

**MAUNSEL (FOURTH CO OWNERSHIP) HOUSING SOCIETY
LTD**

**Minutes of the Committee meeting on Monday 17th November
2025 at 7.15pm @ Bay 20**

Present: Basia Kapp (BK), Bella Murray (BM), Robert Larkins (RL), Denise Heywood (DH), George Tormod-Little (GTL), Hilary Arnold (HA),
Murray John (MJ), Dominique Van Roey (DVR).

Guests: Marie Travers (MT), Ben Lamb (BL), Shahrzaz Razzaq (SR), Chris Bushell (CB), Simon Slater (SS), Russell Mulchansingh (RM), Olivia Cox - Minute Taker (by recording)

		ACTION
1	Apologies: Jen Jeffrey (JJ) Rick Fisher (RF), Philippa Collie-Cousins (PCC), Cerys Matthews (CM) Veronique Siligman (VS) - representing leaseholder of no.21	
2	Minutes of the last meeting - RL has an amendment which MT is actioning. Otherwise, agreed upon.	
3	Financial update	
4	Boundary wall - maisonettes gardens no 1-24	MT
5	Drainage update	CB, MJ
6	AOB (i) Decision on defibrillator (ii) Meeting dates (iii) Magnolia tree	MT

3. Financial update

MT informed the committee that everyone has been sent a copy of the proposed service charge budget for the next year. BL outlined the objectives of the evening: 1. look at the budget for the last financial year and see whether costings were accurate, 2. look ahead to the budget for the current year, and 3. look ahead to next year's numbers.

For the last financial year (24/25), income was significantly higher than predicted, mainly due to unforeseen clawbacks. BL noted that the decision was made to include £20,000 in the budget as that was the average over the last 17 years. The actual clawback received was over £50,000, through three sales. BL stressed that this is never guaranteed. Operating costs came in a little lower than estimated. This meant there was a surplus in the accounts, with an increase in bank account funds by £32,000. Total in account: £312,000. BL is happy with how budgets have been stuck to, and how accurate the estimates were. BL flagged that there were no major works last year.

Service charge has increased by 3.5%, since 1st October. BL explained that the need for this is that costs are increasing, and it is important to ensure that income keeps up to speed with inflation. BL has made some predictions and forecasts in a very similar way to the last financial year. Not expecting any major works, but there might be some expensive surveys upcoming. BL told the meeting that he has an 11 year financial plan for WS, making sure there is enough cash in the bank to service two rounds of re-decs.

MT explained that money is held in a reserve account. She can share interest rates.

4. Boundary wall - maisonettes gardens no 1-24

MT told the meeting that MJ raised a concern after the previous meeting re the boundary wall. It was agreed that the square would get a structural engineer to visit. Access was gained to all gardens bar one. From that, they were able to do a report plus photographs, plus potential calculations of how much the wall was leaning in some areas, with recommendations. The survey was circulated to the committee, and also all the garden co-owners along the stretch of 1-24. Following that there were email discussions. Simon came up with some questions, which MT answered. There was a zoom meeting with the structural engineer, which was also opened up to committee members plus aforementioned leaseholders. This was minuted. The next stage is to potentially do some exploratory work to establish what the foundations are, to get a clearer picture.

PCC has emailed some points to MT as she wasn't able to attend the meeting. PCC requests that meetings going forward be held on a Tuesday rather than a Monday. PCC also requests that any course of action agreed should be discussed on a zoom another evening with the relevant households, as per the lease. PCC's main point is that she thinks it's

important to get the approach right with RBK&C, with whom WS should be having discussions with, regarding remedy. Once WS does anything with the foundations alone, WS bears the burden of the whole cost forever, which PCC believes would not be prudent for the whole society. PCC thinks WS should start conversations through the party wall surveyor and consult a solicitor on the answers. PCC believes WS will need a fully costed remedy before going ahead. In 1986, the buttresses were erected to support the wall - PCC requests what the metrics were then.

MT reported that the next stage is clear instructions. She has approached three different surveyors. MT has sent the structural engineer's report and photographs. One returned a fee proposal (Calcula). Others were: Nick Beynon from NJC services, and Collier Stevens (recommended by RL). As soon as a surveyor is appointed, the consultation process will need to begin, since it is unknown how much the project will cost at this stage. Once a surveyor is appointed, they may do an exploratory further down and liaise with Clive Watson (structural engineer), in an area where the wall isn't so unstable, to get more information on the footings and foundations. There would then be a specification drawn up. At the first stage of the consultation process, MT would issue a notice of intention, informing everyone in WS of what potential works might be carried out. This gives 30 days for queries. The exploratory could be done separately, before. MT believes the surveyor needs that fact finding before drawing up the specification. The surveyor would then go out to tender, with consideration for any recommendations. After 30 days, the fees and costings for the project (including a contingency) would be issued. The surveyor would then liaise with a party wall surveyor. This is necessary because it's a junction line party wall notice needs to be served to RBK&C. The surveyor then would liaise with the highways division re the section of pavement, and MT would need to consult with the building insurer prior to any works starting. Because the issue has potentially been known about for 20 years or so, it is unlikely there is a claim to be had against RBK&C.

MJ told the committee that at the point you notice the defect, you must make a claim within 6 years.

RL suggested that if RBK&C did the work at that time, they may have a responsibility for the aftermath. St Andrews Square have walls in a similar situation but they're not as high. RL suggests that the height of the wall is the issue, and that if RBK&C specified a wall that high without adequate foundations or knowing what's underneath, they have some form of liability.

RBK&C may appoint an independent surveyor rather than using WS's surveyor.

It was noted that Tony Richardson was involved in the square around 2004/5, and looked at the wall.

MT reminded the committee that a vote was taken not to re-appoint Charles. 6 committee members were against re-appointing, 5 would go with the majority. 1 did not respond.

Re RL's recommendation - MT has not been able to send documents as only contact has been via an online form. RL believes the surveyor is on-board with the height of the wall.

MT confirmed that everyone in the square will receive notices, but gardens 1-24 will also be separately updated.

5. Drainage survey

MT told the committee that following the last meeting, MJ wanted to go into depth on the quotes received. MJ reported having two quotes, but both made a condition that WS have a GPS digital survey. All information currently obtained is quite inaccurate and mainly involves sketches. MJ went back to both to ask for a quote including this. 1 quote is £10,000, the other is £5,750. This would be a full GPS survey.

MJ noted three aspects of the flooding situation:

1. general surveys of the area, available from council website
2. leveling of the garden to establish where drains are, which isn't on a general survey
3. calculate rainwater loss from the roofs and down pipes. MJ suggests this is something for the surveyor to co-ordinate.

CB noted a Portobello Road flood group, and suggested asking them for recommendations, since Portobello was very seriously affected back in 2021.

HA suggested lifting one of the paving stones outside number 50, since it is one of the most flood dangerous areas in the whole square. MJ noted that the flood risk report will identify this.

MJ to circulate info re GPS survey.

CB met with Thames Water, and asked about the valve that they installed, whether there was any evidence that that had been in operation, and whether it had helped. RF is yet to hear back. CB to keep getting in touch.

GTL noted that Rachel's sister experienced a bad flood in Walthamstow, near the marshes. They did a big community drive, and the council built massive drainage holes.

MJ suggested pressing the council to add non-return valves on all the drains in WS. MT suggested presenting evidence from the GPS survey to the council.

6. AOB

(i) Decision on defibrillator

MT told the committee that the pads and batteries have come to virtually the end of their life. MT has circulated options to the committee. One option is to rent a defibrillator. This would come with yearly service, pad changes, battery changes, training, signs, and replacement if used in an emergency. The company would install this in a protective hard casing. Cost is £1 per day. The other option is to buy a new one. This would require pad and battery replacements as necessary. There is also the added cost of training. There are several types on the market suitable for both adults and children, usually costing around £945 + VAT. MT has previously installed a rental defibrillator in another building and reported that it has worked out well. RL checked whether the rental would be insured, which MT confirmed. A vote was called. The majority voted in favour of renting. Location will later be decided, but the company will advise on this.

(ii) Meeting dates

RL wished to raise the suggestion of not having meetings on a Monday. MT reported that meetings were previously moved to a Wednesday, which yielded lower numbers of attendance. DVR suggested occasionally moving meetings to Tuesdays, on an ad hoc basis. MT told the committee that the next meeting will be mid-Jan, which will involve planning for the AGM. MT to draft the AGM agenda and circulate to everyone with notice of the AGM after the January meeting. Audited accounts will be sent in due course, MT hopes there might be a draft accounts by the next meeting, but certainly by the AGM.

(iii) Magnolia tree

CB told the committee that he has now been given permission to cut down the magnolia tree in their front garden.