

Name of resident at Jefferson House

Ms N K-Dit-Rawé

All correspondence to:

P.O.Box 33766

London SW3 1WS

Flat #

(I had to resort to doing this. I check it once a week on Saturday)

6 July 2003

STRICTLY PRIVATE & CONFIDENTIAL

Dear Resident,

Although I do not know what your current position is in relation to Jefferson House, I am sending you this letter and attachments in case they prove of interest.

As you may be aware, (at enormous costs to myself) I have been the only resident challenging Steel Services/Martin Russell Jones at the Leasehold Valuation Tribunal (LVT) following their application last autumn to the Tribunal to determine the reasonableness of the global sum demanded for the major works (i.e. £564,467.00 – to which should be added VAT and management fees).

I have received a decision from the LVT (dated 17 June 2003). According to my surveyor:

- 1) they have disallowed c. **£132,858.00** on the basis that the items were either unreasonable, or improvements and thus, under the terms of the lease, could not be charged to the lessees
- 2) for some other items, amounting in total to c. **£144,745.87** they have stated that they could not make a decision as the specifications were insufficient. (Hence specifications for these items need to be re-drawn and should be re-tendered)
- 3) they have stated that the current reserve fund of **£141,977.00** should be used as contribution towards the major costs as this is the purpose of such fund

Some of the key points from the LVT's decision are in my attached letter to the County Court of 22 June 2003 (see attached ¹)

Full LVT decisions are public information. Hence, can be obtained from the LVT. In my case, it is a c. 15 page report with, in addition, a dozen (landscape) pages of a 'Scott schedule' which lists individual items.

On Tuesday 24 June, as I was waiting to see the Judge, Mr Silverstone of CKFT handed me some documents he was going to give to the Judge, including one headed '*Major works apportionment 24 June 2002, Outstanding at 24 June 2003*' on Martin Russell Jones headed paper (see attached ²) – (where you will also see that it includes five other flats in addition to mine).

Of course, these revised amounts are as viewed by MRJ. In handing me this schedule Mr Silverstone did not provide me with any supporting evidence for the basis of the calculation –

¹ My 22 June 2003 letter to the District Judge, West London County Court

² MRJ '*Major Works apportionment 24 June 2002, Outstanding at 24 June 2003*'

and I have not received any to date. I disagree with the revised amount. See attached my calculations³. I am going to write to MRJ and copy CKFT saying that in light of the LVT's decision (citing the three numbered points above) I disagree with their revised amount. I will also ask for an explanation of how they arrived at this amount.

(At the 24 June hearing, the Judge agreed with me that the hearing should not have taken place - principally, because I have leave of appeal to the Land's Tribunal. She awarded the costs of attending the hearing to myself and the other two residents (see attached⁴).

I gave a copy of my letter of 22 June 2003 to the County Court to the solicitors who represented two residents (H: _____) at the 24 June hearing. (See attached first page of 'Case Summary' given to me by Mr Silverstone on 24 June 2003 which lists all the residents cited in the West London County Court by CKFT⁵. The number given to each is **not** that of their flat). If you know of other residents who may be interested in the information contained in this correspondence, please, feel free to pass it on.

Finally, *for your consideration*, I also include extracts from LEASE website (<http://www.lease-advice.org/lvtsframe.htm>) regarding the Appointment of a Manager⁶. See the site for more details.

Regards _____

³ Impact of Leasehold Valuation Tribunal decision on sum demanded for major works

⁴ West London County Court, 25 June 2003

⁵ First page of 'Case summary' handed out by Mr Silverstone, CKFT, on 24 June 2003

⁶ Extracts from LEASE website regarding the 'Appointment of a Manager'