



16 Blantyre Street World's End Estate London SW10 0DS Tel: (020) 7795 3095 Email: wera@worlds-end.org.uk Web: www.worlds-end.org.uk

Minutes of the WERA Annual General Meeting held on Wednesday, 26th of October 2005 at 7.30pm in the WERA Clubroom, 16 Blantyre Street

Actions

The Secretary, Jules Montero (JM), confirmed that a quorum (25 members) was present. The number of members present and able to vote was recorded as 34.

The Chair, Margaret Grayling (MG), assisted by the Secretary, Jules Montero (JM), chaired the meeting. Alasdair Manson (AM), Gary Riley (GR), Catherine Rock (CR), Alethea Dougall (AD) and Mamusu Banguru (MB) were present on behalf of the borough-wide TMO.

1. Introduction

JM welcomed everyone to the World's End Residents Association (WERA) AGM and apologised for the short delay in starting the meeting, JM then introduced himself and asked everyone else seated at the front of the meeting to do so. MG, AM, GR and CR introduced themselves to the meeting.

2. Minutes of the Previous AGM

JM asked the meeting to examine the copy of the minutes of the previous AGM that had been distributed and asked those members present at the previous AGM to consider whether they were an accurate record of what had transpired. A show of hands was called for to approve the minutes of the previous AGM. The meeting voted unanimously to approve the minutes of the previous meeting. The minutes of the previous AGM are therefore approved.

3. WERA Reports

- 3.1 MG read out the committee's Report to the meeting and then asked the floor if there were any questions. There were none.
- 3.2 JM read out the Financial Report to the meeting and then asked the floor if there were any questions. There were none.

4. New Constitution

- 4.1 JM described the background and purpose behind the drafting of the new Constitution. JM then proceeded to summarise each section in turn, clarifying any points and answering any questions as required.
- 4.2 The meeting were asked to approve the new Constitution. A show of hands was called for. There were 31 votes in favour, 0 votes against and 2 abstentions. The new Constitution has therefore been approved by more than two thirds of those present and voting at the AGM. It is now the Constitution of the World's End Residents Association (WERA).

5. Election of Committee

- JM introduced the next item on the agenda, the election of WERA officers and committee members, and then handed the meeting over to GR.
- 5.2 GR thanked the committee for its hard work and commitment since the last AGM and then proceeded to go through each of the nominations in turn. To expedite matters, a show of hands would only be called for unfavourable votes or abstentions unless these were found to be significant

in number.

- 5.3 For the position of Chair, the sole nomination was for Margaret Grayling. The nomination was seconded. Margaret Grayling was asked to make herself known to the meeting. A show of hands was called for. There were no unfavourable votes or abstentions. Margaret Grayling is therefore duly elected as WERA's Chair.
- 5.4 For the position of Secretary, the sole nomination was for Jules Montero. The nomination was seconded. Jules Montero was asked to make himself known to the meeting. A show of hands was called for. There were no unfavourable votes or abstentions. **Jules Montero is therefore duly elected as WERA's Secretary.**
- 5.5 For the position of Treasurer, the sole nomination was for John Rendall. The nomination was seconded. John Rendall was asked to make himself known to the meeting. A show of hands was called for. There were no unfavourable votes or abstentions. **John Rendall is therefore duly elected as WERA's Treasurer.**
- 5.6 GR stated that the election of officers was now complete and proceeded to the election of members of the committee.
- Joy Laven was nominated for election to the committee. The nomination was seconded. Joy Laven was asked to make herself known to the meeting. A show of hands was called for. There were no unfavourable votes or abstentions. Joy Laven is therefore duly elected to the WERA committee.
- Kaz Gasior was nominated for election to the committee. The nomination was seconded. Kaz Gasior was asked to make himself known to the meeting. It was noted that Kaz Gasior was not present. JM stated that under the WERA Constitution the meeting would decide whether the nomination was to be considered in the nominee's absence. A show of hands was called for. The meeting decided that the nomination should be considered in the nominee's absence. A show of hands on the nomination was then called for. There were no unfavourable votes or abstentions. Kaz Gasior is therefore duly elected to the WERA committee.
- 5.9 Monica Boholst was nominated for election to the committee. The nomination was seconded. Monica Boholst was asked to make herself known to the meeting. A show of hands was called for. There were no unfavourable votes or abstentions. **Monica Boholst is therefore duly elected to the WERA committee.**
- Helen Morris was nominated for election to the committee. The nomination was seconded. Helen Morris was asked to make herself known to the meeting. A show of hands was called for. There was one unfavourable vote and four abstentions. **Helen Morris is therefore duly elected to the WERA committee.**
- 5.11 Marye Kenton was nominated for election to the committee. The nomination was seconded. Marye Kenton was asked to make herself known to the meeting. A show of hands was called for. There were no unfavourable votes or abstentions. **Marye Kenton is therefore duly elected to the WERA committee.**
- 5.12 Caroline Fairchild was nominated for election to the committee. The nomination was seconded. Caroline Fairchild was asked to make herself known to the meeting. A show of hands was called for. There were no unfavourable votes or abstentions. Caroline Fairchild is therefore duly elected to the WERA committee.
- 5.13 Flora Levi was nominated for election to the committee. The nomination was seconded. Flora Levi was asked to make herself known to the meeting. A show of hands was called for. There were no unfavourable votes or abstentions. Flora Levi therefore duly elected to the WERA committee.
- 5.14 Eryl Humphrey Jones was nominated for election to the committee. The nomination was seconded. Eryl Humphrey Jones was asked to make herself known to the meeting. A show of hands was called for. There were no unfavourable votes or abstentions. Eryl Humphrey Jones is therefore duly elected to the WERA committee.
- 5.15 GR stated that these were all the nominations that had been presented. John Rendall and JM noted

that the nomination for Maggie Byrne had yet to be considered. GR stated that no such nomination was present. JM asked that the meeting consider Maggie Byrne's nomination as he could confirm that the nomination had been received within the specified deadline, but had obviously become mislaid. A show of hands was called for. The meeting decided that Maggie Byrne's nomination should be considered.

- 5.16 Maggie Byrne was nominated for election to the committee. The nomination was seconded. Maggie Byrne was asked to make herself known to the meeting. A show of hands was called for. There were no unfavourable votes or abstentions. Maggie Byrne is therefore duly elected to the WERA committee.
- 5.17 John Rendall noted that three committee members had stepped down and had decided not to stand again. John Rendall asked the meeting to thank the committee members concerned Isabel Neves, Brendan Kelly and Tim Rice for all their hard work on behalf of all residents during the previous twelve months. The meeting expressed their gratitude.
- 5.18 GR then handed the meeting over to the newly elected Chair, Margaret Grayling.
- 5.19 A member queried whether the newly elected committee met the requirements prescribed by WERA's Constitution with regards to its size. JM stated that it did; the newly elected committee was composed of twelve elected members, the Constitution prescribed a minimum of ten.

6. Subscription

- JM explained that WERA currently required members to pay an annual subscription of £1 (or 50p in the case OAPs). JM explained that many committee members felt that the subscription discouraged residents from joining WERA and that as a result WERA's collection rate was quite low as committee members often allowed residents to join without paying the fee. The subscription did not represent a significant source of income. The committee did not feel that the present situation was acceptable. JM asked that the meeting set the subscription for the coming year at £0 (i.e. free).
- Helen Morris suggested that rather than abolish the subscription that the meeting consider whether it should be made voluntary. There was some discussion. Alethea Dougall from the TMO's tenant participation department was asked to give her opinion and indicated that either was acceptable. JM noted that WERA was permitted to accept donations and that should any members wish to make a donation to WERA they would be able to do so irrespective of the subscription fee.
- 6.3 Helen Morris queried how WERA would keep track of members if they were no longer required to pay a subscription. JM explained that WERA would still keep a record of all members and that members would still be asked to renew their membership, even if they did not have to pay a subscription. Members could renew their membership at any public meeting of WERA and JM also hoped that committee members would take it upon themselves to carry out membership drives within their own blocks.
- The meeting was asked to vote on the following proposal: whether to make the subscription fee £0 (i.e. free); whether to keep the subscription at its exiting rate but voluntary; or whether the keep the subscription at its existing rate and compulsory. A show of hands was called for. The meeting decided to make the subscription fee £0 (i.e. free) for the coming year.

7. Any Other Business

MG opened the floor to questions.

Before any questions were asked JM asked the meeting to consider the security proposals for the estate, in particular those relating to the proposed installation of CCTV across the estate, and described the works proposed and the current schedule. The following opinions and issues were noted:

 That the existing system was extremely poor. Several noted extreme flaws in the current system, for example the lock to the door to Berenger Tower had been inoperative for nearly two years and there was some concern that the lift serving the mezzanine floor in Greaves Tower was a security risk.

- There was concern as to whether any new system would be properly maintained. Some noted that the Council/TMO had failed to manage or maintain the existing security system from day one and that no serious attempt had ever been made to "make it work" or maintain it properly. Others noted that the existing system was fundamentally flawed and could not be made to work in practice.
- Some felt that any system that would permit TMO staff to deal with incidents of criminal or antisocial behaviour properly would be of benefit. GR noted that the new CCTV cameras in the lifts had proved to be of use in tackling anti-social behaviour, citing a recent incident of criminal damage for which a conviction had been obtained.
- There was some concern that no CCTV cameras were to be installed in the gardens or external estate grounds (e.g. the Piazza, Blantyre Street, embankment-side gardens) despite the fact that incidents of criminal or anti-social behaviour had occurred in these areas.
- There was some concern that the security works project had been split in two. The works to install CCTV cameras were now separate from the works to install a new door-entry system and the introduction of zoning. It was felt this might result in the installation of two separate systems that might not interact with or complement each other properly.

A member noted that the TMO had missed an opportunity to improve the security of all households by omitting all leasehold properties from the recent front-door replacement worst. Another member described how there had been a complete lack of communication with leaseholders throughout the works and that he was now being asked to pay £2,500 for a new door by the installers/suppliers. AM stated that the TMO were not responsible for the replacement of leaseholder's front doors. JM noted that in previous works to tenanted properties the TMO had facilitated the replacement of the same items in leaseholder properties, citing the works to replace the cold-water tanks (for which leaseholders are responsible) as an example. JM stated that he felt it was a pity that in this particular case the TMO had decided not to do the same despite formal requests from WERA. MG noted that a copy of the letter that had apparently been sent to those leaseholders that had expressed an interest in a new front door had not been sent to WERA.

A member noted the ever-increasing problem with dogs on the estate. These could often be found running loose on the estate, fouling and causing damage, particularly in the estate's gardens. GR stated that the TMO were aware of the problem and that they hoped to make some progress in dealing with the problem with the assistance of the dog warden. GR described the TMO's recent introduction of a dog register and noted WERA's opposition to the installation of a dog toilet on the estate. A member noted that many of the dogs belonged to non-residents and that these needed to be dealt with. It was noted that the Police and PCSOs now had more powers to deal with these kinds of problems.

A resident asked when the recent problems with the communal heating and hot water supplies were to be fixed. GR stated that the maintenance engineers were working on the problem but were currently waiting for parts, which were unfortunately not available locally. It was hoped the problems would be resolved quickly.

A number of other general questions were asked. The committee and/or the TMO officers present answered these.

MG thanked everyone for attending.

The meeting then closed	
Chair	