1. Purpose

1.1 To report back to Cabinet the results of the consultation process by PEP on the tenant appointment methodology to the four area partnership boards and to make proposals for the way forward

2. Recommendations

That members agree the four recommendations as outlined in the PEP report as follows:

2.1 That the Council adopts the ‘selection’ methodology for choosing Tenant Board members as indicated as the preferred option by 50% of the tenants responding to the consultation and that it promotes further resident engagement in the process of establishing its new resident involvement structure.
2.2 That the Council agrees an initial Area Housing Partnership Board composition of two Members, three local senior staff and five tenants with an option for the Boards to further co-opt independent Board members.

2.3 That, during October to December 2009, the Council implements a programme to support the development of the Area Housing Partnership Boards by the promotion and provision of joint training and Board development sessions aimed at the relevant Members, Officers and tenants for each of the four Housing Areas.

2.4 That the Council note the initial suggestions made by tenants during the consultation about what should constitute the elements of a Board member person specification.

2.5 That the process of appointing tenants to the Area Partnership Boards begins in accordance with the timetables outlined in the report.

2.6 That a further progress report is forwarded to Cabinet in March 2010.

2.7 That elected Member engagement as part of this process can commence.

3. Issues and Choices

3.1 Report Background

3.1.1 Cabinet considered a report on 4th February 2009 following a health check of the council’s tenant participation arrangements. The health check, undertaken independently by PEP (Priority Estates Project) proposed an area- based approach to involvement via four area housing based partnership boards with an umbrella Housing Partnership Board.

3.1.2 The relevant minutes of that meeting are repeated in full below

**Decision:**

1. The report from PEP is noted.

2. For the purposes of consultation, recommendation 13 (c) of the PEP report is adopted as the basis of formal resident involvement in housing matters, through a process of selection of tenant board members who are not necessarily part of any formal or traditional structure to sit on four Area Housing Partnership Boards and a borough-wide Housing Partnership Board.

3. Recognition is formally withdrawn from the existing Tenant participation Agreement and work is to commence immediately on drafting a new agreement for consultation with all council tenants in the Borough.

4. A further report is to be presented to Cabinet once the outcome of consultation is known.
3.1.3 The decision of Cabinet was called in by Overview and Scrutiny Committee (20 and considered at their meeting on 23rd February 2009. the decision of Overview and Scrutiny Committee (2) was that:

“Resolved: That after all the evidence had been heard that the Call-In be rejected on the grounds that it was unfounded as consultation has taken place”.

3.1.4 Following the decision by Cabinet to commence further consultation, this additional process has now been completed and the aim of this report is to provide a path towards the implementation of the new area based boards.

3.2 The Wider Consultation Process.

3.2.1 The wider process of consultation was carried out initially between June/July of this year. Every tenant household (approximately 12,250) was sent a leaflet from PEP outlining the proposed customer engagement structure, which was also supplemented by a series of public meetings, held throughout the borough, hosted by PEP. The objective was to provide more information about the concept of area partnership boards and to seek tenant views on the appropriate method of appointing tenants to the four Area Boards.

3.2.2 The consultation exercise indicated overall agreement and support for the newly proposed structure of Area Boards plus an umbrella Housing Partnership Board. The following points were raised by tenants attending the public meetings:

i) Tenants are keen to assist in the development of a board member job description and person specification.
ii) Tenants would like to be involved in the development of local involvement plans to support the area boards.
iii) Tenants were willing to become involved in training initiatives to underpin the proposals.

3.2.3 The results of the initial consultation, which included a tear-off response slip from the PEP leaflet and small attendance at public meetings, indicated no clear preference for one particular method of appointing Tenant Board members.

3.2.4 When these are added to other responses from members of the Tenants Sounding Board, a clear majority of the 207 tenants who responded to the consultation favoured a selection process for appointment of Tenant Board Members as opposed to an election method. Overall results were as follows: -

- Selection Option – 104 (50%)
- Election Option – 54 (26%)
- Undecided – 43 (21%)
- Abortive – 6 (3%)

(Appendix 1 of the PEP report provides a full breakdown of the results of the consultation undertaken by PEP)
3.2.5 Whilst it might be questioned whether 207 is representative of the wider tenant community, every tenant was given a chance to comment and the lack of response reflects a general apathy towards formal tenant engagement structures. With initiatives of this kind it is often the case that initially there is some scepticism and lack of interest, but that should change as the Area Boards find their feet and their work becomes known to tenants. The area boards are part of a menu of opportunities for tenants to become involved, which includes:

- The Tenants Sounding Board
- Residents Steering Groups (for capital contracts)
- Mystery Shopping
- Tenant auditors
- “Helping hands” (a programme aimed at younger tenants)
- Surveys

3.3 The recommended appointment process for Tenant Board Members.

3.3.1 As the consultation suggests that selection is the preferred option it is critical that the process of selection is conducted in an equitable and robust manner. This needs to be achieved through the delivery of two distinct phases.

i) The identification and training of tenants for a selection panel (s)

ii) The recruitment of tenants to the Area Partnership Boards by the selection panel.

Full proposals have been developed by PEP on how the above can be delivered and implemented (see appendix 2 of their report)

3.3.2 The proposal is for PEP to set up 4 selection panels, made up of tenants who do not wish to be area-board members. They would receive training on selection and it would be their role to appoint those who come forward as wanting to be a tenant board member. It should be noted that tenants sitting on the tenant selection panel would be unable to apply for the position of Tenant Board member. Should insufficient numbers be put forward for this role in each area, a selection panel could have a wider remit across the four areas.

3.4 Elected Member Representation on the Area Partnership Boards

3.4.1 In accordance with best practice and other similar national models it is recommended by PEP that the area partnership boards should initially consist of the following: -

- 5 x tenants
- 3 x officers
- 2 x ward councillors

3.4.2 As the Area Partnership Boards are intended to comprise a mixture of tenants, council officers and ward councillors, the active engagement of local members is a key element of the overall process.
3.4.3 As there is no legal or internal governance requirement (confirmed by Legal Services) for the representation of elected members to be politically balanced it is for members to decide themselves on how they are to be appointed to the Partnership Boards. To assist their decision a briefing note and informal meeting will be held separately by early November 2009.

3.5. Area Board Development Timetable

3.5.1 PEPs full report (appendix 5) outlines timescale proposals which will ensure that the Area Partnership Boards will be formed by 1.1.2010 and will be “going live” and fully operational by 1.4.2010.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>When</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promotion of the Area Boards and the recommended method of selection.</td>
<td>October 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter to all tenants who have expressed an interest</td>
<td>October 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training for staff</td>
<td>October 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members briefing</td>
<td>October 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two day training course – joint training – develop terms of reference</td>
<td>November 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and board member person specification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant Board Member position advertised and application packs issued</td>
<td>November 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shortlisting by selection panel</td>
<td>November 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews, decision making and notification</td>
<td>December 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Board training commences</td>
<td>December 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of local involvement plans</td>
<td>January 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Board training</td>
<td>January 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code of conduct agreed</td>
<td>January 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terms of reference agreed</td>
<td>January 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further development on local involvement plans</td>
<td>February 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Board training</td>
<td>February 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress report to Cabinet</td>
<td>March 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Boards go-live</td>
<td>April 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Implications (including financial implications)

4.1 Policy

None

4.2 Resources and Risk

4.2.1 Funding and resource support for the development of the Area Partnership Boards during this financial year is contained within the Customer Engagement Budget.

4.2.2 It is anticipated that that the selection process recommended by PEP will assist in mitigating risks of former problems encountered by the previous Customer Panel and N-Tact structures. The process will be lead by independent external advisers (PEP) who have previous experience of this sort of development. In addition a detailed training programme will be delivered to all participants, which will be supported by clear terms of reference and codes of conduct once the boards have been formed.

4.3 Legal

This report contains no direct legal implications.

4.4 Equality

4.4.1 This report does not deal specifically with equality and diversity issues although the new proposals are intended to result in wider inclusion of tenants that has not previously been experienced through previous structures.

4.4.2 The continued development of informal mechanisms through a wide involvement menu is intended to ensure that all groups identified through the customer profile have the opportunity to influence, shape and monitor services. An equalities impact assessment will be undertaken before formal appointment of tenant board members takes place.

4.5 Consultees (Internal and External)

4.5.1 The full PEP report at appendix 1 reports the outcome of extensive consultation undertaken by PEP since the previous Cabinet report in February 2009. All tenants of the borough were invited to contribute to this consultation through a range of personal mail shots, public meetings and direct contact from PEP.

4.6 How the Proposals deliver Priority Outcomes

4.6.1 The proposals are consistent with the following corporate priorities as outlined in the Councils’ Corporate Plan
• **Improve Housing Health and Well-being**
  Improved participation and access to cultural opportunities
  Vibrant neighbourhoods and engaged communities

• **Partnerships and Community Engagement**
  Effective working with voluntary and community sectors
  Increased customer consultation

• **A well managed organisation that puts customers at the heart of what we do**
  Services with a local focus
  Improved customer insight

4.6.2 The formation and development of the Area Partnership Boards is a key objective (5:2) of the Housing Service Improvement Plan 2008-10 which is the directorate driver for the achievement of a “2 star with excellent prospects for improvement” Audit commission rating by 2010.

4.7 Other Implications

None

5. Background Papers

5.1 PEP report (at appendix 1)
5.2 Previous report to cabinet 4th February 2009
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Introduction

During the period June to September 2009 PEP consulted with residents about the Council's proposals to establish a new structure for resident involvement: Area Housing Partnership Boards. In particular, we asked residents for their views about the methodology that the Council should adopt to identify Tenant Area Board members.

We received responses from over 200 NBC tenants about this issue using a range of different methods to obtain their views. These were:

- Tear-off slips in leaflets issued in early June (67 replies)
- Attendance at public meetings in June and July (28 tenants not including those who returned tear-off slips or attended more than one meeting)
- In early September a telephone and e-mail survey of Tenant Sounding Board members (112 replies) who had not returned tear-off slips nor attended a public meeting

Overall, the preferences expressed by tenants during the consultation were as follows:

- Election option 54 (26%)
- Selection option 104 (50%)
- Undecided 43 (21%)
- Abortive 6 (3%)

Total 207

Appendix 1 provides a detailed breakdown of these figures.
Recommendations

1. That the Council adopts the ‘selection’ methodology for choosing Tenant Board members as indicated as the preferred option by 50% of the tenants responding to the consultation and that it promotes further resident engagement in the process of establishing its new resident involvement structure. A draft methodology for establishing the tenant Board member selection process is attached as Appendix 2.

2. That the Council agrees an initial Area Housing Partnership Board composition of two Members, three local senior staff and five tenants with an option for the Boards to further co-opt independent Board members.

3. That, during October to December 2009, the Council implements a programme to support the development of the Area Housing Partnership Boards by the promotion and provision of joint training and Board development sessions aimed at the relevant Members, Officers and tenants for each of the four Housing Areas. See Appendix 3 for a draft action plan to implement this.

4. That the Council note the initial suggestions made by tenants during the consultation about what should constitute the elements of a Board member person specification – see Appendix 4 for details.
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NBC Consultation regarding Area Housing Partnership Boards

June - September 2009

Overall total:

| Total       | 207 |

Supporting:

| Election option | 54 (26%) |
| Selection option | 104 (50%) |
| Undecided* | 43 (21%) |
| Abortive | 6 (3%) |

* Includes preference for more than one option.

The results of the tear-off slips are as follows:

| Total returned | 67 |

Supporting:

| Election option | 21 (31%) |
| Two or more options | 13 (19.5%) |
| Selection option | 12 (18%) |
| Undecided at this stage | 11 (16.5%) |
| Abortive returns | 6 (9%) |

The results of those attending June / July public meetings:

| Total | 28 |

Supporting:

| Election option | 13 (46%) |
| Selection option | 10 (36%) |
| Either option | 3 (11%) |
| Undecided at this stage | 2 (7%) |
The results of the TSB phone – e-mail survey*:

Total responses 112

Supporting:

Election option 20 (18%)
Selection option 82 (73%)
Undecided 10 (9%)

* Includes two tenants surveyed during an estate walkabout

These numbers reflect the number of different individual tenants. Some tenants participated in both the tear-off slips and public meetings. Tenants who participated in the tear-off slips or public meetings were not included in the TSB phone / e-mail survey to avoid double counting.
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Tenant Board member selection process

This process consists of two linked elements:

1. Identifying and training tenants on the Area Tenant Selection Panels
2. Appointment of tenants to be members of the Area Housing Partnership Boards

Identifying and training tenants on the Tenant Selection Panel

- Promotion of joint training / development sessions by letter to those tenants who have already expressed an interest in being kept informed
- Attendance at joint training / development session on Board terms of reference and agreement of Board member person specification that will form the basis of the advert and Tenant Board member application pack
- Tenants attending this session will agree which of the tenants attending will sit on the Tenant Selection Panel for their area. **It should be noted that tenants sitting on the Tenant Selection Panel would be unable to apply for the position of Tenant Board member.**
- Members of the Tenant Selection Panel attend a training session on shortlisting and interviewing skills.

Appointment of tenants to the Area Housing Partnership Boards:

- Promotion of Area Housing Partnership Boards and the selection process by advert in local newspaper, article in ‘My Home’ and letter to those tenants who have already expressed an interest in being kept informed.
- Advertising of the Area Tenant Board member positions
- Application period starts, issuing of application packs
- Application period ends (after two weeks)
- Shortlisting by Area Tenant Selection Panels
- Interviews by Area Tenant Selection Panels
- Decision and notification / publicity
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**Action plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week commencing</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26.10.09</td>
<td>• Promotion of AHPBs and selection method by advert in local paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Letter to interested tenants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Training for staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Briefing for Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02.11.09</td>
<td>• Joint training / development session: local Members, staff and tenants to develop terms of reference and Board member person specification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.11.09</td>
<td>• Tenant Board member positions advertised and application packs issued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.11.09</td>
<td>• Closing date for applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.11.09</td>
<td>• Shortlisting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07.12.09</td>
<td>• Interviews, decision and notification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.12.09</td>
<td>• Initial meeting of Area Tenant, Member and staff Board members to agree next steps locally</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is likely that the Area Housing Partnership Boards will need require two to three months to fully establish themselves. They will need to consider whether to co-opt independents, they will also need to draw up a project plan for the following year including how the local involvement plan is going to be developed and implemented.
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Area Housing Partnership Board member person specification - suggestions made by tenants

During the June – July public consultation PEP asked residents to identify the qualities: skills, experience etc that they thought would be required to be an effective Board member. In addition PEP also delivered a training session in each Housing Area during August to consult further on these qualities as a start to agreeing a ‘person specification’ for Board members. Additional suggestions were also received by email.

Tenant Board member qualities identified by tenants

These are in no particular order of importance and will need to be consulted on further to develop a person specification as part of the selection process.

- Committed about turning up, carries out research and prepares in advance of Board meetings
- Committed to resident involvement and to delivering quality housing services
- Knowledgeable about Council structures, policies and procedures and Government rules / regulation of social housing
- Good verbal and written communication and presentation skills
- Capable of giving strategic leadership
- Able to influence and a skilled negotiator
- Understands tenant concerns and priorities
- Able to work within a team and a commitment to making the board effective
- Ability to learn and to ‘self-improve’
- Integrity and impartiality
- Able to resolve conflicts, able to synthesise solutions – a problem-solver and to be solution-focused
- Knowledgeable about diversity and committed to equality of opportunity
- Will provide regular feedback and be the link for residents
- Approachable and easy to speak to
- Good listener
- Transparency
- Perseverance
- Trustworthy and being willing to trust others
- A willingness to raise issues not their own or with which they disagree
- Adaptability
- Local knowledge or experience of the area
- Relevant business or educational skills
1. Purpose

1.1 To report on an external review of tenant participation in Northampton and to make proposals for the way forward.

2. Recommendations

2.1 That the report from PEP is noted.

2.2 That the Cabinet adopts, for the purposes of consultation, recommendation 13 (c) of the PEP report as the basis of formal resident involvement in housing matters, through a process of selection of tenant board members who are not necessarily part of any formal or traditional structure to sit on four Area Housing Partnership Boards and a borough-wide Housing Partnership Board.
2.3 That recognition is formally withdrawn from the existing Tenant participation Agreement and that work commences immediately on drafting a new agreement for consultation with all council tenants in the Borough.

2.4 That cabinet receive a further report once the outcome of consultation is known.

3. Issues and Choices

3.5 Report Background

3.5.1 Following a procurement process restricted to “Independent Tenant Advisors” (ITAs) approved by the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA), PEP were selected. PEP have a long history of working as ITA to many residents groups around the country, having their roots in the Government’s Priority Estates Project of more than 20 years ago but now operating as independent consultants.

3.5.2 The process of selection commenced before issues arose with the former N-TACT Committee, who have been denied officer support and time since an insufficient number of members refused to sign unqualified individual undertakings about the conduct of meetings. No meetings of N-TACT Committee have taken place on Council premises or involving council officers since October 2008, although PEP have involved individual committee members in focus groups and interviews.

3.5.3 The PEP report is attached as appendix A. The brief initially was to provide a progress report and advice on best practice, to assist the Housing Service to reach “Two stars” (good) by 2010. PEP’s overall assessment was that the tenant participation service was “one Star” (Fair) and they have made a number of practical recommendations which have been accepted and will be part of an action plan for 2009.

3.5.4 During the review the issues with N-TACT Committee came to a head. Although N-TACT Committee members dispute issues of fault and reporting of alleged incidents, the disruption caused by security staff and the police being called to disputes within the N-TACT Committee, not involving council officers, reached an intolerable level and they were all individually advised that all support would be withdrawn until a written undertaking as to future conduct was made by each individual member. This was not forthcoming. The focus of the latter part of the PEP review therefore became increasingly on the way forward. This report is primarily concerned with that aspect of the review.

3.6 Issues

3.6.1 Council Members and officers want to work constructively with tenants who are the service users and residents on Council estates in Northampton. A dialogue with leaseholders is also important and the re-structure of the housing service includes the establishment of leaseholder services officer. The challenge is to establish a structure where; -
• tenants and service users’ views can be established
• constructive dialogue can take place, and
• consultation can be monitored and acted upon.

3.6.2 Some time ago the Council established a “Customer Panel” through which resident representatives could make known their views. This did not meet the aims of paragraph 3.2.1 above and was abolished in 2005. In its place N-TACT was established and on 19 December 2006 Cabinet approved a draft tenant involvement strategy and tenant participation agreement.

3.6.3 The role of N-TACT, the fact that every council tenant in the Borough was automatically a member, and the N-TACT Committee established annually at the Annual General Meeting, has always been problematic. At that time housing services were spread across five different Corporate Management Areas and it is clear that there was no ownership of the Tenant Participation Agreement in the main housing service areas. This is a criticism in the PEP report which is accepted, although attempts were made to improve matters in 2008 and in the lead in to the creation of the housing directorate, by the creation of a Joint Council/N-TACT Steering Group, chaired alternately by the Chair of the N-TACT Committee and the Portfolio Holder.

3.6.4 The role of the N-TACT Committee has been unsatisfactory. Given its own constitution, it could not speak for all tenants. Its membership was too big, its meetings have been dysfunctional and its relationship with the council has irretrievably broken down as set out in the PEP report.

3.6.5 In summary, the criticism of council officers implicit in the report is accepted. At this stage, we do not know the views of former N-TACT Committee members, but they do not escape a share of the responsibility in the report. The main challenge is to deliver a robust structure which promotes customer engagement and tenant involvement, in which tenant representative and council officers can have confidence and which will deliver the improvements set out in the recommendations from PEP.

3.7 Choices (Options)

3.7.1 The PEP report proposes an area based approach to involvement through area based housing partnership boards, with a borough-wide Housing Partnership Board made up of representatives from the area based structure. How this would look in diagrammatic form is set out at Appendix 1.

3.7.2 It is proposed that the Area Housing Partnership Boards should mirror the four housing management and maintenance areas created in the housing directorate re-structure and due to be finalised by 31 March 2009. The exact composition can be decided after consultation but a working arrangement would be three tenant representatives, three ward councillors and two officers, representing housing management and housing maintenance. Individual capital works projects will have their own arrangements, such as a Joint Project Board for Northampton East PFI, and will report to the relevant Area Housing Partnership Boards. Resident representatives from recognised
tenants and resident associations and other ward members who are not formal members of the area housing partnership boards could attend as observers and address the meeting. Matters which are not strictly related to housing services would continue to be referred to Neighbourhood Management Boards and links between the two structures will be explored during consultation. It is suggested that the Area Boards would meet every two months.

3.7.3 The borough-wide Housing Partnership Board would consist of tenant representative’s from the Area Boards, the Portfolio Holder and ward members of the area boards, plus the Director of Housing and the three Heads of Service. It would meet four times a year, but would also commission small working groups to review particular policy developments and monitor their progress.

3.7.4 The PEP report put forward three options for the method of selecting tenant representatives:

- Election
- Restricted election of “approved” candidates
- Selection

3.7.5 As the PEP report states, there is little advantage of an elective process which might give the misleading impression that tenant representatives have a mandate to speak for a particular constituency. Equally, a process of the council selecting representatives is open to criticism. The proposal is therefore to set up a selection panel, made up of tenants who do not wish to be representatives. They would receive training on selection and it would be their job to select from those who come forward as wishing to take part in the partnership boards. Tenants on the selection panel would be debarred from standing as prospective partnership board members and vice versa.

3.7.6 A customer engagement strategy for housing is being developed. It will include the following features:

- A representative “Sounding Board” of about 500 tenants
- A developed “Tenants Profile” to assist Equality Impact Assessments and consultation with hard to reach groups
- Tenant “Auditors” who will review works such as voids and capital works for quality assurance
- Support to setting up local tenants and residents associations
- Support to specific customer groups, such as the “Helping Hands” initiative to involve the 16-25 age group
- Area Housing Partnership Boards
- Ad hoc policy development groups
- Joint project groups
- The Housing Partnership Board

4. Implications (including financial implications)
4.8 Policy

None (see paragraph 4.6 below)

4.9 Resources and Risk

4.9.1 The development will be contained within the proposed participation budget for 2009/10. The key risk identified is that the problems of the Customer panel and the existing Tenant participation agreement will be repeated. This is mitigated by the use of external advisors with previous experience of this sort of development, coupled with the creation of a Customer Engagement Team as part of the Housing service re-structure, and by the form of selection of tenant board members as proposed. Any prospective tenant board member will be expected to sign up to a code of conduct which would be applicable to all participants and in a form similar to that which N-TACT Committee members did not respond positively to in the autumn.

4.10 Legal

None for the purpose of this report.

4.11 Equality

4.4.1 This report does not deal specifically with equality and diversity issues, but the development of new forms of involvement as set out in paragraph 3.3.6 above is intended to ensure that all groups identified through the customer profile have the opportunity to shape and monitor services. An equalities impact assessment will be undertaken before formal recruitment of tenant board members takes place.

4.12 Consultees (Internal and External)

4.12.1 The PEP report at appendix 2 is the outcome of extensive consultation carried out by PEP over the autumn of 2008, although its conclusions have not been shared widely. It is proposed to consult with the sounding board about the Area Housing Boards and the borough-wide Housing Partnership Board and to bring back to cabinet any material changes proposed following that exercise.

4.13 How the Proposals deliver Priority Outcomes

4.13.1 The proposals are consistent with the following corporate priorities as set out in the Corporate plan in support of the Sustainable Communities Strategy: -

- **Housing Health and Well-being**
  - Improved participation and access to cultural opportunities
  - Vibrant neighbourhoods and engaged communities

- **Partnerships and Community Engagement**
  - Effective working with voluntary and community sectors
  - Increased customer consultation
• A well managed organisation that puts customers at the heart of what we do
  o Services with a local focus
  o Improved customer insight

4.14 Other Implications
None

5. Background Papers

5.1 PEP report January 2009

Brian Queen, Interim Housing Advisor, ext 7174