

## **Unipol Code Tribunal**

7th December 2011, Unipol Student Homes, Leeds

### **Meeting to consider issues with the following landlords and managing agents:**

<b>Charlie Boardman</b>	<b>Shahida Malik</b>	<b>Bairstow Eves</b>
<b>Susan Gilles</b>	<b>Amer Natheer</b>	<b>Chrysalis Property Solutions</b>
<b>Imran Haq</b>	<b>Rebecca Nixon</b>	<b>Martin and Co (North Branch)</b>
<b>Jayne Harrison</b>	<b>Jaspel Nottey</b>	<b>Sarah Booth Properties</b>
<b>Michael Heath</b>	<b>Dean Smith</b>	
<b>Keith Langley</b>	<b>James Warner</b>	
<b>Robert Mackenzie</b>	<b>Changes Zafar</b>	

Present: Dr Andrew Brooks (Chair); Ms Jo Johnson (Vice Chair); Mr Steve Kettlewell (Vice Chair);

In Attendance: Mr Simon Kemp (Codes Administrator, Unipol)

#### Details

A number of managing agents who have been members of the Unipol Code Supporters Scheme have notified Unipol that they are no longer trading, operating in the student market or wish to be members. In addition, a number of landlords who signed-up to join the Full Unipol Code have failed to either comply with all of the requirements to become accredited under that scheme, or have requested to withdraw from membership.

The procedures require that all decisions relating to the removal of members of either Code should be approved by the Complaints Tribunal, therefore these issues were brought to the attention of the Tribunal for determination.

#### Other Matters that the Tribunal Took Into Account

The Tribunal was provided with the reasons why each of the agents and landlords were being proposed for removal from the Codes. It was decided to look at the two Codes separately.

#### Report (Code Supporters)

It was reported that Bairstow Eves no longer wished to be supporters, that Martin and Co (North Branch) were no longer operating within the student market and that neither Chrysalis Property Solutions nor Sarah Booth Properties were trading.

#### Decision (Code Supporters)

That all four managing agents be removed from membership of the Code Supporters Scheme.

### Report (Full Code Landlords)

Various reasons were given for wishing to remove the following landlords from Code membership, which are shown below:

<b>Landlord</b>	<b>Reason/s for Removal</b>
Charlie Boardman	Failure to arrange any property inspections
Susan Gillies	Failure to provide a timetable for completion of works following an inspection
Imran Haq	Has asked to withdraw as he does not have the funds to complete the works
Jayne Harrison	No longer renting to students
Michael Heath	Has stated he is no longer interested in being accredited
Keith Langley	Has stated he is no longer interested in being accredited
Robert MacKenzie	Failure to provide a timetable for completion of works following an inspection
Shahida Malik	Failure to complete works within given timescales
Amer Natheer	Failure to provide timetables for completion of works AND to arrange additional inspections as requested by Unipol
Rebecca Nixon	Failure to provide a timetable for completion of works following an inspection
Jaspel Nottey	Failure to provide a timetable for completion of works following an inspection
Dean Smith	Has asked to withdraw as he does not have the funds to complete the works
James Warner	Failure to provide timetables for works following inspections
Changes Zafar	Failure to provide a timetable for completion of works following an inspection. Has stated he is no longer interested in being accredited

### Decision (Full Code Landlords)

The Tribunal agreed to the removal from membership of each of these landlords, but made various recommendations in each case (see below)

<b>Landlord</b>	<b>Recommendation/s</b>	
Charlie Boardman	She be removed with membership and only permitted to reapply if she agrees to respond to all future correspondence	
Susan Gillies	She be removed from membership and informed that another property inspection would be required if she wished to re-apply in the future.	
Imran Haq	He be removed from membership and not permitted to reapply unless he gives an undertaking to complete any actions identified by any future inspections within the timescales given. He should also be asked if he can afford to do any works	
Jayne Harrison	She be removed from membership but is informed that if she wishes to reapply in the future then she can, so long as a visit date is agreed within a month of the application being made.	
Michael Heath	He should be removed from membership and not permitted to reapply unless he gives an undertaking to complete any actions identified by any future inspections within the timescales given	
Keith Langley	He should be removed from membership and not permitted to reapply unless he agrees to a property inspection within a month of submitting the declaration form	
Robert MacKenzie	He be removed from membership and not permitted to reapply unless he gives an undertaking to complete any actions identified by any future inspections within the timescales given. As some of the non-compliance issues related to the need to extend the smoke detection, it was also recommended he be referred to LCC.	

Shahida Malik	She be removed from membership of the Leeds Code, but informed that if she wants to reapply then a charge will be made to conduct a third inspection of the property	
Amer Natheer	They be removed from membership and, should they wish to reapply, they be informed that they will need to provide an undertaking that they are committed to the process. It was also recommended that a charge be levied for the costs of any visits to be undertaken	
Rebecca Nixon	She be removed from the Code and informed a re-application would only be considered if she provides a written undertaking to complete any works required.	
Jaspel Nottey	He be removed from membership and not permitted to reapply unless he can provide current gas and electrical safety certification. It was also recommended that this be referred to the local housing authority.	
Dean Smith	He be removed from membership and not permitted to reapply unless he gives an undertaking to complete any actions identified by any future inspections within the timescales given.	
James Warner	He be removed from the Code and informed a re-application would only be considered if she provides a written undertaking to complete any works required.	
Changes Zafar	He be removed from membership and not permitted to reapply unless he gives an undertaking to complete any actions identified by any future inspections within the timescales given.	

#### Follow-up Action

The Tribunal recommended that the local authority be advised of some of the issues arising from the inspection visits that were carried out. It was agreed not to produce a press release following this Tribunal.