

MINUTES OF THE ELMER SANDS LTD
GENERAL MEETING CALLED BY 5% MEMBERS
AND THE 84TH ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING
HELD AT 2.30PM ON SATURDAY 23rd April 2022
THE JUBILEE HALL, MIDDLETON-ON-SEA

75 people were recorded as present.

In attendance: The Directors – Peter Trebble, Alan Newton, Paula Puleston, John Kirby, Jan Young, the Company Secretary Kim Edden and the Treasurer Judith Bradford.

Peter Trebble in the Chair.

Before the Meeting commenced, Member Pamela Godfrey addressed the Chairman to enquire whether his property was on the market for sale and expressed her views on how this might impact on his suitability to chair the meeting. The Chairman shared that he was not moving from the Estate and in his opinion the enquiry had no relevance to his chairing of the meeting.

The Chairman went on to welcome everyone to the Meeting with a brief reminder that the ESL Directors were volunteers nominated by the Members to act on their behalf. He explained that in February 5% of the Membership had called for a General Meeting (GM) which would have had to be scheduled for mid-March. However, due to the close timing with the Company's Annual General Meeting (AGM) and to minimise inconvenience for Members, the 5% had agreed to hold the GM immediately before the AGM.

Member Kim Anderson asked for the names of the 5% who had called the meeting and the Chairman explained that this would be addressed following the next item.

Validity of the Proxy Forms Submitted by Members

Before the vote on the proxy vote question the Chair was asked several times how many Section B votes he held. Each time he declined to answer as he didn't want the answer to influence voting in the room. After the vote he revealed that he held 17 proxy votes.

Member David Fletcher addressed the Members, first noting that he was a lawyer and former ESL Director, during which time he had written and updated many of the Company's formal documents. He presented his concerns regarding the Council's use of an amended version of the proxy format set out in the Company's Articles of Association. He made specific reference to the wording within the Articles for the submission of a proxy vote i.e. "must be in the following form" .

The Chairman explained to Members why the Council had decided to amend the Proxy form for this particular set of combined meetings. Only 30% of members had replied to a questionnaire issued to members in 2019 and a similar number of votes were received to proposals issued in writing arising at the 2021 AGM. The format of the proxy form issued by ESL for 2022 was intended to obtain the opinions of more members on the issues being voted upon.

Mr Fletcher showed examples of the two versions of the forms highlighting that the amended version offered the option for Members to give their proxy votes to the 'Chairman' which he felt was totally unacceptable.

It was then acknowledged that Mr Fletcher and Mrs Godfrey had been given proxy votes on behalf of a number of members and subsequently prepared and submitted a batch of proxy forms to ESL in the format stated in the Articles.

Mr Fletcher strongly recommended that only the forms that he had produced should be accepted by the Meeting and that the form produced by ESL should not, because in his opinion it was in breach of the Company's Articles. However, because all those who had filled in Section C had spent time thinking about the issues set out in the boxes and completed them in good faith, he proposed that only Section B of the ESL form should be annulled because there is nothing in the ESL Articles which allows the Chair to seek votes to do with as he wishes. He went on to stress that he had contacted ESL in advance of the meetings requesting that, if the Council refused to withdraw its form, he would expect a legal opinion be obtained.

The Chairman told the Members that the Company Solicitor had been unable to give opinion either way and subsequently passed the query to a company law specialist who had also been unable to offer an opinion either way but recommended that it would not be advisable to seek Counsel opinion given what was at stake.

There followed a lengthy discussion and debate regarding the use of the two different proxy forms submitted, with contributions from individual Members expressing their concerns. A number of attempts were made to formulate a specific proposal to settle the matter.

In conclusion, Member Kim Anderson urged those present to acknowledge that absent Members had submitted their proxy forms in good faith and therefore all the forms should be accepted for the purposes of the combined meetings only.

Proposed by Kim Anderson, Seconded by Linda Smith and the motion was carried by a majority.

Member Christopher Cooper abstained from the vote.

THE GENERAL MEETING called by 5% Members

Director Alan Newton read out a request received in advance from Members Jacqui and Paul Cross who wished to know the names of the 5% who had called the General Meeting. It was noted that the individuals had not wanted their names published with the notice of the meeting. Mr Newton read out the names to those present.

Mr Fletcher who was one of the 5%, noted the wording used by ESL in documents circulated with the notice of the General Meeting, quoting ESL's reference to the 5% as "individuals with grievances". Mr Fletcher felt this use of words did not create harmony on the Estate.

The Chairman explained the agenda noting that the full details of the proposals had been previously circulated to Members with the Notice of the Meeting. He confirmed the requirement for a minimum 75% majority vote to pass a Special Resolution and 50% for an Ordinary Resolution. He went on to say that every proposal would require a proposer and seconder and that each should clearly state their name.

PowerPoint slides containing the detail of the following proposals were displayed to those present at the Meeting.

1: Special Resolution –. Members' proposal under a new Article 12B setting out the circumstances when a GM can be held by electronic means

Mr Fletcher stated that in his opinion the Zoom AGM held in 2021 was invalid because (following legal advice given by the ESL sourced solicitor) it was held under Section 360A Companies Act 2006 which allows meetings to be held electronically provided members can speak and vote at the meeting. As votes were held after the meeting the AGM was invalid. He also stated that the Council's proposed wording ('impracticable or impossible') was too vague and that the wording needed to be much tighter ('unsafe or unlawful because of a pandemic, epidemic or other health emergency'). The Chairman confirmed that the legal opinion obtained by the Council had been that a meeting via Zoom was valid because it was not excluded as an option in the Articles.

On behalf of the 5% Members, Mr Fletcher spoke for the proposal to include specifics on ballot paper votes.

The Chairman stated that the Council agreed with both elements of the Members' proposal in principle but believed that they were better recorded in the appropriate areas of the Articles and therefore recommended the alternative proposal 1A.

1A: Special Resolution – Alternative ESL Council proposed amended para 10 and new para 26D.

Members were asked to vote on both proposals and the votes were counted including those by proxy.

Special Resolution 1 – proposed by David Fletcher, seconded by Jo Latus

Result – not carried (Votes - For 41, Against 28)

Special Resolution 1A – proposed by Peter Trebble, seconded by Paula Puleston

Result – not carried (Votes - For 45, Against 26)

2. Special Resolution – Members’ proposal new Article 9B restricting the Council powers to deal with land transfers.

Mr Fletcher explained the rationale behind the Members’ proposal referring to a recent case on the Estate where the ESL Council had been in discussion with a property owner regarding a potential land transfer to settle a discrepancy between the Land Registry and ordnance survey boundaries. Mr Fletcher advised that neither Land Registry plans (under the General Boundary Rule to be found in S60 Land Registration Act 2002) nor Ordnance Survey Maps could be used to determine legal property boundaries. He expressed his view that the case in question highlighted the risk that an ESL Council could sell off land in error, and he then noted that ESL had requested that the property owner pay for a valuation of the land for transfer.

The Chairman responded to Mr Fletcher to clarify that prior to the valuation, both parties had agreed that the existing physical boundary was in the correct position, therefore any transaction to transfer the land would have been administrative.

Some discussion followed with contributions from the floor including that it appeared that the circumstances of the event triggering this proposal would have been acceptable to Mr Fletcher i.e. the existing physical boundaries were not disputed, it was only the Land Registry records that did not reflect the correct position.

The Chairman concluded that the Council was in agreement with the wording proposed for Special Resolution 2 but that it considered this would be properly positioned at 30A. He therefore recommended the ESL Council’s alternative proposal 2A. Mr Fletcher agreed that he was happy with the alternative location.

2A: Special Resolution – Alternative ESL Council proposed same wording but at Article 30A.

Since the Council was in agreement with the wording of proposal 2, placed at 30A, Mr Fletcher representing the 5% Members agreed that proposal 2 could be withdrawn.

Special Resolution 2 – withdrawn.

Special Resolution 2A – proposed by David Fletcher, seconded by Bob Miller

Result – carried (Votes - For All, Against None)

3: Special Resolution – Members’ proposal New Article 44A Member Surgeries.

Mr Fletcher spoke for the proposal and explained that the inclusion of the Article was intended to establish habits for the Directors to provide ‘Surgeries’ at least six times per year offering face to face discussion for Members and he stressed that the wording was for the Council to “use its best efforts”.

The Chairman explained that the Council did not support this amendment to the Articles because it would impose an additional demand on Directors free time. He went on to say that the current Council Members had been providing informal sessions for Members in ‘The Cabin’ for a number of months with minimal attendance from Members.

Directors Jan Young, Alan Newton and John Kirby confirmed that they had been giving up regular Saturday mornings to run the sessions with very low attendance from Members (nil to two) illustrating the interest from Members for this provision.

A discussion followed with contributions from the floor. Member Jo Latus expressed the view that holding surgeries had the potential to put Directors in a vulnerable position and that there was already a mechanism in place to have queries answered via the ESL Secretary.

The Chairman reiterated that all queries from Members could be submitted to the Registered Office for circulation to the Directors and that Members could request a discussion with Directors at any time.

Member Fae Howard said that in her experience she had not received satisfactory responses from the Council when submitting queries via the Registered Office. The Chairman reminded Fae as an example, that the Council had responded to her request for surface water improvements and had installed a new drain outside her property.

Members were asked to vote on proposal 3 and the votes were counted including those by proxy.

Special Resolution 3 – proposed by David Fletcher, seconded by Bob Miller

Result – not carried (Votes - For 21, Against 27)

4. Special Resolution 4 –. The proposed amended Article 6A and new 6B would give the Council the power to charge owners of some AirBnB properties a higher subscription.

Mr Fletcher proposed amending Article 6A by taking out the number ten and allowing the Council to charge a subscription based on the number of guests that can be housed in a property. He also proposed a new Article 6B because it is not clear that Article 6A covers AirBnB properties. The new 6B would allow the Council to charge AirBnB properties a higher subscription.

The Chairman stated that the ESL Council did not support the proposed amendment to the Articles because the provision for the Council to set the subscription charge and for guests of Members to utilise facilities was already included in Article 6A and some of the new wording could restrict the powers that the Council already had.

In response to a query from a Member, the Secretary confirmed that, with the exception of the Care Home in Alleyne Way and the Manor Court bungalow complex which were subject to separate historical formal agreements, all properties on the Estate were currently charged the same Membership Management Fee of £160 per annum.

The Secretary and Directors noted to Members that there were difficulties posed in making distinctions between letting scenarios for calculating fees and ensuring records were kept current, fair and consistent.

A discussion and debate took place with further contributions from the floor.

A Member reported that an Airbnb business in Manor Way claimed that the property was a primary private residence when the evidence clearly showed it was a full-time business premises. Some further discussion took place regarding some specifics of this case.

The Chairman concluded that the general message from the Members present was for the ESL Council to look more closely at the holiday let situation on the Estate and he stated that a discussion would be tabled for a future Council meeting. He then asked Members to vote on Special Resolution 4 and the votes were counted including those by proxy.

Special Resolution 4 – proposed by David Fletcher, seconded by Bob Miller

Result – not carried (Votes - For 34, Against 32)

5. Special Resolution – Members’ proposal new Article 5A.

Mr Fletcher spoke for the proposal and its intention to make clearer the mandatory obligation for every member of Elmer Sands Limited to abide by the Company Articles of Association and members’ Code of Conduct. He further noted that historically not all Members had signed up to this agreement.

The Chairman responded with the Council position that this was an unnecessary addition since Members already signed up to this agreement when applying for Membership.

Members were then asked to vote on proposal 5 and the votes were counted including those by proxy.

Special Resolution 5 – proposed by David Fletcher, seconded by Bob Miller

Result – not carried (Votes - For 30, Against 37)

6. Special Resolution – Members’ Proposal amended Article 14.

Mr Fletcher spoke for the proposal to allow tenants of Members to take part in social events and activities.

The Chairman responded with the Council position that this was an unnecessary amendment to Article 14 since Article 6 already included this provision for tenants, visitors and guests.

Members were then asked to vote on proposal 6 and the votes were counted including those by proxy.

Special Resolution 6 – proposed by David Fletcher, seconded by Bob Miller

Result – not carried (Votes - For 23, Against 47)

7. Ordinary Resolution – Members’ proposal to install 5 x 75mm high speed humps at a cost of £6,792 Including VAT).

The full details of this proposal from 5% Members, including costs and photographic illustrations had been circulated to all Members with the Notice of the General Meeting.

Mr Fletcher spoke for the proposal in some detail. He advised those present that there had been an increase to the costs of the speed humps since the General Meeting papers were circulated to Members. He stated that the new figure for 5 x 75mm high speed humps would be £8,520.00 and he added with some frustration

that if the Council had accepted the proposal when it was first submitted, it would have been cheaper. He stressed that in his view safety was a high priority ahead of spending on security huts and barriers.

Mr Fletcher expressed perceptions of the lack of safety in specific areas around the Estate describing the southern end of Elm Drive as a 'blind' corner, highlighting incidents of speeding and confusion over the conflicting speed restriction signage the Council had installed. Director of Maintenance Jan Young explained that she had purchased stock signage displaying a 10mph speed restriction and the road marking was a maximum of 15 mph. The Chairman referred to the technical expertise of Member Gordon Young who advised that speed humps should be kept to a minimum of 20 metres away from a junction.

Mr Fletcher went on to talk about Sea Way and his serious concerns about the danger of vehicles speeding next to the Toddlers' Playground gate. He also challenged the Council on its failure to maintain the two humps in The Layne that had now worn down over time and there was some discussion and debate about a trial of staggered rubber humps, that due to complaints from Members had ultimately resulted in removal.

Member Gerry Easter said that he had carried out his own thorough research on speed restriction measures concluding that 'chicane' systems were the only effective systems but were not suitable for the Elmer Sands Estate roads.

Member Linda Smith contributed that during her term as an ESL Director she had organised routine road and speed hump surveys with on the ground assessments for e.g. mobility scooter users followed by a programme of regular maintenance and improvements which she believed to be the standard practice of the ESL Council to the present day.

Mr Fletcher moved on to question the validity of the Sanderson Report commissioned by the ESL Council in 2021 for three reasons:-

- 1) It was commissioned during lockdown.
- 2) The figures were split into different speed groups. When added together the results show that:-
 - In Elm Drive 52% of all vehicles exceeded the speed limit
 - In the Layne 25.4% of all vehicles exceeded the speed limit
 - Near the children's playground (ie on the corner of Sea Way/Manor Way) 46.5% of all vehicles exceeded the speed limit.
- 3) The Report did not show maximum speeds recorded.

He also informed the GM that two cats had already been run over and killed on the Estate although the Chairman added that it was disputed as to whether excessive speed was the cause for these deaths.

.

Mr Fletcher argued that the results of the Report did in fact support the need for more speed humps on the Estate and he went into specifics about Elm Drive, The Layne and Sea Way. Mr Fletcher appealed to Members to consider the personal

impact of speeding on the Estate and he quoted from the Parliament Select Committee Report that at a speed of 20mph, one out of ten pedestrians was likely to die after being hit by a car. He went on to graphically describe injuries sustained and the fatalities of two beloved pets and then warned that this could have been a child.

The Chairman responded with a summary of the Council's position confirming that the independent specialist Report, available for Members to read, had concluded that the ATC survey results advised some minor recommendations for Elm Drive for which some adjustments had already been made. He further confirmed the Report had concluded that the other seven roads within the Estate were acceptable for the prevailing circumstances and no further measures or interventions were believed necessary. The recommendation being that 20mph was an acceptable maximum speed on an estate of our type and that existing measures brought sufficient numbers of vehicles to within this speed.

The Chairman also displayed slides setting out the Council position including information from the Highway Code which put the emphasis on the responsibility of road users. He stressed that not everyone would comply with the Code and he pointed out that the advisable 15mph signage on the Estate was not enforceable and was intended to encourage drivers to travel at a reduced speed from the standard 30mph.

The Chairman then advised those present that only 30% of ESL Members had replied to the ESL Council's 2019 Questionnaire, of which 21% voted for more speed humps, only representing 5.5% of the Estate membership in favour.

Members were given an opportunity to share a variety of opinions and debate continued for some time. The general agreement amongst those who contributed was that whatever measures the Estate put in place some drivers would continue to speed regardless.

Member Chris Cooper passionately aired his views about dangerous driving and asked for a strong item on speeding be included in the next Estate Community Newsletter which was noted by the Secretary.

The Chairman advised the Members that the primary vote was whether ESL Members wanted 5 x 75mm speed humps installed on the Estate roads and they were asked to vote on proposal 7 and votes were counted including those by proxy.

Ordinary Resolution 7. Proposed by David Fletcher, Seconded by Bob Miller

Result – not carried. (Votes - For 23, Against 57)

8. Ordinary Resolution – Members' proposal to commission two larger road signs similar to that displayed on the verge of 35 The Layne, one for each entrance to the Estate.

The Chairman explained that the proposed signs in question were 'hedgehog' designs by a resident.

Mr Fletcher pointed out that ESL had separated the request in error and that it was intended to form part of the speed hump restriction proposal. Therefore, on behalf of the 5% Members this proposal was withdrawn.

There being no further business of the General Meeting, the Chairman thanked everyone for their contributions and diligence and announced a 10-minute break before convening the business of the Annual General Meeting.

THE 84TH ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING

In attendance: The Directors – Peter Trebble, Alan Newton, Paula Puleston, John Kirby, Jan Young, the Secretary and the Treasurer.

Peter Trebble in the Chair.

Item 1: Welcome and Apologies

The Chairman opened the meeting. Apologies were received from:

Dr Ken Morris, Michelle & Mervyn Weston, Shirley Brown, Cilla Matcham, Colin & Michelle Bernhardt, Graeme Mansfield, Jacqui & Paul Cross, Jane Harvey, Chris & Dr Paul Ashley, Debbie Brierly, Rick Hughes.

The Chairman conducted the following business:

The Chairman noted that all Members had been given the opportunity to read the Minutes and Accounts.

Item 2: To Accept the Minutes of the Annual General Meeting held on 27th April 2019

Proposed by Gordon Young, Seconded by Sandra Trebble

Approved.

Item 3: To Accept the Minutes of the Annual General Meeting held on 24th April 2021

Proposed by Jo Latus, Seconded by Gordon Young

Approved.

Item 4: To Receive the Accounts of the Company for the year to 31st December 2019

Proposed by Sandra Trebble, Seconded by Jo Latus

Approved.

For the year to 31st December 2020

Proposed by Sandra Trebble, Seconded by Adam Latus

Approved.

For the year to 31st December 2021

Proposed by Sandra Trebble, Seconded by Jo Latus

Approved.

Item 5: To Appoint PKR Accounting Techniques as Accountants to the Company

Proposed by Adam Latus, Seconded by Linda Smith

Approved.

Item 6: To Elect a Maximum of Eleven Council Members from those nominated prior to 26th March 2022 in accordance with Articles 37-40 and to announce the election results

The Chairman thanked all the Council Members for their voluntary services to the Estate and then set out the retirement and election position, noting that the Council could operate with a minimum of five, and maximum of fifteen Directors and that a third of the Council retired by rotation annually.

Retiring Council Members: Dr Ken Morris, Shirley Brown, Cilla Matcham and Jan Young.

The Chairman explained that Dr Morris who had been co-opted onto the Council, was moving away so unable to stand for election as hoped. He went on to thank Dr Morris for his valued service to ESL.

The Chairman then praised the services of Shirley Brown and Cilla Matcham and said that they had both been stalwarts representing the older regime. He added

that they and their families had contributed to the Estate over many years and he paid particular tribute to the late Geoff Matcham.

The Chairman extended his thanks to Jan Young who he said had been key to the successful management of grounds maintenance on the Estate for many years and would be stepping back into a vacant Director position following the election of new candidates.

Director Jan Young then read out a personal note from retiring Director Shirley Brown to those present. (Appendix I).

The new candidates for election were: Julius Allcard, Colin Bernhardt, Michelle Bernhardt, Andy Cooper, Pamela Godfrey, John Kirby (co-opted 2019), Myra Miller, April Moffat, Ruth Rogers and Tim Wright.

The Chairman invited the candidates who were present to briefly stand and introduce themselves to the Members.

The Chairman explained that since there were enough places for all the new candidates to be elected, if the Members agreed it would be simplest to elect them 'en-bloc'.

Proposed by Gerry Easter, Seconded by Kim Anderson

Unanimously Agreed.

Member Claire Godwin addressed the new Board of Directors cordially reminding everyone that they must work for Elmer Sands as a whole and not for their own benefit or own agendas and she asked for her comments to be recorded in the Minutes.

Item 7: Elmer Sands Events and Social Club (ESESC) Proposals:

The Chairman explained that there were three proposals to consider and that the supporting documents from ESL and ESESC for all proposals had been delivered to Members in advance of the Meeting. In addition, those present were shown slides containing summaries of all the relevant detail as reference for discussion.

Ordinary Resolution 1 – ESESC proposal that this General Meeting approves the use of ESL Land (the Playing Field / Kiosk) and facilities (electricity, water access) for the ESESC events planned for 2022.

Ordinary Resolution 2 - ESESC proposal that this General Meeting approves a subsidy of £1,500 for the ESESC Events planned for the 2022.

Ordinary Resolution 3 - ESL Council proposal that no further funding be given to ESESC or that ESL land be used to hold events until revised Constitution and

Protocol documents are published to ESL members using a written proposal on which a vote can be taken.

The Chairman invited an ESESC representative to speak for the Club.

ESESC Chairman, Pamela Godfrey addressed the Members, giving an overview of the Club's commitment to community social events and thanking those who had given up their time and considerable expertise to put on the events to date. She briefly explained some of the logistics and costs involved for the main summer Fete and Fiesta event in 2021, noting that the majority of the revenue had been collected by the Club on the day.

Mrs Godfrey informed Members that unfortunately due to the delay in any agreement from ESL on funding, there would be insufficient time to secure services for another July Fete as hoped. Member Adam Latus suggested that if the Club had the support, it should be possible to arrange an event for the August Bank Holiday. Mrs Godfrey then referred to the information ESL had circulated to Members conflicting with the ESESC proposals, and she expressed the Club's keenness to move forward in a positive and amicable way and forge a good working relationship with the ESL Council.

The ESL Chairman responded to Mrs Godfrey agreeing that it made sense to promote a good working relationship between ESL and ESESC. He went on to clarify that the ESL Council represented the Members' interests and made decisions based on what they believed the majority of members would want. He stated it was the Council's belief that Members would not want to spend large sums of money on social events and as such, since ESL had already contributed a start-up fund of £5,000 to the Club in 2021, its further bid for a top up fund of £2,600 in Autumn 2021 had been rejected. He summarised that when the Council had considered its budget for 2022 it had allocated a £500 social events fund and the ESESC were invited to apply for.

Members contributed to a discussion expressing their differing views on how social events had historically and locally been delivered to the community with a number of examples and suggestions regarding finance and funding.

ESESC Committee Member Bob Miller explained that the Club had originally set out to fill a gap they had highlighted from the ESL 2019 questionnaire responses, putting on an event, the profit from which was intended for the next event. He also said he felt ESL had put a "negative spin" on what was a happy and fun event for members and their families.

Discussions led to a main point of query regarding the ESESC objective to provide events for the wider community which sparked some intense exchanges with varying views on whether events funded by the ESL Membership should be shared wider than the friends and family of Elmer Sands residents. The discussions did not reach any definite conclusion and ESESC Chairman Mrs Godfrey maintained that the

Club's Protocol was very clear regarding selling tickets to Members, their families and friends as well as long term residents (ie tenants of Members).

The Chairman then highlighted concerns that the Council had raised on receipt of the ESESC Constitution and Protocol documents in February and he noted that the most recent Protocol document circulated to residents had contained a change regarding the use of the Playing Field which, if supported, had no restriction on dates of use which was not acceptable to the ESL Council. Bob Miller responded pointing out that three or four events a year had only ever been suggested to ESL. In addition, the Council was unable to agree to the suggested automatic membership of ESL Members to ESESC as an application process would be required.

The Chairman expressed the Council's concerns about the original ESESC Constitution and Mrs Godfrey explained that a revised version was being prepared. The Chairman then stressed that the Council was not saying no to events but that it had a duty to ensure that the Club's Constitution was appropriately revised before there was any agreement for use of Company land or funding future events.

With this in mind and following a proposal from the floor, discussion from the floor concluded that without the applicable revision in place, the Meeting was unable to vote on any of the three Ordinary Resolution Proposals. It was then generally agreed that since representatives from ESESC were about to become ESL Directors, it would be logical to take social events back to Council and work on future proposals and discuss the return of remaining ESESC funds. The result being that all three proposals were withdrawn.

Before the item drew to a close, The ESL Secretary made the point that it was very important to acknowledge all the different groups of volunteers who had laid on social events for the Estate over recent years and that the individuals involved were very much appreciated for their positive contribution to the community.

Item 8: Security Provisions, Manor Way and The Layne Entrances

The Chairman gave an overview of the ESL security provision immediately following the 2020 pandemic 'lockdown' and during an unexpected heatwave. He went on to explain some of the logistics involved, including a great deal of voluntary input at weekends including the regular setting up of gazebos and signage.

Discussion then took place with questions and contributions from the floor.

The Chairman clarified that following an assessment of 2020 and consultation with the Security contractor, the consequential security provision put in place for 2021 was the purchase of security barriers (£4,723), hire of guard welfare huts (£1,212) and Guarding (£4,199). He went on to say that taking on factors e.g. the lack of good weather in 2021, the underuse of the huts and the increase in yellow line management along the Elmer Road, the Council had revised its plans for 2022 and these were then displayed on the screen.

ESL Council Proposals for 2022

- Manor Way entrance only to be guarded on weekends during the summer but requirements to be monitored as weeks progress;
- Barriers to be put back in place during the summer months;
- A gazebo to be sited at the Manor Way entrance for the summer period.

In response to a query from the floor, the Secretary confirmed that the cost for one Guard on the Manor Way entrance was £16 per hour.

Item 9: Questions from Members Previously Submitted in Writing:

The Secretary confirmed that Member Bob Harvey had withdrawn his proposal previously submitted and that he was absent from the meeting.

The Secretary relayed a view submitted by a Member expressing her concerns about the size of recent developments on the Estate, in particular the height of 8 Manor Way and the issue of badly managed materials and the waste at some locations.

The Secretary confirmed that prior to the Meeting and in response to a number of queries from Members, she had contacted the owner of 8 Manor Way who had provided reassurances that the building conformed to the planning permission given and its height did not exceed that of the previous property. A diagram was then displayed on the screen showing the new build inside the volume of the old building.

Item 10: Any Other Business

The Chairman asked if there were any additional items that Members wished to raise.

Member Yvonne Fletcher expressed her grave concerns at the damaging misuse of Facebook within the Elmer Sands community. A general discussion then followed with various contributions from the floor. The Chairman reported that there were a number of community groups on the Estate and locally. He went on to note that the group set up and managed by Member Sandra Trebble was a private closed group for Estate residents and the posts were closely monitored with any personal or improper posts swiftly removed. Mrs Trebble confirmed that administering the group took her an average of two hours a day.

Member Pamela Godfrey suggested that ESL consider an official Facebook group for the Estate. The Secretary noted this for discussion at a future Council Meeting.

Retiring Director Jan Young who had decided to take up a vacant space on the Council extending her length of service, read out a personal statement she had prepared for the Meeting. She referred to enjoyment in her primary role managing

grounds maintenance and also her involvement with parking, security and social events but she noted with sadness the detrimental effect that constant criticism from certain individuals had had on her personal life. She closed by saying that she hoped there was a lovely summer ahead for everyone to enjoy Elmer Sands to the fullest and she reminded Members about the Platinum Jubilee Picnic event planned for the 5th June on the Playing Field.

There being no further business The Chairman sincerely thanked everyone for their attendance and the Meeting closed at 6.20pm.