

## **Meeting between Barking Reach Residents Association And BRL**

**9 May 2018, at BRL offices, Fielders Crescent, Barking, 7pm.**

**Minutes agreed as amended by BRL 31/5/18**

**Present:** Matt Carpen, Project Director at BRL, Pete Mason, Chair; Nuno Amorim, Secretary; Venilia Amorim, Treasurer of the Barking Reach Residents Association

### **Minutes of previous meeting**

Amendments were proposed to the minutes of the previous meeting and agreed.

### **1. Service Charge**

This was the main discussion. Matt Carpen said BRL has made a general request to Pinnacle to be aware of the queries they are getting, in order to be clear on the nature and history of the queries and their outcome. BRL is in the process of contract review with Pinnacle. Matt stated that Pinnacle would meet with individuals only, not groups.

The Association stated that, as agreed at the last residents' meeting on 25 April, the Association had written to Pinnacle's Priya Rawal, Head of Residential Management Services at Pinnacle Places, on 1 May, requesting that she attends the next residents association meeting on the 23 May, to present some examples of how the service charge is calculated, but have not had the courtesy of a reply.

The Association stated that we are being put in the situation where we are considering sending a final, simple request to Priya Rawal to see the accounts on behalf of the Residents Association. Should we not get a response this time, we will propose to the next meeting that we push the issue to a tribunal.

The Chair quoted the advice of the Association of Residential Managing Agents (ARMA) which states that "By law, landlords must 'recognise' and consult with residents associations. If a landlord is refusing the request, leaseholders have the legal right to ask a tribunal to grant them the status of a 'recognised tenants association' ... under the landlord and tenant act 1985, section 29." The Chair, quoted further that "If recognition is granted... [the secretary can] ...inspect accounts and receipts in relation to service charges."

The Association added that there were other issues which we doubted the legality of and, if Pinnacle didn't start dealing directly with the residents association on these issues, despite many requests and attempts to find a non-confrontational route, Pinnacle would force us down the road of taking legal advice.

We reported that our treasurer has written as a representative of a group of residents and as an individual but again no response.

The Association stated explicitly that we want Pinnacle to discuss directly with the Residents Association on the issue of the service charge.

### **2. Road works on Thames Road**

BRRA presented Matt with the proposals for improvements as agreed at the Residents Association meeting on 25 April 2018 and sent to Rachel Groves, Louis Chau of BRL and the councillors (see

minutes of meeting). In respect of two-way traffic on Thames Road from Marine Drive regulated by lights at the Renwick Road junction with Thames Road, this would stop traffic heading south, which would then build up considerably and so might not be an option.

Matt stressed that the road works are the responsibility of Thames Water. He will convene a meeting with TfL and Thames Water to go over residents' concerns. The Association highlighted the proposal from the Residents Association meeting on 25 April 2018 that representatives from the two residents associations meet with BRL, TfL and Thames Water. Matt will look at this.

Matt highlighted the meeting on 24 May of the Thames View tenants and residents association which will be attended by BRL.

### **3. Parking**

The Association reaffirmed it is pleased to see the planning application for more parking spaces going through the council, but is concerned that the public consultation period seems to be extended through the entire period until 6 June. Matt explained that this is a statutory consultation period that the council must follow. Anyone can make a representation until the council makes its decision. The council can however decide not to consider representations outside of the statutory consultation period. In most cases the council will make efforts to report all comments that are received in good time of the decision. That BRL were ready to begin implementing as soon as the decision is made.

The Association asked if there had been any clarification on weekend parking with respect to the single yellow lines and reemphasised that the ending time of 7pm weekdays for the restrictions will be onerous for residents returning from work earlier than that. The Association would hope that the council will respect the submissions which emphasize the need to address this, and proposed 5:30pm instead of 7pm and no restrictions at the weekend. Matt will look into this.

### **4. Community Interest Company (CIC)**

While the project of updating the CIC does not have to be completed until the end of the year, Matt recognises that the matter is pressing and views early summer as a date to share proposals, but has nothing in writing yet. The discussion examined the role of the CIC.

The Association recognised the need for expertise in the running of the CIC, but that nevertheless such expertise should be subject to the decision of the CIC board of directors. The Association further reiterated its adherence to the view, as agreed unanimously at its March meeting, that elected residents have a clear majority on the board of directors of the CIC.

The Secretary, Nuno Amorim, emphasised that the Mace paperwork distributed to residents on the purchase of their properties says that the CIC will oversee the management of the estate and that the management of the company will be undertaken by members of the community. The association takes the view that therefore the CIC should have oversight over the actions of Pinnacle.

### **5. Link Parking**

The association requested feedback on the issues raised in the previous meeting as minuted. Matt said that he had appointed Pat Lee to BRL and had asked Pat to pick this up. He has asked him to get in touch with the Association.

### **6. Heating**

The Association asked for an update on the issues raised previously as minuted. Matt said that much work had gone on behind the scenes and he would ask the landlord to update us. As with Pinnacle, the Association expressed the concern that correspondence from the association was being ignored and reiterated the legal rights of the association as stated above.