park Community. They also wished to ensure ongoing investment in the maintenance of the estate which experience had shown could not be guaranteed under the Council.  After discussion members agreed that they would like to pursue a self-financing model. The decision on whether this should be on an interest only or debt repayment option would depend on further advice and discussions with the Council.  The rational for the decision was that they believed it would deliver their principle objectives of greater independence and future investment at the lowest risk to the organisation. It was however noted that this could be a stepping stone towards stock transfer in the future.  Members asked about the timescale for any change. RH replied that it would probably take about 2 years.  This would depend on the attitude of the Council, particularly in relation to the renegotiation of the MMA. There would inevitably be set up costs relating to this.  Members agreed that the engagement of residents was key. In this they would need to be honest around their motivation for the decision and transparent throughout the process.  The Board thanked RH for his report and looked forward to working with him on the project moving forward.  **The Board agreed**   * **To pursue a self-financing model for the management of the estate.** * **That the Estate Director develop a communications plan for a resident test of opinion to take place in the early autumn** * **That formal discussions with the Council should take place after the test of opinion had taken place** * **That the whole Board would oversee the project and that it would be a standing item on all future agendas.** * **That SO contact Leather Market for their advice on set up and their experiences of self-financing** * **That PPCR would be engaged to further develop the financial modelling once the test of opinion had taken place and discussions with the Council were undertaken.** | **SO**  **SO**  **ALL**  **SO**  **SO** |
| 6  6.1 | **AOB**  MJ asked about the progress of door knocking. MS(1) replied that this needed to be picked up again. | **All** |
|  | **DONM**  **26 JUNE AT 7.00** |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **ACTION POINTS** | **TASKED TO** | **DEADLINE (IF APPLICABLE)** |
| 1. **Training re ASB. Examine options re training for wider resident group** | **SO** | **To discuss with MS(1)** |
| 1. **Board Appraisals – circulate dates** | **MS(1)** | **Ongoing** |
| 1. **Report re planned Maintenance** | **CC** | **June 2018** |
| 1. **Resident Survey** | **SO/EC** | **June 2018** |
| 1. **Community Spring Clean** | **SO/EC** | **19 June 2018** |

Chair’s Signature: …………………………………………… Date: ………………………

Secretary’s Signature: ……………………………….……