

**LINTHOUSE HOUSING ASSOCIATION LIMITED**  
**MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE MEETING**  
**Approved Minutes** of a meeting held at  
1 Cressy Street, Glasgow and Via Teams  
On **Tuesday, 25 March 2025**, at **6.00 pm**

**PRESENT**

Paul Phin, PP (Chair)  
Susan Brown, SB  
Mary Ray, MR  
Heike Bley, HB  
Graham Gillespie, GG (via Teams)  
Frank Murphy, FM  
Collette Ness, CN  
Ayla-Marie O’Ryan, AO (via Teams)

**IN ATTENDANCE**

Irene McFarlane, IM (CEO)  
Bryan McMahon, BM (Director of Property Services)  
Andrea Walker, AW, (Director of Housing and Community Empowerment)  
Colin Jones, CJ, (ICT Manager) (via Teams and in part)  
Michelle Fegan, MF (Corporate Services Officer)

**Consultants:** Sean O’Sullivan, SO (FMD Financial Services) (via Teams and in part)

**Observer:** Phillip Sellars, PS

PP opened the meeting, welcomed PS and invited the attendees to give brief introductions.		
<b>1. APOLOGIES</b>		
1.1	No apologies were submitted, and it was noted that FO remained on a leave of absence.	
<b>2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</b>		
2.1	There were no declarations of interest expressed by the members attending.	
<b>3. DECLARATIONS OF ETHICAL BEHAVIOUR &amp; NOTIFIABLE EVENTS</b>		
3.1	All those present confirmed they were unaware of ethical behaviour breaches, and LHA had no new notifiable events.	
3.2	IM confirmed that there were no open notifiable events.	
<b>4. UNAPPROVED MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 25 FEBRUARY 2025</b>		
4.1	FM proposed the minute as accurate, seconded by CN.	
4.2	Committee <b>APPROVED</b> the minutes of 25 February 2025.	

<p><b>5. MATTERS ARISING AND ACTION POINT REGISTER</b></p> <p>5.1 The Committee moved on to the Action Point Register and received updates on the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 29—Tenancy Sustainment Policy. AW confirmed that an update report will be presented at the April Committee meeting.</li> <li>2. 31 – CCTV. The committee noted the item was on the agenda for discussion at the meeting.</li> <li>3. 56—Self-assessment of meeting effectiveness. The committee noted that the item was on the meeting agenda for discussion.</li> <li>4. 57 – GWSF 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary. Complete and remove from APR.</li> <li>5. 58 – Business Planning Day. Complete and remove from APR.</li> <li>6. 59 – GCC has an opportunity to move into the city centre. IM confirmed that this item had been added to the SDFP and would be monitored through Property services updates. The committee agreed to complete it and remove it from the APR.</li> <li>7. 60. Davislea design team off-site visit. Complete and remove from APR.</li> </ol> <p>5.2 Committee <b>NOTED</b> the Action Point Register</p>	
<p><b>6. FINAL BUDGET 2025/26</b></p> <p>6.1 SO presented the final budget and reminded the Committee that the previous draft budget had estimated a deficit of £557,000 with tight covenants. After meeting with budget holders, savings were identified that reduced the deficit and provided comfortable margins for the covenants. SO also highlighted that staff costs were higher than estimated due to EVH offering a higher pay increase. SO provided an overview of the balance sheet and noted that the cash balance will reduce significantly throughout the year as project spending occurs.</p> <p>6.2 SO invited questions on the budget. None were submitted, although PP noted that this is one area where the Committee defers to the consultants' expertise.</p> <p>6.3 Committee <b>APPROVED</b> the final budget for 2025/26.</p> <p>SO left the meeting at 18:21.</p>	
<p><b>7. CCTV REPORT</b></p> <p>7.1 CJ presented the report to the Committee and advised that despite what had previously been believed, the CCTV at the multi-storey flats (MSFs) was working and only required the recording box to be updated. The box has now been replaced, and the MSF CCTV will only need to be maintained moving forward.</p> <p>7.2 CJ provided an overview of the proposed costs of the other covered areas and invited questions from the Committee. PP asked if the MSF CCTV could be accessed remotely and about the recording quality. CJ confirmed it could not be accessed remotely. However, the cost of attending to view</p>	

<p>on rare occasions would not warrant installing wi-fi and cloud storage costs. CJ also confirmed that while the video quality is not high definition, it is possible to identify objects and people.</p> <p>7.3 MR asked about the office CCTV and the reach of these devices. CJ confirmed that they would be fixed focal points offering a range of approximately 30 metres to protect the premises.</p> <p>7.4 PS noted that the MSF CCTV had not been operational for almost four years, and while he was happy they were now working, there would be residents who would require information on how to access the necessary channel. The Committee expressed concern about the residents accessing the CCTV. CJ explained that the main entrance doors had a non-recording camera that residents could access via channel 99 on their TV to allow them to see who was at the door but would not be able to access any other CCTV at the MSFs. AW confirmed she would arrange a chat with the MSF residents to discuss the CCTV.</p> <p>7.5 Committee <b>APPROVED</b> the proposal to upgrade the CCTV at the Cressy Street office and Elder House.</p> <p>CJ left the meeting at 18:35.</p>	Action
<p><b>8. Q3 WRITE OFF REPORT</b></p> <p>8.1 AW presented the write-off report and confirmed that all reasonable steps had been taken to recover the debts. She added that for many, the difficulty had proven to be tenants taken on via section 5 and then moved on to other countries without notice or information.</p> <p>8.2 Committee <b>APPROVED</b> the Q3 Write-Offs.</p>	
<p><b>9. PROPERTY SERVICES REPORT</b></p> <p>9.1 BM presented the report and advised that he would focus on the approvals first.</p> <p>9.2 BM presented the Social Development Fund Programme (SDFP) for submission. He advised the Committee that this was the first part of negotiations with the Council and while items may be listed for funding, it did not commit LHA to anything.</p> <p>9.3 PP asked about the conversion of empty shops listed in the submission. BM advised that it is included every year to ensure that it is kept on the agenda in case there is ever an opportunity to do something with the vacant shops.</p> <p>9.4 PP then asked about the acquisition of the land behind Cressy Street. BM confirmed again that this is also included every year in case there is an opportunity to move forward with purchasing this land.</p> <p>9.5 Committee <b>APPROVED</b> the submission of the SDFP.</p>	

9.6	BM then moved on to the appointment of contractors for the Vital Spark refurbishment. He advised that CCG had been confirmed as the preferred contractor following an open, non-regulated procurement. MR raised concerns about appointing CCG as they are currently involved in several LHA projects, and if something were to happen to this business, it could leave LHA in a difficult position. She asked if it would be better for the scoring to be split equally between price and quality. BM explained that the procurement process required it to be scored based on the submission in front of you, and factors outside of that scoring process cannot be considered.	
9.7	GG noted that the price range of the nine submissions was quite a significant amount from the lowest price to the highest. GG asked whether BM thought this was based on contractors being more expensive than others or one not understanding the brief. BM replied that it was a bit of both and that this is why the quality scoring helps balance out these submissions. GG noted BM's response and highlighted that he would be uncomfortable changing the current scoring split unless it was a higher favour for quality, as quality should always outweigh the cost score.	
9.8	Committee <b>APPROVED</b> CCG's appointment as the contractor for the Vital Spark refurbishment.	
9.9	BM then moved on to the landscape contract and advised that the contract with John O'Connor was ending. He was seeking approval to grant a 12-month contract to John O'Connor while the service was reviewed.	
9.10	HB raised a point about the condition of the back courts since the removal of scaffolding, and some work would be required to clear areas before JOC goes in to cut the grass.	
9.11	FM asked whether the extension requested was built into the JOC contract. BM confirmed it was not, and this contract had been carried out through a framework assessment.	
9.12	PP noted that the discussion to extend the JOC contract had taken place last year, and issues about quality were raised at the time. PP asked why an extension was being requested if the quality was unsatisfactory. BM disagreed with this point and noted the work the Property Services Team and JOC put in to improve the quality and that JOC were only being paid based on proof of work completed. He added that it was necessary to have this time to plan what the estate service would look like, and this could not be carried out until GCC finalised its plans. BM also noted that there was very little choice available in landscape contractors, with no evidence to support a better option.	
9.13	PP asked what would happen if the Committee did not approve the contract. BM explained that the contract would end, and while the team attempted to appoint a new contractor through the lengthy process, no landscaping work would be carried out, which could result in increased complaints from tenants.	
9.14	GG asked about the compliance framework used for this contract and if JOC was the only landscape contractor on the framework. BM confirmed there were other landscape contractors on the framework; however, JOC came out top in both quality and price. GG felt this information was not clear in the report and asked that more clarity on the framework be provided in the future.	

9.15	Committee <b>APPROVED</b> a 12-month landscape contract to John O'Connor.	
9.16	BM provided the Committee with an update on insurance. He advised that he had received word that the current provider was looking to exit the market, so if they were to make the same offer as the current LHA cover, this could be at an increase of £56,000. BM advised that the broker was proposing that LHA use two insurers, one for property cover and another for public liability; however, this may involve a three-year commitment.	
9.17	BM sought delegated authority to investigate insurance costs using our broker and negotiate the best deal for LHA, whether based on a one-year or three-year commitment. The Committee <b>APPROVED</b> delegated authority to the Director of Property Services and FMD to negotiate insurance for the Association.	
9.18	BM advised the Committee that due to upcoming large-scale investment costs, it was necessary to top up the Hub West fund by £195k. The committee approved the proposed top-up of Hub West.	
9.19	On 9/19, BM confirmed that the Valley Group contract was ending, and he sought to activate the one-year extension clause. The committee approved the one-year extension of Valley Group.	
9.20	Committee <b>NOTED</b> the property investment update, and PP commented that this was the type of information he wanted to see the Association advertising. IM confirmed this information is included in the newsletters and the Annual Landlord Report. This led to PS noting the perception of some tenants that there is a lack of communication from the Association. AW highlighted the various ways LHA communicates with tenants, the information shared for consultation, and the lack of engagement from tenants at several events. AW offered to discuss this further with PS.	
9.21	MR congratulated BM and the team on the numbers for the EICRs.	
9.22	Committee <b>APPROVED</b> the 2025/26 Contract and Procurement Register.	
<b>10.</b>	<b>SELF-ASSESSMENT REVIEW OF MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE MEETINGS</b>	
10.1	IM advised the Committee that the Corporate Services Team would circulate a questionnaire to gain feedback on how effective committee meetings are. She would like each member to complete this questionnaire before committee conversations and return it to MF.	
<b>11.</b>	<b>AOCB</b>	
	1. Annual Leave Balances. MF advised that two staff members had annual leave balances above the standard five-day carryover. MF confirmed that one member had 13 days, which had been pre-approved by the Director of Property Services to carry over for an extended holiday and used in April. The second staff member had nine days of absence because of sickness over Christmas. The committee	

<p><b>APPROVED</b> the carryover of the 2024/2025 annual leave for the TSM and AM.</p> <p>2. Membership Approval – Committee <b>APPROVED</b> the membership application of [REDACTED]. This Item contains personal information and has been redacted in compliance with GDPR legislation.</p> <p>3. Murals project – The Committee were provided with digital examples of the upcoming murals project.</p> <p>4. Davislea – BM provided the Committee with new project designs for the Davislea site.</p>	
---	--

**Meeting closed at 20:00**  
**Chair – Paul Phin**