

CORNER GREEN RESIDENTS SOCIETY LTD

MINUTES OF EXTRAORDINARY GENERAL MEETING – Monday January 14 2008

Meeting convened to consider extensions to Corner Green properties.

Members present:

Simon Tilford (Chairman) (6)
Mark Helm (Director) (8)
Biddy Macfarlane (Treasurer and Director) (16)
Nigel Brookes (Director) (23)
Khalid Khan (Director) (2)

David Howes (Secretary) (7)

Arum Sivanayagam (1)
Stanley Lee (3)
Dan Radcliffe (4)
Mac Cochrane (10)
Juliet Cairns (12)
Nadine White (15)
Kate Healey (19)
Neil MacCormick (20)
Rosie and Richard Hewson (21)
Angharad Smith (22)

Members represented by proxies:

Member	Proxy
Andrew and Diane Sims (9)	David Howes (7)
Jonathan Burton (11)	Juliet Cairns (12)
Natasha Brown and Wing To (13)	David Howes (7)
Stewart MacFarlane	David Howes (7)
Alison Rivers (17)	Neil MacCormick (20)
Claude Perera (18)	Neil MacCormick (20)

Members not represented:

Peter Ruthen (5)

Others in attendance:

Frank Woods - Architect - for presentation of No 23 extension only

Introduction

1. Simon Tilford as chairman of the Directors chaired the meeting. He explained that the meeting had been called to consider the neighbour veto on extensions, the principles associated with a proposed extension to No 23, and specific plans for a proposal for an extension to No 21.

Presentation of No 23 Plans

2. Simon invited Frank Woods to present the proposals for No 23 to members and Mr Woods explained the basis of those plans. He stated that what was presented to the meeting did not constitute detailed plans for an extension, but an outline approach. In response to questions from members he advised that the side extension would be set back from the frontage of the terrace, and that the detailing of the front elevation would be designed to match the existing terrace. The picture accompanying the plans was illustrative rather than a definitive drawing. Members queried the extent of intrusion onto the grassed (as opposed to planted) area to the side of No 23 and it was evident this would need to be clarified in any detailed plans. Members queried Mr Woods' suggestion of a leasehold disposal of the land and were advised that, as an architect, this was not an area he could expand upon.

Procedure for Extensions - Neighbour Veto

3. Members queried why the procedure - and why only the neighbour veto element of it - was on the agenda. David Howes explained that some Directors had felt that an absolute veto was an extreme form of control which might be exercised unreasonably. The meeting had the opportunity to either retain the current procedure unchanged, to arrive at an alternative formulation around the handling of neighbour objections, or to instruct Directors regarding the formulation of such an alternative to present to a subsequent general meeting.

4. Members discussed the merits of the neighbour veto. Some members felt that the need to secure majority consent from the society, and the need to also secure planning consent, constituted a sufficiently high hurdle. Those members felt that the neighbour veto for extensions over 20m³ could be used unreasonably because of personal differences rather than substantial objections. Other members felt that the timing for consideration of the issue was not right, the procedure had worked reasonably well for the Society for around twenty years, and for Foxcombe Investments the landlord before then, and the veto compelled householders to deal with their neighbours rather than relying on the society or the council to resolve issues. On being put to a vote it was

Resolved, by a substantial majority of members, that the current procedure, including the neighbour veto for extensions over 20m³ should be retained.

Outline Extension Proposal - Number 23 Corner Green

5. Members raised a number of concerns about the proposal to extend to the side of No 23, and the consequent request to acquire CGRS Ltd land. Issues raised were:

- the visual impact on the Green from a range of aspects - including the rear aspect from the Corner Green road - which is more of a public aspect than that from the back lane or the bottom path.
- the visual impact on the main entrance to the Green between numbers 1 and 23
- the principal of releasing land held in trust by the Society's members on behalf of both themselves and future residents
- the value of the planted and grassed adjoining area in its own right
- the general over-development implied relative to the original and current position

6. Angharad Smith noted that she supported the side extension since the alternative was an extension into the rear garden which would be more oppressive from her own property.

7. David Howes suggested that since the issues being discussed included matters of principal relevant to any extension onto CGRS land, a resolution could relate not only to this proposal but to other proposals to extend onto CGRS land. This would enable Directors to rely on that resolution without needing to convene further EGMs in the event of other similar proposals. Other members disagreed and wished to restrict the resolution to the case of No 23 only. This latter view prevailed and on being put to a vote it was:

Resolved, by a majority of 18 in favour to 4 against, that the Society does not consent to any disposal of land for a side extension to No 23 Corner Green.

8. Members considered the principal of a two-storey extension to No 23 Corner Green. Objections were raised to the impact on the visual aspect both from different parts of the Green and from the principal Corner Green road, and it was noted that the only precedent (though the society is not bound by precedent) was at No 16 at a less prominent location. On being put to a vote it was:

Resolved, by a majority of 19 votes in favour to 3 against, that the Society do not support a two-storey extension to No 23 Corner Green.

9. In response to a query from Neil MacCormick, David Howes advised that Number 22's neighbour veto (in the case of an extension over 20m³) in respect of detailed proposals for No 23 could be exercised at the time any such detailed proposals were submitted.

Proposal and Plans for an Extension to No 21 Corner Green

10. Dick Hewson presented No 21's plans for a rear extension. The plans previously submitted to members had comprised two options. Dick advised that he was now seeking consent only for the smaller of these two options (Scheme 1). This would be a part-width extension of around 3 metres depth adjoining the boundary with No 20. He advised that revised plans and measurements had been circulated to Directors and neighbours showing a change to the treatment of the rear elevation. Under this change the back door, swivel and other windows on the unextended portion of the rear elevation would be replaced with "trifolding" glass doors with "ventilator" windows above. This would be as far as possible in keeping with the existing style.

11. Dick advised that his architects' detailed measurements showed an increase in volume, net of the existing rear lobby, of 19.76m³. [22.41m³ gross before adjusting for existing rear lobby].

12. Members discussed the extension proposal and asked for the views of the immediate neighbours. Angharad Smith (22) advised that she did not intend to oppose the proposal. Neil MacCormick (20) advised that, though he did not intend to oppose the proposal, he was concerned that, given the length of the extension adjoining his garden boundary, its height should be kept to the minimum necessary, and noted the inclusion of a parapet in the design whose height might be reduced. There was an indication from Dick Hewson that some accommodation could be reached on this.

13. Members noted the description of the extension space as "office". They also noted the regulation in the scheme of management which prevents owners from using their home or any part of it other than as a private dwelling house.

On the understanding that best endeavours would be used by No 21 to keep the extension height to the minimum practicable, especially on the boundary with No 20, members resolved by a majority of 20 votes in favour and 1 against (the vote against not being an immediate neighbour) to consent to No 21's extension plan (modified Scheme 1) as made available to the meeting - subject to any reduction in height which might be agreed between No 21 and No 20.