Minutes of The Annual General Meeting of
Campbell Heights Management Company Limited

The meeting was convened at 4:10pm on Sunday 7th July 2024 on the front lawn of Enterprise Lane, slightly delayed due to the weather. Chaired by Carol Swan, a shareholder and retired director.

1. Attendance and apologies for absence

Attendees: 19 Leaseholders were represented at the meeting in person or by proxy
(10 from Highbury Lane and 9 from Enterprise Lane)
26 Adults and 3 children were present
6 Apologies were received from leaseholders who did not attend

Leaseholders and residents were joined by:
Martin Westley (Keyholder Lettings Ltd)
David Lee (Minutes)

A full register of everyone who attended is available for inspection by shareholders. This includes details of the apologies and proxies appointed.

Correspondence from those making their apologies included the comment *"The Board's good work in and around the development is much appreciated".*

2. Minutes of the last AGM held on 2nd July 2023
The minutes were unanimously approved and formally accepted by the meeting, after correction of the typo in year of meeting - 2022 corrected to 2023

Actions from last year's minutes:

1. Guttering: Work has been done to improve them, but is not a full solution. A proposal for additional work is a separate item in this meeting. **ACTION CLOSED**
2. Bins. The board upgraded the signs at Highbury Lane and are very grateful to whoever put up new signage at Enterprise Lane. It is hoped this may help to guide residents to use the bins correctly. The matter is regularly reviewed and discussed by the board. **ACTION CLOSED**
3. Service Charge apportionment. A review was carried out, and Larry Kavanagh has a detailed breakdown, allowing a verbal report to the meeting as part of the director's report. The findings will be documented and made available on the CHMC website later this year. **ACTION ON-GOING**
4. Possible updates to the Rules and Obligations are to be the subject of consultation in the follow-on informal meeting. **ACTION CLOSED**
5. The bench in the garden was an action from the consultation meeting last year, and not formally recorded. Actions from the consultation meeting will be recorded this year. **ACTION ON-GOING**

3. Directors' Report
Larry Kavanagh gave an initial report on behalf of the board: - Six directors were appointed at the last AGM, in the course of the year David Chandler stepped down. The board expressed their thanks for all who give their time and service both on the board and in other roles to assist in the management of the company and the smooth running of the development. The five current directors have put themselves forward for reappointment. Larry Kavanagh indicated that after this year he will not serve another term on the board and will stand down at the next AGM. The board strongly encourages others, particularly from Enterprise Lane, to step forward and either join the board or enquire informally about the role.

In the course of the AGM and the consultative meeting the other directors would present proposals for consideration and discussion which represented the substantial and strategic work the board had done in the past year. Not everything had gone smoothly and the board acknowledged that there had been communications problems during the decoration contract.
One issue that the board focussed on was its key contractor relationships and Alex Maggs gave an

update on the work regarding the landscaping contract which is done by Barnetts. There are 32 visits during the year to provide maintenance. The increased scrutiny by CHMC has improved the quality, and talks are continuing on what further improvements will be possible. A number of areas where the current planting has reached the end of its natural life have been identified and these are targeted for renewal. A central email address is proposed to allow better communications.

Establishing clearly the scope of the contract and the expected standards will enable the board to consider obtaining alternative competitive quotations for this work. The board will undertake a consultation with all residents and leaseholders to gather their views on the common landscape areas to help the board agree further work going forward. Any significant changes to the scope of the landscaping work could impact the service charge – currently each property pays an average of £170 per year towards the cost of the landscaping in the courtyards, at the front of each development and in the four corner plots. The survey forms will be sent out in August.

Tellers: Martin (Keyholder) and David Lee (minutes) were appointed as tellers to count the ballots, which were common for the next 5 items. 20 voting papers were received, not all were marked for every vote.

4. Finance Update and adoption of accounts
The adoption of the accounts was accepted unanimously via the voting papers.

Tim Hunt gave an update on the accounts, which were sent out about one month previously, and show that costs are very close to the budget. The drop in rubbish cost is due to a new charging arrangement – provision of the bins is charged, but emptying of them is not charged.

Service charges are set to cover the total sum required to deliver the services set down in the lease for each development together with building up reserves for future projects. The leases are not clear in the breaking down of this sum (some consider the leases to be badly written), but the overall principle of the charges being applied only where relevant is followed, with general charges being usually based on the square footage of the property, and cost of items which only affect a group of properties being charged only to that group – an example being the fire alarm only covers the secure area, so the costs associated with it should be met by only those properties.

To say that we set the service charge by simply applying the terms of the lease does not do justice to the complexity of the model that has evolved over the years. Some of the provisions for splitting costs in leases were impractical and unworkable such as where the cleaning of the stairs is allocated to one charge category and the landings to another. From an early stage in the history of the development CHMC has adjusted the charging categories and arrangements to provide a workable, pragmatic solution which ensures that the service charge is the same for each property type in the two developments.

Full details are available from Larry, who has worked extensively at putting all this data into spreadsheets. The service charges are considerably lower than other properties in the Campbell Park area, due largely to the service company being owned and managed by the residents.

In response to a question it was clarified that the service charge covers window cleaning only for windows facing onto the courtyard, which are done once a quarter.

5. Election / Re-election of existing Directors
The existing directors were all re-elected

6. Re-appointment of Keyholder Lettings & Management as Residential Management Company and Company Secretary
It was unanimously agreed that Martin at Keyholder Lettings & Management be re-appointed as Residential Management Company and Company Secretary.

7. Re-appointment of Webb Accountancy as Company Accountants

It was unanimously agreed that Webb Accountancy be re-appointed as Company Accountants.

8. Re-appointment of Lloyds as Company Bankers
It was unanimously agreed that Lloyds be re-appointed as Company bankers.

9. CHMC Guttering Proposal
Angela Fairweather presented the guttering proposal, with the recommendation from the Directors that the inner courtyard at Enterprise Lane be upgraded at an estimated cost of £10,500 together with a further annual inspection at £200/year in order to meet the terms of the 15 year warranty. Previous attempts to improve the guttering have centred on Highbury Lane, and were part of the reason that the Highbury Lane reserves were only 30% of the total for both sites, when, for the number of properties, 40% would be expected. It was pointed out that the £200 annual charge was insufficient to allow inspection by a cherry picker. Such details would be checked by the directors as part of getting competitive quotes and consultations required by Section 20 (Landlord and Tenant Act 1985).

The proposal to proceed with lining the inner courtyard gutters of Enterprise Lane at a cost of £10,500 was carried, the breakdown of votes being:

Location	For	Against	No Preference	Total
Highbury Lane	7	0	0	
Enterprise Lane	4	2	0	
No location specified	6**	0	1	
Totals	**17**	**2**	**1**	**20***

**One vote on this topic was sent by email, resulting in the total number of votes being greater than those who were present at the meeting.*
***It is reasonable to assume that these votes split evenly between Highbury and Enterprise making the result for Enterprise Lane votes 7-2 in favour.*

The proposal was carried.

10. Close
The meeting acknowledged its thanks to all who had helped with arrangements for the event.

The formal meeting closed at about 5:20pm

Notes from CHMC Consultative Meeting

1. Sustainability – “Air Tightness Survey”

Alex described the survey which had taken place in 3 representative properties in the development to determine where air leakages were occurring. Surprisingly the big items like doors and windows performed well but smaller issues such as poorly sealed light fittings and pipes were an issue.

ACTION: Survey results and recommendations will be made available to all in the development.

2. Consultation on resurfacing options for the courtyards

As part of the review of service charge arrangements the board has obtained a quotation for the resurfacing of the courtyards to check if it was making the correct financial assumptions. The quotation showed a major difference in price between using the current light colour material (£100k) and a darker black/grey material (£45k). The work will not be needed for 3 or 4 years but the board felt it was good to start a conversation and consultation on the matter now.

The outcome of the consultative ballot is shown below – these figures are different from the headline result given in the meeting as subsequent auditing picked up an error.

	Enterprise Lane	Highbury Lane	Total
Current Light Colour @ £100,000	7	4	11
Grey/Black Colour @ £41,000	1	5	6
No preference	1	0	1
Total	9	9	18

In the consultation paper the board said the following *“For financial planning purposes the board will assume the higher price option unless there is a very clear majority (two-thirds or above on both developments) leaning towards the lower price surface.”* On that basis and because only 18 out of 52 properties returned a vote, the board will continue to assume the higher price option and will continue to engage with leaseholders on the matter.

There is no requirement for both developments to have the same colour courtyard however if this happened the principle of having the same service charge for the same property-type at Highbury Lane and Enterprise Lane could not be sustained and this could make it difficult for one company to continue to manage both developments.

ACTION: To facilitate further informed discussion of this subject the board will provide an image to show how a different coloured surface would look compared to the current surface.

3. Security of the development

Concerns over the security of the development have arisen over the years with suggestions of installing CCTV and enhanced entry systems. More “low-tech” problems have arisen with the locks for the secure area and the gates for the corner plot. The board propose to engage an independent security consultancy, at a cost of £1500, to conduct a comprehensive risk assessment of the development and to report with recommendations.

4. Improving CHMC/Resident Communications

Concern was raised by a resident about communicating important matters to the whole development in a timely and effective manner. Such as the recent rough-sleeper issue at Enterprise Lane. Beyond participating in the informal “WhatsApp” group CHMC had not communicated with residents except for putting signage on the secure area doors.

The board responded that it did not have the remit, resources or responsibility to provide short-notice updates to residents. Within the developments they rely on people looking out for each other and taking appropriate steps to help minimise risks and to spread important information to neighbours.

ACTION: The board will create and distribute a “Communications Preference Form” to allow leaseholders and residents to indicate their preferred methods of communication and to facilitate the creation of an emailing list.

5. Consultation on revised rules and obligations

Updating the residents’ rules and obligations has been outstanding for a number of years. The board presented an updated draft which includes the following changes:

- The blanket ban on operating a business from the development is qualified to prohibit businesses *“that impact other residents”.*
- The requirement to have sterile hallways and landings in the secure area has been added.
- The requirement to comply with government guidelines on CCTV, doorcams and recording devices has been included.
- Agreement is needed before any alterations are made to the corner garden plots and any alterations must be made-good when the resident moves.
- The use of barbecues, heaters or naked flames is prohibited on balconies.

The consultation on these changes is ongoing till the 20 September. When the board meets at the end of September it will agree and publish the revised rules and obligations.

ACTION: Board to publish updated rules and obligations before the end of the year.

6. AOB

- Tree Pruning
  A resident expressed concern about the visual impact of the tree pruning this year. It was explained that the trees are pruned on a regular basis so as to keep their root systems from growing to a point where they impact the driveways and courtyard. Although they were not due to be pruned until 2025, on expert advice, the board brought this forward to this year as the warm wet summer had created exceptional growth.