Votes from participants	WDCO Lead
12	Jackie, Adrian & Billy
9	Omar & Shifra
6	Jeff & Gloria
5	Adrian & (Person needs to be agreed)
2	
2	Hillary & Ann
2	
2	
1	
1	
	Design Committee Role
	participants 12 9 6 5 2 2

AWAYDAY Priorities – As agreed in January

House in Order remains number 1, see the notes below

Phase 3 is no 2 and the working group is in place – Omar has a plan of action which the board should see and choose perhaps to approve.

I would add to this the rents, etc in Phase 4 - there must be figures in a viability assessment we can plug into the formula. WDCO needs to get ahead of the game

Have we published anything on affordable home numbers?

The Redmond/MHDT has gone up in priority in my mind - we were promised a consultation in May which has not happened. I'd like to see the options 1) merger 2) demerger 3) do nothing and the costs and benefits of each

Block D - there are no optimistic signs emerging

NHG - ?????

Thoughts arising from the "House in Order" working group

Jackie, Billy and Adrian – meeting Wednesday 15/1/25 The group touched on:

- Confidentiality too much of sub-group proceedings is hidden by a veil of confidentiality – take this to the Partners' Awayday
- Minutes of sub-groups All agreed that these should be published promptly
 Is there an archive of past minutes
- WDCO minutes to contain Action Points for board members, which should be acted upon before the following meeting (this was begun at the January Board)
- The Board Action Points will not always be allocated to the usual suspects, but will give a larger number of board members the opportunity to contribute.
- What exactly is the role of the ITLA?
 - o Is there a contract setting out their roles and responsibilities their duties and the amount of control they have and the amount of time they should spend advising social housing tenants
- Action Tracker
- o Do we need an extension to cover the more numerous actions now board members are involved
- Constitutional Review
- o How should we go about this, as there are obvious gaps, e.g. holding meetings remotely
- Town Square
- o Given the current levels of dissatisfaction with the ground floor what is proposed for the Town Square should be reviewed and changed if necessary
- RCC Meetings
 - The arrangements have too many elements that are unsatisfactory
 - The TV is too small
 - The acoustics make it difficult to hear
 - Laying out furniture takes time and effort and distracts from the social/prelim/follow up discussion
 - The tables we need to use are a mish mash of different sizes and shapes and falling into disrepair

Communication with residents - is still poor but I think Yaya and Roy are on board with a different approach as is Mat Jenner

ASB/ shoplifting/phone theft/ muggings are a big societal problem - should we try to do anything?

Existing Housing stock - no one should go on living in damp mouldy homes - do we have the capacity to press for improvements

Communal areas / ground floor / open spaces - i think current arrangements are poor - we should be looking to retro fit better, as well as having more input at design stage

To this I'd add S106 - which is money for infrastructure to the benefit of the estate – who better to decide how it gets spent than the people who live here.