



OFFICE OF THE
DEPUTY PRIME MINISTER

Noelle Rawe

Matthew Pye
Administration Officer
Housing Private Rented Sector

Office of the
Deputy Prime Minister

2/J6
Housing Private Rented Sector
Eland House
Bressenden Place
London
SW1E 5DU

Direct Line: 020-7944-3462
Divisional Enquiries: 020-7944-3462
Fax: 020-7944-3519
GTN No: 3533
mathew.pye@detr.gov.uk

Web Site: www.odpm.gov.uk

Our Ref: Rawe

19 July 2002

Dear Ms Rawe

See: My Diary 28 Nov and 6 May 08 ; London LVT , West London County Court
Wandsworth County Court , CKFT, Pridie Brewster , Martin Russell Jones ,
my 3 June 2008 Witness Statement, etc. for the demands I (and fellow leaseholders) were "faced with"

Service Charges

Thank you for your letters to Lord Rooker and John Prescott about **the possible service charge demand that you may be faced with.** Your letter has been passed to this division as we are responsible for residential leasehold matters. I have been asked to reply.

See my section on John Prescott... and he became a Lord, for what? services rendered to the sacrosanct crooked landlords?

Firstly, I should start by saying that neither this Department nor myself can get involved in any individual case or give advice, that being said I hope the following is of use. If I have misunderstood or made incorrect assumptions please let me know.

From the information contained in your letter it would appear that you have been offered both the right of first refusal (appendix 7 – **letter from Mr Andrew Ladsky to yourself** makes reference) and **have been served with a Section 20 notice** in respect of 'major works' (appendix 1, **letter from Martin Russell Jones**, first paragraph makes reference to a notice forwarded under the Landlord and Tenant Act last year). You may like to check whether, if my assumptions are correct procedures have been followed, and I enclose a copy of this Departments' booklets 'Right of first refusal' and 'Long leaseholders' which explains these issues in more detail.

Where the resolution of service charge disputes are concerned, as your leases state that any such disagreements are **to be taken to arbitration rather than being able to apply to a Leasehold Valuation Tribunal (LVT)**, this is where the matter should, at present, be addressed. For information I enclose a copy of our booklet 'Applying to a LVT' which sets out the procedures were you able to apply to a LVT. With that in mind you may like to know that the Commonhold and Leasehold Reform Act 2002 (the Act) provides that unless arbitration is agreed to after a particular dispute has arisen, such a dispute will (when this particular provision is commenced) in future, be able to be heard before a LVT.

BUT Ladsky and MRJ made application to London LVT

LVTs: as evidenced by my experience - and that of others (My Diary 28 Nov 08) they more often than not ACT FOR THE BENEFIT OF LANDLORDS. Hence, the CLAIM by the State of independence + not needing representation, etc. ARE FALSE

NO, we were NOT offered 1st refusal - see my comments to Ladsky's letter + page on Notices

NO, it was NOT a section 20 notice - see LVT ; Brian Gale ; MRJ... because it was FRAUD

We expect this provision to be commenced in November, although this is, of course, subject to change. You will need to obtain your own legal advice to confirm whether you will, should you wish, be able to use this new provision when it is commenced.

Of course one option you may not have considered is enfranchisement (buying the freehold). The Act is making it easier for leaseholders to enfranchise, including reducing the qualifying criteria for collective enfranchisement of flats to at least %50. Therefore, on a block with 35 flats, such as yours, if you had 18 leaseholders who wished to participate in this you may be able to purchase the freehold. I note that some of the leaseholders are domiciled overseas, and I would point out that the Act is also removing the residency test. These particular provisions are to be commenced on 26 July. I enclose a copy of this Departments booklet 'Initial guidance to the leasehold provisions', which explains the leasehold proposals of the Act in more detail.

I hope this is of help, and once again, I would suggest that you consider getting your own legal advice to this situation.

Yours sincerely,



Matthew Pye