



Minutes

Meeting: Annual General Meeting of Ruskin Court Residents Limited
Date: Monday 15th May 2023 at 6pm
Location: St Johns Church Hall, Church Hill, Knutsford, Cheshire WA16 6DH

In Attendance: XB AS
RB JS
GP VW – Chair person
SL DB
VL SS – joined via video link
MS Emma Bonham-Grant (EBG) - Domain
JM

Item No.	Description	Responsible Person
	Apologies VG (Valerie Gunner) of number 34 and proxy vote was given to the chair person. SM (Susan McNaughton) of number 36 and proxy vote was given to the chair person.	
1.	To receive and accept the Minutes for the last Annual General Meeting These were accepted as a true and accurate records of the discussions had.	
2.	To Appoint Accountants to the Company Morton Baxter Associates Limited were re-appointed as Accountants to the Company from the conclusion of this meeting, until the conclusion of the next Annual General Meeting, and authorised the Directors to fix their remuneration.	
3.	To Appoint Directors to the Company Mr Gary William Purcell and Miss Vanessa Louise Williams, as the longest standing Directors are up for rotation and will be standing for re election. A vote via show of hands was made with 4 votes in the room voting in favour of Gary’s re election and no additional proxy votes. There were 4 votes via show of hands voting against his re election and an additional 2 proxy votes. Therefore, by majority vote Gary was not re-elected as a director at the meeting. A vote via show of hands was made with 4 votes in the room voting in favour of Vanessa’s re election and 2 additional proxy votes. There were no votes via show of hands voting against her re election and no additional proxy votes. Therefore, by majority vote Vanessa was re-elected as a director at the meeting. EBG explained that there had been no further nominations prior to the meeting for the role of Director.	
4.	Any Other Business Tree A comment has been made prior to the meeting regarding the tree bordering Mere Court and Ruskin Court and how it is a nuisance all year round. EBG explained that the Directors received 3	Tree surgeon

	<p>quotes to remove or pollard the tree again and they have made a decision to go ahead with a quote to remove it. However we are awaiting consent from the council and for the nesting season to end before works take place.</p> <p>MS asked why the tree was being removed entirely as it would be a shame given how little trees they have onsite. EBG explained that this was the decision of the board of Directors.</p> <p>XB explained that the original query regarding the tree came from Mere Court and they stated the tree was a health and safety hazard. The tree is leaning into the foot path and causing a risk of falling branches and making the paving uneven. Pollarding the tree is quite a harsh action and given that it has been done before it could kill the tree anyway at the same cost of removing it.</p> <p>JS mentioned that VG would prefer to preserve trees but in this instance she has a lot of good reasons to want it removed and suggested that MS speaks to her if she needs further clarification.</p> <p>Car in the parking area</p> <p>A comment has been made prior to the meeting regarding a car with flat tyres still occupying a space outside the flats that has been there for many years without moving.</p> <p>The car belongs to GP who confirmed that the tyres are no longer flat. EBG explained that the issue is spaces in the parking area and if everyone kept 3 vehicles onsite then very few people would be able to park. The parking policy that was drawn up previously states only one vehicle per property and spaces to be utilized for regular use only. EBG suggested this is discussed at the next Directors to decide if they wish to continue adhering to that policy.</p> <p>Post boxes</p> <p>MS mentioned that she is still receiving everyone's post from the post man and having to distribute it to each postbox. EBG explained that the Directors have explored a few options to remedy this, such as a digi lock on the front door or a key safe but we need to make sure that any option installed can be used by Royal Mail. EBG has tried a few times to get in contact with Knutsford sorting office to no avail but will keep trying.</p> <p>Fire Safety Report</p> <p>VL asked how we progress the items mentioned on the fire risk assessment and the fire door survey. EBG explained that we have now received 3 quotes for the emergency lighting and Directors have asked questions which we await answers to. We are also awaiting a further quote for the works to the internal doors.</p> <p>VL was concerned about the insurance situation should an owner refuse to upgrade their flat door as per the recommendations in the door survey. EBG stated that to date the insurance companies are not asking any questions about doors prior to placing insurance. The Management Company cannot insure something that does not fall within its responsibility ie a flat door that belongs to an owner. However, it does have a responsibility to inform the owner of their obligations to each other and to the law. As such we have had the door survey completed and sent it out to all owners asking that they make the changes needed.</p> <p>SL mentioned that when the assessor measured the doors for the survey he measured them in different places so they were not assessed the same. The spy holes were also mentioned in the report with some being compliant and some not. EBG suggested there would be good reason for that and the assessor is trained and insured to make correct judgement.</p> <p>VL asked to break down the list of items that need carrying out into those that are a legal requirement and must be carried out now vs those that are recommended. EBG suggested that everything is completed over time because these items are now recorded and known to Ruskin Court. SS mentioned that the report records each item using a traffic light system as follows: Red = must be done right away. Orange = some action must be taken but within 6 months. Green = needs to be looked at and agreed / disagreed. It might also be ongoing actions.</p> <p>Signage</p> <p>AS suggested revaluating the signage onsite for each area especially the signage towards the bottom maisonettes as he has experienced difficulty with deliveries and taxi's finding them. The signage is not big enough or in the correct area. EBG suggested this is discussed at the next Directors meeting.</p>	<p>to complete when consent is received.</p> <p>Directors to discuss.</p> <p>EBG to resolve.</p> <p>EBG & Directors to resolve.</p> <p>Directors to discuss.</p>
	<p>With no further business to discuss, the meeting was closed at 7pm.</p>	