

## LEASEHOLDER CHARGING CASE STUDIES

Case Number	Address	Date	Major works or Service Charges?	Description
1	Cardiff House, Peckham Park Road SE15 6TT	2007-2009	Major works	<p>Inconsistent / incorrect section 125 charging scheme; final bill is 500% more than original estimate.</p> <p>Lack of transparency in billing for works proposed and actually done</p> <p>Lack of transparency in the contractor's bill passed on to Leaseholders. For example, about 35% of bill in some cases where allocated to prelims, general prelims etc</p> <p>General lack of consultation when works extended beyond section 20 notice agreement, which attracted extra cost.</p>
2	Elm Grove Peckham SE15 5DE	8 February 2011	Major works	<p>The leaseholder's estimate for the work was £1800-£2500. The Council's estimate was £6250, more than 200% more. 95% of the work on the site specification has not been done and nobody has been to see of the work has been done or not. The leaseholder would like a meeting to discuss the issues</p>
3	Ednam House Frensham Street SE15 6TH	2007-2009	Major works	<p>Inconsistent / incorrect section 125 charging scheme; final bill is nearly £10,000 more.</p> <p>Lack of transparency in billing for works proposed and actually done</p> <p>Lack of transparency in the contractor's bill passed on to Leaseholders. For example, about 35% of bill in some cases where allocated to prelims, general prelims etc</p> <p>General lack of consultation when works extended beyond section 20 notice agreement, which attracted extra cost</p>
4	Ramsfort House Roseberry Street SE16 3NZ	December 2006 - present	Major works	<p>Poor workmanship. Poor planning and design. Work left unfinished. Lack of Council attendance and project management. Incomplete and poor work was signed off.</p> <p>Work charged which should not have been (new work and improvements). Poor decision making and leadership.</p>

5	Osprey House, Pelican Estate SE15 5NT	October 2009 – August 2010	Service charge	No significant work has been undertaken on the block, yet the service charges have rocketed dramatically. The wall is wet due to a problem with the guttering. Water is dripping through and needs urgent repair.
6	Osprey House Pelican Estate SE15 5NT	Ongoing	Service charge and Major works	Communal cobblestones are not cleaned, hedge at the rear is not cut often enough. The gate has been damaged by Council workers.  Windows replaced at a cost of £20,000 but locks keep breaking. Roof work is substandard quality. Electrical window fan fitted in the kitchen but not connected.  Fuse box was replaced with an old one despite being charged for a new one.  No compensation for the removal of a security shutter which had to be removed to install the new windows.
7	Curlew House Talfourd Road	Ongoing	Service charge	Service charge does not reflect the work that is actually done. Someone should go round and actually list the work that needs to be done and charge for that.
8	Columbia Point		Major works	Original Tender £532,309.23 Works Tendered for but not carried out £38,736.33 Thus Tendered price for works actually carried out £493,572.90 Final A/C £628,690.84 Increase in cost of works actually carried out £135,117.94 Percentage increase in cost of works actually carried out 27%
9	Regina Point		Major works	Original Tender £534,582.76 Works Tendered for but not carried out £36,236.09 Thus Tendered price for works actually carried out £498,346.67 Final A/C £633,149.07 Increase in cost of works actually carried out £134,802.40 Percentage increase in cost of works actually carried out 27%

10	Cardiff House Peckham Park Road SE15 6TS	2007-2009	Major works	<p>Inconsistent / incorrect section 125 charging scheme; Lack of transparency in billing for works proposed and actually done</p> <p>Lack of transparency in the contractors bill passed on to Leaseholders. For example, about 35% of bill in some cases where allocated to prelims, general prelims etc</p> <p>General lack of consultation when works extended beyond section 20 notice agreement, which attracted extra cost.</p>
11	Ednam House Frensham Street SE15 6TH	2007-2009	Major works	<p>Inconsistent / incorrect section 125 charging scheme; final bill is nearly £10,000 more, after an initial payment of estimated bill of over £20,000. Lack of transparency in billing for works proposed and actually done</p> <p>Lack of transparency in the contractor's bill passed on to Leaseholders. For example, about 35% of bill in some cases where allocated to prelims, general prelims etc</p> <p>General lack of consultation when works extended beyond section 20 notice agreement, which attracted extra cost</p>
12	Maddock Way SE17 3NH			<p>Originally we were quoted a costing which was £4,445.00 per leaseholder. There are only ten dwellings of which seven are leaseholders.</p> <p>The roof in question had been repaired so many times it was decided to renew in its entirety. Not before the roof above 28/30/32 had to be redone through a total botched job by S.B.S. the second job was fulfilled to a very high standard and then discarded for the complete renewal by Elkins contractors. The reason for the increased costing was over an extended guarantee period. The documents attached should clearly show you what occurred. Because of the way the increase came about the additional cost is still to be finalised</p>

13	Bromleigh Court, SE23 3PW	200?-2011	Major Works	<p>Several sets of major works to the block (windows, electrics, door entry system, disabled access, fire doors etc). Leaseholders have been challenging many aspects of the costs, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The cost of a door entry system was doubled by including disabled ramps without any consultation. Some ramps were installed in the wrong place (e.g. a disabled ramp at a back door allowing entrance to a lobby which then required climbing two sets of stairs, when the front door gave access to the ground floor and a lift) and handrails that look like scaffold poles were installed at the wrong height. The door entry system has had repeated problems (visitors not able to hear residents and vice versa). On each occasion Councillors and leaseholders have had to fight to take unacceptable cost elements out of the contractor's bills</li> <li>• The electrical contractors claimed for wiring that leaseholders argue was not completed and by carefully scrutinising costs they have managed to find duplicate invoices, works that were not complete, items charged for that were not actually used etc.</li> <li>• The council has charged tenants and leaseholders for a communal TV aerial which essentially doesn't work for most properties and has been the subject of repeated complaints.</li> </ul> <p>There are also generic issues such as repeated job numbers for repairs, trades people not attending scheduled appointments and delays getting compensation for missed appointments.</p>
14	Crystal Court College Road SE19 1UZ	200?-2011	Major Works	<p>Leaseholders were given £30,000 bills for major works which included more than £12,000 for ten mobile phones and broadband costing over £500.</p> <p>There were also issues over the levels of the administration fee charged by the council and the “professional fee.”</p>