Highland Court (Woodford) Limited

ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING –MINUTES

DATE AND TIME: Monday 12 July 2017 at 7.30pm.

LOCATION: Redbridge Drama Centre, Churchfields, South Woodford.

Attendees		Apologies
Highland Court	HC	Jacki Wilkerson (18)
Clinton Hunt (27)	СН	
Jean Clavey (35)	JC	Not present but mentioned
Tony Rich (19)	TR	Ron Newly - RN
Brian Ray (27)	BR	Harwood Hutton - HH
Peter Sharp (5)	PS	David Fleming (Solicitor) - DF
Daniele Hammond (33)	DH	
Ash Finlay (6)	AF	
Katya Kemperdick (12)	КК	
Julian Hazeldine (16)	JH	
D Bracken (17)	DB	
Allestree Fisher (24)	AF	
T Smith (31) for CM Smith	TS	
Dennis Drew (34)	DD	
Debbie Bush (36)	DB	
Sheree Horsey (37)	SH	

Minutes

- TO REVIEW and, if thought fit, approve the accounts for the year ended 30th June 2016. Accounts for the year 2015/16 approved by all.
- TO CONSIDER, and if thought fit, re-appoint Harwood Hutton as accountants to the company until next AGM.
 Harwood Hutton was reappointed.
- TO RECEIVE the resignations of the present directors. TO CONSIDER and if thought fit, reelect those officers offering themselves for re-election for the ensuing year and to consider the election of additional directors for the ensuing year.
 DD (34) had resigned during the year – CH thanked him for his help. TS proposed a vote of thanks to the four remaining directors. The re-appointment of CH, DH, JC, and TR was agreed.
- 4. TO CONSIDER the decorating and other maintenance quotations.
 - CH stated that flats are reporting leaks and work on the roof is needed urgently. The temporary work carried out by RN had not been sufficient. Quotes had not come back yet but could be in the region of £40,000. BR was concerned that any work carried out should be properly guaranteed and covered by professional indemnity he would advise CH on this outside the meeting. DD stated that a specification should be drawn up so that all quotes were on the same basis and that we might need to employ a qualified surveyor for this DD would speak to CH regarding this. It was agreed that quotes should be obtained with a view to completing the work before the winter and prior to redecoration.
 - Re-decoration is due this year as it was postponed 3 years ago. This should include communal areas in both blocks (walls, ceilings, bannisters, and doors), garage doors, gates, external rendered panels and remaining wooden window frames. Last time this had cost in the region of £20,000. BR said there are only about 3 flats with the original windows, other owners having changed to UPVC, and suggested that HC should not be responsible for these. CH said that those owners were entitled to have their frames painted but as they were in such poor repair this might not be possible. Agreed to identify flats in question and write suggesting they might want to upgrade their windows. There were suggestions on areas of decoration that could be delayed if there was insufficient money available eg garage doors, much of back block. Owners were asked to say which areas they felt should have priority. It was agreed that itemized quotes should be obtained which would allow choices to be made on carrying out only the most urgent work if this became necessary and that we should also look in to getting specialist cleaning of UPVC frames.
 - The third critical piece of work was repairs to the pathways. The patented product used had not lasted because it was not professionally laid and it could now cause accidents. Quotes to be obtained when funds available.
 - The Directors had also identified the following repairs/improvements when money allowed:
 Replacement of hard drive and more cameras on CCTV to reduce risk of burglary, vehicle theft, dumped furniture and other vandalism.
 Replace fence at front of the development.
 Provision of bike rack.

Possible need for increased expenditure on gates.

- 5. TO CONSIDER the projected budgets and other maintenance quotations. It was unanimously agreed that the Monthly Maintenance would increase to £100 per flat so as to cover the increasing costs identified in 4 above. DD stated that he felt that this was not sufficient and also suggested that a management company should be employed which DB also supported; there was no other support for this.
- 6. TO CONSIDER the use of the store room.

TR explained that residents had not been using the store room properly. There were all sorts of suitcases, cardboard boxes, furniture and unlabeled bikes. There had been a big clear out which had taken a considerable amount of his and RN's time. BR had arranged for unclaimed bikes to be donated to the Salvation Army. A new lock has been put on with keys costing £10 plus a £30 returnable deposit; these cannot now be duplicated. Owners should request them from TR; any bikes stored in there should be labelled with a flat number. There is now space for RN to store gardening equipment.

- 7. Any other business:
 - Proposed Amendment to Lease

CH said that despite a number of reminders to flat owners and notices being put up there were continual and escalating problems with some of the children living in HC, who were both noisy and destructive. Most of these children were from families in tenanted flats which now formed a majority. Owners of these flats must ensure that their tenants were suitable and made aware of the terms of the lease and other rules.

They were making life miserable for other residents. The terms of the lease were not sufficiently robust to prevent this. CH had spoken to DF about the possibility of adding to the lease clauses prohibiting children playing in the car park and around the drying area or after 7pm, specifying that there should be no ball games or use of bikes/scooters or damage to the grounds, with noise to be kept to a minimum and children to be supervised by parents at all times. It was expected that this change would cost around £4,000.

BR made the point that not all of the children at HC were a problem and that even in the case of those causing disruption the blame should be attached to the parents for failing to supervise them properly and take them over to play in the park.

There was support for these changes but DD put forward that children should not be allowed to play in HC grounds and most of the resident owners supported the idea of a complete ban. CH warned that this might be difficult to enforce and would also penalize those children who were not causing a problem. JH and TS felt a complete ban was too harsh.

Following a vote it was agreed that the lease should be amended to impose a blanket ban (8 for; 6 against; 2 abstentions). JH asked if there were sufficient owners present to make such a change. CH would check this with DF. In the interim new notices would be displayed.

• Front Doors to Flats.

DB pointed out that the doors in the back block did not seem as substantial as those in the front. She was concerned that they might not be fire resistant. It was agreed that the Fire Brigade should be invited to come and do a safety check on one of the flats. • Fire Safety.

BR said that fire safety was currently a very important issue. Owners needed to be reminded that they had a responsibility to have a working smoke alarm in their flats (see advice on the HC website). **CH would ask HH to send out reminders to owners of their obligations.** BR asked if the HC insurance gave proper cover should there be a fire and that there was a need to make sure that the directors were properly protected from any liability. **CH would check with Blue Fin.**

Communication from Harwood Hutton.
 DD complained that he had not been receiving any postal or e-mail communications.
 CH would check that HH had the correct information on file.

• Rentokil.

DB asked if the contract with Rentokil had been terminated. TR said this was the case as there was no longer a rat problem and the Rentokil operative had told him it was unnecessary. If that changed the matter would be reconsidered.

The meeting finished at 9.00pm.