



PRESTIGE BELLA VISTA FLAT OWNERS WELFARE ASSOCIATION - PBVFOWA

Meeting No: MC 02/23-25	Management Committee Meeting	Date/Time: 17 Dec 2023 Time: 1600 Hrs
Location: CH	Members Attended: Attached	
AGENDA:	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Welcome2. Prayer- Tamil Thaa Vazhthu.3. Discussion on CAR Parking Proposal drawing shared by PEPL.4. Finalization of Committee list for Circulation to Members5. Advance CAM6. Any other points of discussion7. National anthem8. Closing	
Discussions:	<p>The meeting was chaired by Mrs Maria, President, PBVFOWA</p> <p>As the requisite quorum was not present at 4 PM, the meeting was adjourned by 15 minutes by the secretary.</p> <p>The meeting reconvened at 4.15 PM. The members present was 29 at that time. In terms of Bye Law "If at such an adjourned meeting also no quorum is present, any business which was tabled for discussion at the meeting may be taken up, without further notice, and the decisions arrived at shall be binding on all." Basis this the MC meeting resumed.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Welcome – The President welcomed the MC members present.2. Prayer- Tamil Thaa Vazhthu – MC members3. Discussion on CAR Parking Proposal drawing shared by PEPL. <p>The secretary made the opening marks.</p> <p>He also a gave a brief of what had happened so far. He said since 2016 association had consistently asked Prestige Management to provide complete details which has not happened so far.</p> <p>He recounted some drawings were shared in 2016-17, some excel sheets of allocations in Feb 2021, reply of then president in May 2022 raising various issues on reply to a drawing shared and finally a meeting in June 2023 which too had ended with association asking for complete details.</p> <p>Secretary said that Prestige Management has sent fresh drawings on 08-Dec-2023 of the proposed car parking arrangements and has been calling the association for a discussion.</p>	

Prestige Bella Vista Flat Owners Welfare Association

Registered with Serial No. 321 of Year 2013, under Section 10 of the Tamil Nadu Societies Registration Act, 1975

Tower 15B, Ground Floor, Prestige Bella Vista, Ayyappanthangal, Chennai – 600056

www.prestige-bella-vista.com



	<p>He also said, it is not clear whether the shared proposal is approved drawing as per the CC received.</p> <p>Office Bearers felt that it is very important to seek the views of the MC members also before reverting to the Prestige Management.</p> <p>The drawing was placed on the table for the perusal of the MCs. He said we can have a discussion on the same.</p> <p>Member views</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mr Sankar MC T8 – Visitor car parking details not given. 2. Mr Viswanathan S MC T9C – markings are not correct. Marked all open spaces. This is not a valid proposal. It is not worth considering. Let them share all data and correspondence. We are ready for immediate discussion. 3. Mr Amitabh Srivastava MC T2B – Details of pending allotments not given. Committed plan not stated. No details of who have taken more than approved parking to enable redistribution to manage shortage. 4. Mr Ramkumar Narayan MC T2B – No clearcut list of who have not got. Common space encroached. Privacy of ground floor flats affected in these drawings. 5. Mrs Vedaselvi N MC T11 – Reduce the number here and remove from near generators/ ramps/ driveway etc. The allocation should also be uniform. It appears like there are more allotments to cluster 1 making it more crowded. Privacy is a uniform issue across all clusters. 6. Mr Ramprasad MC T3A – Clear case of oversold car park. All greenery taken out. This will lead to chaos. Driveway encroachment. 7. Mr Karan MC T1A – Redistribution is tough. Who will bell the cat for that exercise. Open surface parking not acceptable. There will be no discipline. 8. Mr Jayakrishnan P MC T7 – He made a point wise observation as under <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) What is the final shortage? This must be disclosed. b) 369 as per CMDA in surface and 486 as per proposal, diff to be clarified. c) Visitors parking not clear. d) Greenery, all open space, Opp to gas banks, electrical panels etc have been taken for parking. e) Have to go for a walk through to fully understand impact of proposal. f) Even driveways are being marked for parking slots. g) However, considering the HOTO delay etc, amicable situation needs to be worked out. h) We may also have to do minor compromise otherwise this issue will go on and on.
--	--



	<p>9. Mr Prakash K MC T15A – Open space encroachment. Impact will be there during events like cyclone on open space parking. Pathway marking not clear/adequate in drawing.</p> <p>10. Mr Jawahar T MC T17B – Old approval comparison and no proposal to be seen.</p> <p>11. Mr Aravindhan MC T16B – Drawings appear faulty.</p> <p>12. Mr Ravikumar MC T18B – In all clusters, open space encroached, space between road and building reduced, road size reduced, parking proposed near ramps etc. Latest plan approval is not given, we need to say what is CMDA approval. Also, Prestige management is still allotting car parking slots unofficially despite knowing the problems.</p> <p>13. Mr Ramesh MC T20B – Need to compare CMDA approval. Does this conform to CMDA guidelines?</p> <p>14. Mr Prasad MC T18A – Other have already said. This is not an acceptable proposal.</p> <p>15. Mr Karan Bhatia MC T13 – Not clear what solution they have overall. And we also need to be clear what are we proposing? Whether compensation etc. There are also instances of part refunds.</p> <p>16. Mr B Raja MC T6 – Made a pointwise submission.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) total number of basement carpark in each cluster as per plan b) how many carpark allotted to each unit- as per 1 carpark for 2/3 BHK and 2 carpark for 4 BHK in each cluster, cluster wise breakup. c) how many units are allotted additional carpark over and above-cluster wise breakup. d) how many 1 BHK units have surrendered their carpark and got money back. e) how many MLCP carpark promised as per agreement with buyer. f) how many surface carpark allocated- with unit numbers and locations. Are these locations as per plan. g) how many visitor carpark as per plan available- specifying locations. h) This information to be made available to MCs for discussion prior to participating in any meeting with Prestige. i) During the second term a similar meeting was held to discuss the carpark issue, but no information was provided by Prestige. j) Let us get all the data, analysis, agree among ourselves and what to ask/how to proceed before meeting them. k) The details given by Prestige management needs full checking. <p>17. J Vaidyanathan MC T4A – Also made a point wise submission</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Whether this has CMDA approval? CMDA approval together with drawings is yet to be shared. b) Reduction of green cover. This may result in legal complications in NGT in future if raised by any government authority or even private member. c) Actuals as per initial approval
--	--



CAR PARKING			
REQUIRED	PROVIDED		
	BASEMENT	SURFACE	TOTAL
2212	1846	369	2215
TWO-WHEELER			
REQUIRED	PROVIDED		
	BASEMENT	SURFACE	TOTAL
600	NIL	600	600

However, Details of actual sold is required in following manner cluster wise.

Cluster 1	No of Units	Total CP Required	Total CP Allotted	Less Surrendered	Net Allotted
1 BHK					
2+2.5 BHK					
3+3.5 BHK					
4 BHK					

- ✓ Whether the drawing conforms to the norms of CMDA and guidelines for other installations like gas banks, electrical lines, garbage collection points and more importantly mandatory approach clearance for fire services etc are not clear.
- ✓ Mr Sankaran MC T20A – If corrective action is taken, then what is the actual number as per as built plan approval? Ball Park numbers/ details on whether these are as per norms. Not acceptable to convert 2 ways driveways to one etc. Car parking size and numbers need to be revisited. We should get a list with full names, allotment data vis a vis as built data along with excess allotted/ agreed with buyers list. Full details are required.
- ✓ Mr Balaram Venkatesh MC T18C – This is not acceptable. We also need to plan among ourselves and decide on the way forward.
- ✓ Mr Vasudevan Jt Treasurer – The MLCP is shelved. What is the fate of those who have been on record in sale deed allotted MLCP. Space left out for fire service is not adequate,
- ✓ Mr Kannan Jt Secretary – Agree that this is not acceptable. However, we should have met and rejected this drawing in person. Chairman had verbally accepted that they have made a mistake. Let them now present data to association.
- ✓ Mrs Bhuvaneswari Jt Secretary – Not acceptable. Will excess allotments be cleared with refunds? It appears that this is only a formality to present to RERA that they are engaging with association.
- ✓ Mr Binu Joshua Jt Secretary – Allotments if not effective, let us have a walkthrough before saying no.
- ✓ Mrs Harini – Jt Secretary - All points are already covered by previous speakers.

Prestige Bella Vista Flat Owners Welfare Association



	<p>✓ President clarified that during the meeting Mr Irfan had mentioned that Prestige Management now don't want MLCP option and would like to give options to which OBs present in the meeting with him did not react.</p> <p>Secretary made the following concluding remarks.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ What are all the various changes vis a vis the approved drawing of 2012 is still not clear. What is presented in as built drawing for which they have got final CC is also not clear. ✓ All secretaries/ President since 2016 have given multiple suggestions including refunds to minimise impact. ✓ CAR Parking is also partly a community problem today with many new cars getting added /space being used haphazardly. ✓ However, pending handover association cannot take the onus on regulating Car parking and it is PEPL who should clear the mess they have created. ✓ Association have also taken up in RERA to ensure builder provides the solution. ✓ Even now no complete numbers given. As against 369 surface parking as per CMDA approval, 153 are marked, 333 are additionally proposed taking the total number to 486. No numbers given for B1 and B2 parking. There has been Zero transparency. ✓ PEPL sent email to Team 4 (term 2021-2023) stating they will provide solution for 305 cars with MLCP & Additional surface allotment. However, the same could not discussed in detail as the basic data on allotment was not given to association. ✓ Even in the 2nd MC Meeting of present term, Ex Officio said the same was insisted upon. ✓ It is also important when we obtain drawings and other corresponding documents, a proper due diligence is must and onboarding of Subject matter expert consultant is necessary and do wholesome analysis. ✓ He further sought the views of MC to move forward. <p>The agenda point was closed with MCs unanimously agreeing that secretary will have to reply to Prestige Management asking for more and specific details.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">4. Finalization of Committee list for Circulation to Members</p> <p>The secretary said that all committees are in place. However, since 3 committees were yet to be finalised, the same is yet to be circulated to community.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disciplinary Committee. The secretary said that while Mr Balakrishnan has given complete details, Mr. Khan has withdrawn from the disciplinary committee nomination. The 3rd applicant Mr Manoj has not responded to association communication for details.
--	--



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was a brief discussion among the members who suggested that secretary should check once again with Mr Manoj before closing the committee formation. <p>Finance Committee - For the finance committee resident owner vacancies, out of 7 persons applied, only 4 persons have shared their profile to association. All of them are bankers. However, one more position needs to be filled. Secretary requested one more person with an audited background to join to close the nominations.</p> <p>Vendor committee –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The secretary explained the usage of Mygate software for the poll and conducting single dimension election using MyGate for shortlisting VC Nominees. • He further said that it had been clearly communicated to all the MCS that we need to choose 5 persons for the vendor committee. All the MCS are also aware that as per by law 5 persons must be chosen for the vendor committee. • It is correct that to one of the queries as secretary had replied that the system may not permit less than 5 options. Thought it was only a technical overlook, it may be wrong but in the light of all the instructions earlier it was important for all the MCS to choose 5 options given. • Hence the demand to revisit the entire process is not correct. • The other Issue raised by some MC members was that whether in such cases the secretary alone should have access. To which secretary clarified that , MyGate system has access for other office bearers, department staffs as well. • However, Society Administrator is Secretary. Regarding the poll, he explained that MyGate has Survey, Opinion poll and Election options. VMC Nominee selection being Single dimension poll, Election option was chosen in which even the secretary does not have powers to view leave alone make any changes during the time when the set police open. • Routine other activities the president and the treasurer have access and can see or check anything. • Some OBs, including Mr Kannan and MCs including Mr Karan Bhatia, Jayakrishnan, Mr Jawahar demanded that there be a repoll and the earlier exercise be null and void. • This was also opposed by some other MCs including applicant Mr Raja B of T6 who said that just go ahead by declaring the votes of those who voted for less than 5 as invalid and there should be no repoll. • Mr Sriram of T20A said that in the beginning Secretary has given wrong introduction and hence there should be repoll.
--	---



- The secretary then clarified that as it is not possible to know who voted for whom, it is not possible to isolate the votes of those who have opted for less than 5. He also said that it has been nearly 50 days since the new team came in and we are yet to communicate this critical piece of information to community.
- Secretary said that it is sad that some of the MCs tried to cast aspersions on poll method in the WhatsApp group just before the poll starts. He further said , While the polling method was well shared in advance, such last-minute attempts are only aimed at doubting integrity of the system and the secretary.
- Secretary also very strongly brought to the notice of MC on objectionable comments being made on Secretary, MC Members & Other committee members by Mr Jawahar MC of T17B calling members as puppets.
- MC Jawahar responded that he had called only the Secretary as puppet. However, it was pointed out by others also that Mr Jawahar had labelled other MCs as puppets. MCs said that decorum should be maintained in the communications and President should proactively intervene to stops such instances. President clarified that she shall do so and has done in the past also.
- It was decided to ascertain the views of MCs present whether we should indeed go for a repoll for the Vendor Committee.
- Upon deliberations, Secretary requested President call for vote to bring closure to the matter.

President asked for MC Votes for re-poll for VMC Selection.

- Only 8 of the 32 MCs present at that time opted for repoll and hence it was decided that the Vendor Committee as decided in the Mygate poll will be treated a final and adopted.

The secretary was asked to circulate the Committee list for all committees to the members.

Prestige Bella Vista Flat Owners Welfare Association



	<p>Discussion on AWB Meet</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MC Member Raja B requested president to sort out any issues within the OB forum to avoid confusions in future and requested her not to post in public forum directly if any differences /communication gaps among OBs. • President replied to Mr Raja that, on her specific post in one of the WhatsApp groups regarding Secretary, Dog committee chairperson and Ward councillor meeting with AWB, she come to know about it only from the public domain, and was upset , hence she posted her message in open forum. • MC Member Raja replied to President that, although your post may be genuine but using your post other residents who could be your supporters are further writing comments and views which will is only instigating others causing the division among the OB/MC deeper. • OB Kannan said, President has initially posted in MC Group, OB Group only and since there was no reply from secretary, she posted in the open forum. President clarified , she posted in Open forum first only and later in MC/OB groups. • Secretary replied that, there are many routine meetings in every committee and post such meeting chairpersons and OBs shall always interchange notes to be in sync. However, moment President Ms Maria posted in Open forum, some residents in the same group (probably supporters) including her husband started writing comments on secretary which are unwarranted. • Secretary also said he has no concern in replying in OB & MC and that it way it should be, however when the post is directly put in open forum about secretary without seeking his views , it seems to be aimed at causing embarrassment to Secretary and overall OB unity. • Secretary also referred , there were earlier communications initiated by President S Maria with our legal counsel and PEPL without the OB & Secretary being consulted prior, however none of those occasions, office bearers went in public forum directly questioning her intent. <p>5. Advance CAM</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members believed this issue is already settled with even the 2nd MC meeting unanimously deciding that members must pay the amount demanded within the extended timeline of 31st December 2023. The matters should not be revisited again and again.
--	---



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • President clarified that there was a mail from member to which she had replied that the email will be discuss with MC. Many members were of the view that we should not bring to MC individual MC matters/ clarifications, and it will set a bad precedent. • President clarified that this being a first communication from the said member, Mr Arumugam of T19 she had responded, and she shall keep the sentiments of the MC in mind. • Mr Vaidyanathan, Chairperson of the HOTO committee of the previous term clarified that these matters have been clarified multiple times. It is sad that Mr Arumugam has once again raised the issue of costing for consultant, among others. • The whole process of appointment of consultant has been explained multiple time including Webinar/EGM/AGM. It was elaborate and fully explained in the AGM/ AGM documents also. Not clear why he raised it again. • It was felt that raising random doubts in social media creates confusion in the minds of members at large and hampers collection process. It should be avoided. • It was also decided by that president may reply to him that all matters raised by him are already clarified resting with decision of MC meeting of 25th November 2023. <p>6. Any other points of discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nothing else was taken up as the meeting had already taken up more than the allotted time. • MCs were insistent that meetings should adhere to specific start and end timings and should not keep stretching. <p>The meeting ended with national Anthem.</p>
--	---



ATTENDANCE SHEET							
3rd MC MEETING - 17-12-2023 - VENUE: CLUBHOUSE							
Tower	Unit No.	Signature		Tower	Unit No.	Signature	
1	1A	1102	MR. GOPALAKRISHNAN G	28	11	11064	MRS. VEDASELVI NELLAIYAPPAN
2	1A	1174	MR. KARAN AIBROL	20	13	13058	MR. KARAN BHATIA
3	1B	1345	MRS. RAJI RAMAN	30	14	14074	MR. BINU JOSHUA
4	2A	2142	MR. VENKAT SURESH	31	15A	15022	MR. PRAKASH BABU M
5	2B	2157	MR. RAMKUMAR NARAYANAN	32	15B	15148	MR. KABILAN KARUNANITHI
6	2B	2185	MR. AMITABH SRIVASTAVA	33	15B	15155	MRS. UMA MAHESWARI S
7	3A	3142	MR. RAMPRASAD V P	34	16A	16172	MR. SUBRAMANIAN K
8	3A	3173	MR. SANTHOSH R K	35	16A	16114	MR. PRAKASH KITTUMANI
9	3B	3028	MR. SUYAMPRAKASAM S	36	16B	16077	MR. ARUNKUMAR CHANDRASEKARAN
10	3B	3105	MR. PURNESH KUMAR	37	16B	16055	MR. ARAVINDAN N
11	4A	4181	MR. JAGANNATHAN VAIDYANATHAN	38	17A	17061	MR. RAVINDRAN A
12	4A	4061	DR. SHANMUGAM A	39	17A	17063	MR. AYYAPPAN PILLAI T
13	4B	4178	MR. SRINIVASAN VALSAN	40	17B	17105	MR. SARAVANAN B
14	5	5064	MR. VASUDEVAN T	41	17B	17148	MR. JAWAHARLAL T
15	5	5011	MS. LATHA	42	18A	18172	MR. VASUDEVAN R
16	6	6123	MR. MUKESH GARG	43	18A	18154	MR. PRASAD S.H.
17	6	6044	MR. BALASUBRAMANIAN RAJA	44	18B	18108	MR. RAVIKUMAR R
18	7	7091	MRS. M SIVAKAMI	45	18B	18098	MRS. HARINI SEENIVASAN
19	7	7082	MR. JAYAKRISHNAN. P. MENON	46	18C	180612	MR. BALARAM VENKATESH
20	8	8063	MS. SANGEETHA S.V.	47	18C	18179	MR. SUNDAR S
21	8	8102	MR. SANKAR S.K.	48	19	19144	MR. KRISHNAN V
22	9A	9112	MS. REBECCA VASURAJ	49	19	19112	MRS. LALITHA JAYASANKAR
23	9A	9154	MRS. BOJANAPATI BHUVANESWARI	50	20A	20094	MR. SANKARAN NATARAJAN
24	9B	9118	MR. SUBRAMANIAN S	51	20A	20031	MR. SRIRAM M.S.
25	9B	9095	MR. GOWRI SHANKAR L	52	20B	20106	DR. RAMESH KUMAR T.C.
26	9C	91710	MR. VISWANATHAN S	53	20C	201411	MRS. MARIA S
27	11	11144	MRS. SAHAANA SANTHANAM	54	20C	201610	MR. KANNAN KRISHNAMURTHY
Ex Officio							
1	6		S RAMESH BABU	2	16B		R VENKATRAMANAN

11

Prestige Bella Vista Flat Owners Welfare Association

Registered with Serial No. 321 of Year 2013, under Section 10 of the Tamil Nadu Societies Registration Act, 1975
Tower 15B, Ground Floor, Prestige Bella Vista, Ayyappanthangal, Chennai – 600056
www.prestige-bella-vista.com



3rd MC MEETING - 17-12-2023 - VENUE: CLUBHOUSE							
Tower	Unit No.	Signature		Tower	Unit No.	Signature	
1	1A	1102	MR. GOPALAKRISHNAN G	28	11	11064	MRS. VEDASELVI NELLAIYAPPAN
2	1A	1174	MR. KARAN ABROL	29	13	13058	MR. KARAN BHATIA
3	1B	1145	MRS. RAJI RAMAN	30	14	14074	MR. BINU JOSHUA
4	2A	2142	MR. VENKAT SURESH	31	15A	15022	MR. PRAKASH BABU M
5	2B	2157	MR. RAMKUMAR NARAYANAN	32	15B	15148	MR. KABILAN KARUNANITHI
6	2B	2185	MR. AMITABH SRIVASTAVA	33	15B	15155	MRS. UMA MAHESWARI S
7	3A	3142	MR. RAMPRASAD V P	34	16A	16172	MR. SUBRAMANIYAN K
8	3A	3173	MR. SANTHOSH R K	35	16A	16114	MR. PRAKASH KITTUMANI
9	3B	3028	MR. SUYAMPRAKASAM S	36	16B	16077	MR. ARUNKUMAR CHANDRASEKARAN
10	3B	3165	MR. PURNESH KUMAR	37	16B	16055	MR. ARAVINDAN N
11	4A	4161	MR. JAGANNATHAN VAIDYANATHAN	38	17A	17061	MR. RAVINDRAN A
12	4A	4061	DR. SHANMUGAM A	39	17A	17083	MR. AYYAPPAN PILLAI T
13	4B	4178	MR. SRINIVASAN VALSAN	40	17B	17105	MR. SARAVANAN B
14	5	5064	MR. VASUDEVAN T	41	17B	17148	MR. JAWAHARLAL T
15	5	5011	MS. LATHA	42	18A	18172	MR. VASUDEVAN R
16	6	6123	MR. MUKESH GARG	43	18A	18154	MR. PRASAD S.H
17	6	6044	MR. BALASUBRAMANIAN RAJA	44	18B	18108	MR. RAVIKUMAR R
18	7	7091	MRS. M. SIVAKAMI	45	18B	18098	MRS. HARINI SEENIVASAN
19	7	7082	MR. JAYAKRISHNAN. P. MENON	46	18C	180612	MR. BALARAM VENKATESH
20	8	8083	MS. SANGEETHA S.V.	47	18C	18179	MR. SUNDAR S
21	8	8102	MR. SANKAR S.K.	48	19	19144	MR. KRISHNAN V
22	9A	9112	MS. REBECCA VASURAJ	49	19	19112	MRS. LALITHA JAYASANKAR
23	9A	9154	MRS. BOJANAPATI BHUVANESWARI	50	20A	20094	MR. SANKARAN NATARAJAN
24	9B	9118	MR. SUBRAMANIAN S	51	20A	20031	MR. SRIRAM M.S.
25	9B	9095	MR. GOWRI SHANKAR L	52	20B	20108	DR. RAMESH KUMAR T.C.
26	9C	91710	MR. VISWANATHAN S	53	20C	201411	MRS. MARIA S
27	11	11144	MRS. SAHAANA SANTHANAM	54	20C	201610	MR. KANNAN KRISHNAMURTHY
Ex Officio							
1	6		S RAMESH BABU	2	16B		R VENKATRAMANAN

Record of members who wanted Report for vendor committee.