



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 4th May 2020	Time	18:00 hrs.	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 • Dave Griffiths 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sarah Morrisen (Chaney's) • Andrew Copley (Chaney's) 	

Minutes of Meeting

Item	Description	Due Date	Action
1 18:00	<p>Meeting commenced at 18:00 hours</p> <p><u>Minutes of last meeting</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minutes of previous meeting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Amendments made to Feb 2020 minutes (as discussed in the previous Board meeting) ○ D'ON confirmed that the proposal re the children's playground had been shared with the other Board members 		

<p>2. 18:25</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Articles of Association – AC confirmed that there are points to clarify and these will be shared at a future board meeting ○ Death in benefit insurance for VHMC onsite staff – Sue Costello will share the proposal with the Board by 18/05/2020 ○ Leak spreadsheet – in progress, available by 18th May 2020 ○ Report re hot water cylinder failures will be shared with the board by 18th May 2020 SM and AC to discuss failure of Leaseholders to repair and their obligations, breach of lease etc. ○ Ex-gratia payment to Sue Ross – AC confirmed that he had spoken to HMRC and they had confirmed that the actions taken by Chaney's were correct. AC asked D'ON to supply contact details re who he spoke to at HMRC who gave different advice. D'ON will supply to AC ○ MG requested that the 2020 minutes are updated on the Winterthur way website within 3 days <p><u>Chaney's Proposal re onsite staff</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● ME presented his compiled spreadsheet of costings broken down into 5 options based on Chaney's proposal for the replacement of site staff and confirmed that he had spoken with AC prior to discuss. ● The spreadsheet was broken down into 5 scenarios as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ (A) – replace JR (Estate Manager) with somebody similar, maintain the onsite cleaners under existing terms and SM under the employ of Chaney's. NB this is the current setup. ○ (B) – replace JR with a handyman, maintain the onsite cleaners under existing terms, SM under the employ of Chaney's, visiting onsite supervision from Chaney's to oversee the site staff and HR support from an external company such as Peninsula as an example ○ (C) – replace JR with a handyman, maintain the onsite cleaners under existing terms, SM under the employ of Chaney's, appoint an assistant property manager under the employ of Chaney's, visiting onsite supervision from Chaney's to oversee the site staff and HR support from an external company such as Peninsula as an example. ○ (D) – The same as (C) above but without the option of a handyman ○ (E) – Contract out all site services currently under the employ of VHMC (Cleaners and Estate Manager) 		<p>AC</p> <p>SCO</p> <p>SM</p> <p>SM</p> <p>SM/AC</p> <p>D'ON</p> <p>AC</p>
---------------------	--	--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Costs of the above per year: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (A) - £129,195, cost per Leaseholder - £342 (B) - £130,922, cost per Leaseholder - £348 (C) - £140,441, cost per Leaseholder - £372 (D) - £128,993, cost per Leaseholder - £341 (E) - £159,511, cost per Leaseholder - £422 • ME – The provision of a handyman would cost IRO £20,000 per year but cost wise would only show IRO £10,000 worth of benefit and Option (D) with no handyman would show an overall saving of £1 per year when costed against the current arrangement. • MG – option (D) is a good step forward, we could add the option of a handyman at a later date if appropriate • D’ON – Options (A) and (D) costings are the same due to the current VHMC cost for an Estate Manager transferring across to Chaney’s re the employ of an Assistant Property Manager. Asked where the costs for Peninsula sit? • AC – in Chaney’s costs, however Peninsula would be employed by VHMC and Chaney’s would oversee as the agent. AC confirmed that Chaney’s have used Peninsula for 3 years and they deal with staff issues, advice re staffing matters including tribunal cases. • D’ON – From experience Peninsula are an insurance. You can ring them for advice, if they give advice and you don’t agree, they advise that you can make a commercial decision. They will always encourage you to settle cases rather than progressing to Court. We also need to be mindful that after a year they act on a rolling contract. • D’ON – Who will deal with Peninsula – Chaney’s or VHMC • AC – Sue Costello (Chaney’s) • D’ON – raised concerns that VHMC have no interaction with VHMC staff • AC – Sue Costello will take on the above on behalf of VHMC and Peninsula will set up and review what is already in place. They will provide templates such as staff handbooks. • ME – we need to manage staff change and the appointment of a handyman and Assistant Property Manager is a step too far and if necessary, the appointment of staff can be done in stages. • WB – interested to hear D’ON views and shares his view that VHMC shouldn’t be directly employing staff but that is for a later discussion. Handyman vs Assistant Property Manager not convinced by any of the options. • D’ON – are the costings for SM to be onsite for 4 or 5 days per week, same for the Assistant Property manager • ME – confirmed that each would be for 4 days per week onsite but not necessarily for the same days so 		
--	--	--	--

	<p>that there is an overlap so there is always a presence onsite.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SS – staff handbook – are we adequately covered by law? • AC – it’s about improving what we already have, Peninsula will give us a framework about what needs to be done and Sue Costello will manage the onsite staff and bring admin, staff reviews etc. up to a standard. • AC – JR wasn’t doing anything practical onsite; he was a visual onsite for Residents. VHMC’s biggest asset is SM and the appointment of an Assistant Property manager will allow SM to delegate admin and deal with higher level projects. • SM – JR was never a handyman; we are not losing we are trying to add a service • AC – SM is the only Senior Property Manager that doesn’t have support (apart from AC and accounts), that the other teams at Chaney’s have (a Senior Property Manager, a Property Manager and an Assistant Property Manager) • SS – would VHMC have their own documents that covered all regulations? • AC – Yes • JP – If Peninsula are a dedicated call centre, does each organisation get a dedicated person and do they deal with staff matters, reviews etc.? • AC – Yes you do get a dedicated person, we can also look at other companies offering the same service. Sue Costello would carry out reviews, site management and feedback to Board. • JP – I have always been an advocate of a handyman, but would we get somebody for the rate we have budgeted for? • SM – foresees employing as a part time role, possibly suit somebody that is semi-retired. • DG asked to comment – felt that everybody had already covered everything necessary. • MG – my experience of employment insurance companies are they are very useful, provide clarity that has avoided the need to go to Court. MG advised that he has used a company called DAS and had no aversion to using a company of this nature rather than taking the task in-house which can prove costly. • D’ON – Managers may ring Peninsula after already making a bad decision and this in turn prompts Peninsula to advise on settlement with an employee. • MG – you seek advice before acting • MG – what would be the improvement if we opted for option (D)? • AC – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assistant Property Manager can take admin tasks away from SM • SM can be more visual – onsite, Facebook, Website • SM can concentrate on projects • SM can be a point of contact for residents 		
--	---	--	--

<p>3. 19:30</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Free up the Sarah's time with more low-level tasks that can be dealt with by the Assistant property manager • MG – what is the skill set required for the Assistant Property Manager? • AC – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Office admin • Leaseholder requests • Arranging meetings/agenda • Emails directed by SPM • Chasing works • Liaising with Leaseholders • WB – We are touching on a scope of services not included as part of the original tender and we should consider carrying out a re-tender process. • Vote held re services of Peninsula: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ME – Yes SS – Yes DG – Yes JP – Yes (12-month contract) D'ON – Yes (Not Peninsula) WB – Yes MG – Yes • D'ON – Option E <ul style="list-style-type: none"> WB – Option D SS – Option D JP – Option D ME – Option D MG – Option D DG – Option D <p>Decision – Option D – Appointment of Assistant Property Manager, Handyman on hold, provision of services of employment insurance service agreed</p> <p><u>Repairs and Maintenance</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AC shared the PMP spreadsheet with inputted costs of ongoing works: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Front entrance doors CCTV and access control Gates Lobby upgrade <p>AC will send analysis per block but in short if we continue with the PMP, taking into account works to date by year 3, block reserves will be reflected as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Birch – Negative Cherry – Low Holly – Low Elm – Low Fir – Normal <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MG – We need to be mindful that we are in a bumpy economic period and the Board need to be sensitive of 		<p>AC</p>
---------------------	---	--	-----------

	<p>keeping service charge levels under control. However also aware that putting PMP off could be a false economy and could prove more costly in the future,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AC – external cleaning can be pushed to next year which won't significantly increase costs • ME – External cleaning should be looked at Façades rather than blocks as some facades suffer worse than others • D'ON – Thames Valley Surveying (Ed Layton) has put together a PMP which should be implemented. • MG – agreed, by not carrying out external cleaning it can bring down the look of the estate. • WB – asked that we discuss cladding before making a decision re the PMP • MG – agreed • <u>Cladding discussed</u> • AC – Government has extended funding to include non-ACM cladding (the type at Winterthur Way) and it's likely that funding will be available to either fund or partly fund the replacement. The cost of surveyor's fees, tendering and associated costs will be included in this funding • D'ON – we should inform members; some members may have valuable information. • D'ON – 2 questions: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the non-compliance following on from the events at Grenfell 2. Is the non-compliance as result of building regs at the time? • AC – these questions will be asked and answered as part of the process for Government funding • AC – SM and Ridge are bottoming out what type of cladding was delivered to site at the time of build and following on from this will explore Government funding and the s20 tender process • <u>PMP</u> Vote to delay the PMP for this year: MG – No ME – Yes SS – Yes JP – Yes D'ON – No WB – Yes (defer for 4 weeks until more clarity re cladding) DG – No until decision re cladding Agreed not to go ahead with PMP and to defer until next year • Vote re informing Leaseholders re the cladding straight away: ME – Yes DG – Yes JP – Yes D'ON – Yes WB – Yes SS – Yes • AC will draft letter to Leaseholders for approval, to all blocks, even those unaffected 		<p>AC</p>
--	---	--	-----------

<p>4. 20:00</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • D'ON – please ask for advice in the letter from Leaseholders that may have valuable information • ME – send to Leaseholders only • AC – To compile and send on behalf of VHMC: Factsheet Letter (signed by MG) Statement to put on website and Facebook <p><u>Leaseholder Issues</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MG advised the Board re the complaint received from Jamie Robins and Matthew Bertrum, the email thread and complaint had previously been forwarded to other Directors for consideration • ME – as they are co-owners, this should be treated as 1 complaint and not 2 • MG – Noted • MG advised that an online Zoom meeting had been set up with the 2 complainants, MG, AC and SM on Wednesday 6th May and MG will report back to the Board • D'ON asked if he could join the meeting (as lobby refurbishment was mentioned in the complaint) and he was lead, it was agreed that in the first instance MG would host the meeting and feedback. • MG – defined the complaint as failures re communication Discussion re Facebook as a communication tool • MG – Facebook can be used as a communication tool, acknowledged that VHMC didn't set out expectations of Chaneys when Facebook was first started. Facebook posts should be: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Acknowledged ○ A post submitted requesting a direct email or call from the person who has raised the query ○ Resolution/agreement found and feedback through a further post on Facebook • Discussion re Winterthur way email address, established that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ help@winterthurway.co.uk (goes through to Chaneys and is working correctly ○ members@winterthurway.co.uk (goes through to VHMC Directors) but currently doesn't work • Agreed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ MG/ME/JP/WB will supply their personal email addresses for direct contact for Leaseholders to Directors as a temporary measure until the issue is resolved ○ Website will be migrated to Go Daddy domain, which is more user friendly, Winterthur way emails will be set up as part of this domain. ○ Office 365 will be built into this for each Director ○ Document storage can be migrated to here to save money and allow cancellation of Docustore which currently costs £30 per month. 		<p>AC</p>
---------------------	--	--	-----------

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Agreed to proceed 		
<p>5. 20:30</p>	<p><u>New Board Members</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 proposals received to Co-opt ahead of AGM: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Matthew Bertrum – 243 Winterthur way ○ Jamie Robins – 243 Winterthur Way ○ Lorcan Loughrey – 248 Winterthur Way • All 3 had submitted a short bio and declared no conflict of interested to MG • Agreed that as MB and JR (243) were joint owners, only 1 could be co-opted and subsequently voted on as a Director as the AGM, however both would be invited to the next board meeting ahead of the AGM, 1 co-opted and I as an observer. • LL (248) co-opted ahead of the AGM 		
<p>6. 20:45</p>	<p><u>Date of AGM</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agreed to hold an online AGM • W/C 15th June 2020 • SM to distribute dates via Doodle poll • SM to draft AGM agenda and send to MG, Directors can also send items to add to the agenda to MG 		<p>SM SM</p>
<p>7. 20:50</p>	<p><u>Financials</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ME shared revamped financial spreadsheet with Option (D) (staff costs) included • SM advised that ME has worked on the spreadsheet to make it more user friendly • ME – Has changed automatic flagging in column X to flag only if the figure is more than £500 • ME advised that SM would take ownership of the spreadsheet but SM/ME would meeting prior to each meeting to review and discuss with a view of SM presenting to the Board • AC thanked ME for all his hard work. 		<p>SM</p>
<p>8. 21:00</p>	<p><u>A.O.B</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • D'ON – asked the following questions re reserves: What are our caps on collection of reserves? Where are our reserves kept? Who has access? AC – The reserve levels are built on the PMP, which was previously presented to Leaseholders and approved by Leaseholders. Only both Directors of Chaney's have access to reserve funds, which are protected in the following ways: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ RICS client money protection scheme which covers £60,000 per Leaseholder ○ PI cover of £50 million AC – the only movement of money from reserves are to core accounts re interest or movement to accounts at year end. D'ON – Do we have a limit on reserves 		

	<p>AC – Reserves will not grow to a point beyond what is needed for the PMP and contributions can be adjusted</p> <p>Agreed – AC to put together a proposal (To ME in the first instance) re a Director overseeing transfer of funds from reserve accounts</p> <p>MG – As per the Articles of Association the 2 longest serving Directors should stand down and be re-elected. The minutes of the AGM’s from 2015 do not formally record this, although AC has confirmed that the process has taken place.</p> <p>AC to offer guidance re completing this process and which Directors this should apply to.</p> <p>Date of next meeting: Tuesday 26th May 2020, 6pm</p> <p>Meeting ended at 21:15 hrs.</p>		<p>AC</p> <p>AC</p>
--	---	--	---------------------

--	--	--	--

2. 18:45			
---------------------------	--	--	--

3. 19:45			
4. 20:10			
5. 20:20			

--	--	--	--

--	--	--	--

--	--	--	--

--	--	--	--

--	--	--	--

--	--	--	--