

507

Residential Property TRIBUNAL SERVICE

## LONDON RENT ASSESSMENT PANEL LEASEHOLD VALUATION TRIBUNAL

## Case Reference: LON/OOAR/LSC/2010/0419

## THE LEASEHOLD VALUATION TRIBUNAL ON AN APPLICATION UNDER SECTION 27A of the Landlord and Tenant Act 1985

Applicants : S. J. Ballard and others

Respondent: Regisport Limited, represented by Pier Management

Premises: Hammond Court, Grenfell Avenue, Hornchurch, Essex RM12 4FJ

Date of Directions 24 June 2010

Date of Determination 3 September 2010

Leasehold Valuation Tribunal: Mrs B. M. Hindley LL.B Mr D. L Edge FRICS

- 1. This is an application under Section 27A of the Landlord and Tenant Act 1985 to determine the applicant leaseholders' (the tenants') liability to pay service charges in respect of insurance premiums in the years 2009 and 2010.
- 2. The application relates to the insurance of a building comprising 16 flats, the tenants of twelve of which make the application.
- 3. It has not been suggested that the leases of all the flats are not in the same form.
- 4. After Directions were issued indicating that the matter could be dealt with on the basis of written representations, neither party requested an oral hearing.
- 5. In response to the Directions the landlords provided a statement setting out the basis on which the insurance was placed. They explained that the building was insured on a block policy through Oxygen Insurance Brokers Ltd who chose Brit Insurance as the preferred insurers for the Regis Portfolio of some 18,000 units. They stated that they did not obtain commission from the subject property in isolation but because of their ability to 'bulk buy' they benefitted from commission on their portfolio as a whole. They commented, in their reply dated 30 July 2010, as set out below on the quotations (attached at Annex 1) obtained by the applicants.
- 6. 'Bluefin the premium is merely £146 lower than Brit. The landlord must show insurance is reasonably incurred and reasonable in amount. We maintain the landlord does not have to obtain the cheapest insurance available.
- 7. Intasure this cover is not 'like for like' and cannot provide any form of comparison.
- 8. Ellis David the premium is £292 lower than Brit, this equates to £37 per flat per year. Again, the landlord must show the insurance is reasonably incurred and reasonable in amount. We maintain the landlord does not have to obtain the cheapest premium available.
- 9. Lansdown we submit that we believe this to be an introductory rate, to win new business from the applicants.'
- 10. The Tribunal accepts the comments of the landlords in connection with the first three of the above quotations but the Lansdown quotation they do not accept can be so easily dismissed. The amount of cover is comparable or better in many instances and it is through a reputable company Allianz. Moreover, the Tribunal notes that on the Schedule attached at Annex 1 it would appear that cover in respect of legal expenses has been omitted since it appears to be included as part of the cover as set out in the summary of cover provided.
- 11. In coming to its determination the Tribunal is very aware of the decision of the Lands Tribunal in Focelux Ltd v. Sweetman and Another, 2001. The Lands Tribunal made it clear that there was not a license to charge a figure that was out of line with the market norm. The quotation obtained is so considerably less than the current premium and yet so very comparable in cover and provided by a highly reputable company that the Tribunal is persuaded that it would not be reasonable to disregard it.
- 12. Therefore, the Tribunal determines the cost of the insurance for the years 2009 and 2010 not to be reasonable, or reasonably incurred and, therefore payable.
- 13. Accordingly. the Tribunal determines a premium for 2009 of £1504. 61 and for 2010 a premium of £1.591.93.

? MAttalley.

3/9/10.

## Yearly Buildings Insurance

	BRIT - Current	Bluefin	Intasure	Ellis David	Lansdown
Buildings Sum Insured Building Declared Value Contents of Communal Areas Sum Insured (where applicable - included free of charge)	2,409,225 1,853,250 10,000	2,409,225 1,853,250 not insured	2,223,900 1,853,250 10,000.00	2,501,887.50 35% uplift 1,853,250 25,000	2,501,888 1,853,250 25,000
Rent Rent Alternative Accomodation Employers Liability Limit of Liability Property Owners Liability Limit of Indemnity Legal Expenses Insurance Section	not insured up to 30% sum insured not included 5,000,000 Included	not insured 5,000,000 10,000,000 Included	up to 25% of buildings declared value up to 25% of buildings declared value 10,000,000 2,000,000	up to 30% sum insured up to 30% sum insured 36 month indmenity not included 5,000,000	833,963 33% 833,963 33% 10,000,000 10,000,000
Premium	2,626.20	2140.49	821.27	2015.91	1,394.59
Insurance Premium Tax inc Terrorism Total Excess	<ul> <li>131.31</li> <li>2,757.51</li> <li>172.34 per flat</li> </ul>	107.03 194.59 2442.11 152.63 per flat	83.06 128.43 1,032.76 64.54 per flat	144 2159.91 134.99 per flat	inc 197.34 1591.93 99.49 per flat
Fire Lighting Earthquake Aircraft Explosion Riot and Civil Commotion Malious Damage	NIL NIL NIL NIL NIL NIL	NIL NIL NIL NIL NIL NIL	250.00	NIL NIL NIL NIL NIL NIL 250	250 250 250 250 250 250 250 250
Subsidence All other damage	1,000 250	1,000 100	5,000.00	1,000	1,000
Property Owners Liability Excess: Third Party Property Damage	250				

Inc Section 3, Terrorism

,

.