



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

**Case Reference** : **CAM/22UG/LSC/2015/0062**

**Property** : **19 Mortimer Gardens, Colchester  
CO4 5ZG**

**Applicant** : **Ms Mary A Cottis**

**Representative** : **Ms M A Cottis In Person**

**Respondent** : **Chime Properties Limited**

**Representatives** : **Ms Misbah Khan, Legal Services  
Ms Eve French  
Mr Robert Howell  
Mr Doherty  
All with First Port Property Services  
Limited - Managing Agents**

**Type of Application** : **Section 27A Landlord and Tenant  
Act 1985 – to determine the amount  
of service charges payable**

**Tribunal Members** : **Judge John Hewitt  
Mr Stephen Moll FRICS  
Mr John Francis QPM**

**Date and venue of  
Hearing** : **21 October 2015  
Colchester Magistrates Court**

**Date of Decision** : **2 November 2015**

---

**DECISION**

---

## **Decisions of the tribunal**

1. The tribunal determines that:
  - 1.1 the only financial adjustment to make is that the applicant is entitled to a credit of £10.10 made up as set out in paragraph 56 below;
  - 1.2 an order shall be made pursuant to section 20C Landlord and Tenant Act 1985 to the effect that none of the costs incurred or to be incurred by the respondent in these proceedings are to be regarded as relevant costs to be taken into account in determining the amount of any service charge payable by the applicant.
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, site inspection and the hearing**

3. On 16 July 2015 the tribunal received an application from the applicant (Ms Cottis). In the application form Ms Cottis made a large number of criticisms of the manner in which the subject development was run and the accuracy of accounting documents said to support the service charges alleged to have been incurred.
4. The criticisms were levelled at the respective managing agents who have been Solitaire Property Management, OM Property Management and now First Port Property Services. All of those firms have operated from premises at Wigmore Lane, Luton. Some of the criticisms were historic and some current.
5. In the application form Ms Cottis cited as respondent in box 4, First Port Property Services. In box 6 Ms Cottis cited as the landlord Bellway Homes Limited or Chime Properties Limited.
6. Directions were given on 23 July 2015 [463] citing as the respondents Chime Properties Limited and First Port Property Services. At the hearing it was clarified and not in dispute that:
  - 6.1 On 27 July 2007 the lease of 19 Mortimer Gardens was granted by Bellway Homes Limited to Olu Funke John;
  - 6.2 On 12 September 2008 Chime Properties Limited was registered at Land Registry as the proprietor of title number EX821184 which includes land at Clarendon Gate, Mill Road, Colchester;
  - 6.3 That freehold title is subject to a number of leases, including that granted in respect of 19 Mortimer Gardens;
  - 6.4 The current landlord is Chime Properties Limited whose current managing agents are First Port Property Services Limited; and

6.5 The correct and only respondent to this application is thus Chime Properties Limited.

7. In accordance with directions we have been provided with a trial bundle which runs to 485 pages. Evidently Ms Cottis did not have to hand a copy of the lease of 19 Mortimer Gardens. Shortly prior to the hearing the respondent was requested to bring copies of the lease to the hearing. They did so. The lease is page numbered 1-32 followed by 6 lease plans (none of which have been colour copied but none of which appear to be material to what we have to decide).

We have not incorporated the lease into the trial bundle so when referring to the lease we shall refer to the page numbers of the lease itself.

8. On the morning of 21 October 2015 we had the benefit of a site inspection. Ms Cottis was present, accompanied by her father. Several representatives of First Port Property Services were also in attendance.
9. Mortimer Gardens is part of a substantial residential development comprising a range of styles and types of residential properties laid out around several estate roadways and evidently developed by Bellway Homes in in the mid-2000s.
10. It appears to be managed in sectors. The subject property is incorporated within a sector or scheme originally known Numbers 1-53 Mill Road. This scheme is said to comprise of 27 units set in two blocks and within an external estate area comprising some landscaped areas, parking spaces and bins stores. An estate plan is at [208].
11. During the course of our site inspection a number of physical features were drawn to our attention in case they should feature in the evidence we were to hear. We noted the small lawned areas around the blocks and the several beds laid mostly to shrubs.
12. The hearing got underway at 11:00. Ms Cottis attended to present her case and she was accompanied and supported by her father who took part in the proceedings. Ms Khan, who is an in-house legal representative, presented the case on behalf of the respondent.

### **The lease**

13. As mentioned above the lease was granted by Bellway Homes Limited. The term granted was 125 years commencing on 1 July 2006.
14. The Building is defined to be: 'the twenty three residential flats of which the Demised Premises forms part'

The Estate is defined to be: 'the Building, the driveways, pathways, amenity space and curtilage as the same is delineated on the Plan and thereon edged blue'

15. The initial ground rent was £250 pa subject to review as provided for in the Seventh Schedule (page 5). A service charge is also reserved as rent and is payable in accordance with the provisions of the Fourth Schedule.

The Fourth Schedule (page 18) defines the service charge to be 'the Relevant Percentage of the Expenditure on Services'.

The Particulars (page 4) define 'The Relevant Percentages' to be:

'Part A Proportion: 5.2632%'

'Part B Proportion: 4.3478%'

'Expenditure on Services' is defined on (page 18) to be 'all expenditure of the Landlord in complying with his obligations set out in the said Sixth Schedule including any interest paid on any money borrowed for that purpose'.

The Sixth Schedule is made up of Parts A, B and C.

#### **Part A**

Part A is headed 'Internal costs (and external amenity)'

It makes provision for internal common parts cleaning every seven years, the repair, cleaning and renewal of the passages, stairways and landings, the lighting, any video entry phone system, maintaining, cleaning and lighting of the amenity area and any communal refuse area and to arrange the regular removal of rubbish therefrom.

There is a provision for the landlord to alter, modify or add to the services provided for as in the opinion of the landlord is reasonably necessary or desirable in the interest of good estate management.

#### **Part B**

Part B is headed 'Structure Costs (and insurance)'

It makes provision for the cost of repair to any party walls used in common by the occupiers of the Estate and the owners or occupiers of neighbouring property, for external redecoration every four years, maintaining, repairing and cleaning the main structure of the Building, the drains, pipes and conduits, the gas and water pipes, entrances, paths and forecourts and the cleaning, lighting and maintenance of any communal refuse store and/or cycle store.

Again there is provision to enable the landlord to alter, modify or add to the services to be provided in the interests of good estate management.

It also makes provisions for the Building and the Estate to be insured to the full cost of reinstatement in conformity with detailed requirements as therein set out.

### **Part C**

Part C is headed 'Costs applicable to Parts A and/or B'

A number of examples of expenditure are listed including:

- '4. To keep accounts and records of all sums expended in complying with the obligations imposed by this Schedule'
- '5. In the management of the Estate and the performance of the obligations of the Landlord hereunder to employ or retain the services of any employee agent consultant contractor engineer and professional adviser that the Landlord may reasonably require'
- '9. Generally managing and administering the Estate and protecting the amenities of the Building and for that purpose if necessary employing a firm of managing agents or consultants or similar and the payment of all costs and expenses incurred by the Landlord;
  - 9.1 in the running and management of the Estate and the collection of the service charges and in the enforcement of the covenants and conditions and the regulations;
  - 9.2 ...
  - 9.3 in the preparation for audit of the service charge accounts
  - 9.4 ...'
- '11. Employing a qualified accountant for the purpose of auditing the accounts in respect of the Expenditure on Services and certifying the total amount thereof for the period to which the account relates'

The Fourth Schedule Part II (page 20) provides that the tenant's proportion of the Expenditure on Services shall be the Relevant Percentage being:

The Part A Proportion of the costs incurred in connection with the matters mentioned in Part A of the Sixth Schedule plus any expenses listed in Part C which is properly attributable to Part A expenditure;

and

The Part B Proportion of the costs incurred in connection with the matters mentioned in Part B of the Sixth Schedule plus any expenses listed in Part C which is properly attributable to Part B expenditure.

Paragraph 2 of the Fourth Schedule Part II provides that if due to any re-planning of the layout of the Estate or the Building by the landlord it

should become necessary or equitable to do so the landlord shall recalculate the percentage appropriate to the flats and give due notice to the tenants.

16. Ms French, who is an experienced Regional Standards Manager with First Port Property Services, told us that despite the provisions of the lease the service charges payable by the tenants of the Building are calculated as follows:

Schedule 1

Estate costs: Payable by 24 units at 4.1667% each = 100%\*

Schedule 2

External

structural costs: Payable by 23 units at 4.3478% each = 100%\*

Schedule 3

Internal

block costs: Payable by 19 units at 5.2632% each = 100%

\* = rounded

From the above it appears that the % charged to Ms Cottis is marginally lower than the contractual provisions. Ms Cottis did not take issue with the % actually charged. However during the course of the hearing it became apparent that some expenditure may not have been allocated to the correct schedule and going forward this is something that First Port Property Services may wish to review.

17. The service charge year is the period 1 April to 31 March in the year following. There are provisions for the landlord to prepare an estimate of the likely service charge and for an interim service charge payment on account to be made by the tenant by way of four equal instalments. At the end of the year landlord is to procure an itemised statement of the expenditure and there are provisions for balancing debits/credits as the case may be.

Evidently the respondent is prepared to allow some tenants to make monthly interim payments on account in certain circumstances.

**The matters in issue**

18. First it was necessary to identify the matters in issue. As mentioned above many of the criticisms made by Ms Cottis in the application form and subsequent materials served by her relate to historic matters which have already been addressed in monetary terms.
19. It may be helpful if we explain that Ms Cottis plainly cares deeply about the way in which the development is run, has high expectations that standards are maintained, that repairs and maintenance is carried out timely and correctly at an appropriate cost. Ms Cottis appears to spend

a fair deal of her time at home child caring and is vigilant about what occurs at the development.

20. Over the years, and starting with the accounts for 2010/11 Ms Cottis has questioned a range of service charge expenditure and has been provided (on a voluntary basis) with a good deal of supporting vouchers. Ms Cottis, who has an eye for detail, has been able to identify a number of discrepancies and has drawn attention to them. Some of these ought to have been picked up by the property manager of the day responsible for the development others might have been picked up by the auditors, although it may be that Ms Cottis' understanding of the role of the auditors is unrealistically high.
21. As a consequence of this Ms Cottis raised a complaint and this was investigated by Ms French. At a meeting in 2013 Ms French made an offer to Ms Cottis of £350 which Ms Cottis accepted. Payment of that sum was made by way of a credit to Ms Cottis' account. It is not immediately clear how this sum was arrived at. In its statement of case at [204] the respondent appears to suggest it was made up at 50% of the management fees paid by Ms Cottis from the commencement of management up until 2013 of £336.15 rounded up to £350.00.

It was not in dispute that at that time Ms Cottis made it clear that if the accounting problems persisted she reserved the right to pursue a further complaint.

22. Ms Cottis did consider that the problems persisted and Ms Cottis decided to take her concerns to the Property Ombudsman which duly began an investigation into a number of matters raised. Negotiations then took place between Ms Cottis and a Ms Susan Stewart who was then the property manager. It was not in dispute that a compromise settlement was arrived at whereby if Ms Cottis withdrew her complaint to the Property Ombudsman the sum of £500 would be credited to Ms Cottis account. From pages [166 and 167] it appears the sum of £500 embraced repayment of accountancy and audit fees which Ms Cottis had paid in the years 2011/12, 2012/13 and 2013/14 amounting to some £458.18.
23. In reliance of the agreement arrived at Ms Cottis duly contacted the Property Ombudsman and withdrew her complaint. First Port Property Services then decided to renege on the agreement arrived at and refused to credit Ms Cottis account with £500. It did however offer a revised sum of £150 which Ms Cottis refused.
24. Out of frustration Ms Cottis renewed her complaint to the Property Ombudsman and decided to make this application to the tribunal.
25. In its statement of case dated 25 August 2015 the respondent confirmed that the offer to pay the £500 was retracted but states that payment would now be credited to Ms Cottis account. That position

was re-stated by Mr Robert Howell, regional manager, in paragraph 7 of his witness statement dated 4 September 2015 [163].

26. Ms Cottis told us that she had not yet seen an up to date copy of her account showing the credit of £500 but she was willing to proceed on the basis of the assurance given to the tribunal that a credit of £500 to her account would be made, if it had not already been made.
27. Thus it was that at the commencement of the hearing we needed to identify which of Ms Cottis complaints and issues had been compromised by the sums of £350 and £500 and which issues remain outstanding.
28. Attached to this decision marked 'Appendix A' is a spreadsheet which had been prepared by the tribunal prior to the hearing. Ms Cottis confirmed we are only concerned with the years ending 31 March 2013 and 2014 coloured blue and pink respectively on the right hand side.
29. Initially all of the items of expenditure tinted or highlighted were in issue. In consequence of the restoration of the promise to credit Ms Cottis' account with the sum of £500 and/or in the light of further information provided by First Port Property Services representatives during the course of the hearing Ms Cottis and her father felt able to withdraw from challenge those items tinted or highlighted in green. Thus the issues for tribunal to determine were those items of expenditure tinted or highlighted in yellow.
30. We shall take each in turn:

#### **Management Fees**

31. The management fees claimed from Ms Cottis are calculated as follows:

#### **2013**

Schedule 1 £2,807.00 @ 4.1667% = £116.96

Schedule 2 £2,690.00 @ 4.3478% = £116.96  
**£233.92**

#### **2014**

Schedule 1 £2,919.00 @ 4.1667% = £121.63

Schedule 2 £2,797.00 @ 4.3478% = £121.60  
**£243.23**

32. Ms Cottis told us that she not made enquiries of local managing agents to obtain some guideline prices for the management of block similar to hers. Ms Cottis considered the level of service provided to have been poor. Ms Cottis was anxious that we understand this case has never



been about the money but about the development not being managed properly. Over the years Ms Cottis has brought to attention a number of occasions when cleaners, contractors and those undertaking grounds maintenance have not done a proper job but she complained that every time she was fobbed off and told following enquiry with the contractors concerned the managing agent was satisfied that things were being done properly. Ms Cottis complained that nearly every time it was the contractors who were believed over her even when she was able to provide photographic or video evidence to support her complaint.

Ms Cottis was content to leave it to the expertise of the tribunal to determine whether the unit costs as claimed were reasonable in amount.

33. Ms Khan and Ms French were not able to explain to us how the cost of management is arrived at for each year. Evidently there are no discussions with the respondent over the level of fees to be charged. It appears that the managing agent is left to decide the amount for itself.
34. Ms French accepted that generally it was good practice for a landlord to market test the provision of goods and services periodically and often at three yearly intervals. Ms French did not know why neither the respondent nor her company had seen fit not to follow that good practice and market test in respect of management services.
35. Ms French maintained that the management fees were competitive but she did not produce any evidence to support that assertion.
36. In the absence of reliable evidence from either of the parties the tribunal can but draw on the accumulated experience and expertise of its members and do the best it can with the imperfect materials before it.
37. RICS recommendations are that management fees should be based on a unit charge against an agreed menu of services that the landlord requires its agent to perform.
38. Developments vary considerably in type, size and complexity of technology and management. At extremes, at one end there may be a house converted into two flats with very minimal services provided and at the other a sophisticated luxury development with communal heating, water softening, underground car parking and providing a 24 hour concierge service. Sometimes, but not always economy of scale can be provided.
39. The upshot is that, in our experience, there is no normal or standard unit fee. For most developments there will be a range or bracket of fee that could be considered to be reasonable in amount for that particular development.

40. For the subject development, in Colchester, we find that a unit fee of less than £234 for 2013 and less than £244 for 2014 fall within that range or bracket of reasonableness. That level of unit fee is not excessive. We have considered carefully whether we should make any adjustment to those fees to reflect shortcomings in the level of service received by Ms Cottis.
41. There is no doubt, and Ms French would not dispute, that on occasions in the past the level of management service has fallen short. Matters have properly been raised by Ms Cottis which ought to have been taken up and dealt with robustly. Many of these are now historic. Adjustments have already been made to Ms Cottis account to reflect them, or at least some of them. In these circumstances we do not find that any further adjustment would be appropriate, just or equitable.
42. We acknowledge that managing agents are sometimes in a difficult position. They engage contractors to perform services but cannot oversee or supervise them on a daily basis. Having identified a reliable contractor they have to take it on trust that the service will be delivered to an acceptable level. Sometimes contractors will have staff difficulties and may have to rely upon temporary or less experienced staff and this may affect the service level. This is in stark contrast to the position where a householder can engage a contractor and oversee his or her work much more closely.
43. In our experience lessees on site who take a close interest in their development can often provide a valuable source of feedback (and evidence to managing agents) on service levels delivered by the contractors. We would encourage the respondent and its managing agents to take full advantage of that resource and harness it to the common good.
44. Subsequent to the hearing Ms Cottis has sent in an email in which she makes reference to a very recent notification of an increase in the management fee. This is not something that was before the tribunal and it was not something which was raised at the hearing. Accordingly it is not something that we can properly make any comment or determination on.

**Bank Charges £45.32 and £11.59**

45. The two sums in question are modest but Ms Cottis case is that the lease does not provide for such charges. Ms French said that the sums arose due to accumulated arrears owing by some lessees and the need to borrow funds to pay bills as they fell due. Our attention was drawn to the level of debtors recorded in the accounts for the two years in question.
46. The definition of Expenditure on Services includes interest paid on any money borrowed for the purpose of providing the services. Borrowings

would not be required if all lessees paid up in advance, but that does not always occur.

47. We find that the very modest costs were reasonably incurred and are reasonable in amount.

**Communal Area Cleaning 2014 £2,899.44**

48. The gist of Ms Cottis case turns on the standard of service for which the charge is made. Ms Cottis believes that the standard has fallen but acknowledged that it did improve a bit after she had made a complaint. Ms Cottis said that on occasions it is obvious that vacuuming is not quite as thorough as it could be and sometimes areas are missed out.
49. Mr Howell and Ms French ran over what cleaning in the common parts entails and promised that they would send Ms Cottis a copy of the written specification.
50. We were told that the specification goes out to competitive tender each year and the contract is awarded to provide a weekly service for the ensuing year. The present cost is £28 per block per week.
51. In terms of regular standards of service we reiterate the observations made in paragraphs 41 to 43 above. We do not live in a perfect world and we have to accept that every now and again a cleaner is going to have a bad day and not be as thorough as usual. That is life and it does not justify any adjustment to the cost of the service taken over the year.
52. Given what is entailed and the size of the block we find that a cost of £28 is not unreasonable in amount. It was not in dispute that it was reasonable to incur the cost of common parts cleaning.

**General repairs 2013 £1,217.16**

53. An issue emerged concerning the cost of rubbish removal. As a result of fly tipping or occupiers of flats dumping articles in the bin stores it has proved necessary from time to time engage a contractor to remove such items and take them to a commercial waste site. The contractor engaged to do this in 2013 was E G Lawrence & Sons, which firm provided a number of services to the development.
54. Ms Cottis obtained from First Port Property Services copies of the relevant invoices issued by E G Lawrence. Each of them made a charge for materials and labour. Ms Cottis investigated further and established that the materials charge was to cover the fee said to have been paid to the waste site operator. Ms Cottis obtained the invoices issued by the waste site operator to E G Lawrence and established that on each occasion the amount actually paid to the waste site operator was much less than the amount of the materials claimed for by E G Lawrence.
55. The representatives of First Port Property Services present at the hearing were aware of this challenge and accepted the documents relied

upon by Ms Cottis but were not able to justify or justify the amounts claimed for materials.

56. We find there has been an overcharge which was not reasonably incurred. That overcharge amounts to £192 made up as follows:

Invoices:	Materials claimed	Actual cost	Overcharge
[442]	£84	£42	£42
[443]	£108	£42	£66
[444]	£96	£42	£54
[445]	£72	£42	<u>£30</u>
			<b>£192</b>

This is a schedule 3 item of expenditure which is charged to Ms Cottis at 5.2632%. Thus a gross overcharge of £192 equates to a net overcharge to Ms Cottis of £10.10.

We find that the most appropriate way to deal with this is for Ms Cottis' account to be credited with £10.10.

57. In the course of discussion it was suggested by Ms Cottis that as regards the supply of digilocks to bin store doors the contractor E G Lawrence may have charged as materials a sum slightly greater than he may have actually paid to the supplier of the locks. There was no evidence to support this because it was not entirely clear what the specification of each of the locks was and from where E G Lawrence purchased them from.
58. This was an issue about which Ms Cottis felt quite strongly. In the absence of evidence it is not something we can make a determination on. We can observe that where a contractor is engaged to supply and fit certain materials it is not unusual in the building trade, or indeed improper for the contractor to add a modest mark up on the trade price he is able to achieve to cover his time and costs in procuring the materials and paying for them up front. Thus, even if Ms Cottis had evidence to support her concerns it is unlikely that we would have considered any adjustment appropriate.

#### **Landscaping 2014 £2,011.25**

59. This was an issue raised by Ms Cottis because she was not aware of exactly what landscaping was undertaken and the basis on which the cost was incurred. This item of expenditure is more accurately described as grounds maintenance.
60. We noted the extent of the maintained grounds in the course of our site inspection.
61. Mr Howell and Ms French said that originally this work was contracted to E G Lawrence but due to unsatisfactory service levels a change was made following competitive tendering against a written specification,

which was briefly described to us. Mr Howell agreed to send Ms Cottis a copy of the specification.

62. Ms Cottis acknowledged that she did not have any evidence to support a contention that the sum incurred was not reasonable in amount. It was not in dispute that the cost was reasonably incurred.
63. In the absence of any evidence from Ms Cottis and drawing on our experience and given the size and scope of the grounds within the development we find that the cost incurred was reasonable in amount.

#### **The section 20C application**

64. Ms Cottis made an application for an order pursuant to section 20C Landlord and Tenant Act 1985 (the Act).
65. The application was opposed. We were told that the respondent had incurred costs in the preparation and presentation of its case but we were not told the amount of those costs.
66. Ms Cottis submitted that it would be unfair and unjust for the respondent to recover any costs as may have been incurred. Ms Cottis again reminded us that this case was never about the money but more about the management of the development and the way in which she has been treated. In particular Ms Cottis reminded us that the catalyst was a compromise settlement to withdraw her complaint to the Property Ombudsman in return for a credit to her account of £500. Ms Cottis relied on that agreement, withdrew her complaint only to find that First Port Property Services, presumably acting on the instructions of the respondent, told her that the promised payment of £500 would not, after all, be credited.
67. Ms Khan submitted that the costs incurred or to be incurred fell within the terms of Schedule 6 and relied upon paragraphs 5 and/or 9. With respect we reject that submission. These proceedings are not about managing or administering the Building or the Estate and they are not about the collection of service charges. They are much more about the manner in which the respondent's managing agents have dealt with issues reasonably and properly raised by Ms Cottis.
68. The paragraphs relied upon by Ms Khan do not make it clear and unambiguous that costs incurred in proceedings such as these are to be included within the definition of Expenditure on Services.
69. We have asked ourselves the question: Even if the lease terms were clear and unambiguous would it be just and equitable to deprive the landlord of that contractual right as regards Ms Cottis and these proceedings?  
In our view the answer is plainly: Yes.  
Given the overall history to this matter and the circumstances in which the promise to credit Ms Cottis' account with £500 was reneged upon we find that Ms Cottis was fully justified in bringing these proceedings

and it would be unjust and inequitable if she was required to contribute to the costs incurred by the respondent in respect of them.

70. We therefore find it is just and equitable to make an order under section 20C of the Act.

Judge John Hewitt  
2 November 2015

### **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.

Expenditure			2012		2013		2013	
			p295	p259	p259	p269	p	
<b>S1</b>								
Electricity	£ 159.40	£ 269.28	£ 424.82	£ 294.47	£ 198.97			
Water & Sewerage	£ 100.00	£ -	£ -	£ -	£ -			
Sweeping	£ 266.64	£ 322.79	£ 259.20	£ 259.20	£ 257.40	£ 257.40	£ 219.17	
Lightbulb Replacement	£ 348.16	£ 1,020.10				£ -	£ 22.00	
General Repairs	£ 3,065.40		£ 817.94	£ 997.94	£ 1,472.79	£ 1,472.79	£ 2,237.18	
Legal & Professional	£ -		£ 6.00	£ -	£ 104.00			
Management Fees	£ 2,565.00	£ 2,565.00	£ 2,699.00	£ 2,699.00	£ 2,807.00			
Accountancy & Audit	£ 220.60	£ 220.59	£ 195.29	£ 195.29	£ 195.30	£ 195.30	£ 203.26	
Health & Safety	£ 486.45	£ 486.45	£ -					
Contribution to Reserves			£ 460.00	£ 460.00	£ 460.00	£ 460.00	£ 460.00	
Prior Year Adjustment								-£ 679.80
<b>Sub-total</b>	<b>£ 7,211.65</b>	<b>£ 4,884.21</b>	<b>£ 4,862.25</b>	<b>£ 4,905.90</b>	<b>£ 5,495.46</b>	<b>£ 5,495.46</b>	<b>£ 5,549.67</b>	
<b>S2</b>								
Insurance	£ 5,654.99	£ 3,193.01	£ 4,335.66	£ 4,335.66	£ 3,701.30	£ 3,701.30	£ 4,684.15	
Aerial System					£ 234.00	£ 234.00	£ -	
Alarm System Maintenance	£ -	£ -	£ 180.00					
General Repairs	£ -	£ 1,438.25	£ 796.32	£ 378.00	£ 738.00		£ 552.00	
Bank Charges	£ -			£ -	£ 45.32			
Management Fees	£ 2,532.00	£ 2,532.00	£ 2,663.00	£ 2,663.00	£ 2,690.00			
Accountancy & Audit	£ 234.89	£ 234.90	£ 187.19	£ 187.19	£ 187.20	£ 20	£ -	
Contribution to Reserves			£ 250.00	£ 250.00	£ 250.00			
<b>Sub-total</b>	<b>£ 8,421.88</b>	<b>£ 7,398.16</b>	<b>£ 8,412.17</b>	<b>£ 7,813.85</b>	<b>£ 7,845.82</b>	<b>£ 7,845.82</b>	<b>£ 8,488.90</b>	
<b>S3</b>								
Electricity	£ 637.62	£ 1,077.13	£ 489.37	£ 1,160.69	£ 686.88	£ 686.88	£ 633.24	
Communal Area Cleaning	£ 3,102.04	£ 3,211.04	£ 3,472.00	£ 3,472.00	£ 2,941.92	£ 2,941.92		
Landscaping	£ 2,474.10	£ 2,286.37	£ 2,821.17	£ 2,821.17	£ 2,599.82	£ 2,599.82		
Lightbulb Replacement	£ -						£ -	
Door Entry Maintenance	£ 52.88	£ 52.88	£ 108.00	£ 108.00	£ -			
Electrical Maintenance	£ 500.00	£ 807.99	£ 615.60	£ 820.80	£ 820.80	£ 820.80	£ -	
Prior Year Adjustments	£ -	£ 1,565.82	£ -					
General Repairs				£ 418.32	£ 1,217.16		£ 201.84	
Health & Safety				£ -	£ 180.00		£ -	
Contribution to Reserves			£ 430.00	£ 430.00	£ 430.00	£ 430.00	£ 430.00	
<b>Sub-total</b>	<b>£ 6,766.64</b>	<b>£ 9,001.23</b>	<b>£ 7,936.14</b>	<b>£ 9,230.98</b>	<b>£ 8,876.58</b>	<b>£ 8,876.58</b>	<b>£ 6,199.77</b>	