

APPENDIX G

POST REPORT SUMMARY – from Hugh Rayner

1. I run a small property management agency in the Colindale area - some of the houses we manage are owned by the agency itself, some by me and some by clients. Our tenants are a generally contented group who live in nice well maintained, properly documented houses, many for more than ten years with some for more than twenty years. Our tenants are generally well satisfied with the service the agency provides. Some, but not all of our tenants, are disadvantaged by not being able to afford London rents. These have their rent funded, or supplemented, by housing benefit. As an agency we do not automatically turn these people away as most agencies do. We realise that just being on benefits does not make you a bad person - indeed some of our best tenants fall into this category.
2. I repeat, for emphasis, that **as a landlord I only receive rent** – I do not claim or receive housing benefit or DHP as Dismore and the newspapers would have you believe. I receive rent! How a tenant sources their rent is their responsibility not mine. My responsibility is to provide the house – theirs is to provide the rent. If the tenant lives in somebody else's house – then rent is due!
3. There is a **big difference between Barnet Homes' 'deposits' and 'incentives' schemes.**
 - a. **'Deposits'** in this context are amounts lodged with the landlord by Barnet Homes, repayable at the end of the lease less any deductions. **Deposits advantage the tenant.** S&H Housing Ltd received one deposit on behalf of one tenant in **January 2013** – which is lodged with DPS with Barnet Homes named as the provider. Note this tenant was previously our tenant in the 1990's before they moved away. They sought us out when they returned. They did not come as a Barnet Home's recommendation – I state this in case it was not clear in my final summary at page 30 of Mrs Cohen's main report.
 - b. **'Incentives'** on the other hand are non-returnable cash sums paid to the landlord. **Incentives advantage the landlord.** Hugh Rayner received one incentive in **July 2014** (well after the meetings about which the complainant is concerned). Note this tenant came to us in the first instance through a private recommendation – not from Barnet Homes. I state this in case it was not clear in my final summary at page 30 of Mrs Cohen's main report. We also received a further incentive at the end of **July 2014** – again the tenant was obtained through private recommendation.
4. **I made no reliance in my property business on any matters arising from Council policy** – indeed I suffered from Council policy in as much as I now need to pay council tax when properties are void and because of the downward adjustments of LHA and caps etc. Most of my tenants were in situ before the meetings about which the complainant is concerned and **all of my tenants came from private referrals – NONE THROUGH BARNET HOMES.** (No tenants were recommended by Barnet Homes - I repeat this in case it was not clear in my final summary at page 30 of Mrs Cohen's main report.) Just for the record our advertising budget during the nearly 30 years I have been in business has been virtually zero – **existing tenants recommend us to their friends!**

5. The bottom line, I believe, is that you must consider whether there has been any impropriety in all this or for that matter any intention of impropriety.
 - a. I do not consider that there was any **impropriety in my dealings with council officers or Barnet Homes' staff** – as evidenced by solicitor Mrs Cohen's research - nothing but inference and conjecture on the part of Mr Dismore and his 'star' witness!
 - b. Nor do I consider there has been any **impropriety in regard to my declarations** at meetings. Matters under consideration at meetings were considered carefully and judgements made in good faith. And if a conflict of interest were to have arisen I would, as stated elsewhere, have made a declaration. In my opinion no conflict of interests arose – even, as it turns out, at the meeting in January 2014 when I did make a declaration.
6. My advisors have expressed serious concerns about the part played by Mr Dismore in all this, about the part played by certain Burnt Oak Councillors, about the declarations of opposition members of BMOSC as well as about the involvement of local newspapers. I am at a loss as what making all these complaints, including those set aside by the Monitoring Officer, was intended to achieve! Whose benefit has it been all for? If I were the bad landlord that Mr Dismore has been making out then surely my tenants, many of long standing, would be up in arms. The fact is that I have **only received words of support from my tenants** and they are totally bemused, and in some cases very annoyed, by the newspaper reports. If I were a bad councillor then I would not have **been re-elected in May 2014**. I do hope this is not just a political ploy on the part of Mr Dismore - part of Mr Dismore's re-election campaign!

HRR

Aug 14