

## Appendix 1b

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

#### **Observations received from the leaseholder in the building ENDYMION ROAD**

Leaseholder has asked for detailed specification of the works, which the Council deems to be required by flat 5A; installation of firebreaks, compartmentation, penetrations, detection, and signage, electrical works, and precisely what the electrical works refer to.

They also want to know what signage refers to.

They also state a consideration asking an independent expert to supply a second opinion of the works required at 5A Endymion Road. This to include a request from the local fire service to send a representative to assess the ability of the premises to withstand fire.

#### **Response**

A detailed general response was sent to the leaseholder explaining what the elements of the works refer to including the legislation under which the works are being carried out. It states that the notice is an estimate and contractors will confirm actual works required to the building.

#### **Observations received from the leaseholder in the building ENDYMION ROAD**

The leaseholder wanted confirmation that areas will be assessed on the basis of their own merit prior to the work being carried out, and costs adjusted accordingly.

Detailed breakdown for each line item estimate and if damage to flats will be rectified/made good.

Supply the information, plans and spatial assessment on which these estimates have been based.

Wanted an elaboration on the Long Term Agreement (LTA) process.

Explanation of enabling works completion & handover and preliminaries and if these and other elements of the works will be limited to the communal area only.

Further observations were provided and these incorporated whether they could attend an assessment, if any disturbed areas will be made good, why was another asbestos survey to be undertaken, what welfare facilities are referred to under preliminaries and a general cost of the figures for the non-specific works.

## **Response**

Each of the above queries was addressed in detail explaining what each element of work meant.

Included within the reply was the Fire Detection Works newsletter with likely questions and answers.

The response to the additional observations confirms that they can accommodate the leaseholder attending the assessment, the contractors will make disturbed areas good and a description of the welfare facilities was provided. This is because this is required by law and for the non-specific works such as completion and handover.

## **Observations received from the leaseholder in the building CHURCH CRESCENT**

Leaseholder raised observation on all the aspects of the proposed works and required additional detail to the summary and cost of works.

Leaseholder wanted to know the mandatory requirements supporting the works and whether any of the works are actually required, including an explanation of what needs to be done on some of the general heading of works such as preliminaries, completion and handover, contingency and fees.

Further to the initial response, they wanted confirmation if the door replacement related only to flat entrance doors and confirmation of the dates the works will commence.

## **Response**

All the raised queries were answered with detailed general responses. Specific explanations were provided to each headline cost including the mandatory requirements supporting the appropriate proposed works.

Regarding the further observations, it was advised that the door replacement did not include the communal door. Letters will be sent to residents shortly and surveys are not likely to be undertaken until May 2020.

### **Observations received from the leaseholder in the building MILTON ROAD**

Leaseholder has queried costs and activities under preliminaries, completion and handover, firebreaks, asbestos, flat entrance door (FED), decorations & new floor coverings.

They also queried why Haringey Council as the freeholder are not paying for the works.

### **Response**

Each individual area of works queries was described and explanations as to what they relate to was provided.

The relevant clause in the lease was given to the leaseholder to explain why they are required to pay a proportional cost for the works to the building.

Included within the reply was the Fire Detection Works newsletter and the specifications for the fire door sets.

### **Observations received from the leaseholder in the building MILTON ROAD**

The leaseholder wanted a clearer description of the elements of works and why they are required. Following attendance at the Leaseholder Forum, the leaseholder asked for the legislation under which the works are carried out and a copy of the Fire Risk Assessment (FRA) to the building.

### **Response**

All the above queries were replied to in very general detail and a copy of the redacted version of the FRA assessment to the building was sent to the leaseholder.

### **Observations received from the leaseholder in the building WOODSTOCK**

Leaseholder queried the cost aspects of all the proposed element of the works provided in the notice. They also stated the estimated costs when compared to market rates and quotes requested from private suppliers, appear overly inflated

They also stated that there is no legal basis for the proposed works and without surveys to properties, the works have no relevance to their building.

### **Response**

Detailed general responses were provided to all the cost queries relating to the element of works. The Leaseholder was also advised that contractors will confirm what works are required to the building via further detailed surveys.

### **Observations received from the leaseholder in the building ENNIS ROAD**

Leaseholder raised queries on the proposed works to the building provided in the notice.

Further to the initial reply, they asked further questions about the following: -

- The flat entrance door is not required to be fire rated. Therefore, disputed that they need to be replaced.
- Strongly objected to paying for the bottom flat door replacement.
- Would not accept anything other than sunk wires in their flat.

### **Response**

Generalised detailed replies were provided to the initial observations. The reply addressed the scope of the works queried.

Regarding further observations, it was confirmed that a couple of the flat entrance doors in the building are not FD30s doors and require replacement.

For the bottom flat door replacement, only one of the Flat Entrance Door needs to be an FD30s door.

If the wires are sunk wires, they were advised that the detail for the wiring of the automatic fire detection would depend on the number of storeys in the building.

### **Observations received from the leaseholder in the building WOODSTOCK ROAD**

Leaseholders wanted to know the following: What is the proposed timetable for the works, if there be a financing option available to spread the cost over a longer period?

The leaseholder wanted to know what Preliminaries, Enabling works, Overheads and profit, contingency, professional fees and fees all relate to. They wanted to know if the freeholder will cover the cost of the remainder of the building cost

### **Response**

A detailed and general response was provided to all the queries from the leaseholder. The replies explained what the general costs related to.

A copy of the Payment options was included as part of the reply.

### **Observations received from the leaseholder in the building ENNIS ROAD**

Leaseholder states their property is separate from the others in the building and there are many elements of your estimations, which do not and should not affect their portion of the intended charges.

They also stated that they do not share a communal door to a communal entrance vestibule. They already have wired smoke and heat detector alarms installed.

### **Response**

Reasons for the works were provided to the leaseholder with a general but detailed explanation of how the estimated costs were generated, including why the works are required to the building.

A copy of Fire Detection Works newsletter and the fire door set specification was included with the response.

### **Observations received from the leaseholder in the building WOODSTOCK ROAD**

The leaseholder queried all the estimated headline costs, asserting that the costs are extortionate for the size of the building and some of the works are unjustified or have been carried out previously.

The leaseholder was unhappy about paying another Major Works invoice as they have just recently finished paying a big bill for the Decent Homes work.

### **Response**

A detailed but general response was provided to all the queries on the headline costs estimated. It was explained why the works may be required but more importantly how the generalised costs have been calculated.

### **Observations received from the leaseholder in the building HARINGEY PARK**

Leaseholders query if their front entrance door is to be replaced as they state they have a private entrance.

They also want to know if a full/detailed survey will be carried out before the electrical works are carried out.

They state that they have limited access to the communal areas but will be paying a proportional cost. They want to be certain that upgrades to their property are included in the programme.

### **Response**

Detailed general responses were provided on why all the elements proposed works to the building might be required. Furthermore, detailed surveys are required to determine the actual works needed to be done and this will be done by contractors when they are appointed and on site.

The leaseholders were further advised that there is no means of benefit test in the lease and areas of the building they have access to does not determine how much they will contribute.

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

### **Observations received from the leaseholder in the building WOODSTOCK ROAD**

The leaseholder queried the overall costs for the works proposed to the building and specifically decorations/floor covering and the amount for preliminaries.

### **Response**

General but detailed responses were provided to the leaseholder indicating why the proposed element of works might be required to the building.

It was also stated that detailed surveys will confirm what works are required. Included with the response was a copy of Fire Detection Works newsletter

### **Observations received from the leaseholder in the building WOODSTOCK ROAD**

Leaseholder has queried reasons for the proposed works and justification for the associated costs.

### **Response**

An explanation of the detailed the activities relating to each of the elements of works was provided. However, because further detailed surveys had not been carried out, it could not be confirmed whether all the estimated works and costs are required for the building.

Included with the response was a copy of the Fire Detection Works newsletter and a redacted version of the Fire Risk Assessment (FRA) carried out to the building.

### **Observations received from the leaseholder in the building BURGROYNE ROAD**

Leaseholder wanted information when the works will be carried out and when the payment will become due.

They requested a breakdown for the decorations/floor coverings, what the fees relate to and if asbestos is in the building, because an allowance was made for this element of the works.

### **Response**

General replies were provided to the queries with information available as at the time of reply. It was advised that contractor surveys will determine what works are required to the building.

Included with the response was a copy of the Fire Detection Works newsletter.

### **Observations received from the leaseholder in the building WOODSTOCK ROAD**

The leaseholder queried all aspects and costs of the proposed works. The leaseholder state that some of the works are duplicates and are not necessary to be carried out and costed for.

They state that the costs are generic and not specific to their flat.

### **Response**

A general but detailed response was provided on all the headline costs for works proposed to the building.

Included with the response was a copy of the Fire Detection Works newsletter and a redacted copy of the Fire Risk Assessment carried out to the building.

### **Observations received from the leaseholder in the building STROUD GREEN ROAD**

Leaseholder requested the following:-

- Detailed breakdown of the cost of the redecoration.
- Evidence of an inspection to ascertain whether any of the flats in 58 Stroud Green Road already have fire doors.
- Relevant building law that states all flats need entrance fire doors.
- Whether items on the proposed work list are deemed to be repairs and maintenance (and the reason for this) and which are improvements and;
- if the works are funded from the central government

There were also further queries to the initial response with as much detail as possible.

## **Response**

Detailed and/or general responses all provided to each of the queries raised.

Regarding the specific aspects of the works, general responses were provided why the works might be required to the building.

Where general questions were asked, example of the relevant building law, the relevant legislation under which the works are being carried was provided to the leaseholder.

It is confirmed that the works are not funded by central government and that all proposed works fall under repairs and maintenance of the building

## **Observations received from the leaseholder in the building WOODSTOCK ROAD**

The leaseholder stated the numbers involved are enormous given the communal area is a single small corridor in a Victorian conversion.

## **Response**

A detailed scope of works will be drawn up by the contractor and validated by consultant partners prior to commencement of works, so that final bills will reflect the works carried out on site.

Our intention is to carry out targeted fire compartmentation and fire safety works, such as fire certified flat entrance doors, emergency lighting. This will be to reduce the likelihood of fire spread, alongside the installation of an early warning system (automatic fire detection) for full evacuation.



### **Observations received from the leaseholder in the building STAPLETON HALL ROAD**

Leaseholder wanted confirmation if the door replacement works includes the communal door. They wanted clarification on what firebreaks and compartmentation meant.

They wanted justification for the cost relating to decoration and replacement of floor coverings.

They wanted to know what the sets of fees related to and state there is no timeline for works provided .

#### **Response**

A detailed and general explanation was provided to each of the headline costs. It described how the costs were generated and why the works may be carried out to the building.

The leaseholder was advised that works would begin on site early spring 2020 and complete late spring 2021, however, further updates will be sent to residents to introduce the contractor once they have been appointed.

### **Observations received from the leaseholder in the building WOODSTOCK ROAD**

The leaseholder has on each of the headline costs of the proposed works detailed reasons why the costs are excessive and they state why some of the works are being duplicated and some may also have been carried out.

#### **Response**

A detailed but general response was provided to each of the headline costs and why the works may be required to the building.

It was also advised that actual works can only be confirmed when the contractors are on site and detailed surveys will indicate the level of works required.

### **Observations received from the leaseholder in the building STAPLETON HALL ROAD**

The leaseholder wanted information on how many quotes were obtained for the works and they asked for further details on what are:-

- Enabling works.
- Fire compartmentation.

- Decoration and floor replacement covering.
- Electrical works.
- Preliminaries, Contingency & Fees.

## **Response**

Individual detailed but general responses were provided to justify the proposed works. It was explained why the works may be required.

They were also advised that once the contractor is appointed, they will carry out detailed surveys to determine whether renewals are required. This information will be validated by our consultants. If the work is not carried out the costs will be omitted from any final bills.

## **Observations received from the leaseholder in the building WOODSTOCK ROAD**

Leaseholders have advised of a delay in the receipt of the Notice of Intention.

Leaseholders have queried all aspects of the proposed works, advising that the costs are excessive based on the size of the building and the communal area and some of the works may already have been done.

They state that the automatic fire system is not mandated for their type of property.

They want a description of the activities under enabling works and state that during recent decent homes work, no asbestos was found in the building. They asked for an explanation of what firebreaks and compartmentation means and what works will be done under this element

## **Response**

The leaseholder were advised that the notice was posted out on the date of the notice 1<sup>st</sup> class by Royal Mail. They were advised to contact the mail office.

A detailed and general explanation was provided to each of the headline costs. It describes how the costs were generated and why the works may be carried out to the building.

## **Observations received from the leaseholder in the building WOODSTOCK ROAD**

Leaseholder requested: -

- A breakdown and explanation of what preliminaries, completion and handover, enabling works, contingency, professional fees relate to including what the costs cover and how has the estimate been reached.
- What the sinking fund will be used for?
- Timeline for the works.
- They wanted to obtain their own quotes.
- the council's policy state in relation to resident engagement and how observations will be embedded in the process.

## **Response**

Individual replies have been provided to all the requested information. It was advised that the works were competitively tendered via the London Construction Programme (LCP) Framework and notices were sent to all leaseholders in November 2013 and August 2015.

A description of the sinking fund was given and advised that it will be applicable when the invoicing is processed. A timeline for works was provided and as the contract was procured under the LCP framework, the leaseholder cannot nominate a contractor as per Paragraph 7 of the notice.

For resident engagement, taking due regard to the observation is part of this process.

## **Observations received from the leaseholder in the building HILLFIELD AVENUE**

Leaseholder states that she will make no contribution towards the cost of the works as she does not access the building through the communal entrance.

They state the works will have no benefit to their property, and the works are not to her property.

## **Response**

A general description of the works was provided in the reply. An explanation was given for the works to the flat entrance door and fire detection works. The leaseholder was advised that there is no means of benefit test in the lease and as the property is part of the building, they will need to contribute.

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

### **Observations received from the leaseholder in the building FERME PARK ROAD**

Leaseholder states the entrance to their property is separate from the building and they do not have use of the communal entrance.

They raised an issue about scaffolding which could allow intruders.

#### **Response**

The leaseholder was told that as their flat is part of the building, they are required under the terms of the lease to contribute.

They were advised that all works are internal and scaffolding would not be required.

### **Observations received from the leaseholder in the building STROUD GREEN ROAD**

Leaseholder queried the works regarding the FED and floor coverings.

Leaseholder wanted to know if the flat entrance door (FED) would be safer or easier for criminals to break based on a previous experience.

#### **Response**

General but detailed responses were provided to each of the issues raised, advising why the works may be required but if further detailed surveys indicate works are not required, this would not be billed for.

It was advised the FED is Secured by Design, a standard promoted by UK Police Services. Secured by Design focuses on crime prevention of homes and commercial premises and promotes the use of security standards for a wide range of applications and products.

### **Observations received from the leaseholder in the building PAGE GREEN TERRACE, HIGH ROAD**

Leaseholder states that it contains no specific or actual details relating to my block and no further information will be received until works are completed and they receive a bill.

#### **Response**

This provided a general response to what the works are and how the costs were calculated.

It was also confirmed that the works were competitively tendered via the London Construction Programme (LCP) Framework on the basis of quality and price.

### **Observations received from the leaseholder in the building MILTON AVENUE**

The leaseholder queried the cost of the proposed works and that there is no justification for the costings provided in the estimates. In addition, they state some of the proposed works may be duplicated and that they will seek receipts for the works done.

### **Response**

An explanation was provided to each of the proposed works and the activities to be carried out under each element. A copy of the fire door set specification and the Fire Detection Works newsletter was included as part of the response.

### **Observations received from the leaseholder in the building BLYTHWOOD ROAD**

Leaseholder has raised the query about the estimated cost for decoration and replacement of floor coverings in the public area is £4,490. This relates to a shared hallway approximately 2m x 5m.

They also require an explanation as to how so small an area warrants such a high a cost.

### **Response**

A detailed general response on each of the headline cost was provided to the leaseholder. This reply explained what each individual element of works will involve if the works are to be carried out

The reply advised that each communal area may differ in size and extent so the actual scope of works to each address may differ.

An email copy of the Fire Detection Works newsletter was provided as part of the reply.

### **Observations received from the leaseholder in the building WOODSTOCK ROAD**

Leaseholders state that the calculation method is incorrect but in addition that they were not aware of any consultation. They were not advised of the initial consultation documents under the LCP programme.

They also stated that because they are the basement flat, they do not use or have access to the communal parts of the building and want to know which of the proposed works will benefit their flat.

## **Response**

A copy of the email to the leaseholders' solicitors during the purchase that has the previous consultation documents dated 29/11/13 & 11/08/15 was included with the reply.

It was explained that the method of calculation is the bedroom formula based on when the property became leasehold, which was after 1990.

They were advised that there is no means of benefit test in the lease and because the flat is part of the building, they are required to contribute towards the cost of the works.

## **Observations received from the leaseholder in the building WOODSTOCK ROAD**

Leaseholder wanted information on the following:-

- Under what type of contract will Mulalley be carrying out these works?
- What the finished product for the communal hallway flooring and stairs will look like?
- Is the communal door included as part of the works?
- Will the asbestos survey for the recent Major Works, form the basis for the survey for these works and passed to the contractor to remove the cost of the survey?
- If the regulations under which these works will be carried out are the same as those for blocks?
- If the new fire system proposed is an integrated one for the building?

## **Response**

They were advised that a sample number of surveys had been sent to dwellings. This was to assist with the compilation of a general specification of works and an 'estimated' cost.

They were also advised that contractors on site will provide a detailed scope of works will be drawn up to capture the actual works required for the building as communal areas differ in size and extent of the scope of works.

A description of works was also provided to each of the headline element of the works and what activities may be required if these are carried out

### **Observations received from the leaseholder in the building WOODSTOCK ROAD**

Leaseholder stated that their flat has a new FD30 door, heat detector system and electrical works have already carried out to their property. They expected these costs to be omitted when the actual surveys are carried out.

The leaseholder also queried every aspect of the costs of the proposed works including explanations for what the elements are. They wanted to know the calculation method for the other units in the building.

### **Response**

An explanation was given that these houses when originally converted pre 1991, were not generally completed to the required compartmentation standard, between the flats. Each work element proposed was explained and why it may be required. Further explanation was given on elements such as preliminaries, overheads & profit, fees including asbestos removal why these were included as part of the works.

The leaseholder was advised of the total number of units in the building, how many leasehold units there were and the method of calculation for the other leasehold units.

## Appendix 2b

### **SUMMARY OF NOMINATIONS MADE IN RESPONSE TO NOTICE OF INTENTION DATED 19/11/2019:**

No nominations were received for this programme.