

Derby Road Fund

Committee Meeting 24 July 2019 at 7 pm Held at 3A Derby Road

Present:

Sean Mitchell (Temporary Chairman)
David Moro (Treasurer)
Paula Benham (Minutes Secretary)
Julie Mills
Simon Scaddan
Gillian Vooght

Apologies received from Jamie Harcourt, with authority given to SS re proxy vote if necessary.

The Minutes of the Committee Meeting held on 17 July 2019 had been approved and seconded.

Proposed letter and completed summary of PP questionnaire for distribution:

JM and SS had met during the week and SS had put the comments into broad themes. It was agreed that no information would go out to residents via FB. In future, JM would reply to comments regarding the DRC/DRF or PP with a standardised committee response directing posts to the DRF email address. There were 72 names on the FB page and was not a true representation of the number of residents.

It was agreed that the actual results of the poll questionnaire would be sent out as an appendix to the letter. The revised PP closure dates 1 September to 31 December 2019 would also be included, but not laminated this time. All residents would receive these dates.

It was agreed that the draft of this letter should be approved by 1 August then delivered around 9/10 August 2019. **SM**

There had been a strong response from 82 residents, representing 41%, and the statistics gave approval for the retention of the PP, but with a reduction in the number of consecutive closure days. The new list would show now mostly a one day a week closure. But we would not always coincide with GR as some days we would be open when they were closed. Under the old format there would have been 17 closures and now reduced to 13. It was felt that the households who hadn't responded possibly were more neutral to the PP, but no firm conclusions were drawn. It was felt residents would make their own conclusions from the results.

The comments received with the questionnaire fell into broad categories, these would be covered in a Q&A sheet. **SS**

- Increased or improved signage about the road closure – DM would arrange signs “Road subject to frequent closure” and would approach IL and 33 DR with a view to attaching them at either end of DR. DM suggested ordering all additional signs, ie 2 x 15 mph to go mid road, mentioned at the AGM, at the same time in order to save on carriage. Once

ordered, delivery should take about 2 weeks. It was hoped to have signs in place by 1 October 2019. **DM**

- Clarification would be given re positioning of PP: street light, turning points, speed hump, verge restrictions, visibility splay and visibility from each end of DR.
- A ramp should be provided for wheelchair/pushchair/cycle access. **DM** and **SM** would investigate a 4' wide path to the south side of the PP.
- **GV** had made final enquiries with regard to written confirmation but stressed that verbal acknowledgement had been received from all emergency services. **GV**
- **DM** confirmed that the PP had been checked by the Highways Department and a Certificate of Lawfulness issued. There was no insurance in place to cover claims to damage to vehicles using the road, speed humps or PP.
- Volunteers have been reminded of the need for punctuality with regard to the PP and contingency plans had been put in place.

PB/**██████████** and **SS** volunteered to go on the rota. **JM** said that residents could knock on her door if the PP wasn't opened on time and therefore she would appreciate a list of volunteers. Contact details would be given to all key holders together with a list of who was opening/closing and when.

All Committee members' names were on the DR web page for reference.

For the final paragraph, it was felt that neutral language should be used to say that all comments had been taken into account and the committee agreed that the statistics provided a clear mandate and pointed us to the way ahead. We fully expected pushback and a challenge.

GV mentioned that a new resident had expressed interest in joining the Committee. **PB** would ascertain his surname in order to invite him as a guest to the next meeting. **██████████** had spoken of applying to become Chairman. **JM** thought it a good idea to encourage someone onto the committee who was more critical. **SS** wondered whether we could attract a resident from **FV**, but **GV** pointed out that personal approaches had been made in the past, as well as the recent letter to all residents. Only one vacancy existed so someone would need to resign if both/all were elected on. It was agreed the Committee shouldn't become too large and unwieldy. **PB**

Any resident was entitled to observe a committee meeting but advanced notice would need to be given because of seating arrangements. Any questions in this connection could be answered via the DRF email.

It was agreed that a proposal would be put forward at next year's AGM to create a "No Cold-calling Zone" and that a 60% approval would be needed.

The main gates would be closed on August Bank Holiday Monday.

JH had suggested a street party on 14 December but it was agreed it was the wrong time of year. **GV** thought when the main gates and the PP were closed on the same day would be a good time for residents to get to know one another.

DM would write in response to queries raised by **██████████**.
SS and **JM** would visit him to discuss safety and traffic management.

DM
SS/JM

Any Other Business:

SM confirmed [REDACTED] would distribute notifications to Mander Court residents in the future.

DM stated there had been an on-going disagreement with both [REDACTED] the owner of [REDACTED] and the Management Company of FV with regard to the maintenance of the verge by the PP. They had asked us to prove this but at the time we did not have all the FV deeds, just one person's. It had been agreed that a copy of deeds for each of the different off shoots should be obtained; DM did this. However, the FV deeds do not contain the covenant of the deeds from the previous purchasers. On a number of occasions Mander Court have also asked for proof.

But referring back even further, to the 1950s and the previous owners of the whole estate, they did produce a document whereby the previous chairman, secretary and treasurer of the Committee agreed to take responsibility for the whole length of the verge for all properties facing DR. Therefore we are responsible for the upkeep of the whole verge. This includes the lime tree mentioned as causing lack of visibility for residents turning out of FV.

However, in the same document it states FV have an obligation to contribute to the DRF (currently disputed by 10 FV non payers). This fact has been confirmed to DM in writing by the previous owner's solicitors on the sale of each of the properties in FV.

It was agreed not to challenge this responsibility until such time as we had received costings for the annual upkeep of the verge, pollarding and posts. **DM**

This matter would be discussed again at the next meeting, when a decision could be made as to whether to divide this amongst the 53 residences of FV or between the 200 other residences under the DRF umbrella.

The next Committee Meeting would take place on Wednesday 2 October 2019.