



**GGHT Board of Directors
29 June 2011
Council Chamber**

Minutes

Attendance: Fran Murray (Chair), Phil Pemberton, Royston Willard, Jan Kitshoff, Sue Jones, Sylvia Barcock, Jeff Richards, Roy Smith.

Peter Mercer, Peter Fitzhenry, Angela Perry, Carl Talbot-Davies, Alison Foy, Charlie Martin

Apologies: Terry Spencer, Sheila Woodyatt, Carole Hassan, Jim Stockton

		Action
1.	<p>Apologies</p> <p>As above.</p>	
2.	<p>Declarations of Interest</p> <p>Sue Jones declared an interest in item 8, Castle Wall Project.</p> <p>Roy Smith declared an interest in Item 7, Longford Quality Project.</p> <p>The Board agreed that Roy Smith and Sue Jones interests were not prejudicial and would not be required not leave the room for these Items.</p>	
3.	<p>Minutes of Board Meeting held on 25 May 2011</p> <p>Matters arising:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ The minutes referred to Jeff Richards as 'JF'. It was noted that this was a typo and should be amended to 'JR'. ❖ Item 8 – AF advised that the next quarterly performance outturn report will include outcomes for customers. ❖ Item 9 – AF advised that the scrutiny panel had been consulted on the role of Board Champions. It was noted that the Scrutiny Panel did not support the proposal for Board Champions to be nominated by members of the panel. PP questioned whether the role of the scrutiny panel should be given further consideration to ensure maximum effectiveness. PM advised that the panel was in its infancy 	

	<p>and that PM and FM will begin to meet with the Chair of the Scrutiny Panel.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Item 11 - AF advised that Weightman’s Solicitors had been consulted on the shareholding membership criteria and that their response will be fed back to Board. ❖ Item 13 – A Member asked whether families would receive water meters under the financial inclusion strategy. It was explained that single people were targeted as larger households would possibly incur greater costs through water usage. ❖ Item 13 – A member asked for clarification on which properties could not have water meters installed. AP explained that the water supply to a property affected whether or not a water meter could be installed. <p>The minutes were approved as a true and accurate record.</p>	PM/FM
4.	<p>Minutes of the PV Meeting 17 June 2011</p> <p>PM provided an overview of the PV meeting minutes and updated the Board on the progress around the proposed installation of 300 PV Panels using WBC resources.</p> <p>PM advised that GGHT is reviewing the head room in the business plan to support additional investment opportunities. This includes targeting all 3,500 properties that been assessed as suitable for PV Panels.</p> <p>Questions/Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Future direction - When will the final options for the future investment priorities be agreed? – <i>GGHT have presented the final options to WBC and are awaiting the Council’s approval.</i> ❖ Will the WBC Rent-a-Roof type offer enable a private company to profit from the installation of PV Panels? <i>The capital gains made by an external company through this arrangement will be considered in the final appraisal. All profits will be shared with WBC, but it is important to note WBC are taking the majority of risk.</i> <p>The Executive Board 18/07/11 will be advised of the Board’s approval for WBC to fund the installation; collecting the F.I.T. tariff and paying the contractor to install the 300 panels.</p> <p>GGHT 2011 - 86</p> <p>The Board endorsed the minutes and approved the pilot installation of the 300 units (or more if funding available) and the strategic decision to fit PV panels to 3,500 properties subject to funding arrangements.</p>	
5.	<p>Capital Investment Programme Update</p> <p>CTD presented a report that updated the Board on progress with the capital programme in terms of procurement, cost, delivery and customer satisfaction.</p>	CTD

	<p>Questions/Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ During window installation has the issue with the lintels been resolved? <i>Yes. Pre-survey work is carried out to identify any lintel failures.</i> ❖ Does GGHT ensure that adapted properties are targeted to tenants? <i>Yes we try to allocate to those who need it and the Chooseahome adverts specify whether or not a property has been adapted. Adapted properties are only allocated if there is no other suitable tenants available.</i> ❖ If a tenant has refused to have work done what assurance is in place to ensure that work is completed before new tenants move in? <i>If work is postponed then the cost of proceeding with installation at a later date will be reviewed alongside the Business Plan.</i> ❖ Does GGHT review the profile of tenants who refuse access? <i>The most prominent area of no access is central heating and elderly tenants. However this profile varies according to the work being carried out.</i> ❖ Do we look at the average tenure of those tenants who refuse access as refusals will have an impact on the void costs in the future? <i>This is something that we haven't looked at, but can do.</i> ❖ Capital saved through refusals should be ring-fenced for installation work to be completed at a later date. The decision on whether to spend this capital on former refusals should be agreed by Officers. ❖ Is there any match funding on aids and adaptations? <i>No we have never received any match funding for this work.</i> ❖ Will sub-contractors be used to assist with the fencing installation? <i>The Castle Walls project will enlist the support of sub-contractors. The recruitment of internal labour in other areas has been built into the Business Plan.</i> ❖ Could more information be provided on nature of complaints received? <i>The majority of complaints relate to housekeeping for e.g. operatives not using dust sheets.</i> <p>The Board noted the progress on the procurement and delivery capital works.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">CTD</p> <p style="text-align: center;">CTD</p> <p style="text-align: center;">CTD</p>
<p>6.</p>	<p>Award of Central Heating contract- Decision</p> <p>CTD provided an overview of a tender that will provide for the installation of new central heating systems. A detailed tender analysis had been carried out by Fusion21 and Pennington Choices and both recommended the appointment of Bramall construction for the proposed works.</p> <p>CTD apologised that the report was only being tabled at the meeting and it was explained that due diligence had been completed on 26/06/11 and that GGHT was keen to progress the programme. The Board noted this and requested that, in future, Members were given sufficient time to review material prior to Board.</p>	

	<p>Questions/Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ The rates offered by Bramall Construction appear to be very low, what is the reason for this? <i>The low rates are due to Bramall employing its own workforce and the other works awarded have enabled the company to reduce their overhead costs.</i> ❖ Should additional measures be taken to monitor Bramall's management structure, quality of work, number of claims etc.? <i>GGHT is recruiting an Officer and Manager within the gas team to monitor risk and ensure installations meet the required safety standards.</i> ❖ As a sector leader, should GGHT target properties with SAP ratings threshold lower than 54? <i>GGHT is tackling this as it was detailed as an action in the Energy Strategy.</i> ❖ What impact would condensing the 5 year heating programme in a shorter period have on the Business Plan? <i>GGHT would need an additional loan from Santander to bring the programme forward. This would result in adjustment interest payments but would enable GGHT to make savings in completing the work sooner and tenants benefitting from the work sooner.</i> ❖ What is the risk to the central heating installations programme if brought forward? <i>No serious risk. The proposal will still be on the table in 6 months.</i> ❖ Is the heating programme a fixed price contract? <i>Yes, and GGHT should be able to increase the through put to 40 property completions per week.</i> ❖ The Business Plan will be updated to account for future costs and these will be discussed at the Board Away Day in October. ❖ PM advised that a follow up report be taken to Board on 27/07/11. <p>GGHT 2011 - 87</p> <p>The Board approved the award of contract to Bramall Construction (installation) and Grahams (heating equipment suppliers). The Board agreed to award the contract to Bramall in 1st place and that the 2nd place contractor be considered (subject to due diligence) if there were any complications with Bramall.</p> <p>The Board also agreed to review bringing forward of the programme in October at the away day</p>	AP
7.	Longford Quality of Life Project	
	<p>PM presented a report that provided an overview of the Longford Quality of Life Project and detailed the issues to be tackled and plans to work in partnership to maximise outcomes in the area.</p> <p>Members attention was drawn to the 2010 multiple indices of deprivation, high levels of residents not feeling safe at night, lower levels of satisfaction with the neighbourhood. Other problems highlighted include crime/ASB and</p>	

	<p>rubbish/litter.</p> <p>Questions/Comments Bewsey and Dallam are areas of high deprivation that also need to be addressed. <i>Longford had been identified as the most deprived ward in the area with two super output areas based on the multiple deprivation indicators 2007 (1 and 7) and 2010 (2 and 7). The Longford project has the focus of the local partners and provides GGHT with a leadership role in 'closing the gap'.</i></p> <p>The Board noted the report.</p>	
8.	Castle Wall Regeneration Project	
	<p>AP presented a report that updated the Board on progress with the design and cost options for the replacement of the Castle Walls and extensive tenant consultation results.</p> <p>Questions/Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ The report could place a greater focus on community safety <i>Installation of castle walls and gates links in with safety.</i> ❖ Will the installation of good quality hard standing also be considered and how will this be maintained? <i>Hard standings are not included on the costs outlined in the report.</i> ❖ What about the other areas of the Borough where parking is an issue, they would probably like gates and dropped crossings and may feel that it's unfair. <i>This area is one of the most deprived and other agencies have signed up to tackling some of the issues. The Board will have to tackle problems like this and make decisions on that address issues in certain areas.</i> ❖ Have the following points been considered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High turnover of tenants in Longford; • Impact that scheme will have on Right to Buy properties; • Annual Cost in terms of maintenance and demand. <i>Owners of Right-to-Buy properties will not be affected by the planned works. Replacement of castle walls at these properties will only be carried out if funded by owners. They will be offered the preferential rates. Tenancy and site management will monitor the upkeep of driveways/gates/fences. Tenants will be encouraged to maintain properties through the Government's Get Britain Working and Keep Britain Tidy initiatives. This will be given full focus by our neighbourhoods team.</i> ❖ The regeneration project is aimed at key areas of deprivation within Longford. A summary of work carried out in areas outside of Longford will be circulated to Members. ❖ Regenerating the area, we should be considering installing hard standings as the job isn't finished. <i>This could add an additional 340K to the budget if all those who could have a drive wanted one.</i> ❖ Has drainage off dropped crossing been considered? <i>Discussions have taken place with WBC and united utilities to ensure effective</i> 	<p style="text-align: right;">PF</p>

	<p><i>drainage is installed.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Should GGHT be paying for dropped crossings? <i>Safety is an issue that had been highlighted by the tenants, WBC have agreed to invest £750k for improvements to carriage crossings, paths, gullies and lightning and this will include any drop crossings required.</i> ❖ Have WBC confirmed this? <i>Yes there have been ongoing discussions with senior councillors and officers at WBC.</i> <p>GGHT 2011 - 88</p> <p>The Board approved the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ The installation of brick walls at all properties including corner plots; ❖ The installation of double gates ❖ The installation of driveways/hardstanding at all properties that have been assessed as suitable; ❖ The additional works will be circa £1.4M with WBC resources for carriage crossing reducing this figure for GGHT to fund. 	
9.	Whistle-blowing policy	
	<p>AF provided an overview of the Whistle-blowing policy for staff, Board members, consultants and members of the public. The policy aims to protect individuals who may raise a genuine concern. Examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Criminal offence ❖ Health & safety issue ❖ Corruption/bribery ❖ Failure to deliver proper standard of service <p>Questions/Comments</p> <p>The Unions have suggested that section 4.1 of the policy ‘bullying/harassment’ should be removed as GGHT has separate policies to deal with behaviour. However, it is recommended this section be included to encourage individuals to blow the whistle if there is a ‘culture’ of harassment and bullying within the organisation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Section in the policy what is not covered, bullying and harassment? This isn’t clear. <i>It was agreed that the wording of the policy will be amended.</i> ❖ The Chair/Board should be added to who people can raise their concerns <p>GGHT 2011 - 89</p> <p>The Board approved the Whistle Blowing policy.</p>	<p>AF</p> <p>AF</p>
10.	Summary News Items	
	Were noted.	

	<p>Questions/Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Recruitment of independent and co-opted Board Members – 36 expressions of interest and 6 applications received – closing date 4/7/11 ❖ A copy of HQN reports on flats to PP ❖ CCP forward plan will be incorporated with the Governance plan and lined to Board Structure 	AF
11.	Minutes of Customer Consultative Panel 24 May 2011	
	Minutes were noted	
12.	Minutes of Chair's Briefing – June 2011	
	Minutes were noted	
13.	Part II Confidential	
14.	Any Other Business	
	None	
15.	Date of Next Meeting: 27 July 2011 at 4.30pm	
	JK forwarded his apologies for the July meeting.	