

Appendix 1a

SUMMARY OF OBSERVATIONS MADE IN RESPONSE TO NOTICE OF INTENTION DATED 19/11/2019:

Observation was received from a leaseholder in the building WOODSTOCK ROAD

Leaseholder states that there has been no survey of our property and they would like to attend with a surveyor regarding the proposed works.

A second observation received for the following:-

- How the estimated sum was calculated and how it is broken down
- The quote is for a very broad specification, were any properties surveyed?
- Works were carried out some years ago and had permissions and consent to change internal doors and windows, how this would affect calculating shared costs now for proposed works?
- If the company surveying the properties are the same as those carrying out the works, I do worry about a conflict of interest so some details would be great.

Response

The advice was that the works were tendered competitively via the London Construction Programme (LCP) Framework based on quality and price.

Once the contractor is appointed, a further detailed scope of works will capture the actual works required for your building and will be validated by professional consultant partners prior to commencement, so that actual works can be reflected in any final bills.

Detailed but general replies were provided to the 2nd observations and the leaseholder was advised that the detailed surveys would determine the actual works required to the building.

Observation was received from a leaseholder in the building LANCASTER ROAD

Leaseholder state a smoke detector has already been installed in the property and will not pay for any replacement.

Leaseholder would also like a surveyor as part of your detailed survey to visit the property as the conversion is very unique. The house is split down the middle and there is no first floor or ground floor flats.

Response

The reply to the leaseholder was that the works include the installation of AFD in the communal area and installation of an interlinked heat detector in each flat hallway.

The item includes all fire stopping, firebreaks and compartmentation in relation to the works. Installation of a new Automatic fire detection (AFD) system to the communal area, a fire-rated enclosure for electrical installations and statutory fire signage.

All works are subject to survey and if they are deemed not required, they will be omitted.

Floor coverings and wall linings have been identified in the fire risk assessments (FRA) as a risk in some properties. This may not be the case for all properties.

A Fire Detection Works newsletter was included as part of the response.

Observations was received from a leaseholder in the building GLADESMORE ROAD

The leaseholder has asked for cost break down for enabling Works, Preliminaries, Overheads and profits and Professional fees (communal & external).

The leaseholder wants information on when these proposed works will be undertaken so they can be available at the property.

Response

Each area of works for additional information was individually answered in general terms.

The reply to the leaseholder was that communal areas may differ in size and extent and the actual scope of works to each address may differ, as the notice is an estimate cost for works.

Once the contractor has been appointed, a further detailed scope of works will be drawn up to capture the actual works required to the building.

The Fire Detection Works newsletter was included as part of the reply.

Observations was received from a leaseholder in the building PEMBERTON ROAD

Leaseholder stated they replaced floorboards recently and wanted the cost of this to be removed from the works programme.

Leaseholder wanted to know what Preliminaries/Overheads & Profit/Provisional Sums/Contingency would relate to, and if leaseholders will have any input into the designs, when the works will commence and when the billing will take place.

Response

Floor coverings and wall linings have been identified in the fire risk assessments (FRA) as a risk in some properties. This may not be the case for all properties and cost will be removed if this is not required.

Each individual element of works was replied to in general terms.

Observations was received from a leaseholder in the building NORTH HILL AVENUE

Leaseholder states that the cost of the works is excessive and unaffordable and needs to be tendered to other contractors. They also state the specification needs to be reviewed and a more modest and affordable installed such as a sprinkler and alarm system.

Response: The leaseholder was sent a copy of the - Fire Detection Works newsletter which examines possible questions and the answers.

Observations was received from a leaseholder in the building LANCASTER ROAD

Leaseholder states that the following works were done a few years ago:-

- Fire resistant front doors installed - already done 2 years ago.
- Floor coverings in communal areas - already done 2 years ago.
- Asbestos survey - already done 2 years ago.
- Electrical works - already done 2 years ago.

Response

The reply sent to the leaseholder indicates that some works may already be carried out and would therefore be unnecessary. It was advised that the costs were based on generalised specification and that definitive works and costs will be known when contractor appointed.

Observations was received from 2 leaseholders in the building CURZON ROAD

One of the leaseholders has advised that the building is a period property and in a conservation, area and unwanted changes may change the features.

They also state the estimated costs are out of proportion and are not representative of the works planned to the building.

The **other leaseholder** has also advised the period features of the building and as it is only 3 stories, no changes are needed. They also advise that they own a business and carry works in these areas and the costings are extortionate and overpriced

Response

Fire Detection Works newsletter was sent to the leaseholder to answer some of the questions in the observations raised

Specific replies were provided to costs for flat entrance doors, floor coverings and the AFD system

For the **other leaseholder**, individual responses were provided to the costings for floor covering, flat entrance door, and the AFD installation.

Observations was received from a leaseholder in the building DONOVAN AVENUE

The leaseholder queried some of the proposed works indicating that some of them had been carried out under other works – asbestos survey. They also wanted to know the regulations under which the AFD works were being carried out and they also requested for descriptions of elements of works such as enabling works, completion & handover, preliminaries, overheads & profit and professional fees.

They also asked why the works were required and a timeline for the works to be done.

Response

Each of the questions were answered in general terms advising that detailed surveys had not been done but these will indicate specific works required to each building.

Included with the reply was the Fire Detection Works newsletter with questions and answers that provided additional information.

Observations was received from a leaseholder in the building SCARBOROUGH ROAD

Leaseholder states that the flat door was replaced with an FD30 door with brushes & self-closers within the last four years.

They also state as the common parts are three sq metres at most they wanted confirmation if the quotation is the result of any inspection or survey to this specific building. They state that the council and the contractor must inspect the common parts and arrange a reasonable specification and quotation.

Response

A general explanation provided to each of the proposed works to the building but indicating that the costs are based on a general specification.

Included in the reply was the Fire Detection Works newsletter and the specification for the fire door set.

Observations was received from a leaseholder in the building OAKFIELD ROAD

Leaseholders were concerned about the cost of the works, which they believe were extortionate for the size of the building. They also want to know why the works are required.

Response

A general explanation was provided to explain the list of works to the building. In addition, it was explained that the costs were general in nature but the contractor when chosen will carry out detailed surveys to indicate the actual works required to the building.

Observations was received from a leaseholder in the building STUART CRESCENT

Leaseholder state the costs are unreasonable and the landlord is legally required to provide two separate quotes, with at least one being independent of the landlord- which is not the case here.

They have not seen any correspondence inviting leaseholders to nominate possible contractors, again in breach of regulation.

They also do not agree with the type of proposed works as there is no need to fully replace the doors to make them compliant with fire regulation; there are cheaper alternatives.

The proposed bill also appears to include 'recommended' works and decoration works, which appear to be unnecessary.

Response

The leaseholder was advised that the works were competitively tendered via the London Construction Programme (LCP) Framework based on quality and price and reference was made to Paragraph 7 of the notice for additional explanation why 2 tenders were not required. This also explains why nominations are not required.

An explanation of the list of works was provided but that not all these may be required but the contractor subject to further detailed surveys will make a determination.

Observations was received from a leaseholder in the building GROVE PARK ROAD

The leaseholder wanted an explanation why the list of works provided in the notice are required and why these elements of works are expensive.

Response

Individual explanations provided to each of the proposed works to the building. It was also advised that once the contractor is appointed a further detailed scope of works would be drawn up to capture the actual works required for your building.

Observations was received from a leaseholder in the building COOLHURST ROAD

Leaseholder wanted clarification/explanation to the list of works to the building including how the costs have calculated.

Response

A general explanation to each of the proposed works to the building was provided and included with the reply was the fire door set specification and the Fire Detection Works newsletter for additional information.

Observations was received from a leaseholder in the building UMFREVILLE ROAD

The leaseholder states that a flat entrance door (FD60) was replaced in 2014 and a new one was not required. They also state that costs of the overall works are exorbitant.

Response

It was noted that a new door was fitted during structural works, but detailed surveys will confirm whether the door meets current fire regulations. If the door

meets the current regulations, it will not be replaced and any costs deducted from the final bill.

Included in the reply was the Fire Detection Works newsletter for additional information and the specification for the fire door set.

Observations was received from a leaseholder in the building MARQUIS ROAD

Leaseholder has raised the query that they have specifically installed a managed ADT fire alarm system, which logs and informs the fire service in the event of a fire.

They also query costs of works proposed and the details of the works proposed.

They also query the formula for the calculation of costs and state Haringey have included an additional bedroom in its calculation.

Response

Each individual query was responded to with explanations why the works are required to the building.

It was also explained what the individual works related to as the heading were general in nature.

It was explained that the method/formula for calculation of costs is contained in the lease and in particular, the method applied depends on when the flat became a leasehold property.

Observations was received from a leaseholder in the building NELSON ROAD

Leaseholders raised queries if costs relate only to the porch/shared area of our property; high-cost items, prelims and profit have no intrinsic value, confirmation if the works relate to the communal door or just the flat entrance doors.

They also wanted advice if they can use their own contractor if any part of these works is legally required and wanted the number of bedrooms revised from 4-bedroom to 3-bedroom.

Response

All the questions relating to the works answered in general terms, as contractors are not on site to determine any actual works.

Leaseholder advised under separate cover and confirming that licence for alteration granted in 2014 to change from 2-bedroom to 4-bedroom and there is currently no confirmation that the property has been changed back to a 2-bedroom.

Observations was received from a leaseholder in the building BURGoyNE ROAD

Leaseholder queried what is enabling works, completion and handover, when will the works commence to the elements of fire breaks, compartmentalisation, floor covering and electrical works.

The leaseholder wanted to know whom the fees for the works are paid.

Response

A detailed but generalised response was provided to each of the elements of works proposed to the building. It was explained what each element entailed and that the actual works will be determined by further detailed surveys by the contractor.

Included with the response was the programme newsletter that covered likely scenarios to give leaseholders a clearer idea of how the works will be carried out.

Observations was received from a leaseholder in the building CROUCH HILL

Leaseholder raised queries regarding costs and they fail to understand the costs required for such a small communal space, particularly for floor coverings, emergency lighting, and firebreaks.

The leaseholder wanted to know what preliminaries represent, why there is a cost for asbestos survey and what is accounted for in overheads and profit

Response

There was a general response that costs are based on a general specification but general individual responses provided to specific aspects of works raised.

Included in the reply was the Fire Detection Works newsletter that provided additional information to the replies.

Observations was received from a leaseholder in the building FERME PARK ROAD

Leaseholder queried the cost for the replacement of x4 front doors and they do not believe it is value for money.

They also queried the cost for decorating and replacing flooring in the communal hallway, which is a small area.

They query the cost for the asbestos survey and why another survey is scheduled to the communal area.

Response

A general but detailed response was provided to the queries raised by the leaseholder. It was explained that the houses when originally converted pre 1991, were not generally completed to the required compartmentation standard, between the flats.

It was advised that once the contractor has been appointed a further detailed scope of works would be drawn up to capture the actual works required for your building.

Observations was received from a leaseholder in the building WHITTINGTON ROAD

Solicitors on behalf of the leaseholder has asked if the landlord will be making a contribution towards the cost of the tenanted property.

They advised that the works appear to be improvement and not repairs and want a private surveyor to detail the pricing for the element of proposed works.

Response

Reference was made to the appropriate schedules in the lease to confirm if the works are an improvement or a repair.

The leaseholder contributes towards the cost of works via a service charge.

Observations was received from a leaseholder in the building NELSON ROAD

Leaseholder states they were not consulted as per paragraph 7 of the notice.

They do not take liability for the cost of works, as the freeholder should have responsibility for the upgrades

Response

The response provided confirms that the costs are based on a general survey and the contractors when appointed will detail the actual works required when further surveys are done.

The reply also indicated the consultation was a Qualifying Long term Agreement (QLTA) contract and the notices were issued 29 November 2013 and 11 August 2015.

Clause 2 of the lease confirms liability to pay a proportionate part of expenses incurred on a building.

A copy of the Fire Detection Works newsletter was included with the response.

Observations was received from a leaseholder in the building NELSON ROAD

Leaseholder has queried if the fire door, firebreaks and flooring replacement will occur within the whole building or only to the front entrance/communal area.

They also wanted to know if costs for replacing the front door also include a new lock and keys.

Leaseholder wanted a guide of when the payment would be due and if the payments can be in instalments. They wanted a breakdown for prices for the fire protection, decoration and preliminaries.

They asked if any asbestos removal and price would be subject to the survey and the timeline for the works.

Response

Replies were provided individually to the above questions. Regarding the individual works, proposed generalised replies were provided as to why these are required. Detailed surveys will determine the actual works needed.

In addition, a Fire Detection Works newsletter was emailed to the leaseholder with the fire door set specification.

The reply regarding how many keys could not be immediately determined but the contractor may be able to confirm this when on site.

Observations was received from a leaseholder in the building NELSON ROAD

Leaseholder wanted to know the location of the electrical works and emergency lighting and if this will be limited to the communal area only.

Leaseholder also wanted to know the location of the decorations as they state the communal area is currently decorated and the proposed cost is expensive.

With the Installation of firebreaks, compartmentation, penetrations, AFD and signage, the leaseholders' state there is no detail for these works. The location is not stated and if the fire breaks are to be carried out within the flat and/or the communal area.

They make a statement that based on the Fire Detection Works newsletter received 6 November; they will await further surveys to determine actual works and costs.

The leaseholders' also query the cost of the flat entrance doors.

Response

It was explained that each communal area might differ in size and extent so the actual scope of to each address may differ.

Individual replies addressed queries raised to each element of the works.

A copy of the fire door specification was included with the response.

Observations was received from a leaseholder in the building NELSON ROAD

Leaseholder states that the costs for enabling works, prelims, completion & handover, contingency and professional fees do not reflect the size of the common areas of the building.

The leaseholder also advised that they are in the process of purchasing the freehold.

They also do not believe that contractors are passing the economies of scale to the Landlord.

Response

The reply describes what enabling works, prelims, completion & handover, contingency, professional fees are, and why they may be required for the works.

The reply also includes an attachment of the Fire Detection Works newsletter and the fire door set specification.

Observations was received from a leaseholder in the building LORDSHIP LANE

Leaseholder states the front doors to the two flats 505A and 505B including the internal doors are already half hour fire doors and they can arrange the installation of these doors.

Response

Leaseholder was advised that if the doors meet current regulations they will not be replaced. In addition that the front entrance door is not the responsibility of the leaseholder.

The Fire Detection Works newsletter was included as part of the reply to the leaseholder.

Observations was received from a leaseholder in the building HILLFIELD PARK

The leaseholder has advised that the costs are excessive and she is unable to justify the costs for the size of the communal area of the building.

Response

The houses when originally converted pre-1991, were not generally completed to the required compartmentation standard, between the flats. Guidance recommends the installation of AFD systems to allow early and simultaneous evacuation in the event of a fire to all flats within the building.

The different aspects of works were responded to in general detail but advised that the costs in the notice are general in nature based on the 'general' specification of works. It was advised that some of the works may or may not be carried out, depending on detailed surveys

Observations was received from a leaseholder in the building WORDSWORTH PARADE

Leaseholder has requested for a breakdown of how the cost for the proposed fire detection systems have been calculated.

Response

A detailed but generalised reply was provided to all the aspects of the works queried. The reply detailed why the works may be required to the building and it was confirmed that the extent of the works couldn't currently be determined until contractors are on site.

It was also advised that any works omitted from the building would not be charged in the Final Accounts.

Observation was received from leaseholders in the building NELSON ROAD

Leaseholders indicated that there is a current process for purchasing the freehold of the building and want the building to be taken out of the works programme when this process is finalised.

Response

The leaseholders were advised to keep Leasehold Services updated with progress of the freehold purchase.

They were advised that the timeline for the works provides a guide as to when these are likely to commence.

Appendix 2a

**SUMMARY OF NOMINATIONS MADE IN RESPONSE TO NOTICE OF
INTENTION DATED 10/08/2019:**

No nominations received for this programme