

**Maunsel (Fourth Co-Ownership) Housing Society Ltd.
Management Special Committee Meeting
held on Wednesday 8th December 2021 via Zoom at 7.30pm**

Present: Rachael Vick (RV), Sarah Collinson (SC), Bella Murray (BM), Dominique Van Roey (DVR), Ben Gladstone (BG), Robert Larkin (RL), Basia Kapp (BK), Bella Murray (BM)

Guests: Marie Travers (MT), Charles Samuels (CS) Russell Mulchansingh (RM)

1	Apologies - Denise Heywood (DH), Jennifer Jeffrey (JJ), Judith Blakeman (JB), Michael Lynas (ML), Murray John (MJ) Ben Lamb (BL)	
2	Re-decs	MT, CS
3	Open gardens	RV
4	Treasurer's budget	BM

2. Re-decs: MT explained that all the Committee have seen CS's tender document. CS provided a summary to the meeting. CS went out to tender on 22nd October. Tenders were returned on the 23rd November. CS issued tender documents to five contractors. Three were returned, and the two lowest were Mark Alexander Development and E & M Building & Decorating Services. The tenders are quite high but these two are not too far apart. However, some of the pricing for prelims and management were different. The scaffolding costs seem to be extremely high for all the tenders, which is a reflection of the industry at the moment. CS thinks this is because scaffolders are in quite high demand and can charge what they want at the moment. The other cost which is quite high is painting, and some repairs. In terms of repairs to common parts, there will be quite a lot needing to be done, particularly around the porches. CS has allowed a provisional sum of around £8000. Mark Alexander have come in with a price of around £8000 to match the provisional sum. E & M are slightly less, but it is possible that they underpriced theirs slightly. Around the porches seems to be a lot of rotten areas. The other issue that CS highlighted is in terms of time-frame. All tenderers have come in with a 16 week period to do the work. There will be an over-lap that needs to be worked out for the blocks of work. CS's recommendation for a contractor based on price is E & M. CS believes both firms are capable of doing the work. The benefit with MA is that they are familiar with WS. CS raised that there might need to be pointing needing to be

done to the gable ends. This may or may not require scaffolding - perhaps just a localised tower. There are also cracks on the verges. CS is waiting for the roofing specialist to confirm the likely work that will need to be done and the condition of the roofs. A lot of the roofs need moss clearing. MT confirmed that this cleaning is being done next week. MT doesn't think there is likely to be moss build-up issues until summer 2022, which may mean there is some money saved. CS asked if there will be someone acting as a liaison. MT to help arrange access - e.g. provide keys if necessary as there are spares in the JMW Barnard office.

RL raised that the committee didn't have access to the documents before they were sent out to tender. MT confirmed that this is normal procedure. MJ saw the specifications before they were sent out. CS confirmed that documents were sent out to the committee after they had been sent out to tender, and apologised for this. RV suggested that RL speak directly with CS. RV asked CS to provide his opinion as to who the Committee should go with. BM raised a discrepancy between figures on pages 5 and 7. CS to check the £4000 discrepancy raised by BM.

BM asked if the percentage for JMW Barnard and for CS is on the net. This was confirmed. CS's fee is 7.5% + VAT. This is the same fee that MJ charged last time. JMW Barnard's fee is staggered.

MT confirmed that BL went through the specification as he is an architect. He asked questions regarding the different companies. He said he would lean toward MA since WS has worked with them before.

MT will send out statement of estimate to all Co-owners giving them 30 days to comment on tenders received. MT told the Committee that if the recommendation is to go with MA, there will need to be a good reason, since MA is more expensive.

E & M can start March / April. As can MA. They will hold their price until this time.

BG asked for references regarding E & M. CS has had experience working with them, and suggested the committee might want to interview E & M. BG believes the lack of direct contact with E & M in the square previously makes a big difference.

MT told the committee that MA was originally nominated by BG. MT has always found MA very professional, and he has always finished on time. The work was also of good standard. CS added his support to this, and told the Committee that MA has been very communicative and helpful through the whole tender process. MA is very resourceful and creative in his thinking.

RV asked for a timeline between now and March. Following the meeting, MT to email all Co-owners. They then have 30 days to comment on the statement of estimate. There will be a breakdown of costs for the nominated contractor. Following that, since there are funds in reserve, MT could then instruct the contractor around March. The contractor will need some leeway time to prepare. CS suggested this might be around 6-8 weeks. MT would then organise access CS to properties if necessary, and would notify the building insurance of the works. In the lead-up, all Co-owners and residents will be notified of the start date. During the work there will be updates and meetings with CS and the contractor where people can attend if they have issues. The aim is to have the works done by the beginning of July. All scaffolding to be down by end of July to allow residents to enjoy summer.

DVR wanted to make sure that the overall budget would be capped, or whether there is a chance that the costs might go up. CS confirmed that the final cost could change due to something unforeseen. The cost could also go down. Any adjustments will be shown in the progress report with transparent running costs. MT added that there is a contingency. The process for big changes in costs is that the contractor would raise any issues to CS who would pass this on to the committee via MT.

RV requested a Committee vote on a recommended contractor. MA is the Committee's recommendation. CS to warn-off MA. MT will potentially then instruct around the 10th January 2022.

CS raised the fences and gates and suggested a further meeting, perhaps with MJ. CS has been obtaining quotes. CS to present to the Committee at the January meeting (Monday 24th January 2022).

CS raised welfare facilities which will need to be considered. This was previously by CM's house, but there is now the bike hangar there. CS has suggested the back of 25. To be discussed at January 2022 meeting.

3. Open gardens: The secretary for open gardens needs an answer before the end of the year if WS wanted to be included. The date will be 11-12th June. RV has spoken to Ray (new gardener). He is very keen and is available those dates. Some of the Committee will be needed to volunteer on that weekend. SC raised that there might still be scaffolding up. Decision to not take part this year, but potentially the following year.

4. Treasurer's budget: BM shared a simplified budget. The income for the Square every year is £120,000 on service charge. Usually there is a saving of around £20,000

per year. BM summarised that last year gardens came in under and the main change is in management fees. Clawback has also helped a lot, through two sales. BM told the Committee that with MA's fees, CS & JMW Barnard's fees, it will only go £20,000 over budget. £25,000 and £50,000 have also been set aside for the fences and roofing. The last re-decs were in 2014 (finished 2015). The next re-decs were due for summer 2021 but were postponed due to COVID. BM has the documents available to be sent out if anyone wants this.