

RIVERMEAD RESIDENTS' ASSOCIATION

14/3/11 ~~17/1/11~~

PRESENT:

Maria Cooke	-	Chair (Flat 108)
Gill Catchpole	-	Vice Chair (Flat 112)
Peter Walsh	-	Treasurer (Flat 2)
Nicki Puckey	-	Secretary (Flat 14)
Phil Lockett	-	Flat 90
Tim Gregory	-	Flat 19
Marilyn Ash	-	Flat 137

Also present; David and Natalie from D&B Property Management

Apologies

Tim McCormick

Right to Manage presentation/discussion:

David gave a brief overview of D&B and explained the Right to Manage procedures and how it works. The committee had received a brochure outlining the company and their recent managed properties.

MC asked why our charges (basic) are so high. David explained how service charges have been reduced at their other developments and outlined a few examples:-

1. Lighting not left on all night in communal areas
2. Commission on insurance – D&B don't accept commissions so no extra charges on premiums to residents.
3. Only use local tradesmen and contractors, thereby reducing costs ie. travel etc.

More than 50% of each building in a complex have to agree to vote for RTM. Each block is individual for voting purposes.

10% of the flats in Rivermead are Freshwater flats, which amounts to 15 flats.

In the initial contact period the flats that are privately rented would be contacted via the Land Registry so that the paperwork can be posted to the private landlords.

David explained the process of the take over. Notices would be served to all the leaseholders and then Freshwater. Freshwater would object, as this has always happened in previous proceedings.

MC asked about any charges that would be incurred to exit any agreements already set up by Freshwater with contractors with regards to the asbestos removal etc. This would depend on the contracts themselves and whether they had actually been signed or if any sub-contractors had been appointed. If contractors had been

appointed the RTM company can request other quotes to compare prices before work begins.

David also mentioned that in other RTM developments they had never had to take on any staff that were already employed, ie caretakers etc. The issue of continual employment with a new management company would depend on the actual contracts the staff were under. If the contract is with Freshwater and Freshwater lose the management contract/rights to manage Rivermead then the employment contracts would end also. However, there may be an obligation to keep employees in the new management set up. The committee were in agreement that it is beneficial to have an on-site caretaker on the premises but that costs of this should be considered.

The costs for setting up the new RTM company would approximately be £20 per year per flat. The end result of which is that the RTM company is in control of the management of the residential area residents live in and the expenditure to keep Rivermead up to a good standard.

Every leaseholder is invited to vote yes or no.

Freshwater will counter-attack with letters to the leaseholders saying that the RTM company is not a good idea etc.

David mentioned that any non or late payers of service charges are chased legally to ensure fairness to other leaseholders.

David outlined the timeline of setting up the RTM company and the steps involved:-

1. Opinions gathered from committee – 2 weeks
2. Land registry details obtained – 3 weeks
3. Submit the proposal to Freshwater in 6/7 weeks from the outset.
4. Then Freshwater will send out objections.
5. D&B would write back.
6. Freshwater would then write back to D&B with their objections.
7. Then D&B would write back to defend the objections.

Freshwater would have 2 months to hand over all the documentation regarding the management of Rivermead and the funds held from leaseholders on accounts.

The RTM company would be liable for Freshwater's costs in the process, but the Tribunal would oversee and decide on reasonable costs. Freshwater cannot put in an unreasonable figure. No costs had been asked for in previous RTM company set ups at other developments.

Phil Luckett who works for D&B Management Company would be responsible for the running of Rivermead under the RTM scheme. Therefore there would be an on-site contact for the committee to approach with queries/suggestions/complaints.

At 8.35pm David and Natalie left the meeting after being thanked by the committee for their attendance and information.

PL gave the committee a positive view/opinion of D&B Management and of David himself, assuring the committee that the process, if it was agreed upon, would be a positive one.

There followed a discussion among the committee regarding the pros and cons of setting up the RTM company and the reaction of Freshwater towards the scheme, should it be pursued.

If the RTM company was set up it would remain in the control of D&B Management for the first 2 years, after which, if the RTM company was not happy with the arrangement it would be able to seek advice elsewhere.

MC suggested asking for another presentation from D&B now that the committee had been given the full information, in order that a fair view could be obtained to present to residents to obtain their initial reaction/interest.

The next meeting is to be held on **Monday 9th May at 7.30pm in flat 90.**