

Garrison Residents Association

Date: 18 November 2024, 7.30pm start

Venue: Hinguar Primary School

Present:

Committee members: C Marshall, C Coomber, P Melville, D Beech

SGMCL directors: R Spence, J Hunnibal, J Brooks

Fowler & Spencely: R Fowler

Cllr J McMahon

East Beach Residents Association: L Willcox, S Horrigan

Plus c. 40 neighbours

Welcome & introductions	<p>C Marshall welcomed all to the meeting and thanks all for attendance on another cold wet evening.</p> <p>Joined at the front by P Melville (acting secretary of the GRA), R Fowler, C Coomber (treasurer of the GRA), R Fowler (F&S) and Cllr J McMahon</p>
Apologies for absence	<p>P Dewey, N Kenney, D Munsey, D Puddick, (GRA committee members)</p> <p>D Garrun (Ranger – Gunner’s Park), C Bonner SGMCL, PCSO J Twidell, P Lovett (Shoeburyness RA)</p> <p>All apologies accepted.</p>
Approve the minutes of the AGM 27/11/23	<p>Minutes were previously published and shared on the GRA website.</p> <p>Minutes were approved by members present.</p>
Chairs Report	<p>CM gave his annual report.</p> <p>Over the last few years, the Garrison has been the focus of significant attention in respect of controversial development plans. During this time the GRA has held regular meetings to consider the social and environmental implications of these plans and working with the SGMCL have made representations to the developers and councillors to reflect the views and considerations of the GRA residents.</p> <p><u>Our managing agents</u>, Fowler Spencely, have ensured that the Garrison site and infrastructure continue, within budgetary constraints, and where possible improved.</p>

	<p>Additionally, the managing agents have provided an intimate dialogue with Southend City Council regarding those areas within the Garrison which remain the responsibility of the council, which include areas such as the Cricket Ground and its buildings, the Tennis Courts, Coastal Path and many of the trees which line the Garrison roads.</p> <p>Site Inspections are attempted to be made each quarter, involving representatives from SGMCL, GRA and the Managing Agents. This allows us to highlight areas of concern that may require some specific maintenance and repair. Examples of this include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timber posts around Gunners Rise, SGMCL has decided to replace like for like • Clock Tower: Estimates have been obtained for the maintenance of the clock hands and faces • Road safety markings to pinch point junctions <p>There has also been discussion relating to the establishment of a Voluntary Maintenance Group, who may undertake minor repair functions.</p> <p>As within previous years the members of the committee have engaged with our local councillors on several issues concern, which have potential for significant impact on the Garrison. These included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The possible introduction of parking charges to the Cart & Wagon Shed car park. • Security Gates to Bar Pier Car Park • Building Developments at the Barge Pier & Cantel Sites • Allocation of bins to the Gunners Park area. • Festival activities on East Beach • Toilet Facilities on East Beach • Use of BBQs in Gunners Park and East Beach • Cricket Pavilion renovation maintaining the buildings character and appearance, and removal conifers to the rear of the Pavilion which has improved road safety at this junction. <p><u>Development Matters</u> <u>Barge Pier – Belway Development</u></p> <p>In CM's report last year, he highlighted the representations that were made to the Council with respect to the Bellway original planning proposal.</p>
--	--

	<p>There has since been a request made by Belway Homes which reflects our original flood risk concerns as the developer has now identified the need to make significant changes to the original proposal.</p> <p>Flood Risk Assessment guidance is a little complicated – it is based on geography, type and vulnerability. When considering land for new homes, it is essential that flood risk is not just assessed for the present risk, but also considers the impacts climate change will have.</p> <p>As the area concern fall under an Environment Agency assessment of Flood Zones</p> <p>A site-specific flood risk assessment should be provided for all development in Flood Zones 1,2 and 3 (medium or high risk of fluvial or tidal flooding) should have an assessment accompanying all proposals involving: sites of 1 hectare or more; land which has been identified by the Environment Agency as having critical drainage problems; land identified in a strategic flood risk assessment as being at increased flood risk in future; or land that may be subject to other sources of flooding, where its development would introduce a more vulnerable use.</p> <p>SCC has failed to provide updated surveys and to provide data relating to flood events and status, since 1992.</p> <p>It appears that no studies have been made to update flood status, nor to take account of relevant evidence. SBC has been negligent in fulfilling a legal obligation.</p> <p>The application does not comply with Guidance set out in the National Framework for Water Resources which states “We will maintain and enhance existing robust planning policies that direct new development away from areas at risk of flooding and help ensure that new properties and infrastructure are resilient to flooding and coastal erosion.</p> <p>These issues have not been adequately addressed, notwithstanding the major environmental impact of moving 40,000 x 40-ton trucks of make-up material to bolster flood risk stability.</p> <p>Regulations require the sampling of soils, must be taken in accordance with the sampling and analysis plan. The scheduling of chemical analyses on samples of soils and waters collected from a programme of site investigation will refer to the Sampling</p>
--	---

and Analysis Plan (itself informed by the Initial Conceptual Site Model) as well as the observations from the site investigation itself.

Chemical analyses should be carried out at laboratories appropriately equipped (with staff and resources) and accredited (e.g. by UKAS) to carry out the analyses being scheduled. The impact that this development will have to the local area in general, and more significantly to the homes in its proximity cannot be over stressed. I would urge the committee to remain vigilant and continue a dialogue with our councillors to answer questions of concern.

Cantel – Taylor Wimpey

The GRA and the SGMCL are currently qualifying a boundary dispute relative to accessibility onto the Garrison. The Fence line through West Gate and accessibility to the Marketing Suite are under discussion with SCC

SGMCL

The functions of the SGMCL as guardians of the Garrison giving direction to the activities of the Managing Agents, within the confines of the Memorandum and Articles of Association (Mem & Arts) of **Shoebury Garrison Management Limited**, will now allow the Garrison Residents Association to have a more engaged and focussed approach to developing the social fabric of the Garrison community.

The Directors of the **SGMCL** can only be drawn from owner stakeholders of the Garrison residents.

There are a significant number of rented properties on the Garrison reflecting the diverse nature of residents. The **GRA** supports the interest of all residents and as such provides access and a voice to the **SGMCL** and the Managing agents, in additions to local councillors.

The GRA has no legal or management powers, and it is important to understand its purpose is to enhance the social fabric of this community whilst reflecting residents' views and activities that may impact on security, safety, welfare and environmental concerns.

I am sure the committee, would like to extend they're thanks to Pam Dewey who as Secretary, worked tirelessly with the GRA and managing agents to ensure the Garrison is, and remains to be, a great place to live.

Treasurers Report	<p>CC gave his update.</p> <p>Although the GRA remains still solvent if we are to fund ongoing costs - web fees, for instance, campaigns or celebrations, further funding will be required either by member contributions or sponsorship. The incoming committee will need to identify three signatories for the Santander account or consider placing all funds in the PayPal account.</p> <p>Balance at the end of September 2024 is £185.</p> <p>Members noted CC's report and thanked him for his efforts.</p>
Fowler Spencely	<p>R Fowler gave a verbal update:</p> <p>Control of the SGMCL (referred to as Company) was passed to the leasehold and freehold owners of the Garrison 18 months or so ago and its board members are now owners on the Garrison as opposed to it sitting with the developer.</p> <p>The Company is in essence a non-trading Company. The money collected towards the Estate and Service Charges is money held on trust on behalf of the contributors and is used to meet the cost of providing the various services on site.</p> <p>The scope of those services is set out within the individual freehold titles and, in the case of the leasehold properties, reflected in the leases. In short, those obligations include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintenance and upkeep of those roads not adopted by the local authority, which include Chapel Road, Horseshoe Crescent, Warrior Square, the Terraces and the majority of the North camp area. It does not include for example Magazine Road, Gunners Rise, Boundary way and Ashes Road • Maintenance and provision of street lighting on the unadopted roads • Landscaping of the communal grounds, but excluding the parkland, the cricket pitch and verges to the adopted roads, which fall to the Council. It does however include the grassed areas in the midst of Gunners Rise.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintenance of the common areas to various of the leasehold blocks, excluding those where the freehold has been acquired by the leaseholders. • Collect service and estate charge funds and hold the same in a client account, to be spent in respect of the provision of the services mentioned. <p>The Board meet regularly to look at how best to provide these services and how to effectively manage the funds held. Later this month the Board will be looking at the budget for 2025, taking into account a number of initiatives as well as the regular, day to day expenses associated with the Garrison.</p> <p>In particular these will include the following higher profile projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lighting improvements – upgraded to LED some years ago however technology moves on and we can now get larger trays and heads to enable more powerful lamps to be used. Looking to trial an upgrade in a couple of locations where concerns have been raised, in particular Mess Road and Warrior Square Road. • Respecifying and retendering of the gardening services • A review of the Estate Covenants and regulations, where there is some flexibility for change and would propose we sit down with the GRA in the new year to look at these and see how best they can reflect the requirements of the Garrison and its residents. <p>Second half year Estate Charge invoices were recently issued. This was delayed to allow for the account reconciliations for the years up to and including December 2022 to be included. Along with the invoices recipients would have received individual certificates for each year and the majority would have received an overall credit due to an underspend against budget, which was offset against the current period charges.</p> <p>Full, printed copies of each of these accounts were not included, however are available as a download from FSPM's website. If anyone wishes them to be emailed to them or provided in hardcopy then please contact FSPM directly.</p> <p>FSPM's accounts team are finalising the accounts for the year ending 31st December 2023, which are also likely to show an</p>
--	---

	<p>underspend against budget. The intention is to have these available to circulate with the new year invoices. Moving forwards, the intention is to issue the accounts within 6 months of the year end, along with the second half year invoice.</p> <p>So far as the day-to-day matters go, it's been another busy year.</p> <p>Inspections –we have continued to maintain a program of regular inspections on the Garrison, the aim to identify repairs and housekeeping issues in the early stages and ensure they are dealt with as quickly as possible. That's not to say that residents shouldn't contact us directly if they see issues affecting the communal spaces. We also used these visits as an opportunity to meet with residents who have raised particular issues, and also to meet with and monitor the performance of contractors engaged on your behalf. We will continue this practice in 2025 and as such if you do have any issue or concerns then please contact us.</p> <p>Landscaping – we are continuing to work closely with the landscapers and have undertaken regular inspections of the landscaped areas accompanied by their senior management and, on occasion, with a representative of the GRA Committee. These visits are followed up with appropriate action plans.</p> <p>The annual arboricultural survey took place a little while ago and an application was made to the local authority for approval under TPO legislation. As you are perhaps aware many of the Garrison trees are the subject of Preservation Orders requiring Local Authority approval before any work may be undertaken, this may well include those within certain of the private gardens on the Garrison and we would remind all residents to check this before undertaking any tree work.</p> <p>We have the sweeping of the unadopted roads and clearance of the gulleys booked in for the 9th and 10th December. We will be putting up the usual notices to remind residents.</p> <p>Major works projects – The redecoration and associated external repairs to four apartment blocks in Horseshoe Crescent and Chapel Road remains, unfortunately, ongoing. This is not a project that FSPM are managing in house, having brought in a firm of building surveyors who specified, tendered and are overseeing the works. Unfortunately, the contractors appointed to undertake the works did a poor job and the overseeing of the works by the Surveyors has been inadequate. New contractors have been appointed and the works are being completed at the expense of the Surveyors. We are meeting with their Managing Director over the next few days following which it is hoped there will be a clear</p>
--	---

	<p>timeline for conclusion of these works and a schedule of all outstanding elements agreed.</p> <p>In addition, FSPM are presently looking at external redecoration of the 6 marionettes above the garages in Horseshoe Crescent.</p> <p>General - Throughout the year we have received a good number of queries from individual residents which we have worked to deal with in a timely and, hopefully helpful fashion; such issues have included advice on neighbour disputes, noise complaints, planning issues, property sales, insurance matters as well as building repairs. Our responses have, when and where necessary, involved us communicating with external agencies including the Land Registry and various departments of Southend City Council.</p> <p>Parking Control – The SGMCL and FSPM had been asked to consider options by the GRA, who it is understood have over the years received a number of complaints from residents, as indeed have FSPM. This was discussed briefly at last year’s AGM as the minutes reflect. The proposal put forward for consideration was a simple scheme for certain roads only to mirror that adopted by the local authority elsewhere in Shoebury and Southend, namely an hour prohibition on parking that would effectively put a block on commuter parking around the Garrison.</p> <p>Dispensation would be granted to disabled residents and contractors working on properties and the scheme would have been introduced at no cost to residents. A sensible suggestion was made by the GRA that before any scheme was put to residents for consideration that a Health and Safety review should be commissioned to ascertain what legal obligations, if indeed any, the SGMCL was bound to consider. Consultants Watson Wild & Baker (WWB) were instructed and an inspection was carried out on the 12th September 2024.</p> <p>Their view was that the primary legislation that would apply will be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Occupiers Liability Act 1957 – deals with the duties that controllers of land have in respect of visitors • Highways Act 1980 – particularly relevant to vehicles obstructing footways • Road Traffic Act 1988 – relevance with loading and unloading on highway • Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order 2005 -relevant in respect of obstructions preventing fire services access the site
--	---

	<p>Overall assessment by WWB was that parking areas appeared to be adequately illuminated and that parking and access road surfaces were in good condition. They noted that the smallest width between parked cars at the time of the survey was 4m, which is within the threshold advised for the minimum width for safe access for firefighting services.</p> <p>Overall, they were of the opinion that the current parking arrangements posed no immediate safety risk. As such it would seem that there is no legal requirement by SGMCL to introduce parking control. It is therefore really down to whether the residents wish to see some form of control implemented, perhaps on specific roads only.</p> <p>SGMCL will be discussing the findings of the report with the GRA and considering further whether parking management is required and if so, what the available options are. It is however stressed that it remains the case that no form of parking control will be introduced without first undergoing a full consultation with residents.</p>
Neighbour questions	<p>Parking – this was discussed at length following the report by R Fowler. At this point R Spence and J Hunnibal contributed to the discussions.</p> <p>Concerns were raised that parking restrictions (street by street) would sneak in despite promises of consultation.</p> <p>The Chair raised a number of concerns throughout the discussion – emergency vehicle access, blind spots on the corners of named roads, parking concerns stemming from the Wetsuit outlet.</p> <p>Unable to consider at the meeting which of the issues raised during the discussion was the primary issue that parking restriction sought to address, neighbours requested a broader community consultation, to 1) fully understand the concerns of residents in these roads. 2) consider in full, the impact and effectiveness possible solutions to the problem(s) would have for residents in those specific roads and also the Garrison neighbourhood.</p> <p>Neighbours views were divided. Some favoured parking permits. Some questioned whether parking permits was the appropriate solution to the issue(s) - white or yellow lines, signage, corner</p>

	<p>barriers, conversations with the wetsuit outlet as alternative options were posed.</p> <p>Neighbours noted that parking permit restrictions had been considered before and had been rejected. Neighbours were not clear why it was being discussed again.</p> <p>Taylor Wimpey development – Q: will neighbours in this development contribute to service charges to F&S. A: It was confirmed as no.</p> <p>Magazine Road – comments were raised on the condition of the road. As this is an adopted road, this should be directed to the Council not F&S.</p> <p>Community safety – was raised by P Melville following recent events by the skateboard park and phone mugging. Unfortunately the PCSO was unable to attend and PM explained he would raise with the new committee and PCSO in due course.</p>
Election of the Committee	<p>PM introduced the process and explained there were nine nominations for the nine positions on the committee.</p> <p>CM asked that each prospective committee member should continue the good work that has been done by previous committee members. To enable residents to make a considered approval of those new members all were asked to provide a very brief introduction to themselves, expressing their desire to enhance our valued environment.</p> <p>CM added that it is important to remember that the committee members should reflect the views of the Garrison as a whole. The membership is currently drawn from the 9 “Wards” of the Garrison which include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Properties to the North of Boundary War and Ashes Road 2. Gunners Rise East 3. Gunners Rise West 4. Magazine Road, Terraces & Magazine Mews 5. Mess Road, Parade Walk & Outlook Apartments 6. North Camp, Hospital Road & Chesterman. 7. Horseshoe Crescent 8. Chapel Road & Brigadier Way 9. Chapel Road, New Garrison Road & St Georges

	<p>To ensure full inclusivity it is important that membership fully supports these areas, offering resident a voice through their respective representative.</p> <p>As this was CM's last meeting as Chair, he thanked the current committee members for the support they have given, and wish the new committee members good luck in their future endeavours,</p> <p>Neighbours discussed the idea of geographic nominees moving forward and also noted L Melville & P Melville were both nominated. All within the constitution though the new committee may wish to review these points moving forwards.</p> <p>New committee members appointed:</p> <p>D Beech N Boxcer A Gorman R Mistry L Melville P Melville A Powell K Taha C Walker</p>
Changes to the constitution	<p>The two changes proposed were accepted. These were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Permitting the AGM to be held within three months of the end of the August. • Permitting the constitution to be revised at an EGM as well as an AGM. <p>Further discussion held on the geographical residency of committee members and minimising the number of votes per household.</p> <p>It was suggested that the incoming committee may wish to review this.</p>
Notice of forthcoming events	<p>CC reminded neighbours of the forthcoming Carols event on 8 December, advertised on Facebook.</p> <p>Thanks to R Spence for his leadership in organising this important community event.</p>

	Raising money for Little Havens and generously supported by the Salvation Army and the Shoeburyness Hotel (refreshments).
	Meeting ended 9.30pm

Date of next AGM to be set by the new Committee.