



MARYHILL HOUSING ASSOCIATION LIMITED

MINUTES OF THE BOARD MEETING HELD ON THURSDAY 17TH DECEMBER 2020 AT 6.00 PM VIRTUAL MEETING VIA CONFERENCE CALL

Board Members	Attended	Apologies	Officers	Item
Roger Popplewell (RP)	✓		Bryony Willett (BW)	1-2
Caitlyn Maccabe (CM)	✓		Jennifer Simon (JS)	1-2
Isabella McTaggart (IM)	✓		Karen Fee (KF)	1-2
Janaki LakshmiNarayanan (JL)	✓		Carol Bain (CB)	1-2
Jenny Crowe (JC)		✓		
Lindsay Forrest (LF)	✓			
Najah Plakaris (NP)	✓			
Paul Imrie (PI)	✓			
Raphael Rickson (RR)	✓			
Richard Turnock (RT)	✓			
Tim Holmes (TH)	✓			
<i>Observer – name removed (O)</i>				

Item No.	Issue	Action by
1.	Welcome	
1.1	RP welcomed everyone to the meeting.	
1.2	Apologies were noted from JC.	
1.3	IM noted her interest in Glenavon as a resident and a participant in the heating pilots.	
2.	Glenavon heating replacement	
2.1	RP provided the context for the Special Board Meeting and explained that the purpose was to consider a single paper on the future heating options for the three Glenavon tower blocks.	
2.2	RP noted that some questions had been received in advance from individual Board Members and that these would be addressed if required in the meeting.	
2.3	RP explained that the paper as presented was split into two halves – with the first half providing background on the tower blocks generally in terms of the wider option appraisal for the future of the building; the Transformational Regeneration Area; the legal case around the failure of the render and the issues with the existing heating systems. The second	

Item No.	Issue	Action by
	half of the paper focuses on the options for the heating moving forward. RP proposed that the meeting focus on the second half of the paper and the heating options. However, RP invited any questions about the first half of the paper or any general observations.	
2.4	RT noted that there was no recommended option for the heating and suggested that in terms of good governance he would expect officers to make a recommendation of a way forward. BW explained that this had been deliberate but in the future officers would recommend a preferred option.	BW
2.5	RT also noted that there was not a single report author and wanted to clarify which officer was leading the report. BW explained that this was because different officers had fed into different parts of the report – BW had authored the context/background; CB and JS had authored the heating options section and KF had provided financial implications/analysis.	
2.6	CB and JS introduced the second half of the report.	
2.7	TH and IM commented that in light of the customer feedback and the technical feasibility on the air source heat pumps they did not think that this was an option that should be taken forward. RP and CM further commented that the render issues around this option were very significant and therefore it was agreed by the Board that this option should not be taken forward.	
2.8	RP also commented that Option 4 (do nothing) should also be discounted because the Association knew how dissatisfied customers were with the existing storage heaters and the Association had already committed to addressing this. This was agreed by the Board.	
2.9	In relation to the communal option Board Members asked for more information on how this would work. CB explained that in this option the Association would become a supplier of heat and would charge customers for how much they used on the basis of a metering system. O asked if this was the same system as Cube have installed on the Wyndford Estate. BW explained that the Cube system was a combined heat and power system which generated heat in a different way. However, the principles of heat being generated centrally then piped to individual properties is the same as on the Wyndford Estate.	
2.10	IM expressed concerns that the new storage heater systems that had been installed did not seem to be working as effectively as they should be and therefore generating financial savings for customers. CB agreed that this was a concern which was why it was proposed to bring in a third party expert to look at the specification for the most efficient storage heater replacement option.	
2.11	RP commented that deliverability was a key issue and that the time factor for a communal option was a significant concern. TH highlighted that equally proceeding with a single option of replacement storage heaters	

Item No.	Issue	Action by
	<p>may mean that the Association was back to square one if the more extensive pilot identified that they did not deliver benefits to customers.</p>	
2.12	<p>CB explained that the initial pilot for the replacement storage heaters was not sufficiently extensive to provide comfort to officers that the replacement storage heaters, as installed in the pilot, would provide a benefit to residents in terms of reducing fuel bills. Board Members suggested that the size of the pilot for new storage heaters be extended to include 10 – 20 households.</p>	
2.13	<p>TH suggested that the Association should continue to explore the communal air source option but to do this by visiting (virtually or otherwise if restrictions allowed) other housing providers rather than by commissioning a detailed technical feasibility which would incur significant, potentially abortive, costs.</p>	
2.14	<p>It was agreed by the Board that the Association should proceed with Option 3 (a detailed specification and more extensive pilot for storage heaters) but that the size of the pilot would be increased to up to 20 households. It was agreed by the Board that the Association should also proceed with Option 2 (exploring communal options) but that this would be done by officers through learning from other Associations rather than by commissioning a detailed feasibility.</p>	
2.15	<p>It was agreed that an update on the new storage heater pilot would be brought to the Board in January 2021.</p>	
2.16	<p>It was agreed that the 2021/22 Business Plan would assume that the heating systems at Glenavon would be replaced with electric storage heaters, and not by air source heat pumps as had been assumed in the 2020/21 Business Plan. This is because the discussion at the Board tonight had confirmed that individual air source heat pumps were no longer a viable option for Glenavon and the most likely heat solution, based on current information, was replacement storage heaters.</p>	
2.17	<p>Board noted that this would remove the potential covenant breach in the financial year 2021/22. KF confirmed that the lender would be updated accordingly.</p>	