

Cottesmore Owners Management Company

MINUTES OF THE COMC COMMITTEE		
HELD ON:	Monday 31 st July 2023	
AT:	22, Kimball Close.	
Attendance:	Peter Welsh (13) (Chair) Jacqui Booth (22) (Secretary) Tim Seal (35) (Director) Julia Hayes (39)	Rob Mowatt (11) Barry Adams (23) Carl Booth (22) Rod and Gina Waterfield (1)
Apologies & Declarations of Interest:	James Youatt (2) Jamie and Patricia Mulvany (24)	Gary O'Shaughnessy (45) Nicki Boggis (31)

Notes: Include Proposed / Seconded where required

Issues to Discuss		
ITEM	DETAILS	ACTION
1	<p>Pete first thanked Jacqui and Carl for hosting the meeting and providing refreshments.</p> <p>Minutes of Last Meeting 20th January 2023 The minutes were accepted by the meeting. Proposed: Tim Seconded: Jacqui</p> <p>Matters arising: Loose inspection covers adjacent to numbers 1 and 3. Rod reported that all was quiet at present and that should the problem resurface, he would make contact with the council accordingly. Pete thanked Rod and stated that he would now remove the item from the agenda pending any further problems.</p>	
2	<p>Correspondence: Nothing of note reported.</p>	
3	<p>Finance: Jacqui stated that the state of our two accounts were as follows: Savings account: £7,757.80 Current account: £2,021.06 Total: £9,778.86</p> <p>There were presently five homeowners who were still to make their current service charge payments. They will shortly receive reminders which will hopefully prompt them to make their payment.</p>	

Cottesmore Owners Management Company

	<p>Concerning insurance, both the buildings and public liability insurances were due for renewal on the 27/08. We have not yet received a renewal from the brokers. Jacqui stated that if the renewals were significant, she would seek to find a better deal, otherwise we would renew with the same broker.</p> <p>Concerning a previous suggestion that we transfer our savings account to one with a better interest, Jacqui stated that this did not seem a viable option as most accounts offering this were for non-business accounts and that those that did offer to businesses required significantly more in their accounts.</p> <p>Pete thanked Jacqui for her contribution to COMC.</p>	
4	<p>Planning/ House sales Pete stated that there are presently two houses on the estate in the process of exchanging contracts. We were waiting for communications from solicitors to ensure the exchange of the Deed of Covenants.</p>	
5	<p>Website: Jacqui and Tim stated that all was up to date.</p>	
6	<p>Maintenance: There were no reports from Gary concerning the grass cutting and Rob stated that he had no issues with his strimming. Pete thanked Rob for his continued work with maintaining the estate shrubs. He also thanked Tim for his work with weed control and to Roger (no 20) for the work that he does to the shrubs adjacent to his property. Pete also thanked Rod and Gina for planting the flowers under the crab apple to just after the entrance to the estate.</p>	
7	<p>Report from any meetings attended on COMC behalf: Nothing to report.</p>	
8	<p>Any Issues to report regarding Communal Areas including apartment block: Tim stated that the apartment safety check had been completed and that all was in order. Jacqui stated that a Smart meter had now been installed in the apartment block. Pete thanked Rob for painting the front door to the apartment block. Pete stated that following an inspection of the estate footpath he had observed approximately 25 loose and/or broken paving slabs at various locations. These had been replaced/reseated by Mark Adcock at a cost of £310.</p>	
9	<p>Any Other Business: Pete reported that a suggestion had been made that homeowners that do not provide an email address and as a consequence require additional work with printing and delivering correspondence, should have an additional amount added to their service charge. This presently related to two homeowners and might shortly relate to one.</p>	

Cottesmore Owners Management Company

The matter was discussed and it was decided that unless the number increased then it seemed a disproportionate action to resolve a minor problem.

Pete stated that a homeowner had brought to the attention of COMC, the potential development of paddocks adjacent to number 2.

Pete went on to say that at this stage the matter is at the stage of what is known as a 'call for sites'. This means land that has been put forward by landowners for development in the next Rutland Local Plan.

Details of the submissions can be viewed at:

<https://rutland.opus4.co.uk/planning/localplan/maps/submissions#/x:487301/y:310215/z:5/b:31/o:9408,o:9414,o:9415,o:9416,o:9417,o:9418,o:9419>

Pete stated that he had liaised with Langham Parish Council lead on planning, Jennifer Maskell. She responded with the following:

The call for sites is the beginning of quite a lengthy process which RCC have to go through to decide which sites should be included in the emerging Local Plan. They go through a robust methodology, and it is expected that only a small number of these sites will be allocated to the Local Plan, but they have to consider each submission. At this stage Parish Councils are asked for any comments about sites in their parish about which we feel we should make RCC aware.

We will be sending our comments to RCC about all the sites, and also asking them to let us know their expected timetable of when they will be able to let us have information about the sites in Langham that they plan to accept before a final decision is made to include any in Langham in the emerging Local Plan. We will advise RCC that they should contact your residents association via you with regard to the land adjacent to Kimball Close if they were to consider including this site. As you may know we have updated the Langham Neighbourhood Plan which now runs from 2022-2041. You can access this document on the LNP website (www.langham-pc.gov.uk) and you can find a link to it on the home page. Policy SG1: Housing Allocation on p. 23 states the number of houses that Langham is expected to build, according to current RCC requirements, over the next 20 years is 51 houses. This number has already been greatly exceeded by the planning permission for two developments on Cold Overton Road amounting to 68 houses.

As I have said above we currently do not have a timetable from RCC so cannot give you any indication of when they will reach a decision on the sites, but I hope my explanation of the process is helpful.

Discussions then took place regarding the potential consequences of the information. Pete stated that he had made further contact with Langham Parish Council and the only

Cottesmore Owners Management Company

<p>www.kimballclose.co.uk</p>	<p>response that he had received to date was that Jennifer Maskell was no longer a member of the council.</p> <p>It was suggested that COMC should monitor the situation and report back on any developments.</p> <p>Proposed: Tim Seconded: Barry and agreed by all.</p> <p>Pete reported that a resident had asked him about maintenance to the leylandii hedge screening the council depot and whether the height could be reduced.</p> <p>Tim stated that he recalled that the hedge had previously been trimmed by contractors and that COMC had agreed then that this should be done every five years or so. He could not recall the cost. Pete stated that he recalled speaking to another homeowner some time ago and that they had stated that the cost was about £1200. This would probably amount to nearer £2,000 at today's rates. Rod and Gina stated that they were happy with the hedging as it presently was but wouldn't object to it being reduced.</p> <p>The matter was discussed and it was revealed that In order to carry out the maintenance contractors had to hire a cherry picker, hence the high costs. It was not known by how much the hedge had been previously reduced, or how much this affected the cost, or whether the hedge was at its full height.</p> <p>Tim stated that he would research the previous agreement made by COMC. Pete stated that as the hedge appeared in good condition, he would attempt to get a couple of quotes and report back at the next meeting.</p> <p>Proposed: Tim Seconded: Jacqui and agreed by all.</p> <p>Pete stated that he had been approached by the Canal Trust regarding the layby adjacent to Kimball Close. It would seem that the Council might be in a position to release some funds to upgrade the layby and that the Canal Trust wanted any input from us regarding this.</p> <p>Discussions took place and various options were suggested. It was the removal of the layby and rewilding the whole area that was the most popular option.</p> <p>Proposed: Tim Seconded: Barry and agreed by all.</p> <p>Pete stated that since taking over as Chair some five or so years ago the service charge had remained at £200 per annum for house owners and £320 per annum for apartment owners. He wanted to raise the matter with the meeting to see if it might be necessary to increase service charge payments to meet potential future costs.</p>	<p>PW</p> <p>TS PW</p>
-------------------------------	--	----------------------------

Cottesmore Owners Management Company

www.kimballclose.co.uk

	<p>Pete went on to say that COMC income from service charge payments was £7680 and that current fixed outgoings were £5570 leaving us potentially an annual credit of £2,110.</p> <p>The matter was discussed and the meeting agreed that the current state of finances and potential credit were sufficient to allow the service charge to remain at its present amount. It was further agreed that should significant costs alter the position, then Jacqui would raise this and the matter would be looked at again.</p> <p>Election of committee members:</p> <p>Pete stated that long time resident and current COMC director, Charlotte Stokes, is intending to leave the estate and as such is standing down as director. Though not present Pete thanked Charlotte for performing the role. He went on to say that Gary O’Shaughnessy from number 45 had offered to take on the role, as had James Youatt from number 2. Pete stated that he had thanked both for their offers and that James had stated that he was happy to stand aside for someone else. Pete went on to say that Gary was a long term resident and though not present today due to holiday was normally able to attend meetings. James however was a busy businessman and to date this had meant that he had not yet been able to attend a meeting. Pete concluded that it seemed prudent for Gary to take on the role.</p> <p>Pete stated that there were no responses/nominations to take on any of the other roles. He also confirmed that there were no late nominations from those present.</p> <p>Following brief discussion it was proposed that Gary O’Shaughnessy should take over vacant role as director.</p> <p>Proposed: Carl Seconded: Rod and agreed by all.</p> <p>Existing officers agreed that they would be happy to stay in post.</p> <p>Proposed: Barry Seconded: Gina and agreed by all.</p> <p>There were no additional matters raised by persons present.</p>	
<p>10</p>	<p>Date of next COMC Committee Meeting: 29.01.2024 7pm at 22, Kimball Close</p>	<p>All agreed</p>