

**Lewisham Homes Staff:**

Jon Kanareck (JK)– Director of Resident Services  
 Emma Mills (EM) - Head of Home Ownership & Independent Living  
 Alys Exley-Smith (AES) – Community Relations Manager  
 Deji Fajobi (DJ) - Stock Investment Manager  
 Darren Marr (DM) - Special Projects Manager  
 Glenda Omogbai (GO)- Service Charge & Sales Manager  
 Matt Smith- Senior Operations Manager

**Guests:**

52 leaseholders attended the meeting

**Chair:**

Alan Wake (AW), Independent

<b>1</b>	<b>Welcome and Introductions</b>	
1.1	JK opened the meeting at 18.32 and welcomed everyone to the meeting.	
1.2	JK introduced Lewisham Homes staff the independent chair Alan Wake to attendees	
<b>2</b>	<b>Apologies</b>	
2.1	None	
<b>3</b>	<b>Declarations of Interest</b>	
3.1	N/A	
<b>4</b>	<b>Minutes of the last meeting</b>	
4.1	Minutes sent out to everyone. Action log becomes a reporting mechanism	
<b>5</b>	<b>Matters Arising/Action log</b>	
5.1	It was decided the existing action log would be updated following the meeting and shared with attendees	<p><b>EM to update if the meeting with Vicky Foxcroft next week is open to everyone</b></p>
5.2	It was agreed that the action log will be an ongoing reference to actions raised at each meeting and how they have been managed	
5.3	EM was asked to feedback on the EWS1 forms.	
5.4	EM briefly updated to say they haven't had updates yet. There is a meeting next week with Vicky Foxcroft (MP), where we hope we will get more direction.	
5.5	EM will send updates through this group and the LH website when we get more info.	
5.6	EM was asked if residents can attend meeting with Vicky Foxcroft. EM said she would find out and let the forum know.	
5.7	AW discussed extension to leases and that previous minutes had listed lease extension time incorrectly at 99 years. It could be possible to extend for 990 years, but these extensions are to be confirmed	
5.8	A leaseholder stated they had extended to 125 years recently, and asked whether they should have held off for a potential 990 years. EM stated that LH extensions are currently for 125 years. These are arranged through Lewisham council.	
5.9	AW stated there's a need to understand costs on this, and that it is a bit watch this space. Some people may be able to wait to see what happens, but this will be dependent on how long is left on your existing lease, as to whether you can.	

5.10	A leaseholder said they are about to re-mortgage, and they are potentially facing a more expensive product due to the time it is taken on the lease extension and EWS1 forms.	Can the meetings be extended to 2 hours?
5.11	A leaseholder informed the group she is a member of the UK Cladding Action Group (UKCAG) and that there is some very useful information on their website about what is happening and what leaseholders can do. She urged other leaseholders to join.	
5.12	She also urged attendees to ask family and friends represented by Conservative MPs to request their MP to sign the petition to help end the cladding scandal.	
5.13	A leaseholder informed the group about a radio 4 program on Moneybox and urged them to listen to this about the cladding scandal, as there was lots of useful information.	
5.14	A leaseholder requested the meetings were 2 hours long to ensure they can get through the agenda with good time to discuss the points raised. AW said this could be considered.	
5.15	AW has been asked to change running order and go with item 3 first. There were no issues raised with this by the attendees.	
<b>6</b>	<b>Repairs (roof maintenance, proactive repairs and sign off)</b>	
6.1	EM stated LH will invite residents to be involved at the end of the major works as well as the non-statutory consultation the at beginning.	
6.2	A leaseholder talked about major works on the Crossfields estate in Deptford. He stated that he understands there may be a time limit to spend government grants.	
6.3	He mentioned the last major works and that he would presume a survey has been done as part of this. He enquired about whether there could be a longer plan for when we expect major works in 5, 10 and 15 years. He feels they have been coming one after another at the moment and that there needs to be a schedule and details of what's going on to help leaseholders to plan for this financially.	
6.4	Response to enquiries at Lewisham Homes is often that they don't envisage anything, but he is keen to have more notice.	
6.5	The leaseholder raised an associated issue was around the quality and finish of work. Is there a way to involved leaseholders and tenants with everyone as quality assurance, and how would we engage in this process?	
6.6	EM stated there is a new process for this which they are trialling	
6.7	Leaseholder stated they are the Chair of their TRA and that they arranged a meeting on this because they wanted a 5-10 year plan on the buildings. She feels the idea that we're not consulted isn't good. She would like to remove stigma and a good way to do this is to consult residents.	
6.8	The leaseholder understands that something needs to be done like emergency repairs, but that there needs to be an aspect of improvement which we would like to contribute to, to remove stigma and make the environment better.	
6.9	The leaseholder asked if there is a plan of improvements, as she believes every building has the right to be modernised.	
6.10	The leaseholder has been informed Lewisham Homes don't have a 5-10 year plan, but that they are doing a housing stock survey.	

6.11	She stated inspections are a big issue, there has been some breaches of fire investigations. She was disappointed to see that the dry risers installed after Grenfell were not up to specifications for the fire report last year, and wonders who is checking the compliance of this.	
6.12	DF stated that the expectation for residents to have foresight of works is a reasonable one. There has been a program before, but the accuracy hasn't been great. Lewisham Homes have carried out a stock condition survey and this was completed this time last year. It shows investment needed over 30 years, now we have to work through it to prioritise what needs to be done, and potentially respond to changes and reprioritise. This is in addition to other works.	
6.13	Lewisham Homes are in the process of procuring long term contracts, to be cost effective and value for money way and ensure that the works are packaged in a way that delivers value for money. DF stated we need to make sure we have necessary funding, this is provided by the council and we are working with them on clear deliverables.	
6.14	By September this year Lewisham Homes hope to know which contractors are on board and the program going forward and pool these things together.	
6.15	DF's personal view is to determine a sensible but caveated 3 year program, more advance can be too far in advance. We can tell you, for example, the lifespan of windows alongside a program. We look at lifespan and condition of the components.	
6.16	We are working on and will share a 3-5 year program with variables, funding and making sure we can deliver best value for money.	
6.17	AW asked if they could look at 30 years aspirational. If 3-5 years can be published, can we publish aspirational works too?	
6.18	DF responded to say the survey shows a need in plain terms, providing a 30 year program, sometimes does not manage aspirations, as things may change. More practical is a more realistic short to medium term program. We can see if we want to separate to a more firmed up medium term program, but that can bring risk in uncertainty. World very different now, a program too far ahead without getting a handle on what we need to deliver. We would need to caveat this.	
6.19	I can make a commitment on the 3-5 year program and can take back the longer term request to my colleagues. AW reiterated that as long as there is acceptance that the plans are aspirational, that he can't see why we can't look at the 30 year program.	DF to discuss the options of providing a longer term plan of works to residents
6.20	A leaseholder showed images of the works done in the communal areas of his block to evidence the need to sign off on the quality of works. He has heard value for money mentioned several times, including when discussing the new fire regulations.	
6.21	He stated they've had horrible things happen to his block. He has been informed that there is nothing they can do about work once it is done and signed off.	
6.22	He stated they have to pay for ludicrous amounts of money for the poor quality of work and there's no accountability, and that they have tried to investigate ways to remedy it.	DF to discuss with colleagues the work leaseholder shared
6.23	DF highlighted two elements he picked up here, one is the specification for work and how have we engaged and getting this right. The other is	

6.24	<p>the sign off of the work. DF will take to my colleagues to show to understand the justification and thinking of this</p> <p>The leaseholder stated a colleague did come and look, and that he was understanding, but there was nothing he could do because it had been signed off already.</p>	<p><b>to understand why it was signed off</b></p>
6.25	<p>DF stated he was not justifying this, but that we need to be clear about the specification with residents. We are going through a process of reassessing and trialling what we are planning to do before we carry out works. In terms of sign off, we look at what we didn't do so well and where there is some room for improvement. We have a team of clerk of works who sign work off during and on completion and for ongoing quality of work. It may be tricky to guarantee sign off on every single piece of work.</p>	
6.26	<p>The leaseholder responded to say if they're being charged that the work should be properly signed off.</p>	<p><b>DF's team to follow up with leaseholder on works</b></p>
6.27	<p>AW acknowledged that the leaseholder has raised issues and shown some evidence and reminded Lewisham Homes that this isn't a forum where something is raised and not dealt with. This needs to be dealt with still.</p>	
6.28	<p>A different leaseholder stated this is feedback to LH in general, it clearly wasn't working before, same process and asked will it be the same process going forward, as this currently isn't good enough.</p>	
6.29	<p>DM stated Lewisham Homes engaged the TRAs on Pepys on a site walk around, and has gone through consultation with residents there.</p>	
6.30	<p>A leaseholder from Bence House (Pepys) stated residents have been vocal about this and she didn't agree it was proactive from Lewisham Homes. Residents asked to meet major works and contractors, but only fixed 1 tenth of what we want to do. Lewisham homes agreed to fix problems but there was a lack of consultation.</p>	
6.31	<p>The leaseholder stated leaseholders weren't consulted on any of this work, and that they were only given 4 colours for doors and told the style could not be changed.</p>	
6.32	<p>A different Bence House leaseholder stated these buildings are assets and should be enhanced with sensible intelligent design, they should be valued. Cables etc. should not be exposed, as it undermines the value of building and created stigma.</p>	<p><b>Are fire safety works to current requirements?</b></p>
6.33	<p>A leaseholder raised a couple of points stating it may be a matter of semantics on feedback on the condition survey and asked why fire safety issues were not part of condition survey already.</p> <p>His second point, asked why it is crystal ball gazing to consider a 10 year plan.</p>	
6.34	<p>Another leaseholder stated that are for the repairs plan, but wanted to flag that it might make it difficult to sell in the future, asking who would this plan be available to? Would it come up on estate agent searches and how specific would it be? It could affect selling properties.</p>	
6.35	<p>AW stated it would be more of a requirement to give that sort of information with leasehold purchases in the future and may be mandatory.</p>	
6.36	<p>A leaseholder asked if Lewisham Homes are planning for major works in terms of fire safety. She has heard lots of horror stories based on Grenfell recommendations, and requirements being higher. She wants to ensure fire safety works are done to latest fire safety bill. Leaseholders don't want costs rolled over to them twice.</p>	

6.37	She also highlighted that Lewisham Homes were on dispatches about 10 years ago, in relation to a conflict of interest with contractors where every £paid Lewisham Homes got £2 back. She asked is there any relationship with contractor and LH	
6.38	A leaseholder said she has had a leak in my roof for a while, it was a result of a build-up of leaves, etc from guttering. She understand that there is a plan for roof space to be cleared more regularly, but it was mentioned this yearly maintenance will be charged to leaseholders. It's in leases roofs should be maintained, shouldn't they form part of service charge costs?	<p><b>Will leaseholders be charged for clearing gutters in their service charge?</b></p>
6.39	A leaseholder asked if residents will be made part of 3-5 year plan. Will they be informed or will there be consultation? Her second point is perception that poor work is across Lewisham Homes. External cables are happening across Pepys estate too. There's something endemic and needs to be addressed. She asked will we be informed or consulted.	
6.40	A leaseholder stated the communal areas in their block haven't been decorated for over 12 years. It was due to be painted in 5 years time, then radio silence. Can anyone see the stock condition report, and what they take in to account?	<p><b>Leaseholder requires follow up on when the painting will be done</b></p>
6.41	AW made it clear that these issues need to be dealt with in order to move forward.	
6.42	In response to the leaseholder questions DF stated there are additional works that need to be done as a result of Grenfell. The stock condition survey is visual. Fire surveys are more intrusive surveys of a block. A visual survey may pick up fire issues, but most not until the separate intrusive survey.	
6.43	DF said the crystal ball maybe not the right words. The longer the program the more difficult it is to be accurate. A 30 year program is ok, but would need to be heavily caveated. We will consult annually for projects due in that year for the preceding year before the program was due	
6.44	In terms of internal painting. We haven't included redecoration before and significant improvement is needed on this. It is now in place and will be in program for September.	
6.45	The works sign off has changed now and its documented in different ways and there will be significant improvement in signing off work, welcoming residents to be aware of what is happening and build a level of confidence.	
6.46	AW asked if the longer term planning included zero carbon objectives	
6.47	DF responded to say where there is a commitment to do that, yes, we're agreeing what measures we plan to put in place, but there will be some provision on this	
6.48	AW asked how many leaseholders we have got doing this scrutiny. The issue was raised as leaseholders being involved in sign off. Is this too formal a word? I'm interested are we looking at major works or across the board on general repairs as well. Maybe a question we take forward	<p><b>How are residents involved in scrutinise works/ signing off works</b></p>
7	<p><b>General leasehold issues (reform, quality of services, lease extensions, service charge bills, communication and digital engagement)</b></p>	

7.1	A leaseholder stated they had a couple of repair requests recently, He couldn't find the repair on line. So he called. It took 28 minutes to get through. There was no reference number given for repair. All these issues and no reference number. Staff couldn't find his repair request, he stated it's a mess and failing and it's not good enough. He has asked the CEO to try and be a volunteer in the call centre, but there was no reply	MS to see if reference numbers can be included on acknowledgement emails for jobs.	
7.2	Another leaseholder stated repairs has been done in communal areas and included in service charges, but the leaseholder hadn't caused the damage. She asked 'why are Lewisham Homes charging leaseholders for these?' She said some tenants don't look after their accommodation so well and feels leaseholders have to pay for this.		
7.3	MS said he will talk to the contact centre to see if reference numbers can be included on acknowledgement emails for jobs.		
7.4	JK stated the portal is static and information isn't easily accessible and doesn't have much information. We are on a transformation journey on IT, the new offer should allow you to do this in your own time. This is currently not available, and doesn't help in the here and now. The system is clunky at the moment and we need to improve it. It doesn't work the way it should.		
7.5	A leaseholder asked EM why does it take 28 days to get an answer to something like service charge bills.		
7.6	EM explained they use a big spreadsheet and it's a resource intensive exercise, and we are on a journey with IT to make this easier. We have revisited response times, if we take longer we need to ensure you have running commentary.		
7.7	The leaseholder asked if someone was manually putting it on a spreadsheet. Is it per block?		
7.8	EM explained it is borough wide, but there is a new rent and service charge review. This will take some time 18-24 months. It is painful and time consuming at the moment, and we need better systems and better self-serving.		
7.9	AW asked if there is any value inviting someone from the service charges team to this meeting?		
7.10	EM explained they are a brand new team, but further down the line, when they're settled this could happen.		
7.11	A leaseholder said they had been charged several times for the same repair, and asked whether this is being audited.		
7.12	A leaseholder followed to ask if there could be more detail on the bills, there was a charge of £800, with no detail. She said it is the same with grounds maintenance charges, they're not always clear.		Can there be more detail on charges
7.13	AW asked what the timeline is for the service charge review		
7.14	JK replied to say the transformation is just starting and will take about 18 months, the service charge review 18 months too, but maybe a bit longer.		
7.15	A leaseholder stated we all know it's a journey, but it's been a year now to try and sort this, and she's hopeful the journey comes to an end soon. She has spent £10K for 2 windows, and want this to be sorted. But also wanted to say thank you to Lewisham Homes, as they've been really good recently.		
7.16	JK said we know there's been a struggle, and wait times are excessive. Staff have been struggling and there aren't sufficient staff at moment. He said it is not likely to be better in short term, as we're currently running an urgent repairs service and when non urgent repairs come on to this there will be more work to do.		

7.17	A leaseholder asked JK about the 18 month timeline, could you give us an update on what's changed, will happen over each month, as opposed to big update at the end. An update each month in writing if possible?	
7.18	JK responded to say they are looking at work streams, existing ones have been quite linear and we need to look at process instead of people, and need IT to support it. It's not been as big bang as we'd like on timescales, but there has been some improvements and have seen in this that staff are better and lot more empathy and respect. We have a long way to go.	
7.19	A leaseholder stated they didn't feel the service charge is reflective of the work. I was trying to sell my home, but the feedback was that the cleanliness of communal areas wasn't good. The cleaner gave me his number, but I shouldn't have to message him to do this.	
7.20	JK said that the current caretaking is on reduced hours, and will go back to normal after lockdown. It should mean that less work reduces the service charge, but he will need to speak to the council to see how much was saved.	
7.21	A leaseholder asked if Lewisham Homes were aware that there are quite a lot of companies that are falsifying surveys.	
7.22	JK said there are competitive contracts on who we appoint and why, and we're determined to assist leaseholders with this, we're just not sure of best way to do this at the moment.	
7.23	A leaseholder responded to say she hopes 4 storey buildings will be removed from the list of properties required EWS1 forms.	
7.24	JK said we manage 67 high rise blocks across Lewisham, which makes it quite complex.	
7.25	The leaseholder asked attendees to join the UK cladding action group.	
<b>8</b>	<b>AOB</b>	
8.1	AW suggested service charges should be top of agenda next time, and that he takes on board comments on the timing of meeting and whether it needs to be longer.	
8.2	JK thanked you everyone for attending. We want to improve things with you and we will for example use stock condition survey and will ask you what you think and have this debate at the time. He asked whether quarterly meetings are right at the moment, and that he is happy to extend, if we need to think about bi monthly initially then we can look at this, but he will need commitment of time from others.	<b>To consider holding more regular meetings, at least initially</b>

There being no other business, the meeting closed at **20.08**

The next **Leaseholder Forum** meeting will be held on: tbc  
Location: Zoom Meeting