US52-



FIRST-TIER TRIBUNAL PROPERTY CHAMBER (RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY)

Case Reference	¥ \$	BG/LON/00BH/OLR/2017/1216
Property	¢ 8	309 Markhouse Road, London E17 . 8E E
Applicant	9 0	Mr. D Citroen
Representative	6 8	Bircham Dyson Bell LLP
Respondent	đ V	Mr. J Davies & Ms L Davies
Representative	0 0	N/A
Type of Application	¢	Lease extension
Tribunal Member	ע &	Judge LM Tagliavini Mrs H Gysely
Date and place of hearing	в Ф	10 Alfred Place, London WC1E 7LR 24 October 2017
Date of decision Addendum	ę. Ą	24 October 2017 8 March 2018

DECISION & ADDEDUM

The tribunal's decision:

1. The tribunal determines that the premium payable for the extension of the lease for the subject property is £18,725 (eighteen thousand seven hundred and twenty-five pounds).

Background:

2. This is an application made pursuant to section 50(1) of the Leasehold Reform, Housing and Urban Development Act 1993 ("the Act)(missing landlord provisions. By an order dated 15/06/2017 made by District Judge Bell in the County Court at Bow, the application made pursuant to section 42 of the Act was transferred to this tribunal for a determination of the premium payable for the lease extension.

- 3. In support of the application, the Applicant relied upon the witness statement of Bernard D'Monte dated 18 May 2017 and the valuation report of Stephen R Jones BA(Hons) MRICS dated 6 September 2017.
- 4. In the absence of any evidence to the contrary and drawing upon its own knowledge and experience of similar properties in the area of Walthamstow, the tribunal accepts the evidence of Mr. Jones as to the premium payable by the Applicant and as contained in his valuation attached hereto. Therefore, the tribunal determines that the Applicant is to pay the sum of £18,725 to the Respondents in respect of the premium payable for the lease extension of the subject property and remits this matter back to the county court for any further orders that may be required.

Signed: Judge. LM Tagliavini

Dated: 24 October 2017

ADDENDUM

- 5. The tribunal is also asked to determine the terms of the new lease. The tribunal inadvertently failed to do so in its original determination as required by the county court, for which omission, the tribunal offers its apologies. The tribunal now adds this addendum to its original decision.
- 6. In the (original) bundle of documents provided to the tribunal, the Applicant relied upon a draft copy of the proposed terms of the new lease headed "Draft Lease as at 14/08/2017." The tribunal has considered this draft and determines that it is appropriate to approve its terms in full, including the proposed variation to the lease.
- 7. Therefore, the tribunal approves the terms of the new lease as set out in the Draft ease provided by the Applicant as at 14/08/2017.

Signed: Judge Tagliavini

Dated: 8 March 2018