Sunningdale Park Residents' Operating Committee Meeting

Date: Wednesday 18th November 2026

Time: 16:00 – 18:00pm UK

Location: Residents Lounge, Larch Court, Sunningdale Park

ATTENDEES:

Stefano Elia	Chair
Oeschka Hefer	Scholars Row Co-Rep.
Anthony Hooey	Steuart House Co-Rep.
Iyad Omari	Felstead Co-Rep.
Jenifer Chaffey	Holly Hill Drive Rep.
Harry Wilkinson	Mackenzie Court Rep.
Sam Forth	Encore Estate Mgmt.
Simon Gwynn	Encore Estate Mgmt.
Ellie Freeman	Berkeley Estate Mgmt.

WITH APOLOGIES:

Diana Tren	Scholars Row Co-Rep.
Richard Snook	Vice Chair, Dairy Rep.
Sarah Beckitt	Felstead Co-Rep.
Katharine Wilson	Steuart House Co-Rep.
Julien Renaud	Walled Garden Rep.

ABSENT:

Charlotte Herring	Gardeners Cottages Rep.

AGENDA ITEMS:

#	CATEGORY	TOPIC	TABLED BY
1	**General**	Update on actions from last time	All
2	**General**	Sign-off of Private Road Signs Proposal	Ellie F. Stefano E.
3	**General**	Feedback on Grounds Maintenance Team	Stefano E., All
4	**General**	Naming of concierge organised resident events	Stefano E.
5	**General**	Estate Regulations Sign-off	Sam F.
6	**General**	Ongoing Security Incidents	Harry W., Stefano E.
7	**General**	The Gym at Larch Court	Anthony H., Katharine W.
8	**General**	Other Properties Access to Concierge & Gym	Harry W.
9	**General**	Visitor Parking around Mackenzie Court	Iyad O., Sarah B.
10	**General**	Communication with Residents	Iyad O., Sarah B.
11	**Felstead**	Kitchen Door Repair	Iyad O., Sarah B.
12	**Felstead**	Communal Areas and Items Appearing	Iyad O., Sarah B.
13	**Felstead**	Linking Entry Concierge Button with Concierge	Iyad O., Sarah B.
14	**Walled Garden**	Fixing the Pedestrian Gates	Stefano E., Julien R.
15	**Walled Garden**	North Bin Store New Issue	Stefano E., Julien R.
16	**AOB**		

MEETING MINUTES:

1. Update on actions from last time	**Encore reporting and communal issues** • Simon G. reported that October was the first full month covered by Encore's tracker. Chloe checked open items during her weekly visits and Simon reviewed them with the team each week. Most items had come from inspections. Simon recalled that all four resident requests received through Places in October had been dealt with and that the reported KPIs were at 100%. November would provide the first month-to-month comparison. • Encore had issued around ten portal updates in October and thirteen by mid-November, targeting the buildings concerned. Stefano E. welcomed the improved visibility but asked why some older items remained green. Simon G. explained that the target date could be for the next step rather than completion. Members wanted to see how long lower-priority issues had been open, even when the next step was on time. • Iyad O. asked for enough detail to identify which communal issues had progressed. Members felt that anonymised examples would also help the ROC understand what residents were reporting. Simon G. agreed to look at what could be shared without disclosing personal information. • **Action:** Simon G. to review with Ellie F. what detail can be provided alongside the KPI figures, including progress on individual issues and how revised dates are shown. **Scholars Row entrance** • Ellie F. confirmed that widening the entrance from Crimson Avenue remained with Berkeley's technical team. A decision was linked to the plans for the three townhouses at the sales suite. Anthony H. reported that vehicles stopping at the narrow entrance had prevented refuse collections; on one occasion the black bins were not emptied for two weeks. Oeschka H. asked whether removing some of the planting would improve access sooner. • **Action:** Ellie F. to take the access and safety concerns back to the technical team and provide a further update at the January meeting. **SANG access gate** • Ellie F. confirmed that the Land Trust owned the gate in question. Stefano E. said its location had been sent to the Land Trust, and the gate appeared to be working again. The action was closed.

2. Sign-off of Private Road Signs Proposal	• Ellie F. confirmed that Berkeley had approved the wording 'Private Road' on the street nameplates. Berkeley would fund the wayfinding signs at the three entrances and the enhanced street signs for Crimson Avenue and Scholars Row. It asked the estate to contribute towards replacing the other street nameplates already installed. • Ellie F. quoted £9,606 as Berkeley's contribution and £6,426 as the estate contribution before removing a duplicate sign for Archbury Walk. After that correction, she estimated the one-off charge at £24.80 per household, to be accounted for at year end. Iyad O. questioned whether Berkeley should meet the full cost but recognised the value of making the status of the roads clear. When put to the representatives, the proposal to proceed at approximately £24.80 per household was agreed. • **Action:** Ellie F. to instruct the supplier to proceed and circulate the final mock-ups, including Madeira Walk, to the full ROC for comment before production. Installation before Christmas was the aim, subject to the four-week lead time and turnaround of comments. • Further external signage at the SANG entrances would be revisited with the ROC in 2027 as the build progressed. It was separate from the order agreed at this meeting.
3. Feedback on Grounds Maintenance Team	• Stefano E. said that four and a half months into SJM's appointment, areas of long grass and established weeds were still being brought to Encore's attention by residents. Given the annual grounds maintenance cost of around £85,000, he expected Encore's inspections to identify these problems and SJM to know which tasks were due weekly or fortnightly. • Anthony H. noted that the contract with SJM is based on hours worked, so whenever any shortcomings with SJM were discussed, they invariably pointed out that they have worked the contracted number of hours. Anthony H. said it was crucial that any contract that we enter into, (whether with SJM or any other service provider), must be based on work to be completed and not on hours to be worked. The focus of any conversation with SJM would then correctly be on the work they have done and not on hours worked. • Sam F. explained that the tender had been priced on hours. Encore had since agreed a fortnightly cycle with SJM so that each area received attention. Anthony H. said residents needed to know what work would be completed and how often: attending for the allotted hours did not establish that a hedge had been cut or a bed cleared. Members also questioned the skills and supervision of the team on site. • Members asked to see the contract and tender specification. Ellie F. said Berkeley preferred not to share the full contract; the task information already circulated had been drawn from it. Members wanted sufficient detail to assess what had been bought, whilst agreeing that responsibility for managing the contractor should remain with Encore. • Simon G. proposed reviewing the arrangement afresh, with the ROC and Berkeley involved in defining the required standard. Options discussed included a tender based on completed tasks,

	independent advice, and separate contracts for different areas. Ellie F. said Berkeley was open to a retender using the landscape management plan as the starting point, provided Encore could show how delivery would be checked. • **Action:** Simon G. to lead Encore's review and bring back options for the specification, supervision and verification of completed work. Stefano E. suggested a separate Teams discussion before year end to consider the options and lessons from the tender. **Replanting and resident input** • Sam F. had sought alternative quotes for SJM's replanting proposal. One contractor had visited and was awaiting supplier prices; no alternative price was available at the meeting. Members favoured settling the maintenance arrangements before committing to new planting. Spring planting remained an option. • Iyad O. suggested local walkarounds with a landscape designer so that each area could identify what was worth retaining or replacing. Ellie F. supported exploring a gardening subcommittee, with a ROC representative reporting back to the wider committee. **Holly Hill Drive** • Jenifer C. said a Places notice about dumped garden waste had appeared to be addressed to her personally, after she had repeatedly raised the condition of the communal bed. Sam F. clarified that it had gone to all Holly Hill Drive residents, apologised for the impression it gave and agreed that future notices should make their audience clearer. • **Action:** Sam F. to call Jenifer C. about the notice and the outstanding maintenance concerns.
4. Naming of concierge organised resident events	• Stefano E. asked that invitations be signed by the concierge team. The wording 'Sunningdale Park community team' suggested an estate-wide event and did not identify who had organised it. • **Action:** Sam F. to agree the sign-off with the concierge and take up the mailing groups with the app provider. The automated groups were drawing in properties across the estate; invitations for the contributing apartment blocks should reach the intended recipients.

5. Estate Regulations Sign-off	• Sam F. confirmed that the draft had been circulated. Sarah B. had requested a consistent format for estate documents, including issue dates and page numbers. Sam said the issue month had been included and agreed to standardise the presentation. • Anthony H. proposed reducing the maximum stay in a visitor bay from 72 to 24 hours given the limited spaces. Encore explained that the 72-hour maximum reflected the lease and could not be shortened through the estate regulations. Formal parking enforcement would require a parking management arrangement. No such appointment was agreed. • The ROC approved the regulations with the 72-hour provision unchanged. • **Action:** Sam F. to finalise and distribute them to residents.
6. Ongoing Security Incidents	• Harry W. raised concerns about footage recorded by a resident in October at the boundary between Mackenzie Court car park and Berkeley's construction compound. He believed someone had tried to open the fence. Berkeley's interpretation was that a person walking a dog had been looking for a way through. Police attended and found nothing untoward; no breach of the compound was confirmed. • Harry W. said earlier reports of an attempted break-in and suspected drug activity added to residents' unease, particularly when leaving or returning in the dark. He had raised the car park lighting with Abri and reported that Abri intended to install external CCTV on Mackenzie Court. • Ellie F. said Berkeley had reviewed the footage and its compound security arrangements. These covered the construction site, rather than the residential estate, and were reviewed monthly. Berkeley did not consider additional physical patrols of the compound necessary at present. Harry W. remained concerned about the effect on nearby residents; Ellie agreed to feed that back. • On behalf of Richard S., Stefano E. mentioned there was damage to a French window at a property at the Dairy. An attempted break-in was one possible explanation, but the cause had not been established. Members requested the cost of extending CCTV to the Dairy before considering who might fund it. • **Action:** Ellie F. to establish why the Dairy was omitted from the original CCTV provision and investigate the cost of extending coverage. No funding decision was made. **Estate patrols and independent advice** • Sam F. outlined indicative quotes for overnight patrols. One option offered three visits each night throughout the year; the annual figure was given as both £33,000 and £36,000 and was to be confirmed in writing. The Cannons Security option, with three visits in summer and four in winter, was quoted at about £44,800 a year, or £237 per property through the estate service charge. • Members discussed what patrols would achieve as a deterrent and whether targeted lighting, CCTV alerts or remote monitoring would

	be more effective. Anthony H. suggested motion-activated lights at a few vulnerable locations, including the Dairy. Kitty felt that lights coming on for a neighbour's car was an acceptable trade-off. Iyad O. suggested independent security advice before choosing a service. • **Action:** Sam F. to circulate the patrol options and costs, and work with Ellie F. to obtain a price for an independent security assessment. ROC representatives to sound out residents in their buildings or streets on the options and likely annual cost. • Sam F. left the meeting after this item.
7. The Gym at Larch Court	• Anthony H. raised Katharine W.'s concern that residents had bought their homes before the gym was proposed and were subsequently asked to contribute to its running costs. The concern was about the lack of consultation and the precedent this set, rather than the amount charged. • Ellie F. said Berkeley had provided the space and equipment in place of an apartment originally planned as Plot 129. Following handover of the residents' management company, residents could decide whether to retain the gym or use the space differently. • Stefano E. clarified that the ROC had been told about the gym in the summer but had not been consulted on the decision. He also noted that removing a dwelling meant one fewer property contributing to wider estate costs. Ellie F. confirmed that Berkeley would consult the ROC before future changes to the estate or apartment blocks that would incur a charge.
8. Other Properties Access to Concierge & Gym Services	• Harry W. asked whether individual Mackenzie Court residents could buy a pass or subscription rather than committing the whole block. He reported interest from around 10 of its 41 apartments. Current access was for residents of Larch Court, Steuart House and Felstead. • Ellie F. said Berkeley was open to exploring the idea with Abri, but the residents' management company was dormant and arrangements for receiving and accounting for membership income would need to be established. The gym had been designed for low use, with fewer than 100 properties currently entitled to use it. • Members discussed the views of current contributors, whether any offer should extend to houses as well as Mackenzie Court, and the implications for access, cleaning, capacity and long-term funding. A voluntary membership model and a cap on numbers were suggested. Whether gym and concierge access could be offered separately also remained open. • **Action:** Ellie F. to investigate what an optional arrangement would entail, including the discussion needed with Abri. Stefano E. suggested a separate meeting to consider the options. No change to access or charges was agreed. • **Action:** Harry W. to raise with Abri, as it would also require their buy-in with some scenarios to be discussed.

9. Visitor Parking around Mackenzie Court	• Iyad O. raised Sarah B.'s report that the same vehicle was regularly occupying a visitor bay. Harry W. confirmed that Mackenzie Court visitors could use the bays by the park entrance and agreed to speak to the resident concerned. • Harry W. distinguished between closures needed for crane operations and contractors using visitor bays when a contractors' car park was available. Ellie F. apologised for the disruption and said the site team would continue to give notice of construction closures. The six visitor bays beside Mackenzie Court were due to be lined and marked 'V'; Berkeley had not confirmed a date. • Members also raised parking on Larch Avenue and repeated obstructions to access. Iyad O. suggested that the concierge note recurring misuse on site rounds and report it to Encore, rather than residents having to police the bays themselves. • **Action:** Harry W. to follow up the reported resident use of the visitor bay. Ellie F. to remind the site team that contractors should use their designated parking and review whether contractor fines need to resume.
10. Communication with Residents	• Sarah B. had asked how residents would receive written procedures, including those for concierge keyholding, and the dates of Sam F.'s monthly visits. Iyad O. confirmed that a keyholding update had been sent through Places. The dates of Sam's visits were not confirmed at the meeting. • Oeschka H. reported receiving a second incorrectly addressed letter, with the wrong street details and postcode, addressed to 'Dear Resident'. Simon G. said letters to owners should use the named owner's completion details. A generic greeting was normally used for tenants whose names were not held. • **Action:** Oeschka H. to forward the example to Simon G. so Encore can check and correct the underlying address record.
11. Kitchen Door Repair	• The kitchen door was confirmed as repaired. Iyad O. noted that the outcome had not been clear to residents from the earlier message.
12. Communal Areas and Items Appearing	• Sarah B. had raised the example of a plant left in the Felstead lobby. Members asked how personal items in communal areas would be identified and dealt with before other furniture or belongings accumulated. • Simon G. explained that Encore would first ask the owner to remove an item and could arrange removal if it remained. Members expected such items to be picked up during concierge rounds or weekly inspections. Ellie F. said the plant had been noticed on a site visit. • **Action:** Encore to follow up the plant in the Felstead lobby through its usual removal process.

13. Linking the Entry Concierge Button with the Concierge	• Ellie F. said the electricians had confirmed that the 'C' button could not be removed from the entry-panel software. They were investigating whether the Felstead and Steuart House panels could instead be connected to the concierge, potentially using a 4G SIM. • **Action:** Ellie F. to report back at the next meeting on whether the concierge call function can be made operational.
14. Fixing the Pedestrian Gates	• In Julien R.'s absence, Stefano E. raised residents' concern that the gates had failed to lock reliably at night for around four months over the summer. They were locking again in cooler weather, but residents had supplied photographs of the earlier faults and did not regard the seasonal improvement as a lasting repair. • Ellie F. explained that the wall was listed and Berkeley had replaced the original gates like for like in blue-painted timber. She had seen movement in the wood but considered the gates appropriate if maintained correctly. She agreed that several residents should not have had to report the same issue before it was investigated. • Stefano E. questioned why seasonal adjustments were not already scheduled if they were necessary. He suggested investigating reinforcement compatible with the timber appearance and the electronic locks. He illustrated the potential cost of repeated visits as £400 a year if two call-outs cost £200 each. • **Action:** Julien R. to send a formal response. Ellie F. to revisit the issue with Berkeley, including whether a longer-term remedy is practicable. Responsibility for any future costs remained unresolved.
15. North Bin Store New Issue	• Stefano E. reported that the door's lock keep had been damaged and the bin store no longer secured properly. Forcing the door during a collection was suggested as a possible cause but had not been established. Sam F. was understood to have logged the repair on Places.
16. AOB	**(i) Walled Garden parking pergola and lighting** • Stefano E. followed up Julien R.'s concern about the condition of the timber and asked whether lighting could be added to the dark path and parking area. Solar lights and a connection to the adjacent electricity supply were suggested. Residents might consider contributing, but the condition of the pergola needed to be settled first. • **Action:** Ellie F. to chase Berkeley's outstanding response on the timber and investigate the lighting options. No works or contribution were agreed. ----------

(ii) Concierge access to CCTV and residents' parking signs

- Anthony H. asked whether the concierge could see vehicles entering the car parks. Ellie F. explained that Larch Court footage was accessible but was not continuously monitored. Steuart House was being connected, and a lockable screen at the concierge desk was planned once the remaining connections, including the Pavilion, were in place with the opening of Core 1 of Larch Court.
- Anthony H. also reported vans obstructing the garage entrance and contractors using residents' bays. Sam F. had obtained a quote for 'Residents Parking Only' signs like Audley's. Members agreed to return to the quote and alternatives separately; these signs were not included in the road-sign approval under item 2.

(iii) Steuart House Refuse collections

- Anthony H. asked who should contact the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead about missed collections. Ellie F. advised residents to raise these with the concierge, who could log the issue with the council and provide the reference number for follow-up.

(iv) Rat sightings at Scholars Row

- Oeschka H. reported fresh sightings and holes beneath a garden fence. Bait stations were already in place, and an affected resident had offered space in their garden if needed.
- **Action:** Encore to review the existing bait stations and whether additional stations are required.

(v) New steps into the SANG

- Jenifer C. requested a handrail for the new steps. Members described them as steep, with some treads at an angle. Stefano E. supported the request.
- Action: Ellie F. to follow up the concern about the steps and the request for a handrail.

(vi) Parking Issues on Larch Avenue

- Oeschka H. raised concerns about road safety on Larch Avenue. She reported that the number of contractors' cars parked along the road left drivers with very few places to pull in when faced with oncoming traffic, increasing the risk of a collision.
- **Action:** Ellie F. confirmed that Berkeley would address the issue urgently. Oeschka H. asked that the number of contractors' vehicles parked along Larch Avenue be limited.

(vii) Next ROC Meeting

- The next formal ROC meeting was provisionally agreed for Thursday 28th January 2027 from 16:00 to 18:00, with the intention of meeting in the Private Dining Room, Northcote House.