

# The Barbican Association General Council

Minutes of the Meeting on Thursday, 27 January at 7.00pm by Zoom

No.	Item
1.	<p><b>Present:</b>            Elected Members: Chair: Adam Hogg (AH), Deputy Chair: Jane Smith (JS), Sandy Wilson (SW), David Bradshaw (DB), Christopher Makin (CM), Ted Reilly (TR), Randall Anderson (RA)            House Group Representatives: Ben Jonson House: Helen Hulson (HH), Brandon Mews: Humfrey Brandes (HB), Bunyan Court: Derek Penney (DP), Cromwell Tower: Tim Cox (TC), Defoe House: Erin Summers (ES), Frobisher Crescent: Jenny Addison (JA), Gilbert House: Ian Dixon (ID), Lambert Jones Mews: Heather Thomas (HT), Lauderdale Tower: Gail Beer (GB), Mountjoy House: Martin Luff (ML), Seddon House: David Graves (DG), Shakespeare Tower: Sandy Wilson (SW), Thomas More House: Graham Bulpitt (GP), Wallside: Mary Bonar (MB), Willoughby House: Fionnuala Hogan (FH).            House Group stand-in: Andrewes House: Jim Durcan (JD)            Treasurer: Tony Swanson (TS). Honorary Secretary: Fred Rodgers (FR).</p>
2.	<p><b>Apologies:</b> Sue Cox, Helen Hudson, Lionel Meyringer, Andy Hope</p>
3.	<p><b>Minutes of previous meeting:</b> JS referred to an overlap between the proposed Planning and Sustainability sub-Committees and the minutes of 18 November 2022 were approved with “in addition to the remit of the Planning subcommittees, of which they are already a part” added at the end of the following sentence: “MB asked that Conservation Area matters should be added to the Sustainability sub-Committee.”</p>
4.	<p><b>Matters arising:</b> There were no matters arising.</p>
5.	<p><b>Report of WP on City Governance as it relates to the Estate:</b> RA introduced the WP paper by referring to Lisvane’s recommendation that the BRC should be abolished and its functions absorbed by the Property Investment Board (PIB) and that officers and resident together should be responsible for management of the Estate. RA said the actual committee wasn’t important as long as it wasn’t the PIB. We had to decide how the BA accomplishes what residents want it to accomplish and RA said the timescale was limited as CoL wanted to resolve this by March ahead of the elections. After a long discussion with contributions from AH, RA, CM, JS, JD, DB, DG, FH, MB, FR, FH, HH, SW, ID, TC, HT and TR there was no consensus on the WP’s proposals re the RCC. Some members felt that the continued separation of the BA and RCC was necessary for a number of reasons. However, there was a consensus it should be retained, if only as a holding exercise. The meeting agreed that the BA supports (i) CoL’s proposed Housing Committee replacing the BRC; (ii) the establishment of a Barbican Strategy Group as outlined in the WP paper; and (iii) an “RCC” with the “teeth” that should have been in place under the 2003 agreement to be formulated over the coming weeks and confirmed by a plebiscite of residents.</p>
6.	<p><b>To note Outstanding Issues for consideration for 2022:</b> AH presented his paper stating that there was a lot going on and few people to do it. JS said a lot on the paper was</p>

	<p>already being dealt with and JD pointed out there was duplication between BA and RCC over matters like climate change and underfloor heating. AH, TR and SW disagreed. MB said that House Groups needed to organise so more people were engaged. HB pointed out it was hard for small blocks to organise house groups to be RTAs but Brandon Mews residents had been able to and had benefited from it. HH said it was difficult to get additional members for BJH Committee. AH was still of the opinion that too much had to be done by too few.</p>
7.	<p><b>To consider appointment of Chairs for Sub Committees:</b> AH announced that JS had agreed to chair the Planning sub-Committee and FR had agreed to chair the Sustainability Committee. Volunteers were required to chair the other two and AH hoped they would be forthcoming by the AGM. GB said it was important for residents to feel they were achieving something otherwise they stopped being involved, especially if they were working. HH said it was difficult getting anyone to join the BJH committee. AH said House Groups should see what residents are interested in. JS said we shouldn't beat ourselves up over this. When there are issues residents care about, they get involved. Many issues the BA picks up are important but not things that residents should be expected to get excited about. JN suggested using the website to seek volunteers. DB agreed with JS and said the Newsletter was appealing for volunteers. Both TR and CM mentioned CoL's attitude to representation, particularly from elected representatives. The feeling been that the "very few, same people" were zealots. Both AH and JA mentioned this attitude in the recent Centre meeting. GP said there was an underlying need to join membership up across the Estate.</p>
8.	<p><b>Podium Waterproofing Project:</b> AH referred to Helen Hudson's email to the members. It was agreed that SW would act as the liaison for the House Group representatives.</p>
9.	<p><b>Updates for information:</b></p> <p><b>Car Park Attendants/Concierge:</b> CM referred to the City Solicitor's opinion that CoL was able to increase the residents' contribution to the CPAs' costs, which DB confirmed. CM asked if the BA should take legal advice but MB, FH, JS, DG, FR and DB thought any response would be premature until we knew what CoL would be proposing for April onwards but any legal fees would need to be strictly controlled. Both JD and RA said we couldn't allow any suggestion we weren't keeping our bargain but FR was concerned about the position of the CPAs themselves and that residents should pay for the service they get. An opinion was expressed that CoL could interpret leases to enable increasing share of the cost.</p> <p>As far as the Leasehold Service Charge WP is concerned, AH reported that, at last, information is flowing through though not all there yet but officers are joining in. LSCWP has split into two groups one looking at the financials and the other at the organisation. The process to date involves analysing the information and asking supplementary questions for clarification and LSCWP has begun to start questioning the logic of why the BEO does it in the way it does and are there opportunities for improvement. LSCWP believes it has sufficient resources within the group to complete the work by the end of March. This will be dependent on officers taking it seriously and, so far, there is no evidence that they aren't but LSCWP is conscious of the need to give residents progress reports but it is difficult to give detail on account of the confidentiality and sensitivity involved when looking at organisations</p>

	<p>MB didn't think the WP had enough resources to look into what services CPAs provide. AH said the BRC had requested the BEO investigate and cost four possible options for the Car parks ranging from no change through to full automation and that the WP would be looking at the implications for the CPAs. MB suggested House Groups should ask residents what they want from CPAs. ID said he understood supply of information was agonisingly slow and realistically would it be complete by 31 March. AH asked if that was from the previous day's WP meeting and ID confirmed it was. FH was concerned that the CoL response was too tardy but AH insisted it was acting in good faith and moving in the right direction with a good chance of a positive outcome.</p> <p><b>AGM plans:</b> AH asked for volunteers to help with refreshments etc.</p> <p><b>ASB:</b> DB reported that following the last meeting he had asked for House Groups to say whether or not they wanted him to continue to publish ASB details. Only three House Groups had responded. Two were in favour and one against, so he would continue to provide details. DB intended to end the reporting this June.</p> <p><b>Beech Street:</b> TR reported that since CoL hadn't met all the WP's conditions for supporting a continuation of the Zero Emissions Scheme and there was disagreement on this in the House Groups, the BA position would be to leave it to the House Groups to make their own responses to the consultation. RA pointed out that funding for the Barbican and Smithfield Healthy Streets Plan would depend on a successful outcome of the ZES – one wouldn't come without the other.</p>
10	<p><b>Dates for next meetings:</b> Thursday 17<sup>th</sup> March</p>
11	<p><b>Any other business:</b>  JD asked if residents would be able to speak at the AGM as they weren't at last year's. AH confirmed that they would.  The meeting authorised the expenditure of £250 for updating the BA website.</p>
12..	<p><b>The meeting ended at 9.42</b></p>