

## **CORNER GREEN RESIDENTS SOCIETY LIMITED**

### **Minutes of Extraordinary General Meeting 4 December 2000**

Those present were John Harland (chair), Nadine White (15), David Howes (7), Mac Cochrane (10), Maurice Illis (19), Stanley Lee (3), Martin Symes (2), Jonathan Burton (12), Juliet Cairns (13), Philip Astell (13), Arum Sivanayagam (1) and Biddy Macfarlane (16). Apologies had come from Dan Radcliffe(4) and Leslie Inglis (23).

#### **Repainting the houses and garages**

1. The chairman explained that the meeting had been called in order to decide whether to appoint building surveyors as a preliminary to the painting of the houses and garages in the summer. The directors had received a quote from Gilbert & Caswell of Beckenham, for whom two satisfactory references had been obtained. Other firms had been approached but had not got so far as quoting. The directors sought the consent of the meeting to go ahead. The quote envisaged four stages of work, (1) visiting the properties to inspect the woodwork and report to the owners prior to repainting (2) preparing a specification and putting the work out to tender to suitable firms (3) inspecting the work as it progressed and ensuring compliance with the specification (4) acting as Planning Supervisor as required by the Construction (Design and Management) Regulations 1994. The proposed fees for the four stages (all plus VAT) were (1)£500 (2) £500 (3) £750 (4) £250. The fees for stage (1) would be payable when the visits had taken place, but it was understood that the other fees could be paid on completion of the whole job. Stage (1) would involve two visits, one in the morning on 15 December and one in the afternoon on 19 December. The surveyors would be asked to recommend carpenters who could carry out the preliminary repairs, but other carpenters could be nominated by residents. If residents failed to have necessary work done it would diminish the value of their own property and the estate as a whole and they would need to be chased up by the directors. It was suggested that if a number of garage doors needed replacing, it might be possible to put in a bulk order and achieve economy.

As to a projection of the costs of this cycle of repainting, Philip Astell said that his figures at the AGM had been based on an estimated figure of £25000; it was now being said that the cost might be £30000 to £35000. The previous projected increase in contributions to £64 would not be enough and a significant one-off payment would be needed from each resident. If the cost were £30000, his best estimate would be £320 per property or £46 per property per month over 7 months on top of the existing contribution; if £35000, the corresponding figures would be £537 or £77 per month. He said that the options were (a) to go ahead with Gilbert & Caswell's programme to the stage of getting a more exact figure, and then to have another meeting to look again (b) to use the uncommitted reserves of about £6000 towards the costs (c) to defer the repainting for a year. These options were discussed by the meeting and further points for clarification by Gilbert & Caswell were raised, namely, would there be a separate charge for confirming that the repairs had been done? How would failure to do the repairs affect the contractors' guarantee? If more visits were needed while the work was being done, would a further charge be made, and if so on what basis? Would the reports to individual owners be copied to the directors? Would it be possible to have different specifications for different houses, so that those facing

north or east, which get less sun and less wear, would be distinguished from those facing south and west?

Subject to satisfactory answers to those questions, Martin Symes proposed, seconded by Maurice Illis, that Gilbert & Caswell be appointed for the work in their stages (1) and (2), and this was agreed. If the monthly contribution could be kept at £58 or £64, the directors were authorised to go ahead into phases 3 and 4, but if the figures would go above that a new EGM to consider the tenders would be called in March or April 2001. A summary of the surveyors' report on the tenders would go to residents.

A question was raised about whether houses with extensions should pay an extra amount for the work, and whether no. 3, which has two garages, should make a double contribution. It was agreed that the one garage not owned by a resident should bear one-twentyfifth of the cost of the garage painting, but no decision was reached on the other two questions.

#### Repairing the hole in the road

2. The chairman explained that Gilbert & Caswell had also been approached to survey and give a report on the hole in the approach road opposite the top garages. This they had agreed to do at a cost of £50 per hour, plus VAT, with a probable estimate of time as not more than four hours. The directors had received a quote from Seasons for about £870, plus VAT, but it was difficult for them to evaluate the work needed and the reasonableness of the estimate. It would be only too easy for faults in the road to recur unless the precise cause of the subsidence could be established and cured. There might even still be some liability on the part of Thames Water.

It was proposed by Mac Cochrane, seconded by Maurice Illis and agreed that the directors be authorised to have the survey done and to get the repairs carried out at a price, including the survey, of not exceeding £1500 plus VAT, if the liability for the repairs fell on the company. The cost should come from the general reserves.

There being no further items on the agenda, the meeting was then closed and the chairman thanked all the residents who had attended for sparing the time to come.

Biddy Macfarlane  
7 December 2000

(cgr2pai3)