



**FIRST-TIER TRIBUNAL
PROPERTY CHAMBER
(RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY)**

Case Reference : **CAM/26UH/LSC/2016/0002**

Property : **Kilby 1-26, Kilby Road, Stevenage
SG1 2LT**

Applicants : **Tom & Catherine Marshall (2)
Jason Anderson (10)
Sarah Barclay (11)
Aaron & Lindsey Demant (12)
Joyce Drammeah (13)
Nicola Houghton (16)
Trudy Brimicombe (19)
Hanna Marie Chipchase (21)**

Representatives : **Jason Anderson
Ms Hanna Chipchase**

Respondent : **Genesis Housing Association
Limited**

Representative : **Mr J Parker Counsel**

Type of Application : **Section 27A Landlord and Tenant
Act 1985 – determination of service
charges payable**

Tribunal Members : **Judge John Hewitt
Ms Marina Krisko BSc (ESTMAN)
FRICS
Mrs Lorraine Hart**

**Date and venue of
Hearing** : **11 April 2016
Stevenage Magistrates Court**

Date of Decision : **6 May 2016**

DECISION

Decisions of the tribunal

1. The tribunal determines that:
 - 1.1 The service charges payable by the applicants to the respondent in respect of the service charge year 1 April 2014 to 31 March 2015 are as shown in column 2b of Appendix A attached to this decision

In summary there is payable:

| | |
|------------------------|----------------|
| Estate Costs (0.52%) | £318.47 |
| Building Costs (3.85%) | £237.24 |
| Buildings Insurance | £110.24 |
| Audit Fee | £ 10.00 |
| Management Fee | <u>£170.00</u> |
| Total | £845.95 |

- 1.2 No determination is made in respect of the budget for the year 2015/16; and
 - 1.3 An order shall be made pursuant to section 20C Landlord and Tenant Act 1985 to the effect that none of the costs incurred by the respondent in connection with these proceedings are to be regarded as relevant costs to be taken into account in determining the amount of any service charge payable by any of the applicants.
2. The reasons for our decisions are set out below.

NB Later reference in this Decision to a number in square brackets ([]) is a reference to the page number of the hearing file provided to us for use at the hearing.

Procedural background

3. The applicants are some of the long lessees in a block of flats known as Kilby 1-26, Kilby Road, Stevenage. The respondent is the registered proprietor of the freehold interest and is the landlord.
4. Kilby 1-26 is a block of 26 flats. It is one of several blocks of flats on an estate developed about ten years ago. Evidently the estate comprises a total of 198 residential units most of which are flats but there is a small number of houses which contribute to estate costs.
5. On 12 January 2016 the applicants made an application to the tribunal pursuant to section 27A Landlord and Tenant Act 1985 in respect of the actual service charges payable for the year 1 April 2014 to 31 March 2015 and in respect of the budget prepared for the year 1 April 2015 to 31 March 2016.

6. Directions were first given on 8 February 2016. For several reasons we need not go into the parties had some difficulty in accommodating one another as regards pre-hearing preparation and in particular the content of the hearing bundle. It is not helpful to apportion blame or responsibility but much more extensive pre-hearing case management was required than is usual for a case where the issues are relatively discreet.
7. The upshot of this was that for the hearing Mr Anderson, the lead representative for the applicants, provided a hearing bundle running from page 1 to 597 plus some further 20 or so pages which were not numbered. The respondent's solicitors were not confident that all of the documents they might want to refer to had been included in the bundle prepared by Mr Anderson and so they prepared their own bundle which ran from page 1 to 582. Some documents were duplicated and appear in both bundles.

Inspection and hearing

8. On the morning of 11 April 2016 the members of the tribunal had the benefit of a site inspection. Present were Mr Anderson and his partner and two other long lessees, several representatives of the respondent including Ms Reventi Jesani and Ms Grace Brady who is a neighbourhood assistant whose duties are similar to those of a property manager. Mr Parker, counsel for the respondent was also present but at his suggestion he did not accompany us around the block and the estate in order to keep the numbers of the party down to a manageable level.
9. We were shown around both the block Kilby 1-26 and the estate. A number of physical features were drawn to our attention by both parties. We noted the internal common parts were carpeted throughout and although the condition of the carpet was reasonable it had not been properly cleaned. The painted walls were also in reasonable decorative order

A lift served all floors but the floor and walls were dirty, marked and untidy and it did not give the appearance of having been properly cleaned in recent times.

Also the interior of the common parts glazed windows did not give the appearance of having cleaned properly in recent times.

In terms of amount one of the big ticket items was the cost of water supplied to the estate. We asked to see the water meter. The representatives of the respondent present were not too sure where it was located. They thought it might be in a locked cupboard but they did not have with them a key to that cupboard.

10. The hearing got underway at about 11:00.

Mr Anderson presented the case on behalf of the applicants. He was accompanied by Ms Hanna Chipchase. Ms Drammeah and Ms

Houghton were also present and made observations on matters in issue from time to time.

Mr Parker presented the case on behalf of the respondent. He called Ms R Jesani to give oral evidence. Contributions were also made by Ms G Brady.

Shortly prior to the hearing and in accordance with further directions both parties had made comments on a Scott schedule. In the course of that exercise the respondent had felt able to make some concessions on some of the sums claimed. The Scott schedule was a very helpful map.

In essence we went through the Scott schedule item by item and Mr Anderson and other applicants had the opportunity to ask Ms Jesani questions on the respondent's comments in the schedule. Ms Jesani, whose witness statement is at [A184] is a Service Charge Partner who has worked for the respondent since 2003. Ms Jesani is familiar with how the respondent manages its blocks of flats in general terms, its practices and procedures but does not have first-hand knowledge of the subject development or the works carried out on it. Ms Grace Brady provided additional detail and was as helpful as she could be where appropriate but as Ms Brady had only been in post for about a year she had limited direct knowledge of the actual service charges incurred during the year in question.

11. During the course of this exercise the applicants felt able to withdraw some of their challenges once they had heard the fuller explanation given to them and the respondent felt able to make some further concessions once it was clear that some supporting information or detail was lacking.
12. In the event only four items were left in issue. These are shaded green on Appendix A attached to this decision. We will take each of the in turn shortly.

The lease and the service charge structure

13. We were told that the leases of the flats in Kilby 1-26 were in common form and all of them provided for a shared equity arrangement.

A complete sample copy of the lease of 10 Kilby is at [R1]. It is dated 19 December 2006 and was granted by Paddington Churches Housing Association Limited to Miss Rebecca Sims for a term of 125 years from 24 June 2006.

14. The service charge regime is in a fairly standard and conventional form.

Material to present purposes:

The Particulars [R6] define:

Title Number: HD440683

| | |
|---|---|
| Estate: | The land now or formerly comprised in the above mentioned Title |
| Building: | The block of flats constructed on the Estate and comprising the Premises |
| Premises: | 10 Kilby Road ... on the Second Floor of the Building as the same is shown edged red on the ... Plan... |
| Specified Proportion of the Building Services Provision: | A fair proportion of the elements of the Service Provision (as defined in clause 7 hereof) in relation to the costs of the Building |
| Specified Proportion of the Common Parts of the Estate: | 0.52% of the elements of the Service Provision (as defined in clause 7 hereof) in relation to the costs of the Common Parts of the Estate |

15. Clause 7 of the lease provides:

The account year means the year ending on 31 March;

Prior to each account year the landlord is to estimate the amount likely to be incurred in the year by the landlord of the costs of and incidental to the performance by the landlord of its covenants contained in clause 5(2)-(4) of the lease, plus costs of insurance of the Building and the common parts of the Estate, plus the fees and charges payable to persons employed in connection with the management or management of the Building plus:

“(g) any administrative charges incurred by or on behalf of the Landlord including but not limited to:

- (i) The grant of approvals under this lease or applications for such approvals;*
- (ii) The provision of information or documents by or on behalf of the Landlord;*
- (iii) Costs arising from non-payment of a sum due to the Landlord; and/or*
- (iv) Costs arising in connection with a breach (or alleged breach) of this Lease”*

Plus an appropriate amount as a reserve towards certain future expenditure.

The lessees share of the estimated service charge is payable by equal monthly instalments in advance on the 1st day of each month.

As soon as practicable after the end of each account year the landlord is to certify the amount by which the estimate of expenditure shall have exceeded or fallen short of the actual expenditure. Any balancing debit is payable by the lessee forthwith and a balancing credit shall be allowed to the lessee.

16. The respondent has allocated 3.85% as being a 'fair proportion' of Building costs. Evidently this was arrived at on the basis that all 26 flats within the Building were broadly of similar size and thus the costs should be shared equally by all 26 long lessees. This allocation was not in dispute. Of course the allocation of 0.52% to Estate costs is fixed by the lease. We were told by Ms Jesani that the contributions to Estate costs payable by the various persons who are obliged to contribute to them totalled 100%.

The service charges in dispute

Estate Costs

Grounds Maintenance

17. The gist of the complaint by the applicants was that the grounds were not well kept and the costs incurred were unreasonable in amount given the (poor) level of service provided. During the inspection a number of examples were drawn to our attention. We noted a substantial and dated accumulation of cigarette ends outside the front door of the building which had plainly not been swept up for a good while. Also several of the beds around the estate contained shrubs which do not appear to have been cut back or tended for a while and there are large gaps or spaces from which we infer shrubs were planted but did not thrive and subsequently died but no re-planting had been undertaken. In consequence the overall ambience of the Estate is not particularly pleasing.
18. It is evident that there has been some misunderstanding between the landlord and the local authority over the roads on the estate being adopted. We were told that finally the local authority accepted that the roads were adopted in December 2014. It is to be hoped that this will help resolve some confusion which arose in connection with a parking scheme on the Estate roads imposed by the landlord and the allocation of costs of street lighting, both as regards energy consumed and repairs to lamp standards. The landlord remains responsible for the car park areas on the Estate and the lighting of them. The landlord may wish to clarify with the local authority exactly which lamp standards each is responsible for.
19. Ms Jesani had no personal knowledge of exactly what grounds maintenance work is undertaken. Ms Jesani told us that the respondent has a very substantial property portfolio and endeavours to negotiate contracts with major contractors to try and achieve an economy of scale. Those contracts are reviewed regularly and are subject to periodic (3 yearly) competitive tender. Ms Jesani told us that several contracts were coming up for review later this year. The

respondent proposes to try and reduce the number of contractors engaged on the development in the hope that this might improve the quality and economy of the service provided and also accountability.

20. In general terms we were told that in the months May to September the contractor is required to make twice monthly visits and in the months October to April one monthly visit. In addition, the respondent's neighbourhood assistant is required to visit the development on a monthly basis. Any defects or shortcomings noted are supposed to be reported back to the office.
21. We were taken through the invoices relied upon by the respondent as supporting the sums claimed. Originally the landlord had claimed a total of £18,534.61 under this head and this was reduced to £17,757.69 once it had become clear some invoices had been incorrectly entered or posted on the system.
22. The respondent did not adduce any specific evidence to address the apparent quality of the service delivered by the contractor.
23. We concluded that the amount claimed was unreasonable in amount for the quality of the service delivered. We find it cannot reasonably be said that the grounds are well kept. We consider that an adjustment is appropriate. Doing the best we can with the limited materials before us we find that it would not have been reasonable to incur a cost of more than £15,000 for the service actually provided. We have therefore adjusted the sum to which the applicants must contribute to £15,000.

Communal repairs

24. The sum originally claimed was £294.02 but was reduced to £270.02 when the invoices were checked. This was originally challenged on the basis that there were no supporting invoices. Ms Jesani took us carefully through the two invoices.
25. The applicants were not in a position to persuade us that the services were not provided. We have therefore allowed the claim of £270.02.

Building or block costs

Internal cleaning

26. This, like grounds maintenance, was the subject of general dissatisfaction of the quality of the service provided and the cost of it.
27. The evidence of Ms Jesani was that the common parts of the Building are internally cleaned on a weekly basis. Invoices are issued on a monthly basis. In addition, two deep cleans were undertaken in the year in question, hence there were 14 invoices. Ms Jesani was not able to tell exactly what the contractor was supposed to do on each of the weekly visits. The supporting invoices [R195-208] show a monthly charge for Kilby 1-26 of £283.14 plus VAT of £56.63, a total of £339.77. That equates to £4,077.24 per year which, equates to £78.40 per week.

28. The gist of the evidence of the applicants, some of whom work at home or are at home often during the day, is that the cleaner simply vacuums the carpets in a brief and superficial way, not moving any door mats or other objects, but going around them. No dusting of handrails, door frames, wainscots is undertaken and no cleaning of the lift or of the internal faces on the common parts windows is undertaken. Other than to assert that monthly visits by the neighbourhood assistant did not show the need to make any complaints to the contractor, the respondent was not in a position to challenge the evidence of the applicants. The applicants also submitted that they had approached an alternative cleaning company which has quoted a rate of £12 per hour.
29. During the course of our inspection we were able to see for ourselves the cleanliness of the common parts and the lift on that occasion. We accept, of course, that our inspection was only a snapshot of the day in question. Nevertheless, the evidence of the applicants chimed with what we saw. We thus accept the general tenor of the applicants' evidence.
30. Ms Jesani told us that common parts cleaning was another of the contracts coming up for review later this year.
31. In the light of our findings we find that a charge of £78.40 per week for the service delivered is unreasonable in amount. The evidence of comparable cleaning costs adduced by the applicants was not convincing. Drawing on our expertise in these matters we find the reasonable costs of the weekly vacuuming of the common parts and the two deep cleans ought not have exceeded a total of £2,600.00 for the year in question. We have therefore adjusted the sum to which the applicants must contribute to £2,600.00

Management fee

32. This was claimed at £220.00 per unit. Management is undertaken by the respondent in-house. The fee is based on the number of services delivered to the block. Evidently the fee is intended to cover the costs incurred by the respondent in managing the block. There was no evidence before us as to whether the management fees collected by the respondent resulted in a profit, loss or break-even for the respondent.
33. Some of the accounting work and the management and payment of some invoices is out-sourced by the respondent. The evidence of Ms Jesani, which we accept, was that the out-sourcing costs are absorbed by the respondent and are not billed to the service charge account in addition to the unit fee of £220.00. After the hearing Mr Anderson sought to challenge that evidence as regards sums paid to Monarch by reference to a number of spreadsheets, but if they were included in the papers before us, he did not identify the page numbers of them. In a letter dated 18 April 2016 the respondent's solicitors re-asserted that the costs of Monarch, who process and pay the respondent's electricity bills, are included within the unit fee of £220.00. Save in exceptional circumstances, which do not apply here, we have to decide the case on

the basis of the evidence provided to us and drawn to our attention at the hearing.

34. We were not overly impressed with the quality of the management service provided by the respondent. As can be seen from Appendix A, the respondent was required to make several adjustments to the certified costs once copies of invoices had been provided to Mr Anderson and through his diligence in going through them carefully a number of errors and mis-postings were identified. It should not be necessary for a lessee to have to spend considerable time in going through accounts which ought to have been properly kept and which were, evidently audited.

In addition, during the course of the hearing it emerged that the water consumption costs of £32,775.91 were based on two invoices from the supplier both of which were estimated. That is quite extraordinary. Effective management would have ensured prompt and accurate meter readings were given to the supplier so that only reasonably accurate charges are levied. We rather got the impression that the respondent's staff had little knowledge of the location of and means of access to the water meter.

Further it appeared to us that generally there was insufficient monitoring of the contractors engaged on the development.

35. As we have mentioned there was no evidence before us as to whether the fee of £220.00 sought bore a resemblance to the actual costs incurred by the respondent in managing the subject development. The limited information provided suggested to us that the setting of that figure was somewhat arbitrary.
36. The applicants had not made any enquiry of local managing agents to get a feel for what unit fee they would seek to manage a development of the size and type in question.
37. In these circumstances the members of the tribunal drew on their accumulated experience and expertise in determining service charge disputes in the locality. We came to the view that to reflect the level of service delivered it would not have been reasonable for the landlord to incur (or charge) a unit fee greater than £170.00 We have therefore adjusted the sum payable by the applicants to £170.00.

Fences

38. Before leaving the service charge account for 2014/15 we wish to make a point concerning fences.

Some of the invoices relied upon by the respondent made reference to fence repairs. The relatively modest invoices did not all identify to which fence(s) the charge related (but the invoice at [R127] did) and in her oral evidence Ms Jesani provided as much information as she was able, albeit that was rather limited.

Following the hearing Mr Anderson submitted some photographs of what are said to be estate fencing. He appears to make the inference that the poor quality of the fencing shown in the photographs suggests that repairs to fencing were not carried out during the year in question.

In a letter dated 18 April 2016 the respondent's solicitors made representations in answer.

As mentioned before we have to determine the case on the basis of the evidence before us at the hearing. We cannot take the photographs submitted by Mr Anderson into account. Even if we did they do not amount to evidence that the fence works claimed for in the account in question were not carried out. All the photographs show is that in April 2016 the fencing depicted is in poor condition.

The budgets 2015/16 and 2016/17

39. The applicants had, quite properly, included in their application a request for a determination of the budget for 2015/16. The budget drives the amount of service charge instalments payable monthly on account. At the time of the hearing on 11 April 2016 the year 2015/16 had just ended on 31 March 2016. Thus as at the date the hearing all of the monthly instalments had or should have been paid.
40. In discussion with the parties it was agreed that it would be a sterile exercise for the tribunal to determine whether the 2015/16 budget contained any sums which were plainly unreasonable and out of sync.
41. The budget for 2016/17 was not formally included as part of the application. It was however provided to us. In case it is of assistance to the parties we wish to make two observations about it.
42. The first concerns the amount of £9,282.01 allocated to Sewage pumps.

The Scott schedule records, and Ms Jesani confirmed in her oral evidence during the course of the hearing, that new legislation provides that as of 1 October 2016 a sewerage company for the area will take over responsibility for the private pumping station on the development. Accordingly, the landlord will no longer provide this service as from that date and thus it will not incur the cost of doing so.

43. The second concerns the contribution to the water supply. It was not in dispute that this was a supply to the Estate and an Estate Cost. The respondent has treated it as such in the past albeit that in 2013/14 due to an accounting error it could only recover about one half of the cost actually incurred.
44. In the budget for 2016/17 the respondent has taken the water supply out of Estate Costs (to which the long lessees of Kilby 1-26 contribute a fixed 0.52%) and placed it in a Unit cost and propose to seek to recover a contribution of 0.66%. Ms Jesani explained the reasoning for this

was that some of the houses on the development have their own individual water meters and pay the water company direct for this service. The impression given to us was that although the few house owners concerned were obliged, as a matter of contract, to contribute to the communal water supply as part of an Estate Cost, the respondent considered it unfair to ask them to contribute to the water supply cost and thus the respondent proposed to share the cost between a fewer number of persons and thus increase their percentage share to 0.66%.

45. We wish to point out that the leases of Kilby 1-26 fix the lessees' share of Estate Costs to 0.52%. That includes the cost of the water supply. It is not open to the respondent to unilaterally change that fixed percentage. It can only be changed by mutual agreement which ideally ought to be recorded in a deed of variation or by an order of the tribunal on an application pursuant to section 35 if one of the limited circumstances set out in that section applies.

Section 20C order

46. The applicants made an application for an order pursuant to section 20C of the Act in respect of any costs which the respondent might incur in connection with these proceedings. The applicants submitted that it was reasonable for them to have brought the application because when they had pressed for details of the costs actually incurred they had identified a number of discrepancies. When these had been brought to the respondent's attention some were conceded fairly promptly but some were not and further concessions had been made by the respondent during the course of the hearing. They contended it would be unfair if they were obliged to contribute to the costs incurred by the respondent. Mr Anderson submitted that his correspondence shows that he tried to resolve matters without coming to the tribunal including seeking assistance from the local MP. He said they should not have to bear the respondent's costs and it was unreasonable that those costs were incurred.
47. The application was opposed by Mr Parker. He contended that the respondent had responded to Mr Anderson at every turn. He said by an email dated 24 December 2015 Mr Anderson had been provided with a zip file containing copies of the spreadsheets and supporting invoices. It was not the fault of the respondent that Mr Anderson could not open that file or that Mr Anderson's commitments prevented him from going to the respondent's office in London NW1 to inspect the documents there.
48. Mr Parker submitted that the application to the tribunal was made after 24 December 2015. The respondent has responded to it and should be entitled to recover its costs in doing so. Mr Parker relied on the provision of clause 7(5)(g) of the lease which made reference to:

"any administrative charges incurred by or on behalf of the landlord including but not limited to:

There are then set out four categories of costs – mentioned in paragraph 15 above and none of which are directly relevant. In some respects, those categories are unusual to see in a service charge clause to which all long lessees must contribute. They would usually sit more comfortably as variable administration charges payable by the individual lessee whose activity triggers the costs being incurred. For example, if an individual lessee seeks an approval to, say a sub-letting, or to carry out alterations one would expect that individual lessee to be responsible for the costs arising in granting that approval. Similarly, if a lessee requests copies of documents or information perhaps as part of a seller's pack if the lessee is contemplating assigning his lease, one might expect that lessee to be responsible for the costs arising.

Be that as it may, Mr Parker relies upon the expression "*any administrative charges incurred*".

49. On the proper construction of the lease we reject the submission that the expression "*any administrative charges incurred*" extends to costs incurred in defending tribunal proceedings. The expression is too broad and wide so as to be clear and unambiguous.
50. Whilst we accept that the four classes of costs identified is not and was not intended to be an exhaustive list none of the classes cited is close to costs of proceedings defending an application in this tribunal.
51. We have to read the lease as a whole and in context. We note that in paragraph 7(5)(c) of the lease there is express reference to:

"all reasonable fees charges and expenses payable to the Surveyor any solicitor ... or other person in connection with management or maintenance of the Building including the computation and collection of rent ... including the preparation of the account of the Service Charge..."

There is provision there for costs payable to a solicitor to be included within the service charge regime in limited circumstances, namely the management or maintenance of the Building. The subject costs are plainly not incurred in connection with the management or maintenance of the Building. We find that if the parties had intended that costs payable to a solicitor (and or counsel) were to be included in the service charge regime they would have made that clear.

52. Accordingly we find that as a matter of contract the respondent is not able to pass the costs incurred in these proceedings through the service charge.
53. However, in case it be held that we are in error in that conclusion we have considered whether any contractual right which the respondent may have should be curtailed pursuant to section 20C of the Act.

That section provides that a tribunal may intervene and make an order if it considers it just and equitable in the circumstances to do so.

We do consider it just and equitable to do so. We accept and prefer the submissions of the applicants as set out above. Whilst they may not have succeeded on every point they have taken they have succeeded on some and the respondent has made a good number of concessions both after issue of the proceedings and during the course of the hearing.

We thus find it would be unjust for the applicants to have to make any contribution to any of the costs incurred by the respondent in connection with these proceedings. We have made an order pursuant to section 20C so that there should be no doubt about this.

John Hewitt
Judge John Hewitt
6 May 2016

ANNEX - RIGHTS OF APPEAL

1. If a party wishes to appeal this decision to the Upper Tribunal (Lands Chamber) then a written application for permission must be made to the First-tier Tribunal at the Regional office which has been dealing with the case.
2. The application for permission to appeal must arrive at the Regional office within 28 days after the Tribunal sends written reasons for the decision to the person making the application.
3. If the application is not made within the 28 day time limit, such application must include a request for an extension of time and the reason for not complying with the 28 day time limit; the Tribunal will then look at such reason(s) and decide whether to allow the application for permission to appeal to proceed despite not being within the time limit.
4. The application for permission to appeal must identify the decision of the Tribunal to which it relates (i.e. give the date, the property and the case number), state the grounds of appeal, and state the result the party making the application is seeking.

| | 1 | | | | 4 |
|------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|-------------|-------------|
| Expense | 201 | | | | |
| | Act | | | | |
| | (As | | | | |
| | cert | | | | |
| | [pR57] | | | | |
| | £ 32,775.91 | £ 32,775.91 | £ 32,775.91 | £ 36,000.01 | £ - |
| Communal Mtce | -£ 159.14 | -£ 159.14 | £ 159.14 | £ - | £ - |
| Bulky Refuse | £ 4,929.60 | £ 3,865.20 | £ 3,865.20 | £ 1,682.00 | £ 4,500.02 |
| Electrical repairs | £ 1,655.15 | £ 1,655.15 | £ 1,655.15 | £ - | £ - |
| Car park | £ 176.84 | £ 176.84 | £ 176.84 | £ - | £ - |
| Grounds Mtce | £ 18,534.61 | £ 17,757.69 | £ 15,000.00 | £ 23,947.43 | £ 19,499.99 |
| Water Testing | £ 547.20 | £ 336.00 | | £ 5,551.99 | £ 5,551.99 |
| Communal Repairs | £ 294.02 | £ 270.02 | £ 270.72 | £ - | £ - |
| Sewage pumps | £ 4,416.86 | £ 4,416.86 | | £ 9,282.01 | £ 9,282.01 |
| Boosted supply pumps | £ 2,589.16 | £ 2,589.16 | £ 2,589.16 | £ 899.97 | £ 899.97 |
| Playground equipment | | £ - | | £ 1,750.00 | £ 1,750.00 |
| Sub-total | £ 65,760.21 | £ 63,683.69 | £ 61,244.98 | | |
| Share at 0.52%= | | | £ 318.47 | | |
| | | | | | |
| | -£ 123.14 | -£ 123.14 | £ 123.14 | £ - | £ - |
| Internal cleaning | £ 5,218.54 | £ 5,218.54 | £ 2,600.00 | £ 5,479.44 | £ 5,479.44 |
| Door entry phone | £ 1,783.51 | £ 1,598.53 | £ 1,598.53 | £ - | £ - |
| Fire Safety | £ 805.80 | £ 805.80 | £ 805.50 | £ 284.39 | £ 1,137.60 |
| Electricity | -£ 481.39 | -£ 481.39 | £ 481.39 | £ 1,078.44 | £ 1,078.44 |
| Water testing | -£ 57.60 | -£ 57.60 | £ 57.60 | £ - | £ - |
| Lift Mtce | £ 1,337.68 | £ 448.00 | £ 448.00 | £ 589.09 | £ 1,589.09 |
| Sewage pumps | -£ 47.98 | -£ 47.98 | £ 47.98 | £ - | £ - |
| Maintenance | | £ - | | £ 259.99 | £ 259.99 |
| Electrical repairs | | £ - | | £ 494.55 | £ 494.55 |
| Ground maintenance | | £ - | | £ - | £ - |
| Communal repairs | | £ - | | £ - | £ - |
| TV & Aerial | | £ - | | £ - | £ - |
| Water supply | | £ - | | £ - | £ - |
| Sub-total | £ 8,435.42 | £ 7,360.76 | £ 6,162.14 | | |
| Share at 3.85%= | | | £ 237.24 | | |
| | | | | | |
| | £ - | £ - | | £ - | |
| Buildings Insurance | £ 110.24 | £ 110.24 | £ 110.24 | £ 113.75 | |
| Sinking fund | £ - | £ - | | £ 50.04 | £ 50.04 |
| Audit fee | £ 10.00 | £ 10.00 | £ 10.00 | £ 15.00 | £ 10.00 |
| Management fee | £ 220.00 | £ 220.00 | £ 170.00 | £ 220.00 | £ 220.00 |
| | | | | | |
| | | | Contentious Items | | |