

MARTIN RUSSELL JONES

See my 02.02.05 complaint against MRJ to the RICS that was, 'of course', DISMISSED! snapshot OVERVIEW Note 5

1 Watford Way
London Central
London, NW4 3JL

CHARTERED SURVEYORS

apartment
Telephone: 020 8202 3838
Fax: No: 020 8202 9513
email: management@mr-j.co.uk

Miss N Dit-Rawe
3 Jefferson House
Basil Street
London SW1

LYING, CRIMINAL VERMIN, LED BY ANDREW DAVID LADSKY, actively protected and assisted by the British State.

See, in addition to Advisors to Jefferson House: OVERVIEW # 1 to # 3 ; 'Major works' ; Brian Gale ; Sale of apartments ; 17.06.03 report from LVT

Our Ref: JH/MAN

26th March 2002

Dear Ms Dit-Rawe

Jefferson House – Specialist Reports

Also on 26.03.02, Joan Hathaway, MRICS, sent a letter to 'All the leaseholders' FALSELY claiming that there were "no objectors" to the works. See how this assertion translated: 29.11.02 claim against 11 leaseholders representing 14 apartments, filed in West London County Court; LVT # 8.1.2 for letters from my fellow leaseholders

Thank you for your letter of the 10th February and your email received on the 4th February. We should be grateful for clarification in relation to the residents association as previously requested.

We turn now to the contents of your email and we will deal with your points as listed.

Your suggestion that the appointment of professional advisors is in any way connected with any planning application is incorrect. The brief given to the chosen surveyors was to undertake a full and detailed inspection of the internal and external fabric, structure and decorative condition of the building and its services for the purposes of ascertaining the extent of works required pursuant to both the head lease on the property and in turn the under leases of the individual flats in the building.

It is and has been clear to all the tenants in the building as well as to this firm that some considerable work needs to be undertaken to put the property into a substantial state of repair.

Including constructing a penthouse!

We are most concerned that all persons and tenants either in occupation or visiting the building should do so in complete comfort and safety. It is for the above reasons that it is appropriate to employ experienced surveyors and engineers to prepare reports so that the exact extent of the works required to the block can be determined.

The obligations under the terms of the under leases held on the property are clear and continuing. We are sure that we do not have to point out that buildings require refurbishment from time to time, particularly when they are as old as Jefferson house, and we and the head lessees are simply complying with our duty of care and safety to all occupants of the property and the obligations under the leasehold interest.

Lease states: liability ONLY for "repairs and maintenance"

Ⓐ In their 16 Dec 02 letter it had "come to the end of its useful life" (!!)

ROOF

Your assertion that the roof is "perfectly good" is incorrect. Indeed Mrs [redacted] acknowledged, presumably, in consultation with the other residents, including you, that the building requires a new roof. The roof has reached the end of its life and is leaking.

which would be acknowledged.

CRIMINAL VERMIN ANDREW LADSKY'S FLATS

In particular, flats 32 and 33 suffer periodic water ingress and flats 34 and 35, which are on the top floor immediately below the roof, have leaks and damage in many of their rooms. The roof must be attended to as soon as possible as the occupiers of these flats are being forced to live with quite unacceptable conditions as a result of these leaks.

We are very happy to invite you to inspect the roof for yourself and if you wish to do so please contact us and we shall arrange for you to visit it at a mutually convenient time.

It is also in every lessee's interest for the roof and other problems to be dealt with as quickly as possible, in view of the fact that the annual service charge is burdened by the costs of "patching up work" which should not have to take place in a building of this quality and location and broadly, it is money wasted delaying the inevitable need to refurbish the block. Ⓐ

Your understanding of the planning applications is incorrect. The enlargement and construction of the roof lights to which you refer was an application made and implemented more than 20 years ago as were the demolition works in connection therewith. The construction of an internal staircase etc again is an ancient planning application, which was withdrawn. We trust that this clarifies the position for you in respect of the roof. No doubt the surveyors report will deal with this more fully, in due course. True

BOILER

The application to which you refer was made on the 8th December 1967 and implemented almost 35 years ago. The boiler housing is not on the roof but in the basement. The boiler and some of the plant are extremely old and whilst some capital expenditure has been made it was for the purposes of dealing with urgent repairs that were required. Other works are needed. Once again, the engineer's report will clarify the works that may be required. ✓

LIFT

The lift was installed in the building in 1968 and is therefore some 34 years old.

Not so. The lift has been properly maintained and is currently in working order however, lifts do not last forever and the interior and car and plant are evidently showing their age. The lift is the

- B** ① Planning Application for penthouse flat = in 1998- made again under a different number (PP/01/2523) in Nov 01; for modification on 12 Dec 03.
- ② Other planning Application for infill of lightwell on 4 floors made on 25 Nov 02; Application for Amendments on: 7 Jan 04 and 19 Apr 04.

B responsibility of the lessees of the building but we can assure you that the survey is not in connection with any planning application and your conclusion in points 1 and 2 of this subsection is respectfully, both incorrect.

We would also be grateful if you would direct us, as a matter of urgency, to which law you are referring to as we have no knowledge of such a law or our obligation to use the original installation contractor or his agent to carry out maintenance in perpetuity as you suggest. The original contractor ceased trading many years ago.

Again the planning application to which you refer in relation to the roof tank and lift motor room were made and implemented many years ago. You state that the same application includes a request for putting a door in to join flats 29 and 30. Again that is not the case and that application is nothing to do with our clients. May we explain that any person is entitled to make a planning application on any property belonging to any other person or their own not withstanding that they may or may not have any interest in the property or be able or wish to implement such consent. ✓
✓

Finally, your representations were made after the expiry of the landlord and tenant notice period and the reports had been commissioned and should be ready very shortly. You were, incidentally, the only objector out of 35 lessees to the appointments.

We hope that you will appreciate that the building you occupy is extremely old. Some of the structure, fabric and services will inevitably be reaching the end of their life and expenditure is required to properties on an ongoing basis to keep them habitable and safe. Steel Services Ltd and we have a responsibility to undertake such works as are necessary at the appropriate time and are merely seeking to fulfil those duties.

We trust that this helps to clarify matters for you. If you need any thing further from us please do not hesitate to contact us.

Yours sincerely


JOAN HATHAWAY BSc MRICS
for Martin Russell Jones