

**Maunsel (Fourth Co-Ownership) Housing Society Ltd. Committee Meeting
held on Monday 11th September 2023 at Bay 20 and via Zoom at 7.30pm**

Present: Robert Larkin (RL), Judith Blakeman (JB), Ben Lamb (BL), Rick Fisher (RF), George Tormod Little (GTL), Murray John (MJ), Basia Kapp (BK), Hillary Arnold (HA), Dominique Van Roey (DVR), Andy Woodford (AW), Billie Dainton, (BD), Denise Heywood (DH), Cerys Matthews (CM)

Guests: Olivia Cox - Minute Taker, Marie Travers (MT), Sonia Watson (SW), Chirs Bushell (CB), Russell Mulchansingh (RM)

1	Apologies - Philippa Collie-Cousins (PCC), Jennifer Jeffrey (JJ)	PCC tried to join on Zoom.
2	Minutes of the last meeting - MJ flagged that there has been ambiguity about what was meant by 'intended surveyor'. After the previous meeting, MT got independent surveyors' fee proposals for a survey rather than anyone previously working in the square. MT approached 6 surveyors, and Simon Slater (architect in no. 4). MT gave the surveyors a deadline in order to potentially have a roof survey report for an EGM in Sept. Minutes from the last meeting approved. PDF copy requested to put on whatsapp. Approved.	
3	Discussion on surveyor's proposals	MT
4	Bridge Close Development	RL, MT
5	Electrical charging of electrical bikes & scooters	MT
6	AOB (i) Committee meetings (ii) Defibrillator (iii) Budgets (iv) Mice	BK

3. Discussion on surveyors' proposals - MT told the Committee that the following quotes were received:

Rupert Elliot Consulting - declined to quote

Calcula - £875 plus VAT plus £350 plus VAT to instruct contractors. Potentially more costs.

HJP - £1490 plus VAT plus disbursement

True Associates - £380 plus VAT plus further feeds (vague)

MJC Services - £2475 plus VAT plus disbursements

Hardings Consulting - declined to quote

Extra costs would also include the investigation part tower, access, and opening-up of the roof.

Proposal is to have one site to open the roof rather than several, which will produce a snapshot of what is going on, rather than an exhaustive picture.

MJ noted that in this instance, any planned works would be as a result of the surveyors seeing something and acting on that. However, Simon (architect at no.4) feels a one-off, more invasive survey might be a more useful idea.

It was suggested a survey is completed of each of the three buildings in order to address all concerns. MT noted that none of the historical asbestos reports or previous external works / repairs have not been sent to surveyors yet.

CM asked whether, if the survey comes back saying the roof is in a reasonable condition, that there would be no pressure. MT confirmed there is no pressure at this stage, and that these discussions are on a forecasting basis, the Committee being responsible. RL noted that Simon Slater has said that there is every possibility that legislation may change in the future. MT confirmed that there is no actual timeline on external works, and this won't be known until there is further investigation completed. It is being discussed in advance because of the cost of scaffolding and would normally be carried out when full external works are carried out.

MT to ask Simon to clarify his advice and bring his analysis to the next committee meeting. BD suggested a sub-committee.

RL noted that at the last meeting it was raised that there was a lot of creative thinking regarding finances and wiggle room.

MJ simplified that there are a number of stages, beginning with an assessment of how bad the situation is, which requires a condition survey of the roof. CM believes this is a leading question and would prefer 'how is the roof' rather than 'how bad is the roof' to be the language used.

MT confirmed that every year the gutters are cleared and that there is a visual inspection of the roof. At this point, any cracked tiles are replaced / repaired. It was flagged that on the last set of works there was a significant amount of money spent on roof repairs, which wasn't part of a general maintenance programme. This shows that everything possible is being done to complete repairs before replacement is necessary. RL flagged that works on the porches was very reactive and therefore they were in a very dangerous condition. CB asked whether re-decs should be done more frequently with more frequent condition checks. MT suggested a plan to ask Simon what would be involved in an intensive roof survey as this would be a more specialist field. At the moment, the quotes are from general surveyor companies that deal with roof surveys, rather than specialist roof surveyors. The next Committee meeting is in November.

HA flagged that the email sent by MT about clarifying of major works fees is distributed to all the Co-owners. CM wasn't aware that JMW Barnard takes a commission on any major works. MT confirmed that there is a clear break-down sent to everyone during the consultation process at the point of tender. MT flagged that the fee is staggered, going from 5% to 4% after the first £35,000. MT also flagged that there is negotiation space within these fees. The fee is necessary as it is not part of day-to-day management.

The company is listed with the FCA rather than Companies House. Any decisions to allow remunerations as a third party must be declared. There is transparency. It was explained that if people like MJ or SS wish to get remunerated, they must remove their personal interest. The consultation process allows co-owners to nominate contractors. RL believes that at the next re-decs, the tender process must be within the control of the Committee, and that these must be sealed tenders, opened in the presence of the committee. CM agrees. MT explained that tenders must be analysed line-by-line to gain clarification and the bottom line of the sealed bid may not necessarily be the total of the works.

Action: Communication increased - minutes to be sent via Whatsapp pdf, as well as via email. HA suggested that the Chair write to the Square explaining what the process / next steps are, since there is a lot of anxiety. CM has requested clarification of fees (CS' fee, MJ's lack of fee, the JMW Barnard major works fee as part of the consultation process). This is to be circulated by MT. Further action is to ask Simon to present an analysis to the Committee.

4. Bridge Close Development - RL told the Committee that he and others attended the Bridge House lawn meet, and reported that they have warmed-up their previous proposal. The two Rubys seem to have no idea of the application that Bryanstone have made. In particular, a Planning Officer had given pre-planning advice stating that what they are proposing to do goes against the policy of the council (the height of the building in particular). The officer who gave this advice said that she was minded to be not recommending the development because of the height. CB said that there had been previous applications for buildings in excess of 4 stories and they had been refused. CB clarified that the most recent one asked for 9 stories. RL noted that Jen is also Cllr Cem Kemahlilead Councillor of the planning department, and RL copied all of his points and complaints to her.

The response was that letters have been sent out, but none have been received in Bartle Road or in WS. RL noted that the council is legally obliged to communicate.

RL noted that both Cllr Simmons and Cllr Cem Kemahli had met with Icenl on the morning of the lawn meet; Cllr Cem Kemahli also lead Councillor of the planning department, and RL had copied all of his points regarding shortcomings of RBKC in the first planning application, to him.

MJ has measured the Bridge Close Development plans, cross-sections and elevations, and flagged that there needs to be a proper consultation to show the impact on WS. RL suggested a robust response to their consultation, including the obstructions. The planners in the first application were very aware of objections to the developers' consultation. RL flagged that the consultation was faulty at best, which he believes was noted. MT has previously sent out the link.

MT flagged that one of the main issues is the right of light and how the proposed building may affect properties on Bartle Road and in WS. RL referenced a British Standards right to light. There is also the issue of extra traffic that would be caused by the development.

RL suggested knocking on everyone's door in Bartle Road to inform them of what is going on. RL has written to Mona Ahmed and the response was that she needs to speak to Claire.

Action: RL to create a flyer to distribute to Bridge Close to increase awareness of what is going on. MT confirmed that she is happy to print these flyers. RL also suggested a meeting with Bartle Road and Andrew Road residents regarding the proposals. RL reported the ability to log interest on the Council website, which then sends users notifications every Friday regarding any proposals in a given area / postcode. From the lawn meeting and the subsequent communication, there is awareness of the strength of opposition from WS.

5. Electrical charging of electric bikes & scooters - RL reported instances of serious fires and fatalities that have been caused by electric charging. With the growing popularity of electric scooters / bikes, RL wishes to raise this danger, particularly in flats which have a plug point on the first floor. MT isn't aware of anyone charging any of these sorts of items in the communal areas. Suggestion to message all co-owners - MT to email with a leaflet from the fire service. RL wonders whether there is a case to disable these electricity points. Strongly rejected as this is needed for hoovering communal areas and any works. RL further suggested facilities for people to charge electric vehicles outside of properties. Rejected as there is no demand for this currently. To be kept on radar.

6. AOB

(i) Committee meetings - CM has suggested changing time or day of Committee meetings so that she is able to attend. Currently decision to keep with Monday evenings.

(ii) Defibrillator - BK is happy to organise training, which would be £335 + VAT. RL raised the concern of this being stolen, as he believes he has seen people with empty Sainsburys bags in the square. MT suggested the new box should be with a combination lock, with the code distributed to everyone in the Square. This can also be distributed to the defib network.

RL told the Committee that there is a defib warehouse with a box - you dial 999 and get access code to the box.

Suggestion to make basic use for WS since no-one else in the surrounding area is aware of the location. MT to research options but agreed to make the defib secure from potential theft.

The pads are currently expired according to legislation.

MT reported that she had previously reached out to Norman (Community Resuscitation Trainer) and the type of defib in WS doesn't need to be serviced but there are parts readily available if they need to be changed.

(iii) Budget - AW reported there was no budget in 2022/23 so this year's budget will be based on the actuals. John has been extremely helpful. AW has been working with MT to automate the system to a degree. Costs are being manually imputed into the sheet from the general ledger. Once this is complete, this will create the budget for 2023/24, and the forecast for 2024/25. At this point, Michelle (accountancy at JMW Barnard) will be asked to automate this, which will automatically update the sheet, to be shared via google drive so it is accessible. The budget will be updated monthly & quarterly, and everyone will be able to see it in real-time. There will be a quarterly report as well as an annual report. There will likely be an extra cost from JMW Barnard for doing this. The document will be non-edit.

AW raised that the last four treasurers have all either been finance directors or accountants, and suggested the idea of having an independent accountant / book-keeper to update accounts, so that the job of the treasurer becomes managing the budget overall and planning. This means the treasurer doesn't have to have the

requirement of being an FD or accountant. MT reported that at the end of the year all accounts go to independent auditors. RL wishes to minute very grateful thanks to John Mack for easing AW into the post and his on-going support. Also thank you to AW.

(iv) Mice - RF reported that there are mice in the flats on the side of no.18. Pest control have visited and said that doing an individual flat will simply cause the mice to move to an adjacent flat, so any removal would need to be done on a block-by-block basis. MT reported having sent an email everyone in the area concerned, and that nobody else reported the issue of mice. MT noted that this isn't just pest control coming in, it's also blocking up areas, storing foods/cereals etc.