

NIGHTINGALE PARTNERSHIP RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION
SEATON POINT MEETING

Held on	Wednesday, 14th November 2018 @ 6.30pm
At	Nightingale Community Hall, Olympus Square, E5 8PL

Attendees Present	<p>James MacDaid (JMD) – Chair Nicky Wilson (NW) – Interim Vice Chair Carole Baines (CB) – Secretary Lena Ngenda (LN) – Hall Custodian David Stokes (DS) – NPRA member Les Moore (LS) – Chair, Regeneration Steering Group & Seaton Point resident (79) Tommie Minamar (TM) – Seaton Point resident (45) Rodriques Alexander (RoA) – Seaton Point resident (71) Maureen Devine (MD) – Seaton Point resident (69) Eric Branch (EB) – Chair, Seaton Point Concierge & Seaton Point resident (80) Nick Whitty (NWh) – Seaton Point resident (55) Charles Amore (CA) – Seaton Point resident (83)</p>
--------------------------	--

Officers/Guest/Councillors	<p>Ciara Jones (CJ) - Housing Officer, Hackney Housing Nigel Walker (NWa) – Area Housing Manager, Hackney Housing Geoff Payne (GF) – Major Works Manager, Leasehold and Right to Buy Services, Hackney Council Harry Pike (HP) - Project Manager, Wates SG Grant (SG), Capital Delivery Manager, Hackney Council Alex Winters (AW) Project Manager for Seaton Point roof, Hackney Council Ruth Angel (RuA) - Project Manager for Nightingale Estate Regeneration, Hackney Council</p>
-----------------------------------	--

Apologies	None received
------------------	----------------------

1.	Welcomes, Introductions and Code of conduct
1.1	JMD welcomed the attendees and explained that the meeting had been called and organised by the NPRA as Seaton Point residents had specific and historical issues that needed dedicated attention and discussion. After running through the how the meeting would run, the social landlords and Hackney Council representatives introduced themselves. LM asked for Seaton Point residents to introduce themselves which they then did.
1.2	JMD then asked for AW to give his presentation of the work that was to take place on Seaton Point roof first. JMD told attendees to hold questions until the end of his discussion, and once questions had run out that were specific to Seaton Point roof, other questions could be fielded by the other attending social landlords and Hackney Council representatives. JMD stated hope to finish by around 8.30pm, unless meeting was running over and if the speakers were willing to stay for longer. JMD said the meeting was being recorded and minutes would be produced in the near future.

2.0	Seaton Point Questions
------------	-------------------------------

2.1	AW stated he wasn't going to give a presentation because he said that residents were aware that he and his team were doing roof works. LM questioned that by saying that residents were not aware that work on the roof was to be started on Friday [16 th November]. AW said that wasn't the case, saying HP would outline when the works were to begin, next steps, how long it was to take.
2.2	RoA stated that they had received letters announcing work to be done on the outside of Seaton Point but HP said that was nothing to do with the roof works but with tests on the cladding. SG said it was required as part of the Grenfell inquiry that Councils were required to inspect and test all cladding, with the results coming out at a later date. HP added that there was a long queue and backlog for such testing, so the results would take a while to be known.
3.0	Cladding
3.1	EB asked who had put the cladding on Seaton Point, which SG replied that Hackney Council had. EB stated that it was Higgins, which SG agreed as that was the contractor that did the work. SG declared that Hackney Council knew that the cladding used was not similar to the one used at Grenfell, but appropriate inspections and testing were still required to make sure what type it was. EB asked why the Council didn't go back to the contractors to find out what type of cladding was used. SG stated they could go back to Higgins and refer to the O&M manuals [<i>Building Owner's manuals</i>] but because the cladding used was ten to twenty plus years ago they didn't know where the manuals were. SG said they had to do the testing to ensure that they knew exactly what cladding was used.
3.2	MD stated that the notification with regard the cladding testing was totally inadequate, with no phone number and less than 48 hours notice. SG agreed that the notice given was unforgiveable and he apologised for that. SG went onto say that there were limited time slots for the inspections and testing and if they weren't done in the time given, wouldn't be done until after Christmas. SG stated that the notice was inadequate and it should have been at least 5 days notice.
4.0	Seaton Point Roof Procedure of Works
4.1	MD queried about which roof they were discussing, the podium roof or the main roof, HP said it was the main roof. RoA wondered why in the discussion they were not discussing all of Seaton Point's roofs in their entirety, as it wasn't just the main roof leaking, but the concierge roof had been leaking for years.
4.2	HP said he wished to go through the programme and processes he was delivering. HP said they had begun putting in holdings in the car park opposite Nolan Way with scaffold going up on Monday [19 th November] on the elevation opposite the properties being knocked down. [<i>inaudible</i>] due on site by the 10 th December and before Christmas aiming to have the scaffold tower and hoists erected so work can begin on the roof soon after Christmas. HP stated his contract with Hackney Council was just for the main roof only, and he said wasn't personally aware that the concierge roof was leaking.
4.3	The system that was going onto the main roof was an overlay system specified and supplied by a company called Langley one of the major roof manufacturing companies in the country. The gutters will be stripped out and re-laid completely. HP said the reason for the roof leaking were due to UV damage to the surface of the roof and a number of gutters and down pipes are blocked because there is vegetation growing within them.
4.4	RoA queried how the Council were not aware of these historic issues and have been left to fend for themselves, it was unforgivable. He made the point that if Seaton Point residents didn't pay their rent or service charges, they would receive instant red letters demanding payment, but when requests were made for repairs to the main roof, the response was incredibly slow, he found the behaviour of the Council appalling. RoA outlined that not only those near the top floor were being affected, but those, like his brother on the 10 th were feeling the effects of it, effects that were going on for 10 to 15

	years.
4.5	HP wished to finish his outlining of his works programme and that SG would answer RoA queries. He stated that the programme he was to deliver the roof was to be completed in 5 to 6 weeks, weather permitting as wouldn't open up certain sections during January and February if it was raining.
4.6	EB challenged the information HP gave to RoA saying it was incorrect. EB stated he had been living at Seaton Point for 40 years and in his time residents had decamped to allow Higgins to refurbish the roof at a cost of £5 million. When residents returned both roofs started to leak. The roof on top, where he lived and his two neighbours experienced the effects of the leaks, and saw the podium roof was leaking, all reported to Higgins. EB said the Council were aware but did nothing. EB also said that the reason for the damage to the roof was damaged by [<i>unclear what EB said</i>].
4.7	HP stated he had only been involved with the project for 2 to 3 months and what he has seen when he's been up on the roof and survey supplied photographs. HP said he had no evidence of holes in the roof. MD queried what evidence had had seen for the reasons for the roof leaking. HP reiterated that UV light had caused the damage over to the surface of the roof, making it crack and break. MD stated that the roof leaking was due to a design fault the same as the [<i>unclear what MD said</i>].
5.0	Type of Roof
5.1	TM asked if it was a pick up and relay roof, HP said it was an overlay on the main part of the roof. TM pointed out that the gutters had been laid incorrectly, and were on an incline meaning no water could drain away. HP said that the gutters would be removed with new tapered insulation which meant the roof will be sliding towards the drains, with the overlay after that, so will end the pooling of water.
5.2 Action Point (AP): SG	LM asked if they could have the report from Langley Water Proofing Systems with SG replying there wasn't a report but a manufacturing description of how the system will work and what guarantees will be given if used. LM challenged that by saying a full roof survey was carried out in October 2017 by Langley Water Proofing Systems. SG replied he was unaware but LM said that was what was written to him.
5.3	TM made the point that if the roof was not levelled correctly, no amount of material of whatever quality used will stop water from pooling. TM said a typical example was to go to the first floor and look out the window on a wet day to see how the water is pooling and creating a lagoon. TM said that previous work had diverted the falls for the water that was right over the front entrance so people are soaked when they leave Seaton Point. TM reiterated the poor job done by the roofing contractor and the poor design that was adversely affecting Seaton Point residents.
5.4	HP in answering the first point raised said with the Langley system they can build to a certain height, so if there were slight dips in the roof they shouldn't pose a problem.
6.0	Potential Design Fault(s) of Roof
6.1	EB said Council representatives Bob Snow and David Morebe who had overseen the previous roof refurbishment declared that the leaks were due to a design fault. EB also said that the damage to the roof was from the inside, not externally. HP said he couldn't answer such observations but EB stated he had taken photographs and relayed all the information to the previous Regeneration Project manager, Ann Frankel and now the current one, RuA of why the roof was leaking.
6.2 AP: Council	TM stated the reason why the roof was leaking was incorrectly laid drainage pipe work by inexperienced workmen that meant it had been backing up. HP suggested if CCTV could be used to check on where the blockages were in the external drainage pipes, SG agreed.

6.3	<p>MD stated the refurbishment was in 2000/2001 and said it was a design fault from top to bottom. MD asked on which side the scaffolding was going up and when, HP said on the flu/chimney side and on Monday [19th November]. HP then described the scaffold tower.</p> <p>MD asked if residents would be informed that the scaffold was going up and if they would be disturbed by the sight of the host, but it was being erected on the side without windows.</p>
6.4	<p>LM asked about vegetation in the guttering, and asked with regard housing management who is responsible for regular maintenance of the roof. SG answered it was the repairs and maintenance team and said they should be going to the roof every 3 months. LM queried if they were going up every 3 months, SG confirmed, in referring to the ordering system that the team used, it hadn't happened. SG confirmed that no maintenance had been done for over two and a half years.</p>
6.5	<p>LM queried why residents had to pay when maintenance was not happening. SG said the maintenance comprised of someone going on the roof and brushing it, and he stated it must have happened even though not recorded, as the roof would have been in far worse condition. RoA said such a claim could not be made if there were no available records, SG agreed.</p>
6.6	<p>EB asked why SG couldn't go onto the roof and inspect it himself. There was then a short discussion between EB and TM over if there was access to the roof, and EB stated that he could access the roof.</p>
6.7 AP: SG	<p>SG said he was happy to do go and inspect Seaton Point roof, but he referred to the plans that the regeneration team had and referred further questions to RuA over it. LM asked for the discussion to remain concentrated on the main roof, coming back to non-specific questions later on, this was agreed.</p>
6.8 AP: SG	<p>TM asked who was responsible signing off all the contracts for work and aerals and cameras etc for the roof and lets the contracts for such equipment. SG said with regard mobile phones masts, he wasn't sure within the Council who was responsible. As part of the property and asset management team they were responsible for all physical assets within the borough and they were responsible for that roof, ensuring it was wind and water tight.</p>
6.9 6.9.1 AP: JMD / Seaton Point residents	<p>NWh stated that all the down pipes throughout Seaton Point had to be inspected and fixed, not just the ones on the roof. NWh stated that he was a leaseholder and he had been given a capital charge of about £4,000, but if it was a design fault he wanted to see copies of correspondents from when Higgins was given the contract to do the work, and correspondents going back 18 years. If it is shown to be a design fault, residents shouldn't be paying for the work on the roof. SG said he couldn't comment if it was a design fault or not, as he wasn't in place, but he suggested a Freedom of Information (FOI) request to the Council over the correspondents.</p> <p>TM asked why there was no supervision made recognised and qualified tradesmen. NWh asked if minutes of the meeting would be given out, as none were at the last meeting that was arranged. JMD confirmed minutes would be given out, and also a FOI request could be made through NPRA, but the exact question would have to be thought through, how far the request for correspondents went back, but if there was any documentation it should be available over what was and was not agreed with regard work to Seaton Point roof.</p>
7.0	<p>Housing Management of Seaton Point</p>
7.1	<p>RoA asked who was in charge and managed Seaton Point. NWa replied that he and his team were responsible for the housing management side. When it came to things like maintenance; planned maintenance; reactive repairs or any planned works that housing management would liaise with other departments and would collate that information, but they were a conduit for all other departments in gathering information.</p>

7.2	<p>RoA queried the lack of coordination between different departments, giving examples of the lack of understanding and information over the issues with the roof, the installation of the telephone mast that none of the residents were consulted on, and that the panel he and other residents spoke to a few years ago were now all completely different in tonight's meeting. RoA made the further point there was a high turnover of people running Seaton Point and this meant that when someone new came in they were not familiar with the issues concerning residents. Information wasn't being passed over, which means the processes and discussions have to be started all over again. RoA said his complaint wasn't directed at the panel directly, but a continual complaint over the 18 years, which has caused such frustration with residents.</p>
7.3	<p>TM asked how long CJ had been Nightingale Estate housing manager, which CJ confirmed she had been working on the Estate from May 2018. TM reiterated RoA's point about the lack of knowledge she would have in comparison to residents and said all she had to do it work up to the second floor and look out the window on a rainy day. TM made a further observation of the danger of the water going into foul sewer, it backing up, with overflowing stagnant and polluted water which the potential health dangers that could bring. TM said the sewers were know to flood and overflow and it was coming out into the street and was a danger to residents both young and old, particularly Weil's disease from rat urine. LM said that one concierge due to the water leaking through the roof, had become seriously ill twice and been admitted twice to hospital.</p>
7.4 AP: Council	<p>RoA and TM had a short discussion over the water that residents had to walk through even through the concierge. NW stated that a survey was needed of the pipes as quickly as possible, and if they were blocked, could be drained.</p>
8.0	<p>Contractors</p>
8.1	<p>RoA and MD queried how such all the works and repairs did not work, and sometimes made the issues worse.</p>
8.2	<p>TM asked how the contracting jobs were allocated. SG responded that it wasn't the right forum to discuss procurement but the contract was procured two or three years ago, went through a rigorous tendering process that was Europe wide, with three contractors shortlisted, with those three winning the contract. They included Wates, McNally [<i>hard to hear, so unsure if correct</i>] and OMG. They have a three year framework to deliver the works, but the Council can use their past records as a guide to the quality of their works.</p>
8.3	<p>TM stated that if the Council were using the contractors past records they were guilty of a dereliction of duty because their performance was below zero. HP made the point that these were three new contractors, as Higgins was the previous contractor with regard the roof. SG stated that Wates was going to deliver a Langley roof, they were going to do pre-preparation which included removing any loose debris or any clearance. HP continued by saying Hackney Council will have a qualified clerk of works on the job full time to ensure no poor work or workmanship would be done. HP stated that Wates would do a survey of the down pipes and the gullies on top of the roof to see what was going on before the main roof works would begin, with that information to be shared with residents.</p>
AP: SG	
8.4	<p>LM asked what were the guarantees of the new overlay roof. HP stated there was a 20 years guarantee from Langley and he said that Langley would have their own representatives there to inspect the work, and if they were not happy with the works done or being done, they would make it be redone so it's up to their standards and specifications. HP stated that the workers doing the work would be trained in installing a Langley roof and they wouldn't be inexperienced in laying the overlay.</p>
8.5	<p>MD asked if there were any contingency plans in place in case any of the contractors went bust. SG said that Council had insurance backed scheme to cover it.</p>
8.6	<p>JMD stated at this point 45mins had been done with questions concerning the roof with agreement that another 15mins would be done. RoA said that the roof was a very</p>

	important issue for all the residents, as it affected them all. He wondered what actual structural damage had been done to Seaton Point and if any parts of the building would fall away due to water damage. TM and RoA made the points that the Council had the attitude with regard Seaton Point that it was nothing to do with them.
8.7	JMD asked if the residents' fears of all the issues that were going on for years would be addressed and going forward these loose threads and misunderstandings of what had or had not been done, would be addressed. SG reiterated that when the overlay was put on, there would be a vigorous inspection regime to make sure the work is done properly and if there were any issues, the Council representatives were there for the foreseeable future and were not going anywhere.
8.8	JMD asked and there was agreement that all photos, reports could be provided for future meetings for any residents that wish to attend. HP stated he was happy to attend any future meetings to give an update of where the work was, how it was progressing. SG stated that all reports and surveys would be given to AW and he would circulate with JMD via email who would circulate throughout Seaton Point residents.
AP: JMD	
9.0	Communication
9.1	MD asked what would happen if the inspections of the cladding revealed it needed to be removed. SG said he was unwilling to comment until he got the feedback a report.
9.2	MD asked why there wasn't an open forum of emails so any new officers or Estate managers can come in and look at the history, instead of residents going over the same issues that had been apparent for near 20 years. SG said all letters that are sent out, or phone calls coming into the Council are recorded, with records that do go back to the time when the other high rises on Nightingale Estate existed.
9.3	TM queried if the old underlay that was put on 40 years ago would be picked up. HP said he had simplified his explanation by saying an overlay, but not going all the way down to the concentrate, but taking off the top surface taking off the top surface, going down to the membrane, and if it needs changing it will be changed. HP said as they stripped the layers to see what was underneath and if it is found to be substandard they would refer it as a contractor to the Council, saying that they wouldn't put their product on one that it wouldn't take to. Until they started stripping the top surface they couldn't be certain that no further work would be needed.
9.4	RoA went back to MD question on the cladding and the possible lack of contingency plans if it did indeed need to be removed. SG reiterated that there were options, with one of them could be the removal of the cladding and replace it with something else. TM said that the cladding was leaking and allowing water into the main structure, but SG said that he wanted to see what the survey says and when they come back.
9.5	RoA asked if the residents that had suffered water damage from the leaking roof, would receive compensation. SG said if there was damage to people's properties from water they were happy to look at it.

10	Non-Roof Seaton Point Questions
10.1	JMD said questions should be then opened up to the housing management and regeneration team. LM asked why questions over the regeneration were being asked in the meeting as he wasn't aware that's what the meeting was about. JMD explained it was for all issues that affected Seaton Point, with NW adding because of the new foyer and things that were being put in through the regeneration.
10.2	RoA asked over the plans to knock the back section podium down and put houses down directly behind Seaton Point. RA replied to say that the podium would be reduced in size. About half, with a road and houses on the other side. RoA made the point that some residents in Seaton Point do silly things and would throw things out of the windows so it was risky and an accident waiting to happen. Any cars or front garden down below would be liable to have things like bottles, tampons, babies nappies rain down on them.

11.0	Fire Safety and Sprinklers
11.1	TM made the point that there was the danger of another Grenfell with the houses being too close together and an articulated fire brigand being unable to gain access with ladders and men to Seaton Point if surrounded by houses. RuA said they had consulted with the fire brigand about access and there was planning permission with a side road up the side. TM made the point that Grenfell had changed the landscape of fire safety. RuA accepted that but said that over the next six months there would be detailed discussions over the fire strategy.
11.2	TM stated that the hoarding, once the last of the buildings had been knocked down, should be removed to allow fire brigand access and also anyone that wished to park back in the space. RuA confirmed there was fire brigand access to Seaton Point, she had visited with the fire brigand herself and they stated they could get round all sides of Seaton Point and there was adequate access. RuA said that some of the hoarding will be removed by the two buildings that were previously there, but the hoarding surrounding the building that was the former Radio Sound building won't be as there is an electrical box which can't allow access to the public. RuA said they were hopeful in removing the hoarding around the NEAT centre, but the height of the up stand and health and safety concerns had to be addressed.
11.3 AP: NPRA	RoA raise further concerns over the danger to him and his family on the 17 th floor of Seaton Point in light of what happened at Grenfell, and the lack of due diligence by [<i>Kensington</i>] Council and be much more proactive in addressing safety issues, he felt similar with regard Hackney Council. RuA stated there was a new Head of Resident Safety, Donna Lewis, and she suggested the NPRA invite her to the next meeting to answer such questions.
11.4.	CA raised the point about wide spread sprinkler system in the US, which isn't the case in UK, and there appeared to him an undervaluing of life in comparison to property. HP agreed, in part, to the safety given with regard sprinkler systems but made the point that fire in Grenfell went up the outside, so the sprinkler on the inside would never have stopped the fire. HP also stated that the cladding on Seaton Point is not the same as the one used on Grenfell. CA asked if sprinkler systems were to be added to Seaton Point, but SG said the person to answer that was Donna Lewis.
11.5	CA also made his views known about the roof having been leaking for 20 years and he wanted to have all the information with regard the works being carried out with regard the new roof and schedules. It was agreed this would be the case, with HP outlined what he described earlier in the meeting.
12.0	Leaseholder charges
12.1	MD asked why residents would have to pay anything for the roof when it was known for a number of years that it was a design fault. GP stated that the information he had been given was that the roof had gone past its lifetime and needed to be replaced. If a design fault was discovered it would be taken through to senior managers and get their consideration is there should be a recharge to leaseholders or not.
12.2	GP stated that as the licence agreement that leaseholders have, means that any major works done, which includes the roof maintenance or replacement, they will be recharged to leaseholders. GP stated that legislation meant all charges had to be reasonable, and if residents thought the charge was not reasonable due to design faults, they have the option to take the Council to tribunal.
12.3	MD said that wasn't the answer to the question she was after, saying that the roof didn't have a lifetime to begin with, CA stated it had been leaking all the time. MD went onto say the residents had been paying a number of times for repairs that hadn't fixed the roof and they were being asked to pay again, and a significant amount due to the Section 20 notice that had been issued. MD said residents had been told that the regeneration would repair

	the roofs at Seaton Point and pay for them. GP said he had no information that the regeneration would be paying or any such suggestion, so he couldn't answer that question.
12.4	MD said that the notice was put up stating: ..." <i>Landscape and Public Realm improvements, refurbishments works associated with the ground floor entrance lobby and podium of existing Seaton Point tower and all associated infrastructure including the energy centre</i> ", which was part of town and planning which was part of the regeneration. MD went onto say there was no joined up thinking and that asset management have taken over the works and running of the roof and put the cost on the residents.
12.5	RuA clarified that the roof above porch, the front entrance was to be changed as part of the regeneration and there was to be a new roof on top of it. The podium was also to be changed and other works on Seaton Point under the regeneration. RuA said no Section 20 notice had gone out for any of that work; the Section 20 notices that have been sent out are for the main roof, which is nothing to do with the regeneration that is an asset management issue.
12.6	NWh wanted clarity that any future work done by the regeneration that residents weren't going to face additional future costs with regard the redesign of the front entrance, that was incorrectly designed to begin with, and other works. RuA said she could not give clarity on at the moment, although the question had been asked and further information was needed before as a department, they decided if it was appropriate to recharge lease holders or not. RuA said she hoped to have the information and answer in around 6 months.
13.0	Right to Buy
13.1	RoA had put in a request under Right to Buy and was querying how the £350,000 figure for a two bedroom flat on the 21 st floor was arrived at. GP said the Council have valuer that they go to, they have surveys done of the buildings, the flats and the valuer come up with a valuation based on market prices, and with a discount being applied which creates the offer.
13.2	RoA reiterated the problems with Seaton Point's roof, non-working lifts and water in the concierge and asked if it was still worth £350,000 with 20 years of these problems. GP said he couldn't answer the question, but said under Right to Buy that an independent valuation could be sought and that it could be used to challenge the Council's valuation. If agreement could not be reached a district valuer to go to appeal. NW added that it was best to go to two different valuers for a better comparison.
14.0	Uplinks and lifts
14.1 AP: GP	CA raised the point that the residents through their service charge were paying the security of private TV and radio equipment that was up on the roof, which was used by the wider Hackney community including the Council through Uplinks, security services as in CCTV, and asked if that was fair that only Seaton Point residents were paying. GP said he could take that back to the service charge right to buy team and find out what charges are involved and where they come from and come back with further information.
14.2	CA asked about Seaton Point lifts and said that due to Brexit it would be more difficult and expensive to get parts that were needed for the lifts as they used non-British standard parts, such as the German brake shoots. This has led to the lift engineer being unable to do an adequate fix of the lifts and does a bodge job which won't last long. Hackney Council and residents are being constantly charged for a single breakdown that if a standardised British break shoot was used, the repairs would last longer and not result in residents using the second lift, and wearing that out through double use.
14.3	GP said he couldn't answer the question as it's not in his area of work, but in discussing with a colleague in asset management he was told the Council have a stock of

	standardised parts for lifts so when they break down, they can be replaced. JMD clarified CA point by saying that the parts that are being put in, are of German make, and they fail quite quickly. GP stated the failures weren't due to the parts being of German make but to get parts was difficult anyway and they come from different parts of the world but the Council had built up a stockpile of parts.
15.0	No.47 & Notification of Future Seaton Point Meetings
15.1 AP: NWa	TM asked a question on behalf of his neighbour of 45 Seaton Point has no hot water as her boiler system is blown completely. He said that when a plumber that was sent by Hackney Housing and asked to look at the boiler he said he wasn't qualified to do the job. TM went onto say the plumbing in his neighbour's house was a disaster. NWa took the details down [<i>NWa post meeting stated that it was No 47, and he was dealing with it</i>]
15.2	NWh wanted the decisions of the meeting and said that there was inadequate information to residents of notification and no agenda, so they were unaware of the host of speakers that were arranged. JMD said because of the notice was printed out and hand delivered by himself and NW the speakers that were attending were unknown to them a month ago. NWh said that it should be part of the remit of housing management to send out agendas for a formal meeting.
15.3	NWa said that the agenda was set by the NPRA not housing management and they would come to speak to it. NW said the meeting was organised to deal with the issues of Seaton Point and that every flat was leafleted notifying them of the meeting, with the NPRA organising the speakers that could answer most of the resident's questions, there was no set agenda. NW stated it was only the beginning, with the speakers going back with the NPRA providing the speakers minutes with actions of what was discussed tonight. JMD added that in future there would be a month's notice of the meeting and then a two week notice of the meeting, but that had to be done by NPRA members, physically, which was difficult and time consuming.
15.4 A.P: NWa / GP	NWa asked how long ago the uplink towers on the roof had been installed. CA answered that the work was overseen by Andy Wells and were installed about 17 years ago. NWa asked about the heating of No.46 and how long it been not working. TM said it was for three weeks. NWa said that from housing management side they would be following up with No.46 and he'd find out more of the history of the uplinks and more information of the charges regarding it, which GP would follow up with the service charge team. NWa said as leaseholders they should have a statement of the breakdown of costs over the years on what they were paying for.
16.0	Health and Safety for Vulnerable People
16.1 A.P: NWa	RoA outlined his concerns over health and safety over older people and those with health conditions in Seaton Point that would find it very difficult when both lifts are not working, with even one being detrimental for them. NWa said that on his i-Pad he had been emailing different departments as attendees had been speaking. NWa stated that he had emailed Donna Lewis over the fire risk assessment to get some answers, and he will contact the person who looks after the lifts.
16.2	RoA reiterated that some residents, due to the lack of available lifts, had remained in their flat for days and if there was a fire it would be a disaster for older people or frail people. RoA said it was unacceptable that residents should go between 3-5 hours without available lifts.
16.3	MD said that when the lifts do break down and are reported that do not come within the hour, but usually after 5pm due get extra money and the repairs continue into the next day which inconveniences residents.
16.4	MD also asked that for future meeting notifications that the agenda for the meeting and the times are put on one piece of paper.

<p>16.5 A.P: NWa</p>	<p>NWh made the point that for lifts to be out for two weeks was disgraceful for whatever reason they failed. NWa stated that he had emailed the person that leads on the lift to get some answers.</p>
<p>16.6</p>	<p>CA reiterated that the cause of the breakdown of the lifts was due to the break shoots.</p>
<p>17.0</p>	<p>Rats and waste issues</p>
<p>17.1</p>	<p>CA said that due to the changes over the years on Nightingale Estate, some sewers were not being used anymore with cracking damage being done to them with heavy lorries driving overhead. He said that when the Hackney Council waste lorry reverses near Seaton Point they are pushing waste into such sewers which are inhabited by rats. CA said that the recycling and normal bins were located next to the hole and were supplying the rats with food. CA said he understood with all the work being done that the disturbance would make a rodent movement. CA asked if adequate environmental controls had been implemented to address this surge of vermin.</p>
<p>17.2</p>	<p>NW stated that she had been working with the regeneration team on the baiting of the rodents, and had discussed with the demolition contractors, which had led to baiting all behind the hoardings. NW said that the buildings that were coming down there were fewer rats than expected and the baiting was working. RuA said she had received an email from the pest control team that said they had been going there on a regular basis, checking the baiting. The last inspection was on the Monday [11th November] that showed fewer rodents had taken the bait and it had improved.</p>
<p>17.3</p>	<p>NW stated that they were expecting the rodents were to be concentrated around the area near the Community Hall and the Southern Housing side of the Estate, which wasn't the case. There were fewer rodents around the bins because it had been baited regularly but because a resident is continuing to feed the pigeons with excessive amounts of rice there is now a problem on Muir Road, the rodents having shifted. NW said that because residents were leaving rubbish bags out that were unsecured, foxes were coming along and ripping the bags up which encouraged rodents as there was available food for them.</p>
<p>17.4</p>	<p>CA asked if the sewers that weren't in use could be blocked off and the bins tidied so there's no food in them. NW mentioned that little things like putting the rubbish in the bins provided rather than on the floor would save a lot of problems.</p>
<p>17.5</p>	<p>TM said residents and some cultures had an aversion to putting food waste in their blue bins in their kitchens due to the creation of fruit flies and were not separating it out and were putting in the main bin and down the shoot. CJ said it was an issue of awareness and she had been in contact with the recycling team and next year [2019] they were to undertake a big project on recycling. CJ added that she wanted waste management to become involved in this as well as they needed to start educating the residents how to correctly dispose of their waste. In replying to TM's example of a whole flat's possession of the 15th floor being thrown down the shoot CJ said she had noticed that there wasn't proper signage of what can and cannot be put down the shoot.</p>
<p>17.6</p>	<p>MD said that when new residents come in they need to be educated that the shoot at Seaton Point is not a sheer drop. MD said whoever was letting out the flats, which should be part of their tick box. DS said when he moved in he had a large storage box with information pack about Nightingale Estate which he was very pleased over. DS said in the pack he was given all the information, not only of the Estate, but how to deal with the rubbish, what to expect and useful numbers. DS said if that was happening to all new residents that were moving into the flats of Seaton Point, it would really help the situation.</p>
<p>17.7</p>	<p>MD said that they had tried to educate the long-term living residents of Seaton Point about the shoot, but they took no notice.</p>

17.8	CA said a leaflet that outlines what can and cannot be put down the shoot would be useful, and had been done in the past, instead of another notice of rules on the wall.
18.0	Date of Next Meeting
18.1	JMD said it hadn't been decided yet but reiterated that notice of the next meeting would be a month before and then much earlier to the date another leaflet with an agenda and who will be speaking [<i>roughly two weeks before the meeting</i>].
18.2 AP: JMD / NW	JMD they would build on this meeting and as CA revealed the last specific Seaton Point meeting one was 12 years ago. CA outlined how long he and his family have lived in the area and Seaton Point and he loves, he wished it to be developed positively. JMD said they'd be following up on the issues discussed, but the historic ones that were specific to Seaton Point, as well as working on getting more people in the room with speakers that can answer further questions. NW said that they had to be fair to the rest of the Estate as she and JMD had been working hard giving up their free time getting meetings organised, reestablishing the newsletter and website, and had only been in place for around two months. NW said she CJ and JMD would sit down and make a plan of action for the Estate.
18.3	CA said he was happy with some of the changes he had seen thus far with the health and safety and getting the theatre for the children organised, with NW replying that these would be built on but patience was needed over further improvements being implemented.

Meeting ended at 8.36pm

Signed by:

James MacDaid, Chair, NPRA

Nicky Wilson, NPRA member
