

Grove End Gardens Residents Association

Minutes of Annual General Meeting 08-Jul-2019 at Arnold House School

Members of the General Committee present were:-

David Burr (DB) – Chair
Finlay Edridge (FE) – Vice Chair and acting Treasurer
Linda Diamond (LD) – Secretary
Maureen Deeley (MD)

Invited guests present were:

Gary Medazoumian (GM) – CEO, Grove End Housing Limited (GEHL) and
Maintenance Fund Trustee
Julian Butcher (JB) – Property Manager from Rendall & Rittner

Apologies:

Matthew Wilson-Tate (MWT) – Building Manager, Grove End Gardens

DB welcomed members to the AGM, saying he was very pleased to see such a good turnout. **DB** went on to explain the purpose of the AGM was to update everyone on what's going on at the block and with the residents association and to give everyone an opportunity to ask any questions they might have.

DB welcomed the guests: Gary Medazoumian, CEO of GEHL (the freeholder) and also one of the two Maintenance Trustees responsible for the service charge, and Julian Butcher – our property manager from Rendall & Rittner, and thanked them for giving up their evenings and for all that they do for the block. Thanks were also extended to Arnold House, who had once again allowed us to use their facilities at no charge.

DB finally thanked GEGRA's committee members for all that they do in the running of the residents association and FE who as well as being Vice Chair had also agreed to take back his old job of Treasurer because PF had moved away.

1) Chairman's report

DB advised that this year, most of our efforts have been in four areas:

- A. The fire-safety corridor project, including the service charge impact
- B. The future pipework replacement project, again including the service charge impact
- C. Pushing for completion of the freeholder's first penthouse development
- D. Mitigating the freeholder's proposals for their second penthouse project

DB made a direct quote from the speech he made at the 2018 AGM when he said:

"Whilst we don't want to encourage projects to be started prematurely, we continue to be concerned at how long it takes to progress matters at the block. It doesn't seem to matter whether it be service charge projects or the completion of the freeholder's own projects. It is hard to see why we have to wait so long and still not reach completion."

DB said that unfortunately GEGRA felt the rate of progress and the sporadic approach to management had not improved over the last year. For the year to Sep-2018 service charge payers paid the managing agents just over £100k and the maintenance trustee just under £47k. These costs are in addition to the cost of the day-to-day management provided by the full-time on-site building manager. Given all of that management expense **DB** said we don't understand:

- Why there wasn't more warning to lessees of the corridor project expense, particularly as management first became aware of the deficiencies in 2014?
- Why GEGRA had to push so hard for residents' concerns to be heard? Including aspects like the cost of boarding not being a service charge expense and the original proposals being so unaffordable.
- Why it was left to GEGRA to ask the maintenance trustee to seek a refund for the five floors of communal doors, that were replaced by the service charge for reasons of fire-safety and are now said to not be fire-safe after all? How is it that they still can't tell us the amount they will claim in refund when the original project was there's? Why don't they know what they paid?
- Why we still haven't seen a medium-term maintenance plan and service charge projections for the coming years?
- Why we had to push so hard for our practical concerns over the pipework project to be heard?
- Why the first penthouse project still isn't finished? This was meant to be an 18-month project. Dekra started work in Jan-2014 and the freeholder's surveyor was meant to be supervising the project in detail. How was it allowed to get so bad? The freeholder took over the site in Mar-2017 which is 27 months ago and yet they are still doing the works. How can it be that the freeholder takes 27 months to complete works on a project that was only meant to take 18 months in the first place? In all we're about 66 months into this 18-month project and we still don't know when it will end.
- DB queried why the maintenance trustee allowed the freeholder not to honour its service charge subsidy promise when the construction works still aren't finished?
 - We still have penthouse scaffolding on the roof. We still have issues around the garden and the block including, the lifts, undecorated, uncarpeted, staircases, holes in the exterior walls, mismatched pavers, the wonky lawn and the dead hedge. We still await a soft copy of the outstanding items so we can check it's a complete list.
- Why would the freeholder consider it reasonable to plan for a second penthouse development when the first is still in this state?
- Why do we still have to push for remediations for the Grove End Road forecourt and reception project that was meant to be completed in Mar-2014? GEHL had agreed to replace the illuminated sign and the stone path but these have not yet been delivered. Inexplicably there remains a difference of opinion over the suitability of the materials used for the stone steps and internal floor despite these crumbling, cracking and staining. JB tells us these are fit for purpose, but how can that be the case?
- Why are there still service charge and storage cupboard invoicing issues at R&R?

DB summed up by saying that those were a sample of the questions we ponder and issues we push and we look to the collective management to explain what changes they will make so that things improve.

2) Treasurer's report including resolution to approve GEGRA accounts

FE gave his report. Membership revenue was up, and he urged everyone to set up a standing order for their subscription each 1-Apr as it is by far the most efficient manner to support GEGRA. Our expenditure had increased as we had invested in a modest laptop to replace our 15-year-old PC. We have healthy reserves of £6,813.18, which is sufficient for professional advice should we need, as we find we can normally get advice at no charge.

A resolution to approve GEGRA accounts was proposed by **FE** and seconded by **DB**. The members were all in favour, so the accounts were approved.

3) Election for General Committee

Since existing committee members had expressed their wish to stand again and as no new names had yet come forward, there was no election.

DB asked for volunteers to come forward for the committee promising those that volunteered would gain a huge feeling of satisfaction from the work.

4) Update regarding the proposed penthouse development

DB explained that GEHL submitted a planning application on 1-Aug-2018 to build two further penthouse flats on the roof. Their plans included reallocating two of the shared underground parking spaces to the new flats and replacing the two Grove End Road lifts, with one being extended to the new penthouses.

GEGRA had worked with GEHL and agreed certain commitments from them to protect aspects of quality of life during the development. This Oct-2018 document is available on GEGRA's website.

GEHL have since withdrawn their planning application due to concerns that WCC had about how near to the Grove End Road façade the development would reach. GERGA understands that WCC also had some concerns about the reallocation of parking spaces and about refuse collection proposals.

GEGRA ask GEHL that if they resubmit their proposals that they consult with the association meaningfully giving an opportunity to address any concerns before they submit their application. Also, GEGRA asks that GEHL volunteer wording for planning conditions that will ensure any developer delivers on the commitments in the Oct-2018 document.

Finally, GEHL have resisted GEGRA's requests that they commit to compensating lessees for temporary loss of amenities during the development. This is a strange position for them to take. This development would be the freeholder's private commercial project and is only possible if lessees suffer a temporary loss of amenities. Why should the freeholder expect lessees to suffer a loss without appropriate compensation?

Written question: Based upon the experience of the last penthouse development, I am concerned that the removal of the water tank near the Grove End Road façade will cause enormous noise and may even damage the structure of the building.

JB said that the water tank is in a very bad condition and must be replaced and this has no bearing on the 2nd penthouse project. The cost for doing this is significant and we are finding out if it will last another 12 months or more. **DB** said he thought the questioner had in mind the noise associated with the demolition of the concrete tank construction to make space for a penthouse, not the replacement of the tank interior itself.

GM responded that at this stage a method statement for the second penthouse development hadn't been produced but this would be considered in due course.

Written question: Those of us who have lived here for many years and particularly the retired members of our community who spend much of their time at home will

have to endure yet another “hell” if any when this further penthouse development takes place.

DB followed up being saying that GEGRA had been pleased to see that when the Abbey Road Baptist Church development had taken place that GEHL had charged the developers an ongoing rental fee for placing scaffolding on the block’s land. This had served as an incentive to conclude the impact on our land and also meant we were compensated for the duration of the works. This experience and the fact that we saw multiple developers go under during the church project encouraged GEGRA to ask GEHL to agree a similar construction duration compensation with lessees throughout their first penthouse development. This had been agreed but was terminated early by GEHL without agreement. This experience is going to make it very hard to feel confidence in any penthouse 2 agreements.

SG (Flat 127) asked if one of the Grove End Road lifts is to be extended to the proposed penthouse level, does that mean that it will not continue to stop at the existing floors. **JB** confirmed that the proposal was to replace both Grove End Road lifts, that they would both continue to stop at all existing floors and that the larger lift (Lift 4) would also stop at the new 7th floor.

SG (Flat 127) objected to this as there is already too much demand for the larger lift and it visiting yet another floor would exacerbate this. The smaller lift is too small for wheelchairs, pushchairs and more than a few people.

DB responded that GEGRA had discussed mitigations with GEHL during the planning application process. GEHL had said that when replacing the smaller lift they would increase its size if this were possible. GEHL had been unwilling to confirm what was possible as they said they hadn’t time to get advice due to the planning deadlines. **DB** said that now GEHL had withdrawn the application and was in control of if/when they resubmit, they clearly have time to investigate the feasibility of increasing the size of this smaller lift, and we would expect this to be done before a new application was made.

VD (Flat 240) wanted to know if materials would be stored on top of her flat when building the second penthouse project. **GM** responded that this was not known at this stage.

The GEGRA AGM was then adjourned for the question and answer session with Julian Butcher representing Rendall & Rittner.

a) Estate Management and Porterage

Residents praised the performance of the onsite team.

Written question: Why is there so little porterage for the Abbey Road reception? Please can you improve this?

JB responded that MWT is based there for a lot of the day and a porter does staff the desk at intervals during the day.

LD asked if when MWT was on leave whether a porter could spend longer at the Abbey Road reception. **LD** said she had frequently encountered delivery people who

needed help etc. and it would be helpful to have someone there to cover when MWT was not there.

b) Lifts

Written question: Lift reliability at the block is still inadequate. There are problems that date back years that still haven't been put right. It isn't reasonable to expect us to wait so long.

JB responded that the problems in existence today do not date back years and that whilst there had been some problems recently, generally there has been a much better service with fewer breakdowns.

Written question: The emergency telephone hasn't been working in the service lift since Dekra replaced it in 2015. When will you fix it?

JB responded that this would not now be fixed as they had now decided to replace all of the lift telephones with the new intercom system when it is fitted. This will call to the main reception desk so the porter can deal with any emergency and escalate as necessary.

Written question: Please can you fix Lift 3?

JB responded that unfortunately, asbestos had been found in this lift shaft which would need to be removed by specialists before lift engineers could work safely. Asbestos removal is expected to start in 3 weeks and should take 3 weeks and be followed by 2 weeks of lift repairs.

DB summed up that the lift issues generally are allowed to impact residents for far too long. Management ought to know where asbestos exists in the building so repairs are not impacted. The emergency telephone issues should not have been allowed to continue for 4 years. There had been a general lack of reliability for all of the new lifts since they were installed and in response to this **JB** had committed to producing a lift action plan within one month of last year's AGM and this hadn't been forthcoming.

JB responded that a lift action plan hadn't been necessary due to the improvements in reliability but that GEHL had agreed to replace the controller in Lift 1 and if this is beneficial other lifts' controllers would be replaced too. **DB** said that GEGRA had been told this last year but we hadn't seen any action.

Various attendees complained that the lift reliability was still an issue. **MJ (Flat 701)** complained that the pond lift was the only lift to their 8th floor flat and as it was frequently out of order, they were often in the position of having to uninvite friends that were unable to manage stairs, often at short notice.

DB repeated the request made at previous AGMs that statistics be published on each of the lifts' reliability so it could be ascertained exactly how frequently they were out of order and for how long, as without these statistics it was hard to agree that there had been an improvement. **JB** committed to doing this.

MB (Flat 293) asked for any works to replace Lifts 3 and 4 during a further penthouse development to be planned to ensure that we are not left without working lifts. **JB** confirmed this would be done.

JR (Flat 270) complained that passenger lifts were being used for removals. **VD (Flat 240)** questioned why heavy materials were being taken to the roof for the penthouse remedial works using the passenger lifts. **JB** responded that he was not aware of this and would investigate.

c) Noise disturbance

Written question: It is impossible to stay home when there are flat renovations nearby. What can you do to limit the duration of noise?

JB responded that we cannot prevent alterations to flats being done although there are time limits to when noise is allowed.

Following questions **JB** explained that previously, renovations of individual flats were not allowed to last more than 12 weeks, but now the approach was to award a period of time that matched the planned works, and this could be more or less than 12 weeks.

JR (Flat 270) complained that she was retired and had had work going around her home for the last 4 months and it is unbearable and has affected her health.

Written question: Is it allowed to listen to music in the garden? It should not be allowed.

JB responded that listening to music in the garden was allowed but that if someone felt disturbed by excessive noise they should inform the porters.

There was discussion that it wasn't possible for someone to play music in the garden (unless using headphones) without disturbing others. On a show of hands, those present unanimously wanted music prohibited in the garden (unless using headphones). **LD** suggested this be included in MWT's next newsletter.

MD (Flat 125) complained that the flat above her had been allowed to have hard floors and that the resident walked around with healed shoes causing terrible noise at very late hours. Could they not be required to wear slippers to cut down on noise?

JB promised to investigate. He said that whilst it was possible to get licences to replace carpets with hard floors, these licences included clauses that required certain noise insulation and that ultimately carpets would need to be fitted if there were reasonable complaints.

LM (Flat 4) said she was concerned that there seemed to be a difference in these noise controls around freeholder versus leaseholder owned flats. **JB** explained that the freeholder didn't require licences when fitting hard floors as they didn't own leases on the flats and so a 'licence' to vary a lease wasn't needed. However, **JB** confirmed that regardless of this technical point, the freeholder was committed to following the requirements set out in the licences.

d) Outside spaces

Written question: Every year the church garden gets better and better but the main garden hasn't been reinstated properly since the penthouse project.

LD said the enormous improvements in the church garden was due to the wonderful volunteer work of Janice who spent hours each week weeding and planting new plants many of them from her own allotment.

JB said they had been waiting for the matter of the perimeter wall between us and the school to be resolved before improving the lawn. The hedge will be replaced in the Autumn.

DB explained that GEGRA had asked to receive a written statement explaining what was to be done to the lawn and the hedge and to what standard. We didn't want any misunderstandings or disappointments.

e) Plumbing (incl. heating, hot and cold water, drainage)

Written question: Reserve funds have been collected and ring fenced, but it is expected that eventually, further sums will be needed. Please could you update us with the latest plans envisaged for this work?

Written question: Do we have a finalised plan as to how and when the work will commence and when it will finish? Is it still the management intension to install the pipes in accordance with the 'mock-up' provided on the 6th floor or has this now been revised? From an aesthetic viewpoint the mock-up was unattractive and the loss of ceiling height made the corridors claustrophobic and the art deco feel was totally lost.

JB responded to both questions that at this stage it wasn't known what works would be undertaken, how soon they would be needed and how much they may cost. He explained that GEGRA had found an M&E consultant to provide a second opinion and this was awaited. **JB** also explained that the second opinion was sought to understand how the pipes should be replaced not whether they should be replaced as it was accepted that some works would be necessary. **JB** said that we hadn't seen failures of the pipework and we needed guidance as to the life expectancy of the pipes.

RA (Flat 315) said that they were finding black particles in their water and wanted to know whether it was safe. **JB** said that water safety was regularly tested by a specialist company to ensure that all was safe. **JB** said the particles were probably rust particles which had dislodged from the interior of the pipe. **JB** said he would ask them to test the water at Flat 315 on their next visit.

f) Refurbishments of common parts

Written question: I felt forced to replace my door because I can't prove it is safe but the managing agents should have explained the requirements when I replaced it.

JB responded to say that the project was thrown at us at very short notice post-Grenfell and there was not enough time to give lessees more information.

DB said he thought the questioner was challenging why it was that management didn't have a plan in hand for this long ago as that would have allowed those refurbishing flats for the last few years to not waste money fitting non-compliant

doors. Given that the regulations haven't changed, why have management signed off on recent renovations if their doors aren't compliant?

Written question: The new doors are too expensive. It should be possible to get a cheaper door even if it looks less flashy.

JB replied that the original costings were around £3,500 to £4,000 and so the team had done well to get them below £3k.

Written question: You didn't give us enough warning of the service charge rise and the door costs.

JB responded that they had wanted to raise money gradually but unfortunately because of Grenfell we were under pressure to prioritise fire safety improvements.

DB reminded **JB** that management had been made aware of door deficiencies at least as early as 2014 and they would have avoided such financial hardship if they had considered and communicated the financial consequences then.

Written question: When will the corridor project start and finish?

JB explained that it started on 25-Jun and would last 48 weeks. **DB** intervened and stated that **JB's** letter to lessees of 9-May stated that it would be a 33-week project. **JB** promised to look into this and confirm.

Written question: When will the contractor replace our doors?

JB said that a project plan would be issued so everyone could understand the phases and dates.

Written question: Will the corridor contractor stick to the allowable noisy working hours? (9:00 till 13:00 and 14:00 till 17:30).

JB said he would check what the specification states about hours of work.

Written question: We all understand that certain works must be done in line with building regulations. However, it was my understanding that the concept of GEG was originally to provide housing for business people/civil servants etc. with comfortable homes at reasonable costs. We are all finding the additional sums requested in respect of the Flats and Estate Reserve far beyond our budgets and as yet have seen nothing for our money. Many residents live on fixed incomes and are finding it very difficult to keep up with these charges.

DB followed up by saying that there was a disagreement between GEGRA and management as to the level of the proposed works. Management had said that GEG was a prestigious block that commanded works of this level whereas GEGRA was of the view that GEG was a mid-range block in St John's Wood and that proposals were too high-end and beyond what was affordable for people.

JB responded that whilst the block may be mid-range as compared to St John's Wood, that any St John's Wood block was prestigious and commanded works of this level.

DB said that GEGRA disagreed. He explained that St John's Wood was a very diverse neighbourhood with widely differing price ranges and that these works were in excess of what lessees wanted or could afford.

GM said that according to their estate agents, values in the block had improved because of the works to upgrade the receptions. He said that these increased flat values would allow people to afford the corridor costs.

DB asked for a show of hands, all residents present agreed with the statement that GEG was a mid-range block of flats. All but the residents of one flat voted that the proposals were in excess of the block's mid-range level.

JA (Flat 315) said she felt the corridors were well below par. The carpets needed changing and the doors and walls all needed investment.

MB (Flat 293) asked whether the freeholder was using this project to upgrade the block so they could sell it on. **GM** replied that they were not.

MB (Flat 280) complained that the light grey sample carpet fitted in her part of the corridor was terrible and already had black stains on it that showed badly.

JB explained that this had only been a suggested look and that the plan now was not to replace the carpets. Instead this prototype area will be reinstated with the original carpet design.

VD (Flat 240) said that during the 20-May presentation we were asked to fill in forms and leave cheques but these had not been cashed. Are they safe? **JB** explained they had been awaiting the opening of a special new bank account for this purpose.

DS (Flat 263) said she had paid by BACS and had received no indication that the money had been received. **JB** replied that he would investigate.

PP (Flat 167) said he had recently heard that GEHL was offering interest free loans and wanted to know more about this. **JB** explained that whilst around 90% of the apartments have already paid, where lessees were finding it very difficult, GEHL had provided them the opportunity to spread the cost over a longer period.

PP (Flat 167) asked why it was that Cosmur were charging more to mass fit Banham locks than Banham charge to visit and fit these individually.

JB responded that 4 different firms were given the opportunity to tender for the works and that Cosmur were the cheapest for the door as a whole. He also said that with regard to the Banham online prices, these were subject to a site visit so you may end up paying more than their list price.

DB explained that the demands management were making of lessees to prove that any third-party fitted locks would not compromise fire-safety made it very problematic to use someone other than Cosmur. He went on to say that GEGRA were very concerned that in awarding communal projects that management should be extremely careful not to provide contractors with monopoly power to set the prices of extras like premium locks and if a monopoly was in place that management should control these prices. **JB** responded that they had not given up on trying to get these prices down.

g) Rubbish collection and recycling

Written question: Can you collect the rubbish quicker so the bags don't sit in the corridor? **JB** responded that rubbish may only be put out for collection between 6am and 9am and that there were three collections during this time. He didn't know that this could be improved upon.

Written question: Please can you provide a battery recycling bin? **JB** responded that he will investigate.

Written question: Can we have more recycling bins? **JB** replied that we could once the area had been vacated by the corridor renovation project.

RA (Flat 315) said there was a problem with cockroaches in the corridor. **JB** replied that this will be looked into.

JR (Flat 270) asked why on weekends porters are being used to collect rubbish as this is further taking away security from the Abbey Road reception. **JB** said he thought this was a cost saving exercise to not cover yardmen leave.

h) Security (incl. CCTV, Entry fobs, Intercom)

VD (Flat 240) asked whether the dimensions of the new units could be given as she didn't think there was space on her wall for the new unit as it is much wider than the existing unit. **JB** said that dimensions could be made available and that each flat will be visited to see where the intercom can be placed.

i) Service charge accounts

Written question: Many leaseholders were unprepared for the recent, high level of service charge demands. These became necessary because of the urgency to carry out fire precaution works. Sufficient reserves have now been collected and these works started this month. It is now requested that the next service demand covers only the routine annual maintenance work and that no reserve funds are collected for a full year. This will provide some relief to leaseholders, allowing them time to reorganise their personal financial responsibilities.

Written question: Is it legal for the managing agents to put the service charge up so much without more warning? They should make sure we don't get these painful shocks.

JB responded to these two questions by saying management were looking to reduce reserve collections back to the previous level but that we must continue to collect for the pipe project.

Written question: It is noted in the minutes of the last two GEGRA AGMs, you have consistently requested from R&R, a consolidated list of proposed works, with estimated funding and scheduled completion dates. This should enable the following years of reserve service charge demands to be kept at a reasonable and consistent level, based on the legal Section 20 consultation process.

JB responded that as they do not know how much the pipework project will cost or exactly how soon works will be required they cannot be sure what future reserve collections will be needed. He said that the cost of the plumbing project is so high, the

cost of all the other works is insignificant in comparison and that any projected cost plan would be worthless. Therefore the priority is to get more certainty on how long the plumbing project can be delayed, how the pipework is to be routed and a second opinion on the likely cost.

DB responded by saying that lessees have yet to receive any projections in writing and that management were not doing them any favours by not setting out what is known and unknown and projecting the likely impacts so people can plan.

SH (Flat 95) said that it was management's responsibility to project and communicate so households can plan.

Written question: We urgently need to cut the running costs of the building which are now unaffordable. There have been many upgrades since I moved in but the costs are now unaffordable. We need to reduce anything that isn't essential including non-essential staff. **JB** replied that there are no non-essential staff. He felt the underlying service charge was not high it is just the remedial works which have put up the costs.

PP (Flat 167) asked whether in order to save costs we could reduce the portage and not have two porters overnight. **JB** said given the size of the block we could not.

MJ (Flat 701) believes the Maintenance Trustee is responsible for ensuring that there are no large swings in service charges and that a lot more attention needs to be paid to this.

SH (Flat 95) asked what current pipework reserves were? **JB** responded that they were at approximately £1.5 million but that estimates for the work vary widely from approx. £3m to £10m.

SH (Flat 95) asked as there were two Maintenance Fund Trustees what the process was for settling disagreements. Who had the casting vote? **GM** responded that they didn't have a process because there never had been any disagreements. He said it was a collective decision and they consulted professionals for guidance.

SG (Flat 127) asked whether that meant we were paying two people to do one job. **JB** explained that the fee was a percentage of the service charge and wouldn't be any less or more if the number of trustees was less or more.

MJ (Flat 701) said he could see that from time to time the interests of the Maintenance Fund may differ from that of the Freeholder and as the Freeholder appointed both Maintenance Fund Trustees and as they both held roles with the Freeholder too what processes are in place to manage conflicts of interest.

GM responded that there isn't conflict and on the contrary the Maintenance Fund Trustee cooperates very well with the Freeholder. He said that previously a Corporate Trustee had been appointed but they didn't always align themselves well with the needs of the Freeholder.

After the meeting, **GM** said he had intended to say that the Corporate Trustee hadn't always aligned themselves with the needs of the building including the freeholder, lessees, staff etc. Also removing the Corporate Trustee saved the service charge recurring fees.

DB explained that he felt GM's answer showed that there wasn't an understanding of the issue. He said GEGRA had long been concerned with this matter and hadn't seen the Maintenance Fund Trustee challenging the Freeholder in the way they'd hoped.

JB gave an example of the Maintenance Trustee using their influence to convince the Freeholder to take on the employment of the staff from the Managing Agents to save VAT as the rules on VAT were changing. **PP (Flat 167)** felt that the Freeholder employing staff that have Maintenance Fund duties could give rise to conflicts of interest.

JB also said that R&R attend all management meetings and do pass on advice when needed to avoid any issues.

j) Other business

VD (Flat 240) asked whether R&R can provide a list of trusted contractors. **JB** said they could provide names but not references or recommendations and that Matthew should be contacted if names were needed.

RA (Flat 315) asked whether the entrance to the Abbey Road forecourt should be widened further as it was still very difficult for vehicles. **JB** said this could be considered.

Recommended GEGRA AGM

5) Other Association business

None.

DB closed the meeting at 22:16.