



Victory Hill Management Company Limited

Residential Management Company limited by guarantee with
no shares

Co no.: 04659245 Registered in England and Wales
Registered office:

c/o Chaney's Chartered Surveyors
Chaney's Chartered Surveyors

Chiltern House | Marsack Street | Caversham | Reading | RG4
5AP

VHMC Directors Meeting

Meeting Details

Date	Monday 6th April 2020	Time	18:30pm	Venue	Online virtual meeting hosted over Zoom
------	--------------------------	------	---------	-------	--

Present	In attendance	Absent / Apologies
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Matt Garvey • Martin Edge • Jaz Parmar • Wayne Buckley • Des O'Neill • Stewart Smart • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sarah Morrisen (Chaney's) • Andrew Copley (Chaney's) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dave Griffiths

Minutes of Meeting

Item	Description	Due Date	Action
1 18:30	<p>Meeting commenced at 18:30 hours</p> <p><i>Minutes of last meeting</i></p> <p>ME - asked that the following contained in the minutes of the Feb 2020 meeting:</p> <p>ME - yes if we treat everything to the 'T', but this case has been treated pragmatically and Leaseholder has been advantaged/disadvantaged by this acceptable temporary solution</p>		

	<p>Is amended to the following:</p> <p>ME – yes if we treat everything to the ‘T’, but this case has been treated pragmatically and Leaseholder has not been advantaged/disadvantaged by this acceptable temporary solution</p> <p>SM will amend the previous Feb 2020 minutes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • D’ON – provided update regarding the feasibility study on the children’s play area at Winterthur Way. 3 companies approached, only one provided a quote of £17,905. A maintenance package can be provided at any additional cost. ME – comprehensive, useful, however expensive JP – really good, however children could be susceptible to falls so subsequently insurance will be required which could be costly SS – echoes JP’s comments, expensive and concerns re injury of children WB – have we spoken to parents to ask what they want, i.e. a playground or an open space to play football. Agrees with JP and SS re expense and insurance limitations. D’ON – We haven’t looked into issues such as insurance etc. as in the first instance we were just looking at the feasibility of a play area. Cost wise, the play area will last at least 15 years so provides good value for money WB – will it solve the problems onsite? D’ON – No, but it will allow us to direct children to somewhere that they are allowed to play MG – Would like to see the proposal in more detail D’ON – will circulate the proposal MG – what do we want to do and how much should we spend WB – should we consult with Residents or Leaseholders? SS – Consult Residents as they control their children but then put the cost to Leaseholders ME – children playing exists, at the moment we can’t give them an area they can play JP – we need to talk to Residents <p>Agreed:</p> <p>Arrange Residents meeting prior to AGM D’On to share proposal Then take case to members</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ME – Articles of Association – draft completed Needs clarification re voting rights of members AC – website has been updated, will clarify re members voting rights by Friday 10th April ME – Will circulate after this • AC – Directors Code of Conduct – in progress SS – in touch with Natasha from The Head Partnership, the document is in progress and will be distributed in due course 		<p>SM</p> <p>D’ON</p> <p>AC</p> <p>SS</p>
--	--	--	---

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Death in benefit insurance for VHMC staff – This is being led by Sue Costello (Office Manager) and will be circulated by Friday 10th April • AC - Proposal for onsite staff cannot be presented today but will be presented to Directors MG – confirmed that he had carried out a review of the previous minutes detailing the tendering process and its lead up, MG stated the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The actual outcome was clear ○ Overall, the tendering matter was unresolved and undecided until we saw a costing proposal from Chaney's ○ Minutes were unhelpful, we never had a clear consensus from all of the Directors ○ Noted that MG/DG did not want to change from the current arrangement ○ Sept 2019 – agreed to defer the decision ○ The following stand out from the minutes: Some discussions were missing but MG could not recall the exact detail of these discussions Nothing was wrong with the tendering process There should have been a broader level of support from all Directors, noted that some had raised objections in prior board meetings A financial obligation should have been decided from the start Referring to the meeting 20/05 – only 3 members were present (MG, ME and D'ON), we should have waited for a meeting with more members present Does not view the process as unfair but we could have done better However, the costings received were higher than expected hence the request for a proposal from Chaney's D'ON – where are the minutes of the tender discussions? And what did we get from the tender exercise? Felt that the tender proposals were not listened to and were wiped off the table ME – D'ON needs to his tender analysis spreadsheet WB – agreed that this should be shared with D'ON but also commented that after working through the numbers that came from ME analysis, the costs drove the decision making AC – will circulate Chaney's proposal and ME tender analysis by Friday 10th April ME – the purpose of inviting tenders was to learn the cost of contracting out, not to necessarily go ahead D'ON – requested timeline of events has not been fulfilled Re the meeting on 2nd May, although only 3 members were present, no actual decisions were made, only to go forward with tender proposals D'ON – was excluded from meeting regarding the tender process but should have been called back in when any further unrelated issues were discussed but this did not happen AC – we will share all information re the tendering process and then discuss how to proceed D'ON – felt disadvantaged as a board member 		SC
--	--	----

<p>2. 18:45</p>	<p>MG – felt uncomfortable that a tenderer would help draw up a spec and then tender against it D'ON – reiterated that he did not see the tender before helping to draw up the tender specification, instead it was received when the other tenderers did. D'ON – why didn't you express your concerns at the time, you are retrospectively trying to cover your tracks. MG – stuck with the status quo and was not Chairman at the time but is picking up on the issue now as Chairman D'ON – at the last meeting it was proposed that MG would review the minutes of the last meeting and provide a complete timeline but feels that this hasn't happened. MG – it was only agreed that the minutes would be reviewed, and the actual minutes provide a written timeline D'ON – have you reviewed them? MG – yes and I've given you a verbal summary and the timeline is in the minutes and there is nothing to add to the minutes D'ON – upset at being excluded from meetings where issues were being discussed and have asked for a timeline of the process. We are now at the stage that this will happen and after review, will send a formal reply MG – the timeline is in the minutes, not aware of anything else that exists ME – supports MG – not clear what D'ON thinks he is missing and asked D'ON to wait to receive the tender analysis spreadsheet. Confirmed that D'ON bid, which was 1 of 3 was commercially on par with one of the other bids and was taken into account, however the board decided to defer the decision D'ON – I'm not disputing this but where is the vote agreeing to defer? MG – confirmed it was noted in the minutes of the meeting held 15/09/19 AC – all information will be made available by the end of the week. Noted that Chaney's were excluded from some of the meetings. Acknowledged that mistakes were made but D'ON was not deliberately disadvantaged.</p> <p>Minutes of previous meeting agreed</p> <p><u>Site Update</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Birch Block – suffered in the storms and water ingressed into flats, repairs have been carried out and necessary insurance claims raised • Cherry Block suffered in the same way as Birch block MG – did the water go into flats SM – yes, through balcony stands, cracks in the render, in hand but will discuss such issues at a later date • Holly Block – overflowing downpipe caused water ingress into 2 flats • Fir block – leaf from roof affecting 4th floor on both sides – repairs have been carried out • Willow block – leaking stack pipe ingressing into 479 garage ME – who is carrying out repairs? 		<p>SM</p> <p>SM</p>
---------------------	---	--	---------------------

<p>3. 19:45</p>	<p>SM – abseillers carry out external works but can also carry out internal works and Craig Hickman – Handyman. Since the loss of Clive Baron from Abseil & Access, finding an alternative abseiling company proved difficult. One has been sourced now and they have been catching up on a lot of historic works and current issues, the storms also added to works required MG – requested that the leak spreadsheet is updated to reflect</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SM – planned maintenance program – would like to implement asap, gutter clearances, downpipes etc. AC – as abseillers to quote for works as per the PMP • SM – highlighted to the Board that a fundamental problem onsite was leaks from hot water cylinders and the subsequent damage caused to other flat. This in turn leads to increased insurance claims that could potentially increase premiums and excesses. As system of pipework checks needs to be put into place on a yearly basis Agreed that SM would put together a proposal, first to AC and then to present to the Board and will include proposals re funding i.e. funded by VHMC or Leaseholders MG – we need to look into breach of lease charges for those leaseholders that fail to maintain their hot water cylinders • External cladding inspection SM – advised that a fire safety consultant had been appointed to carry out an inspection of the external cladding. Without this and the subsequently produced EW1S form, mortgage lenders would not lend. This has taken place and it has been determined that the cladding is of a non-compliant type, this is based on the fact that the OEM manual do not specify the type of trspa cladding (there are 2 types, one is compliant and one is non-compliant). Agreed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Arrange for an independent test of the cladding to determine if it is fire resistant ○ Engage the insurance company for assistance as they have a vested interest ○ Update at the next board meeting ○ Weekly updates to the board ○ Draft a proposal after checking of the lease re recommendations to update leaseholders <p><u>Projects/Board initiatives</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Estate Office</u> – SM advised that we are pushing ahead for the build to start on 22/04/20 and Ross from Oakstons is happy to work onsite. A site visit prior to this will be arranged and DG will be invited to attend AC will visit site weekly to oversee • <u>Communal lobbies</u> – SM updated that the mirrors have been fitted, the infrared heaters are on order and plants will be purchased. Spend to date discussed, confirmed that after fitment of the heaters, £339.84 if left to spend on plants for each block 		<p>SM</p> <p>SM</p> <p>SM</p> <p>SM</p> <p>SM AC/SM</p>
---------------------	---	--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>CCTV, gates and fobbed access</u> – fitment has been completed but the link back to the estate office will take place when lockdown is lifted. JP – did we look at cameras above each of the lifts? SM – yes, an additional camera will be fitted to overlook the lift MG – having looked at Facebook, has identified the need to increase CCTV footage instrumentally in each of the blocks and once this current project is finished to request that a financial feasibility study is conducted. SM – agreed and noted that the current CCTV has been received well by Residents. WB – do we have spare cameras and moveable cameras for hotspot areas SM – we have 3 spare cameras AC – we have a 4G camera that can be used for hotspot areas 		
<p>4. 20:10</p>	<p><u>Monthly financial update</u></p> <p>Financials discussed W block incorrect – sm to update ME/SM to meet online mon/tues prior to board meeting to finalise the monthly financial spreadsheet, SM will arrange dates with ME</p>		SM
<p>5. 20:20</p>	<p><u>A.O.B</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MG – covid-19 – may affect the ability of leaseholders paying their service charge WB – they will face financial challenges and we need to offer payment plans proactively SM – maybe we should offer payment plans if we are approached rather than as a rule of thumb D’ON – people may take the offer anyway AC – on other sites payment plans are offered only when an approach is made SS – we should take advice from Chaneys and look at each case on an individual basis JP – we should offer help but not put it out there WB – delay legal actions and talk proactively to Leaseholder AC – we will reword the arrears recovery letters Agreed that we can extend the payment plan until December Will start to present arrears as part of the monthly financial update AC – advised that notices re Covid 19 had been placed onsite on the outside of the communal doors. SM – will post the notices on Facebook and the WW website. MG – can we pin the post on Facebook, so it remains at the top 		SM
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • D’ON – Ex-Gratia payment to Sue Ross should not have had tax deducted. D’ON has had this confirmed by HMRC AC – HMRC said the opposite when Chaneys made enquiries and this was confirmed by their financial advisors. We will double check 		SM

	<p>D'ON - will pass his information on</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• MG - in current circumstances feel a Deputy Chairman would be wise and asked that the other Directors considered this and fed back within a week• Next meeting: Monday 4th May; 18:00 hours <p>Meeting ended at 20:40 hrs.</p>		
--	---	--	--

--	--	--	--

--	--	--	--

--	--	--	--

--	--	--	--

--	--	--	--