Brief outline of process in determining Haus as proposed new managing agent for Bexley Park

- Extensive review of alternative managing agents including reading Trustpilot and Feefo reviews.
- Emailed approx. 8 managing agents asking for further information on their company. Explained current issues with FirstPort and desired standards for the development.
- Out of the five that replied, 4 were invited to walk the development with the BPRA and discuss the development in further detail. Walking the development allowed us to point out the issues at hand such as undefined boundaries between resident/managing agent and council land, parking concerns and so on.
- Only 3 site visits were conducted due to diary conflicts.
- Following the visits, all considered in totality it was deemed that one managing agent
 was quite new to the market and whilst reviews were good, we had concerns about
 them taking on a development of this size. We felt more confident in the remaining
 agent however they did not go to the lengths that Haus did to check and ensure they
 could provide a complete service to the development.
- Of the 3 managing agents the recommendation to Haus was made due to several factors...
 - Haus were the only agent to request copies of insurance policies to ensure like for like cover could be obtained without impacting the overall cost of provision to the development
 - Haus are providing their services in assisting us to remove FirstPort on a no win, no fee basis.
 - o Haus were the only agent to review the TP1 documents and seek legal advice on serving notice to FirstPort (other agents assured us it was possible but had not looked at any documentation nor consulted with a legal professional)
 - o Haus' managing fees per property are cheaper than FirstPort yet reviews and current clients report good service and are happy with the provision.
 - Haus have previously removed FirstPort from other developments using the right to manage scheme
 - Haus' reviews were most favourable out of the agents reviewed. Those wishing to view those reviews for themselves can do so <u>HERE</u>

Ultimately at present we have no control or transparency as to where our money is spent. The proposal to move to Haus involves setting up a formal resident association via companies' house who then appoints Haus.

This means if Haus underperforms, they can be removed by providing notice and a new agent can be appointed.

By having a range of resident directors from across the development we hope to see a real tangible improvement in communication, turnaround of repairs and ensuring the development is maintained and serves the residents that pay the service charges.

We hope the above information helps provide transparency in how a decision was reached. To be clear, no member of the BPRA has had any previous dealings with any of the managing agents approached and we have no interest other than improving our development.

To approach the entire development for their views on multiple agents would be impractical – as a voluntary association we do not have the funds to obtain registered owners addresses, post voting forms etc to ensure the canvas was fair. Haus will be providing assistance with this element of the process as previously mentioned on a 'no win, no fee' basis.

We feel strongly that this change can only bring improvements in the long term even if it is a difficult process to work through at present.

Financial Information

A few questions were raised at the meeting surrounding finances for the development which are have summarised below...

• How much is paid to FirstPort for the development?

Note – these figures are from the approved 2021 accounts.

Edenwood

In 2021, FirstPort received a total **of £87,316** in service charge payments. Final expenditure totalled **£76,831** leaving a surplus of **£10,485** to be credited on the next service charge demand.

Note – the development is split into different areas so the credits would be applied dependant on **where** the underspend was.

Managing fees for Edenwood in 2021 were £26,661 Accounts Preparation Fees totalled £3,747

In comparison Haus' proposed charges are £22,200 with an account's preparation fee of £850, this is an immediate saving of £7358.

Copse & Firs

In 2021, FirstPort received a total **of £126,151** in service charge payments. Final expenditure totalled **£122,912** leaving a surplus of **£3,239** to be credited on the next service charge demand. **Note** – the development is split into different areas so the credits would be applied dependant on **where** the underspend was.

Managing fees for Copse & Firs in 2021 were £35,793 Accounts Preparation Fees totalled £2786

Figures for Haus' management charges will be calculated on the same terms as Edenwood. £100 per house & £200 per flat plus VAT. The management fees will be higher in this area of the development due to the increased number of blocks of flats and commercial units but the price per unit doesn't differ on either side of the development.

2021 saw £199,743 paid to maintain and manage our development and of this, £62,454 gets paid directly to FirstPort for their services. 31% of our total income for us to have no say in how our development is maintained or run.

• How much is in our reserves?

Note - these figures are from the approved 2021 accounts.

Edenwood - £128,475.58

4. Reserve Funds for Longer Term Maintenance

| | £ 118,100.70 | 9,500.00 | 874.88 | - | 128,475.58 |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|---------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------|
| S5 Private Access way Area | 1,292.66 | 2,000.00 | 9.58 | - | 3,302.24 |
| S4 Block | 56,397.88 | 5,000.00 | 417.79 | - | 61,815.67 |
| S3 Sewage Pump Williams Way | 17,189.93 | 2,000.00 | 127.34 | - | 19,317.27 |
| S2 Courtyard | 5,538.72 | 500.00 | 41.03 | - | 6,079.75 |
| S1 Estate | 37,681.50 | - | 279.14 | - | 37,960.64 |
| Schedule or Block Name | Forward | the year | (net of tax) | Reserves | Total |
| | Balance Brought | Provision for | Interest Received | Contribution (from) | |

Copse & Firs - £113,535.96

4. Reserve Funds for Longer Term Maintenance

| | Balance | | Interest | Contribution | |
|-------------------------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|------------|
| | Brought | Provision for | Received | (from) | |
| Schedule or Block Name | Forward | the year | (net of tax) | Reserves | Total |
| S1 Estate | 37,241.47 | 4,000.00 | 117.68 | - | 41,359.15 |
| S2A Block 2-18 Maplehurst Cl | 28,226.65 | 4,000.00 | 89.20 | - | 32,315.85 |
| S2B Block 19-27 Maplehurst Cl | 22,197.50 | 3,000.00 | 70.14 | - | 25,267.64 |
| S4 Commercial Units | 11,331.63 | 1,250.00 | 35.81 | - | 12,617.44 |
| S5A Courtyard 61-65 Pinewood | 3,689.62 | 50.00 | 11.66 | (3,616.80) | 134.48 |
| S5B Courtyard 67-87 Pinewood | 447.67 | 50.00 | 1.41 | - | 499.08 |
| S5C Courtyard Chapel Anvil | 618.96 | 50.00 | 1.96 | - | 670.92 |
| S5D Courtyard 70-82 Pinewood | 619.45 | 50.00 | 1.96 | - | 671.41 |
| | £ 104,372.94 | 12,450.00 | 329.82 | (3,616.80) | 113,535.96 |