

Sunningdale Park Residents' Operating Committee Meeting

Date: Thursday 24th September 2026

Time: 16:00 – 18:00pm UK

Location: Private Dining Room, Northcote House, Sunningdale Park

ATTENDEES:

Stefano Elia	Chair
Richard Snook	Vice Chair, Dairy Rep.
Sarah Beckitt	Felstead Co-Rep.
Oeschka Hefer	Scholars Row Co-Rep.
Anthony Hooey	Steuart House Co-Rep.
Iyad Omari	Felstead Co-Rep.
Katharine Wilson	Steuart House Co-Rep.
Jenifer Chaffey	Holly Hill Drive Rep.
Charlotte Herring	Gardeners Cottages Rep.
Julien Renaud	Walled Garden Rep.
Sam Forth	Encore Estate Mgmt.
Simon Gwynn	Encore Estate Mgmt.
Ellie Freeman	Berkeley Estate Mgmt.

WITH APOLOGIES:

Diana Tren	Scholars Row Co-Rep.
Harry Wilkinson	Mackenzie Court Rep.

ABSENT:

AGENDA ITEMS:

#	CATEGORY	TOPIC	TABLED BY
1	General	Review of Estate Mgmt. Performance & Next St...	All
2	General	Presentation on Encore Proposed Service Impro...	Simon G.
3	General	Update on actions from last time	All
4	General	Review of CCTV & Proposed Changes	Iyad O., All
5	General	Landscaping Update	All
6	General	Update on Estate Signage Proposal	Ellie F.
7	General	Update on Concierge & Keyholding Service	Iyad O., Katharine W.
8	Felstead	Update on Replanting of Trees	Iyad O., Sam F.
9	Walled Garden	Health of Plants	Julien R.
10	AOB		

MEETING MINUTES:

1. Review of Estate Mgmt. Performance & Next Steps	• Stefano E. opened the meeting with a discussion between ROC members and Berkeley, before Encore joined to present its proposed service improvements (agenda item #2). • Ellie F. thanked members for the feedback submitted following the August ROC meeting. She explained that Berkeley had initially raised the concerns with Encore's regional management but considered the response and proposed actions inadequate. The matter was subsequently escalated to Encore's senior group management, including its CEO. • Following that escalation, Encore had produced an improvement plan, performance reporting and proposals for additional on-site support. Ellie F. confirmed that Berkeley had already been raising concerns about service delivery following the change in personnel, and that the ROC's feedback reinforced the need for further action. • Stefano E. expressed concern that escalation to group level had been necessary to secure an appropriate response. Ellie F. acknowledged this and confirmed that Berkeley was also addressing the management and behavioural changes required within the regional team. • Charlotte H. highlighted the effect of staff turnover and poor handovers on continuity. She supported giving Encore a reasonable opportunity to improve, recognising that changing managing agents would not itself guarantee a better service. • Ellie F. explained that Berkeley would review performance with Sam F. through weekly calls and fortnightly meetings. Numerical reporting and a written action plan would be shared with the ROC monthly, supported by weekly site inspections by an additional estate manager, Chloe. • Berkeley has agreed three KPIs with Encore and has given them 30 days to ensure that 100% of open issues had an assigned target date; Ellie F. recalled that the current figure was approximately 19%. Multiple ROC members stressed that Places data alone would not demonstrate satisfactory performance where items had previously been closed without being resolved. Ellie F. said site checks would verify completion. • Ellie F. referred to a three-month improvement period and said Berkeley would consider retendering the management contract if sufficient progress was not demonstrated. She also referred to the end of November. Iyad O. highlighted the need for a precise timetable, noting that three months from this meeting would fall over Christmas, and suggested a dedicated review meeting in January 2027. • Action: Ellie F. to confirm the improvement period and a fixed review date with the ROC, together with the timetable for monthly reports. No specific review meeting date was agreed at this meeting.
---	--

2. Presentation on Proposed Service Improvements

- Simon G. introduced himself as Encore's Regional Director and confirmed that he would personally lead the improvement programme and provide closer oversight of the estate management team.
- Encore would issue an action plan covering wider estate matters, with owners and deadlines, alongside performance data showing the number and status of maintenance issues, their age, overdue items and completed actions. Members reiterated that they also required visibility of the individual outstanding communal issues.
- Chloe would review Places requests daily and attend the estate weekly from the following week. Her role would include checking reported faults, verify completed repairs and inspecting contractors' work. Simon G. confirmed that repairs should only be closed once Encore had checked that they had been completed satisfactorily.
- Sam F. would continue his more detailed monthly site assessments, alongside the concierge's daily checks. Weekly visits would also provide an opportunity to meet the concierge and follow up matters identified on site.
- Oeschka H. raised inconsistent answers received through different communication channels. Simon G. said having the same experienced estate manager handle requests and inspect the issues should improve consistency and follow-through.
- Anthony H., Katharine W. and lyad O. repeated the request for a simple communal issues schedule, showing what had been reported, its priority, action owner, progress and expected completion date. Members stressed that residents should not have to make duplicate reports or rely on WhatsApp groups to establish whether a problem was already being addressed.
- Simon G. agreed to review how Places could provide updates to everyone in the affected building or area when a communal issue was reported or progressed. Personal matters and complaints about individuals would need to remain separate from these wider updates.
- Members distinguished between monthly performance reporting and prompt updates on individual repairs. Simon G. confirmed that monthly reporting was acceptable. Stefano E. requested that reports for discussion at ROC meetings be provided a week beforehand, allowing members time to review them.
- lyad O. asked which changes were already in place. Simon G. confirmed that the reporting arrangements and management changes had begun, but Chloe had only just returned from maternity leave and had not yet started the new weekly inspections.

	- Julien R. highlighted inconsistent response times across the Encore documents and questioned whether changing target dates could conceal overdue actions. Simon G. explained that practical requirements, such as scaffolding or parts, could affect completion dates and should be communicated. Stefano E. requested a clear distinction between any revised target completion dates and the original / target service standard against which performance was measured. Action: Simon G. and Sam F. to provide monthly performance reporting and visibility of outstanding communal issues, with meeting papers circulated a week before ROC meetings. Action: Simon G. to confirm the arrangements for building or area-wide updates on communal issues and review the consistency of the stated response times and treatment of revised target dates. Action: Stefano E. to collate further ROC feedback on the improvement documents and send it to Berkeley and Encore for review.
3. Update on actions from last time	Scholars Row road access - Ellie F. had raised the potential widening of the road entrance or bell mouth with Berkeley's technical team. Plans for the final three townhouses at the sales-suite location were still being finalised, so she could not yet confirm whether or how the road could be amended. Action: Ellie F. to report back once the technical team can confirm the proposals and any opportunity to improve access. Audley boundary tree - Sam F. had contacted Audley about the tree of concern near Scholars Row. Audley had not supplied its previous inspection report but advised that another inspection was due next year and requested the precise tree location so it could be included. An on-site review to identify the tree was discussed; its condition remained unresolved. Action: Sam F. to follow up with Audley on the specific tree and the inspection arrangements. Short-term letting and TP1 enforcement - Sam F. confirmed that the relevant TP1 provisions had been reviewed and a letter sent advising against short-term letting and explaining the impact on neighbours. He said there was insufficient evidence at present to take further action. The previous action to review the position and issue correspondence was therefore treated as completed. - Charlotte H. asked how a short-term let should be defined where a tenancy intended to be long-term ended shortly after it began. Oeschka H. suggested that if any utility bills are not transferred to the name of the tenant, that is a signal that it's a short term let.

	Estate replanting proposal - SJM had supplied a more detailed proposal identifying areas for replanting across the estate shortly before the meeting. Sam F. and Berkeley had not yet completed their review. Members requested circulation so area representatives could comment on priorities and suitability before decisions were made. - Ellie F. supported using the proposal as a working document with the ROC to examine the recommendations, costs and questions to be put back to SJM. Action: Ellie F. and Sam F. to circulate SJM's proposal for ROC feedback and further discussion.
4. Review of CCTV & Proposed Changes	- Iyad O. raised the response to the reported security incident at Mackenzie Court and the wider question of how the estate's CCTV supports security. - Sam F. explained that the CCTV contractor had been asked to attend following a police request. Its normal attendance lead time was three to five days. The files initially supplied could not be played and further exchanges were required before usable MP4 files were obtained, approximately three weeks later. Sam F. confirmed that he had checked that the files worked and sent them to the police; no investigation outcome had been received. - Stefano E. noted that the circulated CCTV document referred to immediate police access but did not explain how that would be delivered in practice. Encore distinguished between viewing footage on site and obtaining an exported copy. - Sam F. said the concierges could review footage, but training was still required on exporting and supplying it. The second permanent concierge had started that day, allowing training to be arranged for both staff. Access outside concierge working hours remained a limitation. - Sarah B. asked for residents to receive a factual update on the steps taken following a security incident, including confirmation that footage had been supplied to the police. Iyad O. also highlighted the need to distinguish accurately between a reported attempted break-in and a confirmed burglary. - Simon G. agreed to review what information could appropriately be shared with residents. He acknowledged the value of reassurance and maintaining a record of incidents, even where Encore was not informed of the police investigation's outcome. - Iyad O. questioned whether CCTV was being used effectively to identify relevant activity. He suggested that the concierge could review overnight events highlighted by the system, rather than watch hours of footage. Simon G. agreed to assess whether the installed system supported this and whether it could be incorporated into the concierge's routine. No additional security contract or continuous monitoring service was agreed.

	- Stefano E. requested the camera-location and viewing-angle diagram previously produced by Berkeley, alongside the screenshots already supplied. Ellie F. confirmed that installation at Larch Court was continuing in stages: Core 3 cameras were in place, Core 2 installation was starting, and Core 1 would follow. Action: Sam F. to arrange CCTV training for both concierges and clarify the practical process for police viewing requests and footage exports, including access outside concierge hours. Action: Simon G. to review resident updates following security incidents and assess whether event-based CCTV review can form part of the concierge's duties. Action: Sam F. to share the camera-location and coverage diagram alongside the available camera views, reflecting the installation status confirmed by Berkeley.
5. Landscaping Update	- Sam F. acknowledged that SJM's performance remained below the expected standard. Following earlier discussions, Berkeley and Encore had undertaken a further site walk with SJM that day to address missed areas and clarify how delivery would be measured. - The proposed approach was to set clear service frequencies and standards for tasks such as grass cutting, hedge trimming, bed maintenance, weed removal and leaf clearance. SJM would remain responsible for organising sufficient resources to deliver the agreed work. The examples discussed, including fortnightly grass cutting, were illustrative and still required confirmation in the revised schedule. - Chloe's weekly inspections would check the results against the specification and record failures for follow-up. Members stressed that the number of hours spent on site, or photographs showing attendance, did not demonstrate that the contracted work had been completed. - SJM had agreed to provide a short monthly update explaining work completed, supported by photographs, and the priorities for the following month. Members wanted clearer visibility of seasonal work and any changes caused by weather conditions. - Sarah B. asked about a longer-term planting approach, including dividing and moving established plants to fill gaps and reduce repeated replacement costs. Sam F. said this had been discussed with SJM and was expected to be considered as part of the winter maintenance programme but would be raised again. - Members also asked about aeration, scarification, feeding and weed treatment. Encore said seasonal timings had been incorporated into the circulated specification. Sam F. explained that hard ground and dormant grass had affected the timing of some treatments and said lawn weed treatment had started that week. - Stefano E. reported that a resident had found an SJM employee in their private garden charging a phone without prior permission. Sam F. agreed that this was unacceptable and should be raised with SJM's management.

	• Action: Sam F. to obtain and circulate the revised service schedule from SJM, with clear task frequencies and standards, and arrange the monthly progress updates. • Action: Sam F. to clarify the seasonal treatment programme and the proposed division and relocation of existing plants with SJM. • Action: Sam F. to raise the reported unauthorised use of a resident's garden and electricity with SJM management.
6. Update on Estate Signage Proposal	• Ellie F. brought a sample of the proposed wood-effect posts for the wayfinding signs and invited members' feedback on the material and finish. • Berkeley would fund the three wayfinding signs. The signs near the Walled Garden/Linnet Drive and on Madeira Walk could proceed once the works order was raised. The Crimson Avenue/Scholars Row sign would follow later to avoid overcrowding the area while marketing signage remained in place. • Ellie F. also confirmed that revised road signs could be progressed and offered to circulate the draft designs. Berkeley's proposed wording was 'privately maintained roads.' • Stefano E., Iyad O., Oeschka H. and other members preferred clearer 'private road' wording where appropriate. They felt that identifying who maintained a road did not explain the access restrictions and highlighted continuing problems with vehicles and pedestrians entering residential areas. • Action: Ellie F. to progress the Berkeley-funded wayfinding signs, circulate the updated designs and revisit the road-sign wording and access distinctions with Berkeley's team.
7. Update on Concierge & Keyholding Service	• Members welcomed the additional information on the concierge role but requested clearer, practical guidance on the keyholding service. Questions included how keys were stored and identified, who could access them, how residents authorised collection and how keys were signed in and out. • Sarah B. described uncertainty following an explanation of the Ark process and asked for a simple written guide or diagram that residents could follow. Members also wanted clear document ownership, issue dates and version control so they could identify the current guidance. • Sam F. said standard operating procedures formed part of the concierge's training material and agreed to review the process and any further training required. Simon G. supported providing a resident-facing explanation alongside the operational instructions used by staff. • Sam F. explained that residents should be able to download Ark, create an account and request access to the estate, with the concierge approving the account. Any registration difficulties should be raised with the concierge or Sam F. He also agreed to review the information already circulated.

	• Sarah B. requested documents in a format that remained legible when printed, noting that some of the circulated information was too small to read comfortably. • lyad O. asked whether the concierge call button on the Felstead entry panel could be activated, allowing visitors, delivery drivers or residents to contact the concierge directly. Ellie F. agreed to refer the question to Berkeley's technical team. • lyad O. encouraged Encore to seek regular feedback as the service developed. Stefano E. suggested involving the concierge in relevant ROC discussions, and Ellie F. proposed a brief concierge update at future meetings held in the residents' facilities. Julien R. suggested an open morning to introduce the concierges to residents. Encore agreed to consider arrangements around the staff's different shifts. • Action: Sam F. and Simon G. to provide clear resident guidance on keyholding and Ark, review the associated staff training and ensure the information is identifiable and readable. • Action: Ellie F. to confirm whether the entry-panel concierge call function can be connected and activated. • Action: Encore to consider concierge participation in ROC meetings and an introductory session for residents.
8. Update on Replanting of Trees	• Sam F. confirmed that the two replacement trees between Felstead and Holly Hill Drive had been ordered and were due to be planted the following week. lyad O. requested that a relevant resident representative be present to confirm the positioning. Sam F. said SJM had been asked to make contact. • The additional privacy-screening trees remained a separate proposal. lyad O. explained that the affected residents would first review the effect of the two replacement trees before considering whether to fund further planting, which would cost several thousand pounds. • Sam F. noted that any additional trees would create future maintenance responsibilities for the estate, and that acceptance of those responsibilities would need to be considered by the ROC. No decision to proceed with the additional planting was made. • Action: Sam F. to ensure SJM coordinates the replacement-tree planting with the relevant residents. The additional screening proposal and future maintenance arrangements will be revisited once the replacement trees are in place.

9. Health of Plants	• Julien R. raised the condition of Walled Garden planting and residents' concerns about paying to replace losses potentially associated with inadequate watering. He asked about contractual safeguards against a recurrence and whether replanting had to follow the original approved landscape design. • Ellie F. explained that she and Berkeley's landscape design manager had inspected the area. Berkeley was open to a more practical planting scheme using species better suited to hotter, drier conditions and would discuss changes to the approved design with the local authority as necessary. • Sam F. said SJM had prioritised watering young trees and hedging in line with its understanding of water-company guidance, with some other struggling plants watered by hand. Julien R. said some plants had failed earlier and asked about a condition audit at handover. Sam F. confirmed that no full audit had been completed when SJM took over, although photographs recorded some existing deterioration. • Sam F. was pursuing the previous grounds contractor to establish whether it would offer any contribution or remedial work. Responsibility for the losses and the allocation of replacement costs remained unresolved. • Ellie F. suggested that some of the herb beds could become a voluntary community gardening project, with surviving plants consolidated into other beds. Julien R. said any arrangement would need clear maintenance standards. Sam F. explained that a licence and agreed conditions could be used. • Julien R. also raised concerns about trees with sparse or absent foliage. Ellie F. said Hillier, Berkeley's tree supplier, had advised that the lichen observed was not currently a cause for concern and had recommended feeding and a further review in spring. Berkeley and the grounds team would continue monitoring the trees before deciding whether replacements were required. • Action: Sam F. to continue discussions with the previous contractor and report back on its position regarding failed planting. • Action: Julien R. to seek residents' views on the suggested community herb beds, including the standards and responsibilities that would be needed. • Action: Berkeley and Encore to continue monitoring the affected trees and review their condition in spring, taking account of the supplier's advice.
10. AOB	(i) Walled Garden Parking Pergola • Julien R. raised concerns about the alignment and condition of the parking pergola, including a previous repair that had not resolved the underlying issue. Ellie F. confirmed that Sam F. had raised it with her. • Action: Ellie F. to inspect the issue and discuss the required response internally with Berkeley.

(ii) Estate Regulations Update

- A draft of the estate regulations had been circulated for comment. Sam F. explained that it summarised relevant provisions from the leases and TP1s in more accessible language. Detailed discussion was deferred so members could provide written feedback.
- Encore intended to send the final document through the correspondence arrangements used for financial information, as well as Places, to reach residents who did not use the app. Berkeley would include it in new-home handovers. Sam F. would also explore including it in the information supplied to subsequent purchasers.
- Oeschka H. raised incorrect addressing on the recent parking correspondence and the need for owners to notify Encore when properties were let, so the appropriate occupants could receive estate information. Sam F. agreed that the records and correspondence required attention.
- **Action:** ROC members to send feedback to Sam F. or Stefano E. for consolidation. Encore and Berkeley to finalise the distribution and onboarding arrangements, and Sam F. to review the addressing and letting-information concerns.

(iii) Walled Garden South Bin Store Ventilation

- Julien R. revisited residents' concerns about odour and whether ventilation could be improved. Ellie F. said the technical drawings showed four air bricks and that the store had been built to the approved design. No ventilation alteration was agreed.
- **Action:** Berkeley and Encore to review the cleaning and jet-washing frequency, including washing the bins themselves, and consider how hygiene and odour can be improved.

(iv) Walled Garden Pedestrian Gates

- Julien R. reported recurring problems with gates failing to close or lock, including the gate towards the SANG and the gate between Nos. 7 and 1. He questioned whether the underlying design and exposure to weather needed to be addressed alongside routine maintenance. Ellie F. confirmed that the matter was under discussion with Sam F.
- **Action:** Ellie F. and Sam F. to confirm the proposed response to the recurring gate faults.

(v) Stuart House Fire Exit Door

- Anthony H. reported that he and another resident had been unable to open the fire exit door from inside the undercroft parking area the previous day. The need to check the door's operation was raised.
- **Action:** Encore to arrange a prompt check of the fire exit door and follow up any fault identified.

	----- (vi) Gates Leading into the SANG • Richard S. asked who owned the gates leading into the SANG. Ellie F. recalled earlier advice that they belonged to the Land Trust but agreed to verify this. A further concern was raised about a gate near the lake and the signage on it. • Action: Ellie F. to confirm ownership of the SANG access gates with the relevant team. ----- (vii) Thanks to Encore • Sarah B. thanked Encore for preparing the improvement plan and supporting documents. Members would review the material and provide further feedback. ----- (viii) Next ROC Meeting • The next ROC meeting was provisionally agreed for Thursday 19th November 2026, from 16:00 to 18:00, with the intention of meeting in the Larch Court residents' lounge.
--	---