



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

Case reference : **LON/00AN/LSC/2021/0105**

**HMCTS code
(paper, video,
audio)** : **V: CVPREMOTE**

Property : **3 Munster Road, London, SW6 4ER**

Applicant : **Hugo Coughlan**

Representative : **In Person**

Respondent : **London Borough of Hammersmith and
Fulham**

Representative : **Mr Richard Clarke (Counsel)**

Type of application : **For the determination of the liability to
pay service charges under section 27A of
the Landlord and Tenant Act 1985**

Tribunal members : **Mr A Harris LLM FRICS FCI Arb
Mr C Gowman BSc MCIEH**

Venue : **10 Alfred Place, London WC1E 7LR**

Date of decision : **8 November 2021**

DECISION

Covid-19 pandemic: description of hearing

This has been a remote hearing which has been consented to by the parties. The form of remote hearing was V: CVPREMOTE. A face-to-face hearing was not held because it was not practicable and all issues could be determined in a remote hearing. The documents that the tribunal were referred to are in a bundle of 417 pages and a supplementary bundle of 95 pages, the contents of which I have noted. The order made is described at the end of these reasons.

Decisions of the tribunal

- (1) The tribunal makes the determinations as set out under the various headings in this Decision.
- (2) The tribunal does not make an order under section 20C of the Landlord and Tenant Act 1985.

The application

1. The Applicant seeks a determination pursuant to s.27A of the Landlord and Tenant Act 1985 (“the 1985 Act”) as to the amount of service charges which may become payable by the Applicant although no demands have yet been made.

The hearing

2. The Applicant appeared in person at the hearing and the Respondent was represented by Mr Richard Clarke of Counsel who called Mr Joe Jackson MRICS and Mr Rhys Allison of Baily Garner LLP who dealt with the building works in question.

The background

3. The property which is the subject of this application is a mid-terrace house converted to a ground floor flat and upper maisonette. The Applicant occupies the upper maisonette. The Respondent retains control of the ground floor flat.
4. Photographs of the building were provided in the hearing bundle. Neither party requested an inspection and the tribunal did not consider that one was necessary, nor would it have been proportionate to the issues in dispute.
5. The Applicant holds a long lease of the property which requires the landlord to provide services and the tenant to contribute towards their costs by way of a variable service charge. The specific provisions of the lease will be referred to below, where appropriate.

6. The Respondent is in the process of carrying out major works to the property which were substantially complete at the date of the hearing although practical completion had not yet been achieved and the final account was not agreed. The Works followed service of a section 20 consultation about which there is no issue. No service charge demands have yet been issued in respect of the works.

The issues

7. At the start of the hearing the parties identified the relevant issues for determination as follows:
 - (i) The payability and/or reasonableness of service charges relating to the section 20 works.
 - (ii) The tribunal raised the question if it could make a final determination on payability of the items claimed as no service charge demands had yet been raised. Under section 27A(3) the tribunal can determine whether, if costs were incurred for services, repairs, maintenance, improvements or insurance or management of a specified description a service charge would be payable for the costs and if it would as to
 - a) the person by whom it is payable,
 - b) the person to whom it is payable,
 - c) the amount which would be payable,
 - d) the date at or by which it would be payable and
 - e) the manner in which it would be payable.

It was agreed the tribunal could continue to hear evidence relating to the works but that there would be a further opportunity for the Applicant to challenge payability once a demand for service charges has been raised. The Applicant stated that he simply wanted an independent party to review the works and confirm whether he had to pay for them.

8. Having heard evidence and submissions from the parties and considered all of the documents provided, the tribunal has made determinations on the various issues as follows.

Section 20 consultation

9. On 13 January 2020 the Respondent served a notice of proposals to carry out major works under section 20 of the Act. The estimated cost of the works was £41,237.70 of which £38,675.04 would be chargeable to

leaseholders. There was no dispute that the section 20 consultation had been correctly carried out.

Summary of the Applicant's case

10. The Applicant considers that the cost of the works is excessive. Multiple estimates he had obtained for similar work on the property from other contractors have assessed the work at £5000. The cost the works has been inflated by historical neglect and despite multiple submissions by the leaseholder to carry out repairs and maintenance in a punctual manner, work had been systematically neglected with specific reference to painting and repairing windows maisonette. No consideration is given to collateral damage caused by unnecessary scaffolding. Service charges have been paid over a period of 25 years and no maintenance work has been carried out.

Summary of the Respondent's case

11. The Respondent states that the cost of the works is entirely based on competitive tendering and that the costs are reasonable. The Applicant's estimates are not for similar works and not directly comparable. Historic neglect is denied.

Schedules of work

12. In substitution for the estimated costs of work contained in the section 20 notice, the supplementary bundle contained a schedule of costs to date indicating those costs claimed by the contractor which have been agreed by the respondent and those which are disputed. The hearing worked through this schedule and an annotated copy is attached to this decision.
13. Those items on the schedule which are being queried or where further information is sought by the Respondent are highlighted in yellow and those where costs have yet to be provided are highlighted in orange. The work status column is that provided by the Respondent. The final account has not yet been agreed by the Respondent and the figures are to that extent provisional. As the figures are not finalised and no service charge demands have been levied, the tribunal will make findings as to reasonableness of the work of those which are completed but will not make any findings on payability.

Historic Neglect

14. Before moving on to consider the individual items of work it is appropriate to consider allegations of historic neglect. A major pillar of the Applicant's case is that the cost of the works have been greatly increased by historic neglect on the part of the respondent. The applicant

stated he had pressed the Respondent to carry out maintenance works at various leaseholder forum meetings with the Council. Major works were planned in 2014 but not carried out and this has contributed to neglect of the building, particularly to the windows. Where the Council have done works in the past, they have often taken too long to carry them out.

15. For the respondent, Mr Clarke drew attention to correspondence in the bundle relating to the 2014 notice where the Applicant objected to the scope of the works and to the cost. In consequence the works were not carried out.
16. The attention of the tribunal was also drawn to *Daejan Properties Ltd v Griffin [2014] UKUT 206 (LC)* where the Upper Tribunal said

“The only route by which an allegation of historic neglect may provide a defence to a claim for service charges is if it can be shown that, but for a failure by the landlord to make good a defect at the time required by its covenant, part of the cost eventually incurred in remedying that defect, or the whole of the cost of remedying consequential defects, would have been avoided. In those circumstances the tenant to whom the repairing obligation was owed has a claim in damages for breach of covenant, and that claim may be set off against the same tenant’s liability to contribute through the service charge to the cost of the remedial work.”

17. The case makes the point that the tenant must prove that the cost of the works which are eventually carried out has been increased by reason of the historic neglect and it is not enough to complain that the cost of works is now substantial. The tribunal will consider whether there is evidence that the cost has been increased by any historic neglect and therefore any basis to reduce the sums demanded for major works.

The works

18. The individual categories of works are shown in the schedule attached to this decision which summarises the headings in the accounts contain in the supplementary bundle at page 6. The original budgeted cost came to £43,404.75 of which £16,390 is claimed by the Respondent as correct and a further £7372.50 is being queried. The budgeted cost came as a result of a competitive tender as part of the section 20 process and the costs are based on the successful tender. The comments below will focus on those items where cost is claimed and will not consider those items

which are shown as omitted where the Respondent has stated that no charge will be made.

17.1 Scaffolding £4000

The tribunal's decision

19. The tribunal determines that the amount payable in respect of scaffolding is £4000.

Reasons for the tribunal's decision

20. The Applicant argues that the cost is excessive and that scaffolding could have been provided much more cheaply. It was up for many months which must have increased the cost. He had arranged scaffolding at the rear of the property for less than £1000. The bridge over the roof was complicated.
21. In reply, the Respondent stated that the tender accepted was the lowest of three and the competitive quotations were £5500 and £6000. The bridge over the roof was necessary to gain access to the rear of the property without going through the ground floor flat.
22. The tribunal accepts the figure has been the result of competitive tendering and that alternative quotations provided by the Applicant were not on a like-for-like basis.

17.2 Asbestos survey £500

23. The Applicant objects to this heading of claim as no survey was carried out in his flat. The only access to the loft was through his flat. He therefore challenges the whole amount.
24. For the Respondent, Mr Allison stated that the survey was only of the areas to be covered by the works and as no work was scheduled inside the Applicant's flat, it was not surveyed. The survey was necessary to satisfy the statutory requirement for the safety of the contractor to ensure that there was no asbestos to be affected in the areas where work was to be carried out.
25. The tribunal accepts the Respondents evidence and considers that the claim for £500 is justified.

17.3 Bay roof renewal £1750

26. The Applicant considered that the work was unnecessary as the roof did not leak and that the cost was excessive for half a day's work and 14 or 15

slates. The work is duplicated in pitched roof repairs as no work was necessary to the main roof.

27. The Respondents evidence was that the cost was for a new roof covering and flashings and that the cost was based on competitive tendering. Each individual item on the specification is separately priced and there is no duplication.
28. The tribunal prefers the evidence of the Respondent which was clearly explained by the Respondent's witnesses and accepts that there is no duplication of costs. The cost is based on the competitive tender and the tribunal accepts that the cost is reasonable.

17.4 Pitched roof repairs £220

29. The Applicant submits that this item relates to the bay window roof and is therefore a duplicated item. No work was done to the main roof.
30. The Respondent's witnesses explained that the work comes under two headings, firstly removal of moss et cetera from the roof surfaces at a cost of £100 and repointed which tiles at a cost of £120. Photographic evidence of the repointed was provided. Two further items totalling £305 are under query as it is suggested these may relate to damage done to the roof surface by the contractor.
31. The tribunal accepts the evidence of the respondent's witnesses and agrees that a figure of £220 for roof repairs is reasonable. The tribunal makes no determination on those items under query.

17.5 bay roof void £100

32. The Applicant challenges this figure as he says it is duplicated with 17.3, the day roof recovering.
33. The respondent's witnesses explained that each item on the schedule is a separate item on the specification and priced separately. There is no duplication. Insulation of the roof space was necessary to comply with building regulations.
34. The tribunal prefers the evidence of the Respondent and accepts there is no duplication. The price of £100 is reasonable.

17.6 lead work £340

35. The applicant objects to this work as he says no work was done to the lead work and it appears to be duplicated with other headings in the schedule.

36. The Respondent's witnesses explained that the work was mainly to the rear addition where sections of lead work were re-dressed and new lead clips were provided. Other areas of lead work were checked to ensure that they were in sound condition.
37. The tribunal accepts the Respondents evidence which is supported in part by photographic evidence. The figure of £340 is reasonable. This is made up of checking and redressing lead at £50 and raking out and repointed lead work at £290.

17.7 parapets and coping £778

38. The applicant objects to this item as it is only a small amount of repointing was done amounting to roughly 2 lines of pointing which should cost not more than £400. Photographs show that only a limited amount of work has been done and it areas have not been repointed.
39. The Respondent's witnesses gave evidence that considerably more pointing have been done than two lines and drew attention to photographs in the bundle showing areas where repointing had been done to parapet walls.
40. The tribunal accepts the Respondents evidence which was clearly explained and supported by photographic evidence. It was clear from a comparison of before and after photographs at some areas which were said not to have been repointed clearly had been. The tribunal therefore accepts that the cost of £778 is reasonable.

17.8 facias and soffit £75

41. The applicant objects to this as he says it relates to the bay window renewal and is a duplicated item.
42. The Respondent confirmed that the area of facial in question was around the bay window but that this was priced separately from the roof recovering.
43. The tribunal accepts the respondents evidence as being normal practice of pricing items individually and considers that the figure of £75 is reasonable.

17.9 chimney £100

44. the Applicant objects to this item as he says no work was done to the chimney stack apart from the parapet walls. There is no proof of work. Work. Two Ridge tiles by the chimney stack were cracked by the scaffolders and have not been replaced.

45. The Respondent's witnesses provided photographic evidence of where the chimney stack had been repointed extending to roughly one square metre.
46. The tribunal accepts the Respondents evidence and considers that the figure of £100 is reasonable.

17.10 gutters £400

47. The Applicant states that the only work to the gutters was replacing the gusset around the bay window with plastic guttering. No work was done to pipework.
48. The Respondent's witnesses explained that the gutters had been cleared out internal surfaces coated with bitumen and joints made good in the sections of cast-iron guttering prior to repainting.
49. The tribunal prefers the evidence of the respondent and agrees that £400 for the work to the gutters is reasonable.

17.11 rainwater pipe work £100

50. The Applicant objects this item on the basis that no work has been done.
51. The Respondent says that work was checking the joints on the cast-iron downpipes repacking them as necessary and leaving the pipework in sound already full redecoration.
52. The tribunal accepts the explanation of the Respondents witnesses and accepts that £100 is reasonable.

17.12 foul waste pipework

53. No work is currently claimed under this heading.

17.13 masonry £1180

54. The Applicant accepts that some work has been done to masonry but considers that this duplicates items claimed under the next two headings for render and stonework.
55. The Respondents witnesses explained that masonry rendering and stonework were dealt with as three separate headings and there is no duplication. The witnesses explained that there was a differential rate according to the area of pointing to be considered and that small areas

were more time-consuming than larger areas and therefore attracted a higher rate. The work under this heading relates to repointing.

56. The tribunal accepts the Respondents evidence and considers that the figure of £1180 for repointing is reasonable. Photographic evidence showed areas of pointing which were loose and friable particularly at the rear of the property.

17.14 render £220

57. The Applicant considers this duplicates the previous heading.
58. The Respondent stated that this refers to areas of plinth particularly at the rear of the property which needed replacement.
59. The tribunal accepts the Respondents evidence and considers this sum is reasonable.

17.15 stonework £25

60. The Applicant considers this duplicates item 17.13.
61. The Respondent considers this is self-explanatory relating to reforming drip details on window sills. Stonework around the front door is being queried.
62. The tribunal accepts this figure is reasonable.

17.16 structural

63. No work is being claimed under this heading.

17.17 windows and doors £370

64. This figure is made up of two parts, checking and using Windows at £250 and renewing perimeter pointing around the windows at £120. The latter figure is not challenged by the Applicant. The Applicant states that the checking and easing all windows has not been done.
65. The Respondents witnesses gave evidence that general easing and adjusting some windows had been done at the property. The works amounted to checking that the windows open to close properly but no general overhaul was undertaken to the extent of removing sashes overhauling sash cords and such work.

66. On balance the tribunal is satisfied that the work claimed has been done and the figure of £370 is reasonable.

17.18 timber repairs

67. All of the work under this heading is being queried by the Respondent and the tribunal makes no findings on these items.

17.19 glazing

68. No work is claimed under this heading.

17.20 miscellaneous £150

69. The Applicant states that this work did not happen.
70. The Respondents witnesses stated this related to fastening together loose cables or re-fixing them.
71. The tribunal is not persuaded by this item which refers to unspecified and unidentified cables.

17.21 underground drainage £500

72. The Applicant considers that £500 is expensive for a drain survey, no separate quotation was obtained and the Applicant is unable to say if the survey was done or not.
73. The Respondent point out that the results of the CCTV survey are included in the supplementary bundle which identified various works needed and competitive tenders were awaited for the cost of the work. The first estimate received was £4670. In response to a question from the tribunal it was confirmed this is a private drain.
74. The tribunal accepts the respondents evidence and considers that £500 is reasonable for an underground drain survey. It makes no findings as to the need for future works.

17.22 external area

75. No work is currently claimed under this heading.

17.23 boundary walls

76. No work is currently claimed under this heading.

17.24 redecoration and cleaning £3750

77. The Applicant considers this item is duplication and not chargeable.
78. The Respondents witnesses explained this external repainting. They were unable to say if the Applicants estimates were on a like-for-like basis.
79. The tribunal prefers the evidence for the Respondents and considers that the figure of £3750 is reasonable.

17.25 fire risk assessment actions

80. No work is claimed under this heading

17.26 electrical report £240

81. The Applicant considers that £240 is too expensive for electrical report as there is very little electricity in the common areas apart from the meters above the door.
82. The Respondent explained this was an electrical test report from a qualified electrician on the common areas to ensure the safety of the installation. No further work is recommended.
83. The tribunal accepts the £240 is a reasonable figure for an electrical test report.

17.27 nothing included

17.28 flat entrance doors

84. No work is claimed under this heading

17.29 plasterwork £1012

85. The Applicant considers this item is too expensive and the cost should be half as much.
86. The Respondents witnesses explained that the common parts walls had been covered in woodchip paper which is now considered to be a fire risk and had to be removed. The process of stripping the paper damage the surface of the plaster and a complete re-skin was required to walls top the price is based on the competitive tenders.

87. The tribunal accepts the evidence of the Respondents witnesses that the work was necessary and considers that the price is reasonable.

17.30 ceiling and wall finishes £330

88. The Applicant considers that this item is too expensive and should be roughly half as it only involved stripping wallpaper.
89. The Respondents witnesses explained this concerned the stripping of the woodchip wallpaper which is a time-consuming business and the cost is based on competitive tender.
90. The tribunal accepts the respondents evidence and considers that £330 is reasonable.

17.31 electrical enclosure

91. No work is claimed under this heading at present and the cost is to follow. The tribunal makes no findings on the need for the works.

17.32 floor finishes

92. No work is claimed under this heading at present and the cost is to follow. The tribunal makes no findings on the need for the works.

17.34 fire alarm testing in self-contained units

93. This work is not chargeable and no work is claimed under this heading.

17.35 completion £340

94. The Applicant complains that this work has not being done. Debris remains in gutters and when he pointed this out to the scaffolders they denied it was their job.
95. The Respondents witnesses were unable to confirm whether this work done pending practical completion. It is however state the thought it have been done.
96. On the evidence before to present the tribunal is not convinced either way as to whether this work has been done or not. The Respondents will need to re-inspect for practical completion and will be able to confirm the position at that time. The tribunal makes no finding as to whether this item is reasonable.

Hinge and bolt to bin store £40

97. The tribunal considers this figure to be reasonable.

Summary

98. The Applicant has been unsuccessful in most of the challenges to the cost of the works but this is always going to be a difficult task against competitively tendered work. There are however a significant number of items still under investigation and the tribunal makes findings on the reasonableness of these items.

99. As no service charge demands have yet been made, the tribunal makes no findings as to payability of service charges.

100. The totals under the various headings are shown on the schedule attached to this decision.

Application under s.20C and refund of fees

101. At the end of the hearing, the Applicant made an application for a refund of the fees that he had paid in respect of the application/ hearing¹. Having heard the submissions from the parties and taking into account the determinations above, the tribunal does not order the Respondent to refund any fees paid by the Applicant.

102. In the application form, the Applicant applied for an order under section 20C of the 1985 Act. Having heard the submissions from the parties and taking into account the determinations above, the tribunal determines makes no order under s20C.

Name: A Harris

Date: 8 November 2021

¹ The Tribunal Procedure (First-tier Tribunal) (Property Chamber) Rules 2013

Rights of appeal

By rule 36(2) of the Tribunal Procedure (First-tier Tribunal) (Property Chamber) Rules 2013, the tribunal is required to notify the parties about any right of appeal they may have.

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.

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.

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.

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.

If the tribunal refuses to grant permission to appeal, a further application for permission may be made to the Upper Tribunal (Lands Chamber).

17.9	Chimney							
17.9.1	seal flues	£ 150.00	omitted		£ -			
17.9.2	rake out and reflaunch	£ 30.00	omitted		£ -			
17.9.3	hack off mortar fillet	£ 20.00	omitted		£ -			
17.9.4	replace damaged bricks	£ 60.00	complete	100%		£ 60.00	under query	
17.9.5	repoint bwk	£ 100.00	complete	100%	£ 100.00			
17.10	Gutters							
17.10.1	clear out gutters	£ 150.00	complete	100%	£ 150.00			
17.10.2	renew upvc gutter	£ 15.00	omitted		£ -			
17.10.3	adjust upvc gutters	£ 60.00	omitted		£ -			
17.10.4	make good joints to CI gutter	£ 50.00	complete	100%	£ 50.00			
17.10.5	renew CI gutter brackets	£ 100.00	omitted		£ -			
17.10.6	renew sections of ogeee gutters	£ 240.00	omitted		£ -			
17.10.7	coat internal surfaces CI with bitumen	£ 100.00	complete	100%	£ 100.00			£ 400.00
17.11	Rainwater pipework							
17.11.1	jet and rod through		incl		£ -			
17.11.2	check all pipework		incl		£ -			
17.11.3	renew upvc clips	£ 15.00	complete	100%		£ 15.00	under query	
17.11.4	check iron pipework fixings		incl		£ -			
17.11.5	renw joints to CI pipes	£ 100.00	complete	100%	£ 100.00			
17.11.6	renew section of pipe	£ 120.00	complete	100%		£ 120.00	under query	
17.12	Foul waste pipework							
17.12.1	jet and rod through		inc		£ -			
17.12.2	check pipework and joints		inc		£ -			
17.12.3	supply and fit 100mm balloons	£ 10.00	omitted		£ -			
17.12.4	check pipework fixings		inc		£ -			
17.12.5	refill joints	£ 50.00	complete	100%		£ 50.00	under query	
17.12.6	replace section of pipe	£ 140.00	omitted		£ -			
17.13	Masonry							
17.13.1	remove loose material	£ 150.00	complete	100%	£ 150.00			
17.13.2	remove redundant fixings and make good		inc		£ -			
17.13.4	areas up to 1m ²	£ 750.00	complete	100%	£ 750.00			
17.13.5	areas up to 0.5m ²	£ 40.00	complete	100%		£ 40.00	under query	
17.13.6	areas up to 0.25m ²	£ 280.00	complete	100%	£ 280.00			
17.13.7	rake out grout to cill tiles	£ 100.00	omitted					
17.13.8	renew 5 bricks	£ 100.00	complete	100%		£ 100.00	under query	
17.13.9	trace box boiler flue	£ 150.00	omitted		£ -			£1,180.00
17.14	Render							
17.14.2	areas up to 0.25m ² (plain face)	£ 40.00	complete	100%	£ 40.00			
17.14.3	areas up to 0.5m ² (plain face)	£ 180.00	complete	100%	£ 180.00			
17.14.4	hammer test and renew loose material	£ 30.00	omitted		£ -			£ 220.00
17.15	stonework							

17.15.1	inspect for loose material	£ 50.00	omitted		£ -		
17.15.4	repairs up to 50cm ³	£ 250.00	omitted		£ -		
17.15.5	repairs up to 200cm ³	£ 120.00	omitted		£ -		
17.15.6	repairs up to 300cm ³	£ 562.50	complete	100%		£ 562.50	under query
17.15.7	recast sections of stone cill	£ 375.00	complete	100%		£ 375.00	under query
17.15.8	reform drip details	£ 25.00	complete	100%	£ 25.00		
17.16	structural						
17.16.1	repoint by crack	£ 375.00	omitted		£ -		
17.17	windows and doors				£ -		
17.17.1	check and ease	£ 250.00	complete	100%	£ 250.00		
17.17.2	overhaul sash windows	£ 250.00	omitted		£ -		
17.17.3	renew sealant	£ 120.00	omitted		£ -		
17.17.4	renew perimeter pointing	£ 120.00	complete	100%	£ 120.00		
17.17.5	ease panted shut top sash	£ 100.00	omitted		£ -		
17.17.6	PC sum repairs	£ 900.00	omitted		£ -		
17.17.7	profit on pc sum	£ 200.00	omitted		£ -		£ 370.00
17.18	Timber repairs						
17.18.4	repair method no 03 (50mm)	£ 35.00	complete	100%		£ 35.00	under query
17.18.5	repair method no 03 (100mm)	£ 520.00	complete	100%		£ 520.00	under query
17.18.6	repair method no 04 (100cm ³)	£ 1,980.00	complete	100%		£ 1,980.00	under query
17.18.7	repair method no 04 (200cm ³)	£ 220.00	complete	100%		£ 220.00	under query
17.18.8	repair method no 04 (300cm ³)	£ 390.00	omitted		£ -		
17.18.9	repair method no 5 (face splice 100mm)	£ 600.00	complete	100%		£ 600.00	under query
17.18.10	repair method no 5 (face splice 200mm)	£ 1,590.00	complete	100%		£ 1,590.00	under query
17.18.11	parting bead splice @150mm	£ 400.00	complete	100%		£ 400.00	under query
17.19	Glazing				£ -		
17.19.1	renew putty	£ 197.25	omitted		£ -		not chargeable
17.19.2	reglaze sash window	£ 100.00	omitted		£ -		not chargeable
17.20.0	Misc						
17.20.1	check cables etc	£ 150.00	complete	100%	£ -		
17.20.2	check satellite dishes		inc		£ -		
17.21	underground drainage						
17.21.1	obtain CCTV survey	£ 500.00	complete	100%	£ 500.00		
17.21.4	PC sum for repairs	£ 1,000.00			£ -		estimates to follow
17.21.5	attendance on PC sum	£ 200.00			£ -		estimates to follow
17.22	External area						
17.22.1	remove debris	£ 100.00	complete	100%		£ 100.00	under query
17.22.2	cut back vegetation		inc		£ -		
17.22.3	break up concrete hardstand	£ 200.00	omitted		£ -		
17.22.4	PC sum for repairs	£ 500.00	omitted		£ -		
17.22.5	attendance on PC sum	£ 100.00	omitted		£ -		

17.23	Boundary Walls						
17.23.1	repoint	£ 50.00	omitted		£ -		
17.23.2	rebuild front wall	£ 300.00	omitted		£ -		
17.23.3	renew copings	£ 60.00	omitted		£ -		
17.23.4	renew door to bin store	£ 300.00	complete		£ -		under query
17.23.5	PC sum for repairs	£ 500.00	omitted		£ -		
17.23.6	attendance on PC sum	£ 100.00	omitted		£ -		
17.24	redecorating and cleaning						
17.24.1	repaint external surfaces	£ 3,750.00	complete	100%	£ 3,750.00		
17.25	fire risk assessment actions						
17.25.1	pc sum	£ 100.00	omitted		£ -		not Chargeable
17.25.2	attendance on PC sum	£ 50.00	omitted		£ -		not Chargeable
17.26	Electrical report						
17.26.1	Electrical test	£ 240.00	complete	100%	£ 240.00		
17.26.2	obtain quotes for work identified				£ -		
17.26.3	PC sum	£ 500.00	omitted		£ -		
17.26.4	attendance on PC sum	£ 100.00	omitted		£ -		
17.27	Fire detection (contractor design)						
17.27.1	PC sum for new detection system	£ 800.00	omitted		£ -		not chargeable
17.27.2	attendance on PC sum	£ 200.00	omitted		£ -		not chargeable
17.28	Flat entrance doors						
17.28.1	dispose of existing door		omitted		£ -		not chargeable
17.28.2	supply and fit 2 new doors	£ 3,750.00	omitted		£ -		not chargeable
17.28.3	ironmongery		omitted		£ -		not chargeable
17.28.4	PC sum for new features	£ 400.00	omitted		£ -		not chargeable
17.28.5	attendance on PC sum	£ 100.00	omitted		£ -		not chargeable
17.29	Plaster						
17.29.1	test plaster	£ 640.00	omitted		£ -		
17.29.2	skim coat	£ 1,012.00	complete	100%	£ 1,012.00		
17.30	Ceiling and wall finishes						
17.30.1	strip walls	£ 330.00	complete	100%	£ 330.00		
17.31	electrical enclosure				£ -		
17.31.2	supply and fit new fire rated enclosure	£ 150.00			£ -		cost to follow
17.32	Floor finishes				£ -		
17.32.1	replace existing carpet	£ 520.00			£ -		cost to follow
17.32.2	fit stair nosings	£ 260.00			£ -		cost to follow
17.34	fire alarm testing in SC units						
17.34.1	test and service fire alarms	£ 240.00	omitted		£ -		not chargeable

17.34.2	obtain quotes for work identified		omitted		£ -		not chargeable
17.34.3	PC sum for works	£ 500.00	omitted		£ -		not chargeable
17.34.4	attendance on PC sum	£ 100.00	omitted		£ -		not chargeable
17.35	completion						
17.35.1	thorough clean	£ 100.00	complete	100%	£ -		
17.35.2	clean glass	£ 100.00	complete	100%	£ -		
17.35.3	fill scaffold tie holes	£ 100.00	complete	100%	£ -		
proposal	hinge and bolt to bin store	£ 40.00	complete	100%	£ 40.00		£ 40.00
	Totals	£ 43,404.75			£ 15,940.00	£ 7,372.50	