

CORNER GREEN RESIDENTS SOCIETY LTD

MINUTES OF EGM – Tuesday November 17 2009

Meeting convened to consider tree planting and gate across rear access lane to Nos 2 and 3.

Members present:

Mark Helm (Director and Gardening Committee) (8)
Biddy Macfarlane (Treasurer and Director) (16)
Mac (Director) and Jill (Gardening Committee) Cochrane (10)
Stanley Lee (3)
Dan Radcliffe (4)
David Howes (Secretary) (7)
Juliet Cairns (11)
Jonathan Burton (12)
Nadine White (15)
Neil MacCormick (20)
Janet Parrott (Gardening Committee) (23)

Members represented by proxies:

Member	Proxy
Khalid Khan (2)	David Howes

Members not represented:

Arum Sivanayagam (1)
Peter Ruthen (5)
Simon Tilford (6)
Andrew and Diane Sim (9)
Natasha and Wing To (13)
Stewart and Christine Macfarlane (14)
Alison Rivers (17)
Claude Perera (18)
Kate and Jon Sabapathy (19)
Rosie and Dick Hewson (21)
Tom and Angharad Smith (22)

Apologies for absence

Tom and Angharad Smith (22)

Others present

Derek Ellis Trees Advisor

Tree Planting Proposals

1. Mark Helm chaired the meeting. He explained the difficulty which the directors, secretary and gardening committee had encountered in locating records of formal notifications and replanting requirements associated with previous tree works - either from South London Trees or Greenwich Council. In consequence determining the outstanding planting obligations was mainly a matter for the Society itself. Mark notified members of a new survey by Dolwin and Gray. This had indicated that the last birch outside house Number 1 (numbered 1a on the plan and schedule circulated with the agenda) and the horse chestnut in the green waste dump (numbered 40 on the circulated plan) needed to be removed.
2. Derek Ellis outlined his planting proposals which were described in his covering letter circulated with the agenda and were shown as trees N1 to N7 on the plan circulated with the agenda. He explained the rationale for the choice of trees which included their size and colour and their resistance to honey fungus, given the difficulty and uncertainty of treating soil to remove the infection which had caused the deaths of a number of trees on and around Corner Green.
3. A number of members commented that a tree on the boundary between the upper car park and the Green would help screen the car park, and that the benefit of a tree outweighed the loss of some of the rather untidy shrubs currently defining the boundary to accommodate it.
4. Biddy Macfarlane and Nadine White expressed concern at the proposed tree on the Green outside their houses (15 and 16). They questioned the merit of planting there in general and - in Biddy's case - of planting a tree with low branches in particular which would obscure views from their houses. Other members considered that this was a good location for a tree in order to balance the visual aspect of the Green and allow for the fact that some planting in "virgin" areas would be needed in advance of the inevitable eventual loss of some established trees. At the same time these members acknowledged that a tree with more elevated branches than the proposed Judas tree would be more appropriate for the location to allow views. Some members regretted the loss of birch trees on the development and wished to attempt to plant one despite the risks of honey fungus infection.
5. On the basis of majorities on shows of hands it was resolved that:
 - trees of the type proposed by Derek Ellis should be planted at the locations numbered N1 to N5 and N7 on the plan circulated with the agenda
 - a Judas tree or such other tree as Directors should agree on the basis of advice from Derek Ellis should be planted near the boundary between the upper car park and the Green

- a white-barked himalayan birch (*Betulus Utilis Jacquemontii*) tree should be planted at or near the location shown as N6 on the circulated plan, being on the Green side of the circular path by house numbers 15/16.

Access Gate to lane to rear of houses numbers 2 and 3

6. David Howes explained that the proposal for a gate to the lane between the garages giving access to the gardens of numbers 2 and 3 had been made by Stanley Lee (Number 3) to improve security for the two properties. He explained that the proposal had been considered by Directors and included in minutes to allow members the opportunity to comment before a decision was taken. A member had subsequently asked that the matter be considered at this general meeting. Directors were not proposing to dispose of the access lane. It would remain the property of CGRS Ltd but a security gate of a design to be approved by Directors would be installed at the front of the lane - aligned with the garage fronts - at the expense of the households concerned on a basis to be agreed between them. A representative of the Company independent of the two households would be a keyholder so that the Society could get access to the lane if it needed to for any reason.

7. Members generally accepted the merits of a gate and recognised that the security issues associated with the current open access were not solely applicable while No 2 was unoccupied during works. Members were concerned that the future position of the Society should be protected beyond what was already evident from the land registry plans which would continue to show the lane as being in CGRS ownership.

8. On the basis of a majority on a show of hands it was resolved that:

- the installation of a security gate at the west end of the lane giving access to the rear gardens of Nos 2 and 3 be agreed in principle, on the basis described above and subject to appropriate documentation to current owners emphasising;
 - the fact that the alley remains in CGRS ownership
 - the fact that a representative of CGRS Ltd independent of the two householders will hold a key and have access at all times
 - the fact that the gate may not be replaced without consent of CGRS Ltd
 - the fact that owners should draw these matters to the attention of purchasers at the time of any sale