

Appendix 1c

SUMMARY OF OBSERVATIONS MADE IN RESPONSE TO NOTICE OF INTENTION DATED 18/11/2019:

Observations were received from a leaseholder in the building MONTAGUE ROAD

- The leaseholder wanted specifics of the cost provided in the notice of estimate as they state it is a small house split into 2 flats and the costs are not proportional.
- They do not want the character changed of the property with blank fire doors and want comparison quotes of same specification and standard.

Response:

A copy of the Fire Detection Works newsletter was emailed to the leaseholder for additional information.

Observations were received from a leaseholder in the building BEACONSFIELD ROAD

- The leaseholder stated the price is high and most of the work is unnecessary as there are only 2 flats and a small communal area of less than 2 meters, and the door to my flat is a fire-check 1.

Response:

A copy of the Fire Detection Works newsletter was emailed to the leaseholder for additional information.

Observations were received from a leaseholder in the building OAKFIELD ROAD

- The leaseholder wanted to know the proposed AFD works relate to the works carried out two years ago.
- The leaseholder wanted to know why another asbestos survey was being carried out and why the fire doors are being replaced again.
- They wanted to know what enabling works, preliminaries relates to and the breakdown, why the estimate cost for doors are expensive, what internal redecoration is required, what flooring.

- They wanted to know what electrical works were required based on the fact that the electrical installations are in a varying condition and will require work.
- The leaseholder also was interested in following up with progress of the works when this commenced.

Response:

A copy of the Fire Detection Works newsletter was emailed to the leaseholder to provide answers to the above queries.

In addition, individual replies provided to explain each of the queries raised.

It was advised that enabling works costs allow for asbestos surveys.

Preliminaries include items such as site management, site set up, plant and access.

For the electrical installations, it was advised that the previous FRA report, the works that were carried out under the fire risk assessment recommendations and the current FRA works would be compared and if the works overlap from the works proposed, these will be omitted from the scope of works to the building.

Regarding the cost of the doors, it is advised that consultants made an assumption for the number of doors that may be required over the whole contract.

For internal decorations, it was advised that allowance is made for the removal of wallpaper coverings and to redecorate communal areas and/or making good within 2, 3 and 4 storey buildings. If the communal area currently meets this specification, the work will be omitted from the scope of works and final bills.

Regarding redecoration, they were advised that the consultants have drawn up a general specification to capture the works that may be required for their block. Once the contractor is appointed, a further detailed specification will be carried out to capture the actual works required and this will be reflected in the final bill.

For the asbestos survey, it was advised this is a legal requirement.

Regarding interest in following up with the works, the leaseholder was advised they will be provided with contact details for the site team so that they can ask to be present during the detailed scoping of works.

**Observations were received from a leaseholder in the building
RATHCOOLE GARDENS**

The leaseholder had an issue with all the estimated costs provided in the Notice

Response:

A copy of the Fire Detection Works newsletter was emailed to the leaseholder to provide answers to the above queries.

In addition, individual replies were provided to explain what is included within the costs.

A copy of the Fire Door Set specification was also included as part of the reply to the leaseholder.

Observations received from a leaseholder in the building HAROLD ROAD 22A/B

The leaseholder emailed a copy of the certificate of completion confirming replacement of French doors.

Response:

The certification related only to the replacement of French doors but the works proposed are for the replacement of the flat entrance doors to each dwelling for which the council is responsible.

A copy of the Fire Detection Works newsletter was also included as part of the response to the leaseholder

Observations received from a leaseholder in the building BELMONT ROAD

The leaseholder queried costs relating to all the works in the programme for their building including a timeline for the payment for their share of costs.

Response:

The timeline for the payment, billing for work normally starts when works begin on site. However invoices will be withheld until works are completed, so they reflect the works that are actually carried out.

Individual responses provided to explain the reasons for the inclusion of the works to the building.

A copy of the Fire Detection Works newsletter was emailed to the leaseholder with a copy specification of the fire door set.

Observations received from a leaseholder in the building BROAD LANE

The leaseholder raised queries regarding the cost of the flat entrance door replacement, decorations and floor covering and fees.

Response:

Individual responses provided for each of the queries raised and a copy of the Fire Detection Works newsletter was emailed to the leaseholder with a copy specification of the fire door set.

Observations received from a leaseholder in the building ALBERT ROAD

Leaseholder queried the list of works when there has not been an internal inspection at the property.

The front door replacement is mentioned in the list and a new one was replaced a couple of years ago.

Because the flat is not in a block of flats but a first floor flat above a ground floor flat they expected that the building will not be treated under the fire requirements as those in large blocks.

Response:

The Fire Detection Works newsletter was emailed to the leaseholder to answer their questions.

Observations received from a leaseholder in the building RADLEY ROAD

Leaseholder queried amount for £6k charged to his flat and wanted to know what the amount is to be used for

Response:

A copy of The Fire Detection Works newsletter was emailed to the leaseholder for additional information.

The leaseholder was sent a copy of the Fire Door Set specification.

In addition, the leaseholder was advised that the costs in the estimate notice related only to general specifications.

Observations received from a leaseholder in the building TYNEMOUTH ROAD

Leaseholder queried all the estimated costs in the Appendix for the building.

The leaseholder also raised the issue relating to the amount paid in the sinking fund.

Response:

Explanations were provided for the all the headline costs in the Appendix as to why these were needed to be accounted for.

Statutorily there is a 21 day turnaround period to reply to observations from the day of its receipt.

The external works covers the external and/or communal parts of the building, which, the landlord (freeholder) as per the terms of the lease is responsible for. No works carried out inside of any property.

Their lease provides the responsibility to make a contribution towards the cost of works carried out to the building. **Clause 4 (2) (a)** and **Schedule 3** of their lease allows for charging of costs for works carried out to the building or estate (if applicable)

They were advised the notice is not a demand for payment and that when the billing for these works are carried out, any **Sinking Fund Payments** made will be taken into account towards the bill

Observations received from a leaseholder in the building HANOVER ROAD

The entrance door on the exterior of a two-storey building does not need replacement with an FD30 door.

Given the size of the communal area the installation of fire breaks, signage and emergency lighting as completely unnecessary.

The communal area is small and to redecorate should not require anything close to the amount quoted in the Appendix provided.

They also concluded that if change is required in order to meet fire safety laws then this is the financial responsibility of the freeholder and not the leaseholder

Response:

A copy of Fire Detection Works newsletter was emailed to the leaseholder for additional information.

Observations received from a leaseholder in the building MIDDLE LANE

The leaseholder wanted to know who's making the decision, why these works are necessary and what legislation are you following to ascertain the necessity of these works?

The leaseholder wanted to know how the estimate costs were derived and specifications for the works with alternative quotations including one from my own builder?

The leaseholder failed to see the benefit in replacing the existing front entrance door with FD30s and in any case if works are done for individual flats the cost should be borne by the owners of these flats

Response:

The leaseholder was sent a copy of the Automatic Fire Detection (AFD) Frequently Asked Questions providing additional information on the works.

The leaseholder was also advised of the legislation governing the works, which is the LACORS (**Local Authorities Coordinators of Regulatory Services**) Fire Safety Guidance/Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order 2005/building Regulations Approved Document B.

It was also confirmed that the landlord has responsibility for the flat entrance doors, and leaseholders under the terms of the lease are charged for works carried to the external and/communal fabric of the building.

Observations received from a leaseholder in the building DENTON ROAD

The current floor in the communal area is original, mosaic tiled, will this be replaced.

On what basis do you think there is asbestos to be removed?

What exactly is compartmentalisation, and has the contractor visited the site?

Do the works include the replacement of the inside doors to the two flats, or just the external door?

Response:

No feature tiling will be removed, only floor coverings will be replaced to prevent the spread of fire.

An asbestos survey is legally required for works to the building.

Compartmentalisation is to prevent spread of fire between flats and will assist with early warning and provide safe evacuation in the event of a fire.

The estimated costs was based on general' specification to capture the main elements of work. When the contractor is appointed, a further detailed survey will determine the scope of works.

Only flat entrance doors, will be replaced in this programme.

Observations received from a leaseholder in the building NIGHTINGALE LANE

Leaseholder was concerned no surveys done to arrive at estimated costs and the costs are not representative for their building and leaseholders interest were not taken into account by the Council.

Leaseholder was concerned that there were no alternative quotes for the work.

Response:

It was confirmed that estimated costs are based on general specifications and that contractors on site will confirm individual specifications.

The Leaseholder was advised that programme is carried out under a framework agreement and the works were competitively tendered via the London Construction Programme (LCP) Framework based on quality and price

Observations received from a leaseholder in the building RATHCOOLE GARDENS

The leaseholder queried the reasonableness of the cost for the size of the property and they asserted that the works proposed are excessive for the type of property.

The leaseholder has asserted that most of the works required are not required.

Response:

The reply to the leaseholder was that the notice is not a demand for payment but an estimate of works.

It was confirmed that the costs were based on a general estimate and detailed surveys will confirm actual costs but this will be available when works are completed.

Observations received from a leaseholder in the building GLADESMORE ROAD

Leaseholder requested a breakdown of the costs provided in the Appendix sent with the notice of intention and wanted confirmation if the works related to the communal areas.

Leaseholder wanted to know if they have been registered as the current property owner as notice was issued in the name of the previous leaseholder.

Leaseholder also wanted to know based on the initial response and the AFD update letter that actual costings will be determined when the contractors visit the site.

Response:

The reply provided confirmed how the costings for the elements of works to the building were arrived at.

They were advised that the name of the current leaseholder is now registered against the property and correspondence will now be issued in their name.

The Fire Detection works newsletter was included as part of the response to the leaseholder.

The leaseholder was advised that the detail of the works and the cost for this would be determined when the contractor visits the site and the invoicing/billing will be based on this.

A copy of the door specification was forwarded to the leaseholder as well.

Observations received from a leaseholder in the building WOODSIDE ROAD

The leaseholder raised objections to the works and the cost of these to be carried out to their building.

They provided their own costs for the works and materials included.

Response:

A copy of Fire Detection Works newsletter was sent to the leaseholder as part of the response including specifications for the fire door sets.

The response also provided answers to the costing for the specification of works to their building.

Observations received from a leaseholder in the building WOODSIDE ROAD

Leaseholder wanted more detailed information on how the cost of the proposed works were calculated and they also wanted to know what each cost actually provides.

Leaseholder also stated that the main works, are decoration/flooring, smoke alarm installation, flat entrance door replacement and fire signage

Response:

Detailed replies were provided regarding the cost of the proposed works including the activities that will be carried out under each heading.

It was confirmed that when contractors are on site, actual works required to the building could be confirmed. The Fire Detection Works newsletter was included as part of this response.

Concerning the query about compartmentation, they were further advised that the houses when originally converted pre 1991, were not generally completed to the required compartmentation standard, between the flats.

Observations received from a leaseholder in the building BARRINGTON ROAD

The leaseholder stated a lack of clarity and information regarding the agreed scope of works and associated costs, which are arbitrarily listed but unsubstantiated and without an adequate and proper breakdown.

They also stated the works have not been competitively tendered and this opens up the possibility that the works are not properly defined or costed.

Leaseholders states that he doesn't believe the proposed works are covered under his lease.

Response:

The response provided to the leaseholder addressed each of the cost headings in the appendix.

The reply also advised the leaseholder that the lease for their property is an improvement lease and this type of lease covers the proposed AFD works.

The leaseholder was advised that a type of contract called a Qualifying Long Term Agreement is carrying out the works. All leaseholders have been consulted before the contract was entered into.

Observations received from a leaseholder in the building BEACONSFIELD ROAD

I understand that in the Section 20 process, leaseholders should be able to see at least two quotes for major works and there is no evidence for the 2 quotes.

Further observations:-

- Leaseholder stated the management pack did not contain documentation about previous consultation.
- Leaseholder wanted information on all of the estimated costs and what each cost involves, as they are extremely high (e.g. redecoration). They were also concerned about various fees and other costs, which are vague, such as enhancing costs.

The leaseholder was concerned about the current state of the main front door. This door is poorly fitted and not secure and included a quote from a contractor

Why must I pay for works, the council has to legally carry out for Council tenants?

Response:

The reply stated that the proposed works are carried under a contract called a Qualifying Long Term Agreement and consultation was carried out in November 2013 and August 2015.

When works are carried out under these contracts, we are only required to provide one tender. However, all leaseholders were consulted before the contract was entered into. The consultation Notices were sent to all leaseholders in November 2013 and August 2015.

Response to the further observations were that the management pack provides documents where the statutory consultation has not yet finished. They were advised the communal door is not included as part of the current AFD programme as legislation doesn't cover this.

They were also advised that leaseholders pay a proportional cost of works to the building and do not pay for the Council tenants.

Observations received from a leaseholder in the building TYNEMOUTH TERRACE

The leaseholder raised a query about the property being bought initially as a Right to buy property and there is no provision for the AFD works in the management pack.

The leaseholder also raised queries about the estimated costs on all the proposed elements of works.

Response:

Leaseholder was advised that the information regarding the Right to Buy only applied to the seller who purchased under the right to buy and will not apply to any subsequent buyers.

The Fire Detection Works newsletter was attached to the response and this information provided generalised explanations to the cost of works to the building and the specifications for the door sets.

Each aspect of the element was addressed individually with generalised explanations including explaining that if the works are not carried out, these will be omitted from the costs.

Observations received from a leaseholder in the building GROVE PARK ROAD

Leaseholder wanted to know the following:-

- If the service charge fee (**sinking fund**) paid by the sellers would apply to them to pay towards these kind of works, if they will be expected to pay the fee in full?
- Why another asbestos survey is being carried out when previous surveys have been done and no asbestos found?
- Which door(s) will be replaced – the communal or flat or both?
- If the works are guaranteed to be completed as previous communication regarding flat entrance doors indicates nothing has happened?

Response:

They were advised that the sinking fund the leaseholder refers to does not apply to the property and the previous owners did not pay towards this.

The billing for the works will include the option to pay in full with a 5% discount or the invoice amount can be spread in monthly instalments depending on the amount of the invoice.

By law Haringey Council as the building owner must take steps to find out if asbestos is present in our buildings, and what condition it is in before

commencement of any specific building works. If no asbestos is found, this element of cost will be removed from the final bills.

The doors being referred to in the notice is the flat entrance door giving access into the flat and not the communal door giving access to the building.

Observations received from a leaseholder in the building HORNSEY LANE GARDENS

Leaseholder wanted to know more about:

The decorations and replacement of the floor coverings and considered the works to be expensive and advised that following an asbestos survey in 2016 no asbestos was found.

The leaseholder advised that they are likely to purchase the freehold

Response:

They were advised that the costs are based on generalised specifications based on a sample survey, but if any of the advised works and costs are not carried out, they will be omitted from the final bill.

The leaseholder was advised that by law, an asbestos survey has to be carried out to protect operatives on site, but if no asbestos found a charge for the works will not be in the final bill.

On the freehold purchase, the leaseholder was advised that the building will remain in the programme until there is certainty that the purchase will go ahead.

Observations received from a leaseholder in the building DUCKETT ROAD

The leaseholder stated:

The assessment for the works fails to take into account the circumstances, in particular the size of communal area and type of property. The measures you have proposed are neither reasonably required nor necessary under the Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order 2005.

Response:

They were advised that the list of works are generalised specifications based on sample surveys and that not all the works may relate to the building and the works are being carried out under the **LACORS** Fire Safety guidance / Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order 2005 / building Regulations Approved Document B.

The Fire Detection Works newsletter, FRA assessment (redacted) for the building and the fire door set specifications attached as part of the reply.

Observations received from a leaseholder in the building FARRANT AVENUE

Leaseholder raised cost queries on all the aspects of the proposed works in the notice.

They also requested the freeholder share its assessment of the proposed tender in delivering value for money and meeting the necessary technical specifications.

Response:

Detailed general responses were provided to all the cost aspects of the proposed works to the building including how the costs were generated.

The leaseholder was advised that the works were competitively tendered via the London Construction Programme (LCP) Framework and checked by professional consultant partners who have considered that this represents best value for money and is considered satisfactory as the basis for a contract.

Included with the replies is the Fire Detection Works newsletter and the fire door sets specifications.

Observations received from a leaseholder in the building MALVERN ROAD

The leaseholder(s) queried the cost of the front entrance door replacement, decorations, emergency lighting.

The sum of £6k is an extremely high amount for works, which mostly, do not even need to be carried out. Surely, there is a much more cost-effective solution.

Response:

They were advised that the costs were based on the general specifications from sample surveys, and that if the works are not required to be done it will be omitted from any final invoice.

Regarding the cost-effectiveness of the works, they were competitively tendered via the London Construction Programme (LCP) Framework based on quality and price and costs were checked and considered best value.

Observations received from a leaseholder in the building UPLANDS ROAD

Leaseholder wanted to know why the flat entrance door (FED) is being replaced as this was recently done and if HFH will absorb the cost if the FED is replaced in this programme?

Leaseholder states that many of the works proposed seem to us to be unnecessary and excessive, particularly emergency lighting, floor covering and decorations.

Leaseholder wanted to know the available payment options.

Response:

Detailed general responses were provided regarding the replacement of the FED and what the leaseholder states were unnecessary and excessive costs for some of the element of works.

A link was sent to the leaseholder to view the payment options on Homes for Haringey's website.

Included with the reply was the Fire Detection Works newsletter and detailed for the specification of the fire door set.

Observations received from a leaseholder in the building ARNOLD ROAD

The leaseholder stated that the reasons given by the Landlord for the works are meaningless and most of the works listed in the notice have already been carried out.

They also stated that the letter does not give consideration as to whether leaseholders as per the terms of their lease are required to pay for improvements.

The leaseholder also stated they were not made aware of asbestos when they purchased the property and if they were, would not have bought the flat.

Response

The Fire Detection Works newsletter was part of the reply provided and they were advised that these works are part of the repair and maintenance of the building and they are required to make a contribution towards the cost of works.

They were advised that a fire engineered approach and the works are being carried out under LACORS (**Local Authorities Coordinators of Regulatory Services**) Fire Safety Guidance/ Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order 2005 /Building Regulations Approved Document B.

Regarding the asbestos, they were advised that by law the landlord has to take steps to find out if asbestos is present in our buildings and what condition it is in before commencement of any building works.

Observations received from a leaseholder in the building RATHCOOLE AVENUE

The leaseholder expressed the following queries:-

- They have decorated and maintained the communal area and do not wish for any unnecessary change.
- They are also in the process of freehold purchase and this should be taken into consideration before any expense.
- They want to be kept informed at all times before any schedule of work is carried out.
- They would want to have a choice of door in keeping with the current door.
- The installation of fire breakers are completely unnecessary and a waste of money. It is not a statutory mandate

Response:

Houses were not completed to the required compartmentation standard between the flats. The installation of an AFD system allows early and simultaneous evacuation in the event of a fire to all flats within the building.

They were advised that any door fitted to an individual dwelling that meets current fire regulations will not need to be replaced.

Contractors will confirm the specifics of the works when further surveys are done and that invoicing has been postponed until works are completed.

Leaseholder was assured that the Project Team would continue to work with them throughout the programme.

Observations received from a leaseholder in the building TERRONT ROAD

The leaseholder expressed the following queries:-

- Sample surveys bear little resemblance to the actuality of costs to the property.

- Both flats had the doors into the communal area replaced with FD30 compliant doors couple of years ago.
- The leaseholder wanted to know what is enabling works, fire compartmentalisation, preliminaries, decorations & floor coverings.
- Expressed an individual survey to be done to the building.

Response:

Replies were provided to the queries raised in general terms, as detailed surveys not been carried out.

The replies confirmed why the works were required and the legislation under which the AFD works were being carried out was provided. It was confirmed that works that are not required would be omitted from the final bills when further surveys are done.

Works relating to Enabling works, Preliminaries and firebreaks were described in the replies.

Observations received from a leaseholder in the building SALISBURY ROAD

The leaseholder has stated that their maintenance team advised that the costings are expensive and the works are achievable at lower costings.

Response:

They were advised that the works were tendered via the London Construction Programme Framework on the basis of quality and price. The tenders have been professionally checked and confirmed it represents best value for money and considered satisfactory for a contract of the size.

The leaseholder was advised that the costs in the notice are based on general specifications but subject to further surveys the actual costs will be determined when contractors are on site.

Observations received from a leaseholder in the building ALBERT ROAD

A leaseholder advised the following:-

- How there can be a list of works when there has not been an internal inspection at my property? The comments read as a generic description and not those for my specific flat
- My flat is not in a block of flats but a first floor flat above a ground floor flat and expects it will not be treated under the same fire requirements as those in large blocks.
- The flat entrance door was recently changed during some other works and should be paid for by the landlord.

Response:

A copy of the Fire Detection Works newsletter emailed to the leaseholder advising this would answer the questions raised in his observations.

Observations received from a leaseholder in the building MIDDLE LANE

Leaseholder wanted confirmation who makes the decision about the proposed works, why these works are necessary and what legislation necessitating the works as the property is a 2 story house.

Requested specifications for the works.

Response:

An AFD newsletter was included as part of the response to provide answers to some of the generalised questions.

They were advised that the landlord has responsibility for the Flat Entrance Doors and leaseholder under the terms of the lease are charged for works carried to the external and/communal fabric of the building.

They were advised that the works are being carried out in accordance with LACORS (**Local Authorities Coordinators of Regulatory Services**) Fire Safety Guidance / Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order 2005 / building Regulations Approved Document B.

It is confirmed the works were tendered and priced under a Long Term Qualifying Agreement; costs are considered to represent the best value for money and is considered satisfactory as the basis for a contract.

Observations received from a leaseholder in the building OAKFIELD ROAD

Leaseholder advised of the following:-

- Requested an appointment during the contractor's visit to understand the nature and extent of the proposed works.
- Wanted to know if detailed costings will be made available after the contractor survey
- Also wanted to know if they can propose an alternative contractor to Mulalley & Co.

Response:

When the contract is awarded, the contractor details will be provided to the residents.

Costings are based on general specifications and contractor surveys will determine actual costings.

The proposed works were consulted under a Qualifying Long Term Agreement. All leaseholders were consulted before the contract was entered into with consultation Notices were sent to all leaseholders in November 2013 and August 2015.

Observations received from a leaseholder in the building NIGHTINGALE LANE

The leaseholders advised of the following:-

- The doors would have a detrimental effect on property appearance and devalue the property, they have requested to have sight of the product.
- The cost to their property is disproportionate if the communal entrance door is not listed to be replaced.
- Wanted confirmation of the intended product for replacing the floor coverings.
- Wanted to know if the cost of asbestos removal will be removed if none found.
- Wanted confirmation that the electric meters in the communal areas will be boxed in rather than exposed.
- Wanted confirmation of a long term payment structure rather than a lump sum payment.

Response:

Detailed general responses were provided to each of the queries. Attached with the response was the Fire Detection Works newsletter and the specifications for the fire door sets

The reply also included a link with details of the payment options

Observations received from a leaseholder in the building RANGEMOOR ROAD

The leaseholder queried all the costs provided including an explanation of costs for elements such as completion & handover costs, preliminaries, profit. They wanted to know why two sets of fees are being charged

They state that a sinking fund is applicable to the property

Response:

A detailed but general response was provided to the leaseholders explaining how the costs for works were generated. In addition, it was explained what the general works refer to.

An explanation of what the fees are was provided to the leaseholders

Regarding the sinking fund, a copy of the management pack confirming that sinking fund was not applicable was provided to the leaseholder as an attachment .

Observations received from a leaseholder in the building UPLANDS ROAD

Leaseholder questioned the cost of a flat entrance door and was not convinced that the size of the communal area would have generated the cost for works in the notice

They wanted an explanation of what completion & handover refers to

Response:

A detailed but general explanation was given to the leaseholder as per the queries that were raised

Observations received from the leaseholders in the building RATHCOOLE GARDENS

Observations included confirmation of scope of works for electrical works, internal decoration and finishes as well as emergency lighting, activities to be carried out for completion and handover, breakdown for prelims/OH&P

There was also a request for a breakdown of the FED works, firebreaks & compartmentation and they stated they will not pay for an asbestos survey as information in their management pack in 2014 did not identify any ACM (asbestos containing material) in the building.

They requested for a breakdown of the fees and state if the sinking fund will be used to offset costs for the works.

Response

Detailed generalised responses were provided to each of the areas of works proposed to the building.

Included in the reply was a copy of the Fire Detection Works newsletter, the fire door set specification and a copy of the management pack confirming that sinking fund does not apply to the property.

Observations received from a leaseholder in the building INDERWICK ROAD

Leaseholder stated that no one has had access to the property to assess the requirements and they are not prepared to pay for the decorating in communal areas that they do not have access to.

Leaseholder is not willing to pay for council tenants who cannot pay their proportion of these expensive works

Response

Each element of works was responded to explaining why they may need to be carried out but also explaining that if the works are not required they will not be included in the billing for works.

Also included in the reply is the Fire Detection Works newsletter.

Observations received from a leaseholder in the building WIGHTMAN ROAD

Leaseholder queried the cost of the works that they believe has no supporting evidence and the costs and descriptions are vague.

The leaseholder also stated that as they believe the costs are unreasonable even under a long term contract and that they will bring in their own surveyor to provide costings

Response:

A detailed but general description of the proposed works were provided to the leaseholder. An explanation was given how the costs for the proposed works were generated, but that it may not apply to all properties as a determination of what is required to be done be advised when contractors are on site.

Observations received from a couple of leaseholders in the building STANMORE ROAD

Leaseholder stated the current FD30s door only requires the addition of an intermission strip.

They required additional information on firebreaks, compartmentalisation, penetrations, decorations and replacement of floor coverings.

The leaseholder stated that vinyl carpet would not provide appropriate noise insulation and request that any replacement covering consider this.

They also stated that some of the costs for the other works are not proportionate to the size of the communal area.

Response:

Detailed general responses were provided to the request from the leaseholder. The leaseholder was also advised that the specifics of what is required would be determined when the contractors come on site.

Included as part of the response was the Fire Detection Works newsletter and details of the fire door set specification.

Observations received from a leaseholder in the building WAKEFIELD ROAD

Leaseholder raised a query regarding what their sinking fund is for and that the cost of the works are excessive. The leaseholder specifically stated that the cost of floor coverings are expensive for the size of the communal area.

Response

The response regarding the amount paid into the sinking fund was that, the amount will be offset against any bill when the invoice is produced.

The reply to the cost of the floor covering was that when contractors are on site, they would accurately determine if any works are needed and if so how much it will cost

Observations received from a leaseholder in the building BRAEMAR AVENUE

Leaseholder queried the cost of the flat entrance door and if this will be opaque. If the doors have standard British locks fitted, a description of what preliminaries, contingency, fire breaks & compartmentation relate to. They want to know why there is a charge for profit with the overheads.

They are also concerned about the inter-linked fire alarm as this may be triggered continuously.

Response:

Detailed general responses were provided to all the aspects of works queried with the emphasis that an actual list of works will not be determined until the contractors attend site.

Included with the response was the Fire Detection Works newsletter and a copy of the specification for the fire door sets.

Observations received from a leaseholder in the building MOUNT PLEASANT ROAD

Leaseholder stated a survey for the proposed cost of works should have included them and that the wooden floor does not need to be covered up

They acknowledge the need for the fire safety works but unsure if the freeholder has negotiated the best price.

Response:

The Fire Detection Works newsletter was included as part of the response to advise that the costs are based on general specifications.

They were advised that Floor coverings and wall linings have been identified in fire risk assessments (FRA) as a risk in some properties and this aspect of the proposed works will be looked at on a case-by-case basis.

Observations received from a leaseholder in the building COURCY ROAD

Leaseholder stated that the flat entrance doors in the flats were replaced under the Decent Homes Works in 2016/17.

They wanted to know the make and model of the proposed flat entrance doors with the high cost.

They wanted to know the material to be used to replace the flooring to justify the estimated amount in the notice.

Response:

A detailed but general response was provided to explain the reasons for the flat entrance door replacement. Furthermore, if the door specifications met the current regulations may be omitted from the final cost of works.

Floor coverings and wall linings were identified in fire risk assessments (FRA) as a risk in some properties but to determine if this element of works is required to be done, will be on a case-by-case basis.

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

Observations received from a leaseholder in the building DAGMAR ROAD

Leaseholder queried every aspect of the proposed works stating some have been carried out but in addition, they will wait until further consultation/surveys are done to determine if he will raise additional challenges.

Response:

A detailed but general description was provided to each area of works listed to the building.

It was emphasised that the notice was based on a general specification and when contractors are on site, the actual scope of works will be determined.

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

Observations received from a leaseholder in the building MOUNT PLEASANT ROAD

Leaseholder queried all aspects and costs of the proposed works to their building.

They requested justification for the estimated costs and an explanation of preliminaries, overheads and profit, completion and handover. They have asked for what the contingency cost is for and an explanation of what the different fees relate to.

Response:

Detailed response was provided to the specific works in the notice, advising why these works may be required to the building.

For aspects of works such as contingency, completion and handover, overheads and profit, fees, an explanation was provided to what these relate to.

Appendix 2c

SUMMARY OF NOMINATIONS MADE IN RESPONSE TO NOTICE OF INTENTION DATED 18/11/2019:

No nominations received regarding the proposed