



Leasehold Valuation Tribunal
Case Ref: CAM/00KF/LSC/2011/0147
CAM/00KF/LSC/2012/0036

Property : The 24 flats in Carlton Avenue,
Westcliff-on-Sea SS0 0QH (as listed on
the Directions)

Applicant : Isaac Oyedale Odeniran
Represented by : Ms Elizabeth Joseph Counsel

Respondent : RMB Trading Limited
Represented by : Mr Stephen Boon RMB Employee

Date of Application : 10 November 2011

Type of Application : To determine the amount of service
charges payable – Section 27A Landlord
and Tenant Act 1985 (the Act) and the
amount of administration charges
payable – Schedule 11 Commonhold and
Leasehold Reform Act 2002

Date of Original Directions: 19 November 2011
Date of Revised Directions: 29 March 2012

Date of Hearing : 24 August 2012

Date of Decision : 24 September 2012

Tribunal : Mr John Hewitt Chairman
Mr Stephen Moll FRICS
Mr David Cox JP

DECISION

Decision

1. The decision of the Tribunal is that:

1.1 The service charges payable for the period 1 January 2010 to 1 August 2010 are as follows:

Insurance £37.50 per flat (This was agreed by the parties)
Accountancy £7.50 per flat (This was agreed by the parties)
Management £70.00 per flat (This was determined)

1.2 The amount of interest payable on late paid ground rent and service charges was agreed between the parties at £900 which equates to £37.50 per flat.

1.3 The arrears and other sums claimed in the court proceedings are summarised in Schedule 1 attached to this Decision.

1.4 Since the court proceedings were issued the Applicant has made further payments to the Respondent generally on account of his liability, the Respondent has re-formulated the 2010 accounts to accord with the regime set out in the leases and has made consequential debit and credit entries on the individual cash accounts; the parties have agreed some of the sums which were in dispute and the Tribunal has determined those matters which the parties did not agree upon. In consequence of all of these adjustments the balance of service charges and administration charges outstanding and payable by the Applicant to the Respondent as at 2 May 2012 is the total sum of £4,362.64 as shown on Schedule 2 attached to this Decision. A breakdown showing the service charges and administration charges which have been arrived at is shown on Schedule 3 to this Decision.

1.5 For the sake of good order we record that the parties are agreed that as at 2 May 2012 all of the ground rents are fully paid and there are no arrears of ground rent.

1.6 The Applicant's application for an order pursuant to section 20C of the Act is refused but we record the Respondent acknowledged that the leases do not make provisions for the costs of proceedings such as these to be regarded as service charges payable by the lessee.

1.7 The Applicant's application that the Respondent be required to reimburse him £350 in respect of fees paid by him to the Tribunal in connection with these proceedings is refused.

1.8 The court file shall now be returned to the court together with a copy of this Decision.

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.

The background

2. In or about July 2008 the Respondent became the freehold owner of a development of 28 maisonettes 175 – 201A Carlton Avenue, Westcliff-on-Sea. 24 of those maisonettes are let to the Applicant on a series of long leases which were granted to him in 2005 by a predecessor in title of the Respondent.
3. It was not in dispute that the leases provide for the landlord to insure the development and to provide repairs and other service and that the lessees are to contribute to the costs incurred by the landlord in complying with its obligations.
4. The leases set out a service charges regime, the terms of which were not in dispute. The service charge year is the calendar year.
5. The Applicant and the Respondent have never really got on with one another. In 2009 the Applicant made an application the Leasehold Valuation Tribunal (Case Ref: CAM/00KF/LSC/2009/0015) - (the First Application) for a determination as to the reasonableness of the budgets for 2008 and 2009. A determination was made. The Applicant did not pay the sums determined. The Respondent issued court proceedings to enforce the determination. By order dated 25 February 2010 the Edmonton County Court made an order that the award be enforced in the court and made an order that the Applicant pay to the Respondent the sum of £6,882.96 plus court fee of £35 and costs of £75.50 [163].
6. The Applicant sought to set that order aside; his application was adjourned and has not yet been heard. It has now rather been overtaken by the Second Application, see below.
7. In 2010 the Applicant made an application to the Leasehold Valuation Tribunal (case Ref: CAM/00KF/LSC/2010/0046 (the Second Application) for a determination of the actual service charges payable for the years 2008 and 2009.
8. The Decision on the Second Application is dated 7 October 2010. It determined the service charges payable as follows:

	2008	2009
Accountancy	£nil	£ 387.75 (£13.85 per unit)
Insurance	£nil	£3,442.88 (£122.96 per unit)
Interest	£nil	£nil
Management	£1,400.00	£3,080.00 (£110.00 per unit)

9. With effect from 1 August 2010 the Applicant acquired the right to manage the development and has taken on that role.
10. The parties were in dispute as to the service charges payable for the period 1 January to 1 August 2010.
11. On 10 November 2011 the Tribunal received from the Applicant the present application and directions were issued. It then became apparent that on or about 17 October 2011 the Respondent had issued proceedings against the Applicant in Edmonton County Court in which it claimed alleged net arrears totalling some £17,367.32. Schedule 1 to this Decision sets out a breakdown of the sums claimed in those proceedings.
12. The application before the Tribunal was stayed pending a determination by the court as to the whether or not to transfer all or any of the claims made in the court proceedings to the Tribunal. A contested application was heard by the court and on 19 March 2012 Deputy District Judge Wagner made an order that the Tribunal determine whether the service charges (including insurance) sought by the Claimant/Respondent are payable, and if so, whether they are reasonable and an order whether the administration charges sought by the Claimant/Respondent are payable, and if so, whether they are reasonable.
13. On 29 March 2012 revised directions [7] were issued taking into account the court order of 19 March 2012. It appears that those directions have broadly been followed. The parties have exchanged statements of case and have given disclosure of sorts. The Applicant provided the hearing files running to some 513 pages each.
14. On the morning of 24 August 2012 the Tribunal had the advantage of a site inspection. The Applicant was present. The Tribunal had been informed that the Respondent did not propose to send a representative to the inspection.

The hearing

15. At the hearing the Applicant was represented by Ms Elizabeth Joseph of counsel. The Respondent was represented by Mr Stephen Boon. He told us that he was an employee of the Respondent. He also appears to be connected with a firm named Eyre & Johnson whose notepaper states it provides 'Specialist Legal Services'.
16. With some encouragement the parties were able to agree a number of matters including that:
 1. The sums payable for Accountancy, Insurance and Management for 2008 and 2009 are as determined by the Tribunal in the Second Application;
 2. Insurance payable for 2010 was £40.99 per unit;
 3. Accountancy payable for 2010 was £7.50 per unit;

4. Interest payable on late paid rent and service charges as provided for in clause 7(b) of the lease [16] amounted to £37.50 per unit as at 2 May 2012.
 5. Since the court proceedings were issued the Applicant has made several lump sum payments to the Respondent generally on account of his liabilities under the leases, that in making the payments he did not designate any particular allocation, account or liability, that the creditor was entitled to allocate the proceeds to such accounts as it chose, that funds have been allocated to the ground rent account so that currently there are no ground rent arrears, that the balances have been allocated to the service charge and administration charges accounts so that if there are presently arrears due they will be arrears of service charges and administration charges.
17. In the event the only service charges and administration charges for the Tribunal to determine were:
1. Management fees for 2010; and
 2. An administration charge of £765.68 relating to legal costs incurred by the Respondent in seeking to enforce in court the determination made on the First Application.

We shall take each of these in turn.

Management 2010

18. The managing agents appointed by the Respondent are Hillcrest Estate Management. Evidence was given by Mr Arthur Jenner of Hillcrest. His witness statement is at [246]. He supplemented his evidence by explaining that in late 2009 he agreed with the Respondent's representative a unit fee of £200 (incl of VAT) for 2010.
19. The gist of the case for the Applicant was that in May 2010 he received an email from Hillcrest which stated that Hillcrest was no longer managing the development. The Applicant was unable to provide a copy of the email. Mr Jenner was cross-examined about it and he denied any knowledge of it. Mr Jenner said he was aware that in 2009 the Applicant intimated an intention to acquire the right to manage but the claim notice was not given until March 2010. Mr Jenner explained that in the meantime it was necessary to continue to provide management services. He said that a responsible landlord should not cease to provide management simply because an intimation of an intention to acquire the right to manage was given. Such intimations are often given but, for one reason or another, they do not all come to fruition. Mr Jenner was not cross-examined by Ms Joseph on paragraph 3 of his witness statements as regards to the services provided from 1 January to 31 July 2010.
20. The Applicant gave evidence and was cross-examined. He was sure he had seen an email in May 2010 but he was unable to produce it.

21. We accept and prefer the evidence of Mr Jenner. We were not persuaded that an email was sent in May 2010 to the Applicant to the effect that it had ceased management.
22. The services provided to the block were about as minimal as can be. Although a budget for 2010 was prepared it was not provided to us and no sums on account were demanded of the lessees. We find that a unit fee of £200 was agreed between the Respondent and Hillcrest but we find it unreasonable that the Respondent should have agreed such a high fee given the minimal level of management services to be provided.
23. We accept that the fee of £200 was agreed before the Tribunal in the Second Application determined (in October 2010) a fee of £110 for 2009.
24. We have considered carefully the reasoning given by the Tribunal in the Second Application for its decision to set the cost of management at £110 and we respect and adopt it in principle. We find that for 2010 it was unreasonable for the Respondent to agree the cost of management at a sum greater than £120 per unit (incl of VAT).
25. We are concerned with a seven month period 1 January to 1 August 2010 and so we determine the management fee at £70 per unit.

Administration charge of £730.68

26. The evidence of Mr Boon was that this was a cost of £695.68 incurred with Brethertons Solicitors [162] and a court fee of £35 [163] both of which related to the application to register the decision made on the First Application with the court with a view to enforcing. He said, and it was not denied, that the Applicant had not paid the sums on account determined in the First Application. The fees were incurred before the Second Application was made.
27. Mr Boon submitted that the fees were payable by virtue of clause 11(a)(ii) of the lease [25]. This was not disputed by Ms Joseph. Mr Boon said that for ease of administration all of the costs had been allocated to the account of flat 175 but that it would have been legitimate to have apportioned them across all 24 leases. It is an academic point and of no adverse consequence to the Applicant and no point about it was taken.
28. The gist of the Applicant's case was he should not pay the costs because in the Second Application he achieved a measure of success and the Tribunal awarded less than the Respondent claimed. We reject this submission. The costs were incurred before the Second Application was made. The Applicant failed to pay the sums determined on the First Application. We find it was reasonable for the Respondent to seek to enforce the determination on the First

Application. The court made an order to that effect. That order has not been set aside and the Applicant appears to have abandoned his application to set it aside. Mr Boon submitted that the budget sums determined on the First Application were in fact less than the final sums determined on the Second Application so that it was not correct for the Applicant to assert success on the Second Application. As neither party produced to us the determination on the First Application we are not able to verify what Mr Boon had to say.

29. We find that the administration charges are payable pursuant to clause 11(a)(ii) of the lease, that this was not disputed, and that the charges were reasonably incurred. There was no challenge by Ms Joseph about the quantum of the charges. Drawing on the accumulated expertise and experience of the members of the Tribunal we find that amount of the charges are well within the range of what can be regarded as reasonable for the work carried out. We find they are payable by the Applicant.

The section 20C Application – limitation of landlord’s costs of the proceedings

30. The substantive application included an application under s20C of the Act with regard to the landlord’s costs incurred or to be incurred in connection with these proceedings and an order was sought that those costs ought not be regarded as relevant costs in determining the amount of any service charge payable by the Applicant.
31. Mr Boon acknowledged that such costs are not expressly mentioned in the service charge regime. Further he helpfully acknowledged that as the Applicant had acquired the right to manage the Respondent no longer had the right to prepare or issue service charge accounts or demands.
32. Thus Mr Boon said that the Respondent would not seek to recover the costs of the proceedings as service charges. However, Mr Boon reserved the Respondent’s position as to whether such costs might be recoverable as administration charges under clause 11(a)(ii) of the leases. That said, Mr Boon explained that during several adjournments of the hearing good progress had been made in the parties agreeing a number of matters. The Respondent was keen to draw a line under historic service charges and administration charges and would abide by what had been agreed and what was to be determined by the Tribunal. On this footing all matters claimed in the court proceedings would be dealt with and determined. The Respondent proposed to bear the court fee of £395 incurred in the court proceedings and did not propose to seek costs in the court proceedings or to raise any further administration charges assuming that the Applicant did not propose to pursue a counterclaim in the court proceedings. The Applicant said he

was also looking for closure and did not propose to pursue a counterclaim.

33. Bearing the above in mind and, in particular Mr Boon's concession that the service charge regime did not include costs of proceedings such as these we find that it is not appropriate or necessary for us to make an order under section 20C.

Reimbursement of Fees

34. An application was made by the Applicant for the reimbursement of fees of £350 paid by him in connection with these proceedings. The application was opposed and Mr Boon was rather dismayed it was being pursued having regard to the matters set out above.
35. Ms Joseph submitted that the Applicant had tried to resolve matters and that he was forced to come to the Tribunal and incur the fees. Ms Joseph relied in support on the letters at [59 & 60]. We reject the submission. In the proceedings before us the statement of case served by the Applicant challenged many of the sums claimed. At and during the hearing he modified his position and some claims were admitted and some were the subject of a compromise agreement. There was no evidence before us upon which we could rely with any confidence that the Applicant made any serious attempts to try to resolve matters with the Respondent before he issued his application.
36. In all of the circumstances we do not find that it just or equitable to require the Respondent to reimburse any part of the fees paid by the Applicant.

Further action

37. In the light of our findings and bearing in the court order made on 19 March 2012 the court file is now to be returned to the court in case any applications are to be made in the court proceedings.

To be noted

38. We wish it to be noted that copies of Schedule 1, 2 and 3 were sent to the parties on or about 28 August 2012, for comment on arithmetical matters, and in particular the total amount recorded on Schedule 2 as having been paid by Applicant generally on account of his liability. We have received a letter from the Applicant dated 29 August 2012 and a letter from Mr Boon dated 3 September 2012. We are grateful to Mr Boon for correcting a minor error on one entry on Schedule 2. We are pleased to record that both parties are agreed that as at 2 May 2012 the total amount of the sums paid and credited on Schedule 2 is £26,323.40 and that as at that date the arrears payable stood at £4,362.64 as shown on Schedule 2.

The law

39. Relevant law we have taken into account in arriving at our decision is set out in the Schedule below.

.....
John Hewitt
Chairman
24 September 2012

The Schedule

The Relevant Law

Landlord and Tenant Act 1985

Section 18(1) of the Act provides that, for the purposes of relevant parts of the Act 'service charges' means an amount payable by a tenant of a dwelling as part of or in addition to the rent –

- (a) which is payable, directly or indirectly, for services, repairs, maintenance, improvements or insurance or the landlord's costs of management, and
- (b) the whole or part of which varies or may vary according to the relevant costs.

Section 19(1) of the Act provides that relevant costs shall be taken into account in determining the amount of a service charge payable for a period –

- (a) only to the extent that they are reasonably incurred, and
- (b) where they are incurred on the provision of services or the carrying out of works, only if the services are of a reasonable standard;

and the amount payable shall be limited accordingly.

Section 19(2) of the Act provides that where a service charge is payable before the relevant costs are incurred, no greater amount than is reasonable is so payable, and after the relevant costs have been incurred any necessary adjustment shall be made by repayment, reduction of subsequent charges or otherwise.

Section 20C(1) of the Act provides that a tenant may make an application for an order that all or any of the costs incurred, or to be incurred, by the landlord in connection with proceedings before a leasehold valuation tribunal are not to be regarded as relevant costs to be taken into account in determining the

amount of any service charge payable by the tenant or any other person or persons specified in the application.

Section 20C(3) of the Act provides that the tribunal may make such order on the application as it considers just and equitable in the circumstances.

Section 27A of the Act provides that an application may be made to a leasehold valuation tribunal for a determination whether a service charge is payable and, if it is, as to-

- (a) the person by whom it is payable,
- (b) the person to whom it is payable,
- (c) the amount which is payable.
- (d) the date at or by which it is payable, and
- (e) the manner in which it is payable.

Commonhold and Leasehold Reform Act 2002 Schedule 11

Paragraph 1 sets out a definition of a 'variable administration charge'.

Paragraph 2 provides that a variable administration charge is payable only to the extent that the amount of the charge is reasonable.

Paragraph 5 provides that any party to a lease of a dwelling may apply to a Leasehold Valuation Tribunal for a determination whether an administration charge is payable and, if it is, as to :

- (a) the person by whom it is payable,
- (b) the person to whom it is payable,
- (c) the amount which is payable.
- (d) the date at or by which it is payable, and
- (e) the manner in which it is payable.

No application may be made in respect of a matter which:

- (a) has been agreed or admitted by the tenant,
- (b) has been, or is to be, referred to arbitration pursuant to a post-dispute arbitration agreement to which the tenant is a party,
- (c) has been the subject of determination by a court. Or
- (d) has been the subject of determination by an arbitral tribunal pursuant to a post-dispute arbitration agreement.

A tenant is not to be taken to have agreed or admitted any matter by reason only of having made any payment.

Leasehold Valuation Tribunals (Fees) (England) Regulations 2003

Regulation 9(1) provides that subject to paragraph (2) a Tribunal may require any party to the proceedings to reimburse any other party to the proceedings for the whole or any part of any fees paid by him in respect of the proceedings.

Flat	Ground Rent	Interest	Bldg Ins	Accounts	Management	Legal Costs	Total		Payments Made	Net Claim
175	£ 695.34	£ 45.28	£ 176.19	£ 13.85	£ 271.35	£ 765.68	£ 1,967.69		-£ 746.28	£ 1,221.41
175A	£ 695.34	£ 48.79	£ 176.19	£ 13.85	£ 271.35		£ 1,205.52		-£ 746.28	£ 459.24
177	£ 695.34	£ 52.07	£ 176.19	£ 13.85	£ 271.35		£ 1,208.80		-£ 746.28	£ 462.52
177A	£ 695.34	£ 55.37	£ 176.19	£ 13.85	£ 271.35		£ 1,212.10		-£ 746.28	£ 465.82
179	£ 695.34	£ 58.77	£ 176.19	£ 13.85	£ 271.35		£ 1,215.50		-£ 746.28	£ 469.22
179A	£ 695.34	£ 62.06	£ 176.19	£ 13.85	£ 271.35		£ 1,218.79		-£ 746.28	£ 472.51
181	£ 695.34	£ 65.66	£ 176.19	£ 13.85	£ 271.35		£ 1,222.39		-£ 746.28	£ 476.11
181A	£ 695.34	£ 68.85	£ 176.19	£ 13.85	£ 271.35		£ 1,225.58		-£ 746.28	£ 479.30
183	£ 695.34	£ 70.39	£ 176.19	£ 13.85	£ 271.35		£ 1,227.12		-£ 746.28	£ 480.84
183A	£ 695.34	£ 71.92	£ 176.19	£ 13.85	£ 271.35		£ 1,228.65		-£ 746.28	£ 482.37
185	£ 695.34	£ 75.31	£ 176.19	£ 13.85	£ 271.35		£ 1,232.04		-£ 746.28	£ 485.76
185A	£ 695.34	£ 79.20	£ 176.19	£ 13.85	£ 271.35		£ 1,235.93		-£ 546.28	£ 689.65
187A	£ 695.34	£ 83.09	£ 176.19	£ 13.85	£ 271.35		£ 1,239.82		-£ 346.28	£ 893.54
189	£ 695.34	£ 83.09	£ 176.19	£ 13.85	£ 271.35		£ 1,239.82		-£ 346.28	£ 893.54
191	£ 695.34	£ 83.09	£ 176.19	£ 13.85	£ 271.35		£ 1,239.82		-£ 346.28	£ 893.54
191A	£ 695.34	£ 83.09	£ 176.19	£ 13.85	£ 271.35		£ 1,239.82		-£ 346.27	£ 893.55
193A	£ 695.34	£ 83.09	£ 176.19	£ 13.85	£ 271.35		£ 1,239.82		-£ 346.27	£ 893.55
195A	£ 695.34	£ 83.09	£ 176.19	£ 13.85	£ 271.35		£ 1,239.82		-£ 346.27	£ 893.55
197	£ 695.34	£ 83.09	£ 176.19	£ 13.85	£ 271.35		£ 1,239.82		-£ 346.27	£ 893.55
197A	£ 695.34	£ 83.09	£ 176.19	£ 13.85	£ 271.35		£ 1,239.82		-£ 346.27	£ 893.55
199	£ 695.34	£ 83.09	£ 176.19	£ 13.85	£ 271.35		£ 1,239.82		-£ 346.27	£ 893.55
199A	£ 695.34	£ 83.09	£ 176.19	£ 13.85	£ 271.35		£ 1,239.82		-£ 346.27	£ 893.55
201	£ 695.34	£ 83.09	£ 176.19	£ 13.85	£ 271.35		£ 1,239.82		-£ 346.27	£ 893.55
201A	£ 695.34	£ 83.09	£ 176.19	£ 13.85	£ 271.35		£ 1,239.82		-£ 346.27	£ 893.55
Totals	£ 16,688.16	£ 1,750.75	£ 4,228.56	£ 332.40	£ 6,512.40	£ 765.68	£ 30,277.95		-£ 12,910.63	£ 17,367.32

Flat	Ground Rent	Interest	Bldg Ins	Accounts	Management	Legal Costs	Total		Payments Made	Now Payable
175	£ 795.34	£ 37.50	£ 163.95	£ 21.35	£ 230.00	£ 730.68	£ 1,978.82		-£ 1,096.81	£ 882.01
175A	£ 795.34	£ 37.50	£ 163.95	£ 21.35	£ 230.00		£ 1,248.14		-£ 1,096.81	£ 151.33
177	£ 795.34	£ 37.50	£ 163.95	£ 21.35	£ 230.00		£ 1,248.14		-£ 1,096.81	£ 151.33
177A	£ 795.34	£ 37.50	£ 163.95	£ 21.35	£ 230.00		£ 1,248.14		-£ 1,096.81	£ 151.33
179	£ 795.34	£ 37.50	£ 163.95	£ 21.35	£ 230.00		£ 1,248.14		-£ 1,096.81	£ 151.33
179A	£ 795.34	£ 37.50	£ 163.95	£ 21.35	£ 230.00		£ 1,248.14		-£ 1,096.81	£ 151.33
181	£ 795.34	£ 37.50	£ 163.95	£ 21.35	£ 230.00		£ 1,248.14		-£ 1,096.81	£ 151.33
181A	£ 795.34	£ 37.50	£ 163.95	£ 21.35	£ 230.00		£ 1,248.14		-£ 1,096.81	£ 151.33
183	£ 795.34	£ 37.50	£ 163.95	£ 21.35	£ 230.00		£ 1,248.14		-£ 1,096.81	£ 151.33
183A	£ 795.34	£ 37.50	£ 163.95	£ 21.35	£ 230.00		£ 1,248.14		-£ 1,096.81	£ 151.33
185	£ 795.34	£ 37.50	£ 163.95	£ 21.35	£ 230.00		£ 1,248.14		-£ 1,096.81	£ 151.33
185A	£ 795.34	£ 37.50	£ 163.95	£ 21.35	£ 230.00		£ 1,248.14		-£ 1,096.81	£ 151.33
187A	£ 795.34	£ 37.50	£ 163.95	£ 21.35	£ 230.00		£ 1,248.14		-£ 1,096.81	£ 151.33
189	£ 795.34	£ 37.50	£ 163.95	£ 21.35	£ 230.00		£ 1,248.14		-£ 1,096.81	£ 151.33
191	£ 795.34	£ 37.50	£ 163.95	£ 21.35	£ 230.00		£ 1,248.14		-£ 1,096.81	£ 151.33
191A	£ 795.34	£ 37.50	£ 163.95	£ 21.35	£ 230.00		£ 1,248.14		-£ 1,096.81	£ 151.33
193A	£ 795.34	£ 37.50	£ 163.95	£ 21.35	£ 230.00		£ 1,248.14		-£ 1,096.81	£ 151.33
195A	£ 795.34	£ 37.50	£ 163.95	£ 21.35	£ 230.00		£ 1,248.14		-£ 1,096.81	£ 151.33
197	£ 795.34	£ 37.50	£ 163.95	£ 21.35	£ 230.00		£ 1,248.14		-£ 1,096.81	£ 151.33
197A	£ 795.34	£ 37.50	£ 163.95	£ 21.35	£ 230.00		£ 1,248.14		-£ 1,096.81	£ 151.33
199	£ 795.34	£ 37.50	£ 163.95	£ 21.35	£ 230.00		£ 1,248.14		-£ 1,096.80	£ 151.34
199A	£ 795.34	£ 37.50	£ 163.95	£ 21.35	£ 230.00		£ 1,248.14		-£ 1,096.80	£ 151.34
201	£ 795.34	£ 37.50	£ 163.95	£ 21.35	£ 230.00		£ 1,248.14		-£ 1,096.80	£ 151.34
201A	£ 795.34	£ 37.50	£ 163.95	£ 21.35	£ 230.00		£ 1,248.14		-£ 1,096.80	£ 151.34
Totals	£ 19,088.16	£ 900.00	£ 3,934.80	£ 512.40	£ 5,520.00	£ 730.68	£ 30,686.04		-£ 26,323.40	£ 4,362.64

Ground Rent (Agreed)			
10.07.08 to 31.12.08	£	95.34	
01.01.09 to 30.06.09	£	100.00	
01.07.09 to 31.12.09	£	100.00	
01.01.10 to 30.06.10	£	100.00	
01.07.10 to 31.12.10	£	100.00	
01.01.11 to 30.06.11	£	100.00	
01.07.11 to 31.12.11	£	100.00	
01.01.12 to 30.06.12	£	100.00	
Total	£	795.34	
Interest (Agreed)	£	37.50	
Insurance (Agreed)			
25.03.09 to 24.03.10	£	122.96	
25.03.10 to 01.08.10	£	40.99	
Total	£	163.95	
Accounts (Agreed)			
01.01.09 to 31.12.09	£	13.85	
01.01.10 to 01.08.10	£	7.50	
Total	£	21.35	
Management			
10.07.08 to 31.12.08 (Agreed)	£	50.00	
01.01.09 to 31.12.09 (Agreed)	£	110.00	
01.01.10 to 01.08.10 (Determined)	£	70.00	
Total	£	230.00	