



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

**Case Reference** : **TW/LON/00AW/OC9/2014/0084**

**Property** : **Flat 5, 17 Redcliffe Gardens,  
London SW10 9BG**

**Applicant** : **Alfred Cyril Lippiatt**

**Representative** : **Winkworth Sherwood Solicitors**

**Respondent** : **Victoria Elizabeth Sophie Stanbury**

**Representative** : **Summers Solicitors**

**Type of Application** : **Assessment of costs under section  
60(1) of the Leasehold Reform  
Housing and Urban Development  
Act 1993**

**Tribunal Members** : **Judge O'Sullivan**

**Date of Decision** : **6 February 2015**

: :

---

**DECISION**

---

## **The background**

1. This is an application brought by the landlord for a determination of reasonable costs under section 60(1) of the 1993 Act.
2. The fees in issue total £3,555 plus Vat.
3. Directions were made further to which a bundle of documents was lodged. The application was considered by way of a paper determination on 6 February 2015.
4. The costs before the tribunal were as follows:-
  - (a) The Applicant's legal costs in the sum of £2,555 plus VAT; and
  - (b) The costs of the Applicant's valuer in the sum of £1,000 plus Vat.

## **The Legal costs**

5. The total costs are £2,555 plus Vat.
6. The Respondent made its submissions in response by letter dated 6 January 2015 and objected to only two items as follows which the tribunal deals with below;
  - i. Work done on documents
  - ii. Disbursement of £20
7. Investigating the tenant's right to a new lease has been timed at 1 hour and 48 minutes in the heading of "Work Done on Documents". The Respondent says that this time charged is excessive and suggests that no more than 48 minutes would be necessary for such an exercise. Accordingly it is submitted that the sum of £260 should be allowed in relation to this item. In response the Applicant says that it is very reasonable for the landlords to spend such time in considering the validity of the notice served by the tenant. This time is said to relate to considering the claim notice, title documentation and lease. It is said that minimal time has been claimed such work is recoverable in full.
8. The tribunal agrees that this time is recoverable in principle under section 60(1)(a) and having considered the documents in question allows the time claimed as reasonable.

9. A disbursement in the sum of £20 is challenged on the basis that it is unclear how such a sum could properly be recoverable under section 60(1) of the Act. In response the Applicant says that this charge relates to completion and should have been included under section 60(1)(c) rather than Section 60(1)(b) but is in any event recoverable.
10. The tribunal agrees that the disbursement in the sum of £20 which represents a bank charge is recoverable under section 60(1)(c).
11. It does not appear that the valuation fee is in dispute. However for the sake of clarity and completeness the tribunal allows the valuation fee in full as it considers a reasonable fee for this type of valuation.
12. The tribunal confirms that the costs are allowed in full in the sum of £3,555 plus Vat making a total of £4,266 as set out in the schedule dated 27 December 2014.

**Name:** Sonya O'Sullivan

**Date:** 6 February 2015