

**Maunsel (Fourth Co-Ownership) Housing Society Ltd.
Committee Meeting held on Monday 15th January 2024 at 7.30pm @ Bay 20**

Present: Robert Larkins (RL), Andy Woodford (AW), George Tormod-Little (GTL), Murray John (MJ), Hilary Arnold (HA), Jen Jeffrey (JJ), Billie Dainton (BD), Philippa Collie-Cousins (PCC).

Guests: Russell Mulchansingh (RM), Steve Abbott (SA), Chris Bushell (CB), Marie Travers (MT), Olivia Cox - Minute Taker by recording

1	Apologies - Basia Kapp (BK), Rick Fisher (RF), Cerys Matthews (CM), Ben Lamb (BL), Judith Blakeman (JB), Dominique Van Roey (DVR)	
2	Minutes of the last meeting	
3	Discussion of the latest roof surveyors quotation - Hutton & Astrom	MT
4	Re-carpeting of common parts	MT
5	Accounts	MT
6	AOB (i) window cleaning (ii) open gardens (iii) hyperoptic proposal (iv) agreement for gardening budget (v) drainage (vi) lights	MT, RL

2. Minutes of the last meeting - RL mentioned a draft of amendments from CM and himself.

RL wished to note that OC is taking minutes from a recording.

RL raised the relationship between CS and WS. The minutes note that he is local and reasonable, RL wished to add that he was selected by JMW Barnard. MT corrected that this is not accurate. At the AGM it would be discussed which surveyors or to use. JMW Barnard use a number of different surveyors. Previously CS did the drone roof survey and oversaw some Licence to

alterations. He is not just linked to JMW Barnard. He was appointed by the Committee. *Post meeting note* : Charles Samuels contract was agreed by the Chair and Treasurer at this time.

CM also raised the issue of whether people would be able to stay in their homes. MT clarified that MJ said this is a maybe for certain periods (in stages), and it's not possible to say until there is advice. To be further discussed.

3. Discussion of the latest roof surveyors quotation - Hutton & Astrom

The quotation was circulated.

Fees have been scaled in different points Site investigation - £4,800

Drone deployment - £880

Drawing markups - £450

Interpretative reports - £2,600

Consultancy support - £1,200

Travel expenses - £474

All plus VAT

If this company was chosen to go forward, there would then be documentation and past history supplied.

MT has approached about 8 different surveyors. This is more in-depth. JMW has not previously worked with this surveyor. MJ explained that they came from the society for protection of ancient buildings.

RL raised that the first port of call should have been to ask for a report and opinion from the roofers. He wonders whether they should be given the opportunity to give their input. MJ confirmed that a quote has been obtained from the company who did the roof several years ago.

HA raised that the question asked was to do an independent survey after MJ & CS submitted their survey. RL thinks there are many better uses of £10,000 and that this is complete speculation. HA confirmed that the survey was previously voted on by the Committee. RL thinks it is essential that someone should explain exactly why the survey has taken place. MJ explained that Anthony Richardson was the architect 15 years ago and he recommended that WS budget for the cost of renewing the roof as so many of the tiles were being replaced. This happened again in 2014 when Hensman was the roofer as many tiles had broken with hairline cracks and the felt was starting to perish. The same thing then happened with Charles Samuels during the last external decorations.

The aim of the survey is to find out how much it will cost and when this is likely to need to happen. RL raised Anthony Richardson's report in 2009, which mentions the roof in particular and deflections of the west slope of numbers 25-30, covering uneven tiles. The report states: "others in good condition". MT clarified that this was first raised about this time last year after the external works when MT explained how much the reserves were remaining.

It was brought up that the Committee have to be responsible if potentially the roof replacements have to take place. CS was asked for a potential cost, and an independent surveyor was asked to do an analysis of the roof to potentially get a report and then have an EGM. This EGM has not happened because this survey report had not been obtained. The output of the report will provide an assessment of the condition now, a projection of the longevity of the roof and its constituent parts, and the options to deal with that going forward - from ongoing repair and maintenance, to replacement. Any costs would be approximate. Accurate costs would only be gained at the time of going out to tender. The idea of the survey is to make budgetary decisions and plan for the finances to accommodate for any works needed going forward and relates to the service charge increase.

RL is concerned that the greater membership hasn't had a voice during this process, which is why people asked for an EGM. HA clarified that there could be written consent from every single shareholder ahead of the survey taking place but that this is not essential. Anything above the £12,500 threshold requires this consultation. The survey is £10,404 plus VAT (under the threshold).

RL believes that what came out of the meeting in June was a feeling that many people felt remote from the Committee. CB noted that residents have every opportunity to attend Committee meetings as guests or to reach out to committee members. HA clarified that the Committee reports to the square. If Co-owners are dissatisfied with the actions of the Committee, they can have the Committee investigated but the Committee does not have to go to the square in order to make decisions. MT added that she tries to be as transparent as possible. In the first quarter of last year there were multiple enquiries and she tried as best as possible to answer queries directly.

RL believes that moving forward with the survey might upset some people. RL was invited to present these people with the opportunity to come forward with their concerns. RL doesn't think the survey is appropriate or necessary. RL again suggests asking the roofers. MT clarified that when the survey was raised she was asked to find a surveyor that was independent and hadn't worked with JMW Barnard previously.

MT told the Committee that eight companies have been approached, but they're not like-for-like. Some of the surveys offered are less intensive, and therefore entail a lower cost. This one is more of a forensic survey.

It was suggested some of the costs in the breakdown and queried - e.g. travel expenses. MT to go back, negotiate, and explain that the square can provide a parking permit.

It was suggested that since the survey cost is so close to the threshold, to involve all shareholders and invite feedback. This would be in the form of a letter laying out all the facts. RL raised the conduit of communication between the Committee and all shareholders. MT usually sends an email if information needs to go out to everyone in the Square. This is to continue as the regular format for communications.

MT to draft communication re survey and send to Committee for approval, then send to Square.

4. Re-carpeting of common parts

MT explained that DH, Carlos and RM have worked on a proposal, which has been circulated. The proposal also includes costs for frosting of the flat doors, letter boxes, and handles. Carpets range from £11286-22188. Cresswell was the cheapest. CM recommended The Carpet Store - £14544. Carpet Rite were the most expensive. Cresswell is local and has recently carried out a carpet job in Cambridge Gardens. MT suggested this might be discussed at the AGM. RL doesn't want frosted glass. MJ added that it is possible to get laminated glass which is a little bit more expensive. Georgian wire glass is a little distorted but is the cheapest. MT to circulate three quotes to the whole square with the recommendation to potentially go with Cresswell. The colour suggested is a grey tweed with a black coir matting. Question as to the variation in quality in existing carpets. Some have been very well looked after, some have not. Suggestion to go ahead with replacing all rather than just the ones in poor condition. The current carpets have been in place for over 20 plus years. Proposal is for a blend of synthetic and wool.

5. Accounts

MT explained that accounts are still with the accountants. MT is hoping to receive a draft shortly, in advance of the AGM. Mon 26th Feb or Mon 4th March proposed for the date of the next AGM, taking half term into consideration (12-16th Feb). Tuesday 27th agreed @ 7pm. The agenda usually contains:

Apologies
Minutes of last AGM
Annual report from the chair
Summary of accounts for year ending 30th Sept 2023
Treasurer's report and future expenses presented by Andy
Appointment of auditors
Resignation and re-election of existing members
Nomination of new members
Management
Garden update
AOB
Agenda agreed by the Committee. MT to get notice of AGM out to everyone asap, with nomination forms.

AOB

(i) Window cleaning - MT explained that back in the beginning of December, Mark approached MT to say that the current window cleaning seemed excessive as it was every month. Previously (approx 5 years ago), it was voted at the Committee whether to change the window cleaning schedule. At the time, MT approached the window cleansers who said it wouldn't be worth their while if only attending once per quarter, so cost would go up for each visit. Another concern with

only doing window cleaning quarterly is that if a property was missed (e.g. owners / tenants were away and couldn't grant access), this would create a long lag between cleanings. MT to approach window cleaners and ask for a quote for bi-monthly. MT to also approach other companies and obtain quotes for bi-monthly window cleaning.

(ii) Open gardens - GTL raised that Rachel has asked re open gardens. There is a deadline for registering. It was decided not to do open gardens last year and to potentially do it this year. HA added that this hasn't been done for 4 years because of lockdown. Agreed to register.

(iii) Hyperoptic proposal -. RL explained that the Square has been waiting 18 months for a full-fibre connection. Hyperoptic have a reputation more broadly for delivering good customer service. However, MT has had a different experience and RL would tend to agree with this experience, since the customer service centre is based in Serbia. The way it works is hyperoptic would put the system in place, and then residents have the option to sign up individually. There is an option for this to be run from the pavement, through RM & DVR's garden. AW suggested that the first question that should be put to Co-owners is who actually wants Hyperoptic, before going back to the company for next steps of installation. RL confirmed that it is possible to make a single installation. RL noted that there is an installation in Bartle Road without the need for boxes. Hyperoptic are asking for approval for a full survey for the Square, which would be quite invasive. Rejected. If RL wishes to go ahead with Hyperoptic for himself, he would need to get approval from the Committee. RL to go to Hyperoptic directly and come back to the Committee. However, it was flagged that if more people do want Hyperoptic, they might benefit from economies of scale.

(iv) Agreement to the gardening budget

BK asked for approval for £3000 budget for plants. AW explained that the total budget for gardens for the year is £23,385, with a separate line for trees and additional planting. This was based on the actuals for 2022-23, which was £22000 which was a decrease from the previous year. RL noted that on Ray's last visit, they put in plants opposite BK's, which had been taken out of another garden so were zero cost to WS. HA really believes there needs to be money spent on planting. In the budget there is £3,800 allocated to plants, mulch and compost. HA that the square is almost self sufficient in composting. AW to double check figures as there is some discrepancy between his budget and the budget available on the website. MT flagged that if WS is going ahead with open gardens this year, it might be good to spend a little on planting at this point.

(v) Drainage

RM wished to raise this to follow up on the visit before Christmas. MT corrected that the last drainage clearance was in July. MT contacted the Council about Bartle Road to check they were maintaining and clearing. This is Thames Water's responsibility to maintain the gulleys on the street. MT did not receive a report from them following the visit, but she did get an email saying they visited and there were no blocked gulleys. RM flagged that the person who visited said to him that there is no over-run relief within the Square. This had been raised previously, especially relating to the north side, which is most at-risk to flooding both from within the Square and from Bartle Road. The aim of an over-run would be to remove excess water. MJ noted that the ground is at or below the garden.

RM noted that all maisonettes have lower gardens. Both sides of the Square are equally at risk as the other. RM suggested an appraisal done for relief-type drainage that runs the north side of the pathways, to join into the main sewer at Kingsdown Road. Initially, suggestion to get CS to do a feasibility report. MT explained that in the case of a flood, WS's insurance would cover damage, but there would be a high excess.

(vi) Lights - CB flagged that the lights along the strip have been out since October. MJ reported that the scope of works has been agreed on, and an estimate is being waited-on. RL wishes also to have a quote for cabling along the wall. RL doesn't want bollards in the planting, and the lighting isn't as good as over-head lighting in terms of security.