



Residential  
Property  
TRIBUNAL SERVICE

**LONDON RENT ASSESSMENT PANEL  
LEASEHOLD VALUATION TRIBUNAL**

**DECISION OF THE LEASEHOLD VALUATION TRIBUNAL**

**REF: LON/00AY/LSC/2006/0299**

**9 REEVES HOUSE, BAYLIS ROAD, LONDON SE1**

**L.B. LAMBETH**

**Applicant**

**MS LOUISA BUONAMICO**

**Respondent**

Tribunal: Mr M Martynski (Solicitor)  
Mr F Coffey FRICS  
Mrs A Moss

Present at hearing: Ms N Muir (Counsel for the Applicant)  
Ms M Vernon- Ellington (Applicant's employee)

Date of hearing: 7 November 2006

Date of decision: 7 November 2006

**Introduction**

1 This is a case transferred from Lambeth County Court by order of District Judge Zimmels. The case concerns the Applicant's claim against the Respondent for the sums of £3008.00, and £1,168.00, which were claimed by way of service charges from the Respondent.

2 The Respondent has a lease ("the Lease") of 9 Reeves House, Baylis Road SE1 ("the Flat") which commenced on 12 May 1986 and which is for a period of 125 years.

**The inspection**

3 The exterior of the building in which the Flat is situated was inspected on the morning of the hearing by the Tribunal and by the Applicant's Counsel, Ms Muir. No access could be gained to the interior of the building or the Flat as no answer could be gained from the Flat.

**The hearing**

4 The Respondent was not present at the hearing. She had not complied with the directions given in this case to file a reply to the Applicant's statement of case setting out in detail the outstanding service charges which are challenged.

5 The Applicant told the Tribunal that the Respondent had in fact paid the sums which were claimed in the County Court proceedings referred to above.

6 The Applicant therefore withdrew its application before the Tribunal. It further stated that it would the County Court proceedings and that within those proceedings, it would not claim any costs from the Respondent.

7 Accordingly no determination is necessary on the reasonableness or payability of the service charges which are the subject of these proceedings. It therefore remains open to the Respondent to make a further application to the Tribunal regarding those issues.



Mr M Martynski (Chairman)

7 November 2006