

**LINTHOUSE HOUSING ASSOCIATION LIMITED  
MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE MEETING**

**Minutes** of a meeting held at  
1 Cressy Street, Glasgow and Via Teams  
On **Tuesday, 24 February 2026**, at **6.00 pm**

**PRESENT**

Paul Phin, PP (via Teams)  
Collette Ness, CN  
Heike Bley, HB  
Frank Murphy, FM  
Susan Brown, SB  
Lyle Mitchell, LM  
Kelly Brown, KB  
Ayla-Marie O’Ryan, AO

**IN ATTENDANCE**

Irene McFarlane, (Chief Executive Officer)  
Alison Greig, AG (Corporate Services Manager)  
Elaine McDermott, EM (Housing Manager)  
Bryan McMahon, BM (Director of Property Services)  
Emma Shaw, ES (Corporate Services Assistant - Minute Taker)  
Fettes McDonald, FMD Ltd (Via Teams)

<b>1.</b>	<b>APOLOGIES</b>	
1.1	Apologies were received from Graham Gillespie.	
<b>2.</b>	<b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</b>	
2.1	None.	
<b>3.</b>	<b>DECLARATIONS OF ETHICAL BEHAVIOUR &amp; NOTIFIABLE EVENTS</b>	
3.1	None.	
<b>4.</b>	<b>UNAPPROVED MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING HELD 27 JANUARY 2026</b>	
4.1	The minute was <b>APPROVED</b> by CN and HB.	
<b>5.</b>	<b>MATTERS ARISING, ACTION POINT REGISTER</b>	
5.1	Item 99 – EM stated that work is ongoing to provide this information for the Committee.	
5.2	Item 100 – AG explained that a training date is being organised for the Committee to learn more about the SHARE E-Learning portal.	
5.3	Item 101 – Completed.	
5.4	Item 102 – Completed.	
5.5	Item 103 – BM updated the Committee that the visit went well. EM confirmed that the properties had been assigned to tenants.	
5.6	Item 104 – Completed.	

**6. ANNUAL RENT CONSULTATION 26/27**

6.1 EM presented the report and outlined the process undertaken for the newer Committee members

EM referred members to the Appendices and reminded them that the consultation on a 6.2% increase was presented and approved by the Committee at the November meeting, alongside the draft budgets. The Appendices included comments received by tenants as part of the consultation. Response rates represented █ of the tenant base. There were several ways to respond, including online, via a QR code, in person, and by phone, as well as a drop-in session operating from 10am-7pm, to which only 2 people attended.

IM commented that █ of tenants in the area are in receipt of benefits, and outlined why the 6.2% increase was necessary to ensure continued investment in the housing stock. IM added that the Scottish Housing Network (SHN) has been asked to review Linthouse's rent affordability, and is comparing it with other Associations.

6.2 PP opened for questions or comments. CN stated that she did not agree with a 6.2% raise as she felt it was too high, particularly for working tenants not in receipt of any benefits. KB agreed with CN's comments, although acknowledged that LHA's rent was cheaper than private landlords and other Associations.

IM responded to the concerns raised and explained that many of the comments received mentioned the addition of new windows and doors. IM explained that these stock investments mean it is inevitable that rents would need to be increased to allow the Association to continue carrying out these works.

IM advised that the 30-year investment programme would be covered by FMD at the Business Planning session, and reminded members that the Association had received █ in Scottish Housing Net Zero Funding (SHNZF) towards the windows and doors work.

IM continued that for every █ increase in rents, █ in income is generated, resulting in an additional █ annually, which would otherwise be lost to investment in the existing stock. CN acknowledged the significant stock investment work carried out so far, but still felt that 6.2% in the current climate was too high, particularly as wages do not increase by the same amount.

EM stated that every tenant who commented during the consultation period had been contacted to ensure they were maximising their income and to offer support through LHA's wraparound services, such as Welfare Rights and Energy Advice. IM commented on the increased costs of materials, insurance, and other bills, which have also impacted. BM concurred with IM's comments and added that now that most of the

<p>windows and doors work in the Pre-1919 tenements are coming to an end, the Association can assess the investment needed in other stock areas.</p> <p>6.3 PP opened a vote to approve a 6.2% increase. CN proposed a 4.5% increase. PP asked what the effect would be on stock investment work if the Committee agreed to CN's proposal. BM stated that a 4.5% increase would require going back to the 30-year projections. IM advised that 6.2% is what the Association would require to fulfil the existing investment plans.</p> <p>IM added that additional rental income from acquisitions could reduce pressure on future rent increases, depending on how many the Association makes within 26/27. PP stated that a reduced increase would mean borrowing more, which would also impact the investment plans, requiring them to be revisited and savings made elsewhere. BM provided further context on the projected costs of investing in kitchens, bathrooms, new boilers, and other works over one year.</p> <p>IM proposed that the Committee agree to the 6.2%, and the Executive Team and FMD be instructed to look at reducing costs for 27/28. PP asked SB and HB for their thoughts. SB commented that rents are unlikely to get any cheaper as inflation will continue to rise.</p> <p>6.4 By a show of hands, the Committee voted on a rent increase of 6.2%; agreed by PP, SB, HB, LM, KB and FM, and for a 4.5% agreed by CN and AO. The majority <b>APPROVED</b> a 6.2% increase, subject to a review taking place to reduce costs and rental increases in 27/28 and beyond.</p>	<p><b>Action</b></p>
<p><b>7. CEO REPORT</b></p> <p>7.1 IM presented the report and proposed holding the Business Planning session on the evening of the 31st of March instead of the normal Committee meeting, due to the limited availability of members to attend a full-day session. The session would start at 5pm, with dinner provided by the Association, and finish at 8pm. It would be necessary, however, to include any urgent reports that required Committee approval. The Committee <b>APPROVED</b> the date for the Business Planning session.</p> <p>7.2 IM referred to item 3 of her report regarding Council grant-funded support available to RSLs for acquisitions that help to address the current housing emergency. To date, LHA has received [REDACTED] for acquisitions that have added 35 properties to the housing stock. IM advised members that she had approached the Neighbourhoods, Regeneration and Sustainability (NRS) lead officer to enquire about bridge funding from NRS to enable further acquisitions now, with the grant funding to be drawn down in July from the Council. NRS has agreed to this arrangement.</p>	

<p>IM asked members to consider and approve delegated authority to her as CEO to pursue bridging funding for approved acquisitions, subject to receipt of a letter of comfort from NRS confirming that the grant funding would be paid by the end of July 2026.</p> <p>FM asked if the Association had sufficient funds in the bank for any acquisitions, or whether it would be necessary to borrow further under the loan. IM responded that the Association had sufficient money in the bank and would not need to increase LHA's borrowing.</p> <p>7.3 The Committee <b>APPROVED</b> delegated authority to the CEO to progress with the bridging funding, subject to a letter of comfort being provided by NRS.</p>	<b>Action</b>
<p><b>8. PST REPORT</b></p> <p>8.1 BM presented the report and advised that some items were for noting and others for approval. He referred members to the information provided on the Davislea development, and outlined the areas required to be built into the development specification, these being:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Low Carbon Heating with air source heat pumps</li> <li>• Sprinkler/Water Mist System</li> <li>• Electric Vehicle infrastructure</li> <li>• Biodiversity and Sustainable Drainage, rain gardens, and green roofs to bin stores</li> <li>• Solar panels</li> </ul> <p>CN asked what a rain garden was. BM responded that it is a garden that will absorb water, so the drains will not get overwhelmed by the rainfall.</p> <p>8.2 BM said he had spoken recently with Scotland Excel and had been given advice regarding the procurement of Davislea about ensuring there were no conflicts of interest for members of the scoring panel. BM had advised Scotland Excel that he had no concerns in this respect. He advised members that the tender outcome report would be presented to the Committee at the next meeting, and advised who the 5 scoring panel members would be.</p> <p>8.3 BM asked that the Committee approve delegated authority to him as DPS to top-up the Hub West Scotland Framework by ██████ (excl. VAT) to allow the Davislea project to progress. The Committee <b>APPROVED</b> delegated authority to the DPS to top-up the Hub West account, subject to the conditions outlined in his report.</p> <p>8.4 BM referred to the list of health and safety policies in his report that were under review. He advised the Committee that, as LHA is a member of Scotland's Social Housing Safety Network, he has asked them to undertake an independent review of the policies to ensure they are legislatively compliant and meet good practice.</p>	

<p>FM asked if there were any material changes suggested, would the policy(ies) be presented to the Policy Working Group. BM responded that this would be the case should any material changes occur.</p> <p>8.5 BM proposed a 12-month contract extension to the contract with John O'Connor while his team review the landscaping services. The Committee <b>APPROVED</b> the appointment of John O'Connor for a further 12 months.</p>	
<p><b>9. POLICIES FOR APPROVAL</b></p> <p>9.1 AG presented the report and explained that the Forensic Readiness and Mobile Device Management policies had been scrutinised at the February AASC meeting, and members agreed to recommend their approval. The governance policies, Standing Orders and Scheme of Delegated Authority, and Entitlements, Payments and Benefits, had been reviewed at the recent Policy Working Group (PWG). Members of the PWG agreed to recommend approval of the policies to the Management Committee, except for a paragraph outlined in the cover report.</p> <p>9.1.1 <i>Forensic Readiness</i> PP explained that the ICT Manager presented this policy well at the AASC meeting, and added that he felt it was very comprehensive and a good start for the Association in ensuring a robust cybersecurity strategy. No questions were submitted.</p> <p>9.1.2 <i>Mobile Device Management</i> PP advised that AASC members had considered this policy and agreed it was a good foundation for building on other aspects of LHA's ICT device management. No questions were submitted.</p> <p>9.1.3 <i>Standing Orders &amp; Scheme of Delegated Authority</i> PP advised that this policy was presented to the PWG and that some changes were made while others were not. IM commented on the recommendation that the Chair of the Management Committee not serve on either Sub-committee. She explained the reason for this recommendation, noting that the main Committee Chair has the final vote should there be a tie at the main MC meeting.</p> <p>FM stated that if PP wanted to join a Sub-committee, it would be as a member and not as the Chair, and added that the lack of Committee members was another factor that should be taken into account when ensuring a quorum for meetings.</p> <p>PP provided a further outline of what the recommendation meant. He advised that the Association sought legal advice regarding this matter and was told that it would not be an issue for the Committee Chair to attend either Sub-committee, just not as Chair. IM commented that it</p>	

<p>was unusual for the Chair to serve on an audit committee, and recommended speaking to GG to clarify why this had been the case previously. PP mentioned that he had already spoken with GG, who did not see any reason he could not be a member of AASC, given that the Association had previously sought legal advice.</p> <p>IM pointed out that as the Chair is her line manager, it would be difficult for her to raise an issue at SSC, and asked what would happen in that instance. PP answered that the Chair would have to excuse themselves from the SSC if this were the case, and added that if the Chair were excluded from either Sub-committee, it would be a governance issue requiring further detailed review.</p> <p>PP asked members to consider whether they would like to keep the changes made at the PWG or discuss them further. IM stated that if members were unsure, they should seek independent advice. After further discussion, PP proposed that the Committee accept the changes made at the PWG, and that the Chair would be allowed to sit on either Sub-committee. The majority of members present agreed with PP's proposal.</p> <p>FMD joined the meeting at 19.28.</p> <p>9.1.4 <i>Entitlements, Payments &amp; Benefits</i> AG provided an overview of key changes following a recent review of the model policy undertaken by the Scottish Federation of Housing Associations (SFHA). No questions were submitted.</p> <p>9.2 The Committee <b>APPROVED</b> all policies presented.</p>	
<p><b>10. KPI REPORT</b></p> <p>10.1 AG presented the report and noted that there were no areas of concern. AG referred members to the comments column for further information from Managers, and opened for questions.</p> <p>EM asked the Committee to note a change at Indicator 20 regarding the number of court actions reported. EM mentioned she has updated the report and that the number of court actions in Q3 was 4, with a year-to-date total of 9.</p> <p>AG referred the members to Appendix 2, the independent tenant satisfaction figures, and noted that some had improved between Q2 and Q3, and overall, there were no concerns.</p> <p>FM asked about the time frame for non-emergency repairs. BM responded that it was concerning enough to warrant his involvement. BM stated that they are monitoring the contractor closely and expect improvements in the next quarter.</p>	

<p>10.2 The Committee <b>NOTED</b> the KPI Report.</p>	
<p><b>11. MANAGEMENT ACCOUNTS Q3</b></p> <p>11.1 FMD presented the report and noted that the Q3 accounts had been reviewed at the AASC meeting. The budget had a projected deficit of [REDACTED]; however, there was an actual surplus of [REDACTED] resulting in a positive variance of [REDACTED]. The main variances were lower staffing, insurance, and maintenance costs, and lower interest charges. Cash in bank was healthy, and arrears were continuing to decline. There were no issues with covenants or ratios. PP opened for questions. No questions submitted.</p> <p>11.2 Management Committee <b>APPROVED</b> the Q3 accounts.</p> <p>FMD left the meeting at 19.41.</p>	
<p><b>12. AOCB</b></p> <p>12.1 FM noted the information session GCC is hosting in LHA about the Master Plan for the area and the Glasgow Innovation Hub.</p>	

**Meeting closed at 19.43**  
**Chair – Paul Phin**