



LANDMARK PLACE

Leaseholders' Meeting

Monday 22nd September at 6.30 pm

Venue: Foyer, Landmark Place, Churchill Way, Cardiff

Agenda

1. Apologies for absence
2. Concierge
 - a. Security
 - b. Communication
 - c. Hours of cover
3. Car Park
4. Commercial Units
5. Lease
6. Refuse
7. Resident Representation & Consultation
8. Any other Business



LANDMARK PLACE

Minutes of Leaseholders Meeting 22nd September 2003

In attendance:

Charles Lucas	Mainstay Residential	Chris Lewis	Concierge
Sarah Breeze	Mainstay Residential	Tania Martin	Concierge
Haydn Selway	Buildings Manager	Peter Williams	Concierge
David Calder	Concierge	Mr & Mrs Hall	Apt 207
Mrs Dominguez	Apt 212	Mrs Harding	Apt 31
Dr & Mrs D'Auria	Apt 156	Mr & Mrs Hopkins	Apt 59
Mr Tracey & Mr Redfuen	Apt 198	Mr & Mrs Walker	Apt 254
Mr Ashley	Apt 241	Mr & Mrs Willmott	Apt 15
M Young	Apt 223	E Jones	Apt 81
Mr & Mrs Mcinnes	Apt 9	Paddison	Apt 5
Mr Jones & Miss Latish	Apt 149	M Board	Apt 37
Mr & Mrs Hunterstone	Rep Apt 38	Mr R Thomas	Apt 151
M Llewellyn	Apt 196	Mr Davies	Apt 122
N Palser	Apt 10 & 108	R Hopkins	Castle Estates
Mr & Mrs Moore	Apt 266	Mr & Mrs Rowe	Apt 253
Dr Dev	Apt 220	Mr Greenland	Apt 105

1). Apologises:

Mr & Mrs Petre	Apt 215	Mr Brooks	Apt 259
Ms Ahmed	Apt 186	Mr & Mrs Vick	Apt 85 & 271
Mr Thompson	Apt 13	Mr & Mrs Bryant	Apt 50
Mr Lang	Apt 2		

2). Introduction

Charles Lucas introduced himself and Sarah Breeze of Mainstay Residential and the Landmark Place Concierge Team. Apologies were made for the lack of chairs.

Residents were concerned that not all of them had received a meeting invite; it was asked for anyone who did not to contact Mainstay Residential with their correct correspondence address. On investigation it would appear that Mainstay have not received notification of all completions from Palser Grossman, the details of which will be chased from them.

The presence of a St David representative at meetings was requested prior to the meeting and again during the meeting. Mainstay to advise St David.

3). Concierge

Open discussion on three main areas;

i. Security & Contractor Management

Residents feel that 24 hour security has been sold to them on a false basis as at times the desk is unmanned namely for legally required rest breaks, security patrols or when assisting residents. Residents of core 1 feel that they do not receive the same level of protection as other cores. This was referred to the developer who advised that no changes could be made and that Mainstay were to continue managing the building within restrictions. It was agreed that the concierge team would endeavour to carry out more patrols in this area. Security doors to cores 3 & 4 only working intermittently, it was explained that this malfunction is part of a contractual dispute between St David, Sir Robert McAlpine and the sub contractor Security Centres. Car park gates can be pushed open and are often propped open by contractors. It was agreed that there is scope for improvement on the existing security gates and this was to be discussed with St David. Residents felt that if answers were not provided then questions should be redirected to the Birmingham branch (Crosby).

A number of residents commented that the security systems in place were not good enough and that this was not a reflection on the Concierge Teams' performance as they were providing a good service.

It was asked whether there were any reportable security incidents – there have been no burglaries or car break-ins to our knowledge but there appear to have been some incidents where people have got into the building unnoticed.

ii. Communication and Resident Consultation

A mobile phone is to be provided to the team so that residents may contact them when patrolling the building. It was asked that the concierge be provided with a PC so that residents can correspond directly with the concierge team and to improve information sharing, Mainstay to discuss with St David.

iii. Hours of Cover

As referred earlier there are gaps in cover. Within budget levels Mainstay have endeavoured to provide some double cover on shifts. Some residents present felt that this was appropriate. To provide complete double cover would have a substantial impact on service charge levels.

Any comments on add-on services, residents would like to be undertaken by the concierge should be forwarded to Mainstay Residential.

4). Car Park

Mainstay Residential have not yet been invited to take management handover, however St David have advised that contractors are currently finishing off and will start to clean the car park from the top down. They hope to handover towards the end of October. Mainstay cannot manage the car park until this is achieved. Any one parking in your space should be reported to concierge who will assist.

Residents suggest trying to obtain voluntary vehicle registration details to aid the concierge in confirming ownership of incorrectly parked vehicles. However it was felt that this would be difficult to housekeep.

Permanent parking spaces are now in operation and residents commented that since then the situation has marginally improved. It is thought that at handover when contractors are off site that further improvement will be noticed. As a last resort clamping will be introduced.

A resident helpfully suggested a parking scheme whereby an identity tag is hung from the interior mirror easily identifying incorrectly parked cars. Mainstay to investigate this further and to also seek clarification in regard to spaces for service providers / cleaners.

5). Commercial Units

Further to the last resident meeting it has been advised that there is the possibility of a retail let for the units on Ground & 1st Floor although this is not yet confirmed.

Residents again voice their extreme disappointment with the lack of a leisure facility and swimming pool. It was decided amongst the residents that they would discuss further the possibility of taking legal counsel in regard to a claim under the Estate Agents Act. A resident commented that rather than spending extra money on increased concierge cover to utilise this money on legal counsel. Mainstay will refer to St David.

The commercial units will not be under the management of Mainstay Residential.

6). Lease

Following on from the previous meeting it was advised by Palser Grossman that there might be variances between the main lease and the sub under lease. These should have been discussed with solicitors at the point of purchase, however if any resident has a question that their solicitors are unable to answer then they are able to write to Palser Grossman.

7). Refuse

Following from the last meeting the possibility of refuse holding stores were investigated. St David advised that these are normally included at planning stage and as such there is no facility to include these in the building now.

Permanent bin stores are to be at lower level car park – exact location is to be confirmed.

8). Resident Representation & Consultation

The level of attendance at this meeting shows a good level of interest in the management of the site. Enclosed is draft specimen of Resident Association Constitution, which can be changed as needed. St David has only 2 units to sell at Landmark Place and will be shortly looking to resign as directors of Landmark Place Residential Ltd. There will then be a need to appoint new directors. There are many issues surrounding the formation of an association, which need to be discussed. Mainstay Residential are happy to act as a forum for information.

9). Any other Business

Insurance Claim – escape of water in core 1 emanated from flat 14 – this was due to a faulty ball cock to the cold water system. Residents were concerned that this may happen again. They asked Mainstay to request that St David organise a check of all systems. Apt 9 commented that their floor was still waterlogged. The insurers are currently liaising with the loss adjusters, Capita McClarens in order to ensure they manage the claim including the instruction of contractors and liaison with the leaseholders. Discussion about the level of excess is also taking place.

Window Cleaning – with the exception of communal windows this is the responsibility of the lessee. This may be something that could be put to vote by a residents association?
Comments were received regarding the lack of a builders' clean to the windows – this matter is to be referred to St David.