

MCH Resident's Association Committee Meeting  
4 October 2006  
Minutes  
[Circulation – All residents via the website](#)

Version 4 Draft, 11 Oct, for approval by Gary and Dean, Peverel

Attendees

**Peverel** Gary Humphries, Building Manager  
and Dean Clarke, Estate Manager.

**Committee** Hitesh Patel, Richard Quick, Emma Beardmore, Kirsty Allen,  
Kit Reynolds, Gemma Bentley, Franceso Cerminara

1) **Exterior redecoration**

a) **long term maintenance plan**

Peverel advised that as part of the external redecoration works surveyors will be using the opportunity provided by the cradles to access and report on the building's condition. The report will be used to develop a long term maintenance plan.

The committee asked that following requests from the majority of residents at the 12 Sept RA AGM, that Peverel also investigate options for improving the glazing and insulation of the building. Dean advised costs are likely to be prohibitive but will investigate a ballpark cost for budget purposes.

**Action point – Dean Clarke** advise committee on outcome of surveyors findings and a long term maintenance plan

**Action point – Dean Clarke** investigate budgetary cost for glazing improvements.

b) **Explanation of external redecoration works in layman's terms**

Peverel agreed to issue a summary of the external redecoration works to include more information on the scope of the work covered by the contract, forecast timing and phasing of works.

**Action point - Dean Clarke** to issue summary to RA and residents via Avenue

c) **colour consultation**

Gary from Peverel advised that some residents were consulted regarding the colour with a feedback book placed on reception around a year ago however this immediately resulted in heated disputes, and therefore Peverel decided against the possibility of a change in colour and instead plan to match the existing colour scheme.

d) **budget monitoring**

Dean from Peverel advised that they will monitor the external works budget carefully, but will only consult residents in exceptional circumstances, for instance if the surveyors uncover a requirement for additional work that it may be efficient to do alongside the external

re-decoration works, and the costs require Peverel to issue a capital works notice (Section 20) to residents.

**e) co-ordination of building work**

Gary from Peverel advised the external re-decoration is likely to be completed before Vantage (new block E), and that the re-decoration works are timed to avoid interference in terms of dust and dirt from the Vantage build. More details will be confirmed in the summary report action point 1 b above.

**f) Why Formation selected for external re-decoration contract**

Dean advised that Formation Management Ltd were chosen for the external re-decoration works contract because apart from providing the lowest estimate, Peverel have confidence in the quality of their work at other Peverel managed properties where they are a preferred contractor, in addition they were selected as ICI Dulux partners and therefore offer a guarantee.

Following concern expressed by the committee, Dean confirmed that other than building contracts Formation management are in no way connected in terms of ownership or management with Peverel OM.

**g) ambulance / emergency access**

The committee questioned how an ambulance / emergency vehicles would access the south block now that St George had fenced off the car park to build the new block. Peverel responded that they were confident building regulations were being followed by Laing O'Rourke (subcontractors of St George, however, they would follow up on this matter.

**Action point** – Gary Humphries to ask this question of Laing O'Rourke and feedback to the committee.

**2) Communications**

**a) Peverel and RA**

Agreed need to be more regular, as a minimum letters to be acknowledged within 14 days. Committee to meet with Gary as and when required and Dean Clarke to attend meetings once a quarter.

**b) St George**

Peverel questioned why the committee chose not to meet with St George as offered for 4 October 2006. The committee explained that they did not feel it was their responsibility to liaise directly with St George regarding the running of the building site. Peverel accepted this position and explained that a Liaison Officer was to be put in place by Laing O'Rourke, however any communications / complaints relating to the building site should be made via Gary Humphries the Peverel Building Manager, [gary.humphris@virgin.net](mailto:gary.humphris@virgin.net)

### 3) **Parking**

#### a) OPC

OPC permits to allow residents to park within MCH had now been issued to all applicants. OPC had not commenced visiting the site / issuing permits as there had been some problems with the maps showing authorised parking areas.

**Action point - Gary Humphries** distributed a note to residents informing them that OPC will commence monitoring the car park / ticketing from 6 October – **Complete**

#### b) Nighthawk / St George

Southwark council permits to allow residents to park on streets surrounding MCH have now issued by St George. Should residents need to obtain / alter these permits they should contact Andrew Anderson of St George [andrew.anderson@stgeorgesl.com](mailto:andrew.anderson@stgeorgesl.com)

#### c) Additional spaces for Portacabin

The committee questioned why an additional 6 spaces had been cordoned off, on which a Portacabin had now been placed. Peverel explained that this Portacabin was for the external redecorators employed by Peverel. The committee pointed out that this was not communicated to residents appropriately before this took place. Also, given the feelings of residents against the loss of parking spaces to St George, it was seen as poor example of customer service by Peverel.

Furthermore, by removing a further 6 spaces, there was a risk that Peverel had in fact put St George in breach of their planning permission as the loss of these 6 spaces had not been authorised.

**Action point – Dean Clarke** to investigate the relocation of a Portacabin for use by external decorators.

### 4) **Floods**

#### a) reasons

Recent flood and March 06 flood due to contractors working on site. Insurance claim ongoing for recent flood. The committee expressed concern that floods were occurring regularly and that drainage pipes in place might not be the appropriate size for a residential building. Gary advised that the drainage had been professionally inspected following the February incident, including the use of CCTV and the specification of the system was sufficient.

b) Tarmac / Wetherspoons

The damage was caused by a burst water main. Gary Humphries currently looking into getting the tarmac repaired / flagstones replaced. This is a private road and not public highway, responsibility for this land lies with MCH. Potential costs for repairing this are between £12k to £35k at present stage. This amount of expenditure would not trigger a section 20 notice when carried out.

The flood was possibly caused by the road surface being pushed down by the weight of HGVs against the pipe causing it to burst. The committee expressed concern that Wetherspoons delivery lorries daily park on this stretch of road and as such felt it was not the responsibility of residents to pay for this repair.

Peveler believe it unlikely to be able to prove responsibility for this matter.

5) **Shared facilities**

The committee questioned whether residents of the Vantage tower had been granted access to the shared facilities (gym, pool, residents lounge, etc). It had previously been established that the freehold for the shared facilities was owned by Peveler. Dean Clarke informed the committee that he had found a letter from Tony Bilson (Peveler) to St George granting the Vantage residents access to these facilities.

**Action point – Dean Clarke to provide the committee with a copy of these communications.**

6) **Any other business**

Carpet replacement

As a result of the recent flood in the North block, affected carpets will be replaced through an insurance claim. An initial Section 20 notice was issued to residents in April regarding carpet replacement. A second and final notice will be issued in due course, for the remaining carpets to be replaced.