

# Housing and Property Chamber

## First-tier Tribunal for Scotland



**First-tier tribunal for Scotland (Housing and Property Chamber)**

**Repairing Standard Enforcement Order (RSEO): Housing (Scotland) Act 2006  
Section 24**

**Chamber Ref: FTS/HPC/RP/16/1032**

**Title no: GLA196485**

**Flat 6/3, 1071 Argyle Street, Glasgow, G3 8LZ ("the house")**

**The Parties:-**

**Mr Iain Strachan and Mrs Stephanie Strachan, formerly residing at the house, now care of Messrs Anderson Strathern LLP, George House, 50 George Square, Glasgow, G2 1EH ("the Tenant")**

**Mr Owen Ryan, care of Countrywide Lettings, 71 Candleriggs, Glasgow, G1 1NP, represented by his agents, Countrywide Lettings ("the Landlord")**

Whereas in terms of their decision dated 10 April 2017, the First-tier Tribunal for Scotland (Housing and Property Chamber) ("the Tribunal") determined that the Landlord has failed to comply with the duty imposed by Section 14(1)(b) of the Housing (Scotland) Act 2006 ("the Act") and in particular that the Landlord has failed to ensure that the house meets the repairing standard in that:-

- (a) the house is wind and watertight and in all other respects reasonably fit for human habitation;
- (d) any fixtures, fittings and appliances provided by the landlord under the tenancy are in a reasonable state of repair and in proper working order;

the Tribunal now requires the Landlord to carry out such work as is necessary for the purposes of ensuring that the house concerned meets the repairing standard and that any damage caused by the carrying out of any work in terms of this Order is made good.

In particular, the Tribunal requires the Landlord:-

- (i) to repair, or, as necessary replace, the seal around the patio door in the master bedroom to ensure that it is wind and watertight, and
- (ii) to repair the gas ignition switch on the gas hob by replacing the missing safety cap to ensure that the switch is in a reasonable state of repair and proper working order and poses no safety risk to those using it.

**N Weir**

*Legal Member*

The Tribunal order that the works specified in this Order must be carried out and completed within the period of 21 days from the date of service of this Notice.

**In terms of Section 46 of the Tribunals (Scotland) Act 2014, a party aggrieved by the decision of the tribunal may appeal to the Upper Tribunal for Scotland on a point of law only. Before an appeal can be made to the Upper Tribunal, the party must first seek permission to appeal from the First-tier Tribunal. That party must seek permission to appeal within 30 days of the date the decision was sent to them.**

Where such an appeal is made, the effect of the decision and of any order is suspended until the appeal is abandoned or finally determined by the Upper Tribunal, and where the appeal is abandoned or finally determined by upholding the decision, the decision and any order will be treated as having effect from the day on which the appeal is abandoned or so determined.

**Please note that in terms of section 28(1) of the Act, a landlord who, without reasonable excuse, fails to comply with an RSEO commits an offence liable on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding level 3 on the standard scale. A landlord (and that includes any landlord's successor in title) also commits an offence if he or she enters into a tenancy or occupancy arrangement in relation to a house at any time during which an RSEO has effect in relation to the house. This is in terms of Section 28(5) of the Act.**

IN WITNESS WHEREOF these presents typewritten on this and the preceding page are executed by Nicola Weir, Legal Member of the Tribunal at Glasgow on the 10 day of April, Two thousand and seventeen in the presence of this witness:-

**F Weir** \_Witness

**N Weir** \_Legal Member

Nicola Thomas Weir name in full

% 2 Field End Address

Lower Beckwith Way

TRING, HP23 4LN

# Housing and Property Chamber

## First-tier Tribunal for Scotland



**First-tier Tribunal for Scotland (Housing and Property Chamber)**

**Statement of Decision of the First-tier Tribunal for Scotland (Housing and Property Chamber) under Section 24(1) of the Housing (Scotland) Act 2006**

**Chamber Ref: FTS/HPC/RP/16/1032**

**Title no: GLA196485**

**Flat 6/3, 1071 Argyle Street, Glasgow, G3 8LZ ("the house")**

**The Parties:-**

**Mr Iain Strachan and Mrs Stephanie Strachan, formerly residing at the house, now care of Messrs Anderson Strathern LLP, George House, 50 George Square, Glasgow, G2 1EH ("the Tenant")**

**Mr Owen Ryan, care of Countrywide Lettings, 71 Candleriggs, Glasgow, G1 1NP, represented by his agents, Countrywide Lettings ("the Landlord")**

### **DECISION**

**The First-tier Tribunal for Scotland (Housing and Property Chamber) ("the Tribunal"), having made such enquiries as it saw fit for the purposes of determining whether the Landlord has complied with the duty imposed by Section 14 (1)(b) of the Housing (Scotland) Act 2006 ("the Act") in relation to the house, and taking account of the evidence presented and the written and oral representations, determined that the Landlord had failed to comply with the duty imposed by Section 14 (1)(b) of the Act.**

**The Tribunal comprised:-**

**Mrs Nicola Weir, Legal Member**

**Ms Lorraine Charles, Ordinary Member**

### **Background**

- 1. By application received on 23 December 2016, the Tenant applied to the Tribunal for a determination of whether the Landlord had failed to comply with the duties imposed by Section 14(1)(b) of the Housing (Scotland) Act 2006 ("the Act"). The Application by the Tenant stated that the Tenant considered that the Landlord had failed to comply with his duty to ensure that the house meets the repairing standard and in particular that the**

Landlord had failed to ensure that:- the house is wind and watertight and in all other respects reasonably fit for human habitation; the structure and exterior of the house (including drains, gutters and external pipes) are in a reasonable state of repair and in proper working order; the installations in the house for the supply of water, gas and electricity and for sanitation, space heating and heating water are in a reasonable state of repair and in proper working order; any fixtures, fittings and appliances provided by the landlord under the tenancy are in a reasonable state of repair and in proper working order; and any furnishings provided by the landlord under the tenancy are capable of being used safely for the purpose for which they are designed. Specifically, the Tenant complained that the en suite shower is leaking to such an extent that the floor is unsound; there is a strong odour of dampness in the property; both toilet seats were loose; the property was extremely unsanitary; the crockery was chipped and dirty; the seal on the patio door was compromised, causing a draught and noise pollution; the bed was ill fitting; the handle was loose on the bedroom door; the blinds were broken; the sofa and chair were worn, dirty, littered with debris and there is an odour from the cushions; the service buzzer was malfunctioning; the property was decorated to a poor standard; the ignition on the gas cooker was inoperative. The Tenant further stated that despite repeated calls, the letting agents have failed to provide a copy of the report on the repairs necessary; it is believed that the bathroom/shower-room requires to be ripped out and replaced and new flooring laid; a new hob is required; new sofa; new bed; new blinds; new seal installed (*sic*). Papers submitted with the Application included a copy of the Tenancy Agreement and proof that the Tenant had notified the Landlord of the required repairs prior to submitting the Application.

2. On 10 February 2017, a Convener of the Tribunal, acting under delegated powers in terms of 23A of the Act made a decision to refer the Application, under section 23(1)(a) of the Act, to a Tribunal. Notice of Referral in terms of Schedule 2, Paragraph 1 of the Act was served upon both the Landlord and the Tenant.
3. Following service of the Notice of Referral, written representations were submitted on behalf of both the Landlord and the Tenant. Both confirmed that they would attend the Hearing.
4. The Tribunal inspected the house on the morning of 27 March 2017. Ms Fiona Scott, Senior Branch Manager and Mr Scott Singh, Property Management Team Manager from Countrywide Lettings ("the Landlord's Agent"), were present during the inspection.
5. Following the inspection of the house, the Tribunal held a hearing at Wellington House, 134-136 Wellington Street, Glasgow, G2 2XL. Mr Iain Strachan, Tenant and Ms Fiona Scott and Mr Scott Singh for the Landlord's Agent were all present and gave evidence.

## **The Inspection**

6. At the time of the inspection, the weather was dry, warm and sunny, with no wind. The Tribunal noted that the house is a sixth floor two bedroom flat in a block of flats, being a modern development situated on Argyle Street in the Finnieston area of Glasgow. The house can be accessed from Argyle Street, via a secure door entry system to a common lobby with elevator and stair access to upper floors. The Tribunal were able to inspect the whole house. Inspection revealed the following:-

- (a) The secure door entry system was functioning. The house was clean, tidy and decorated throughout to a satisfactory standard. The Landlord's Agent advised that (other than the en suite bathroom) no decoration of the house had been carried out since the Tenant had vacated. The crockery in the kitchen cupboards was examined and found not to be chipped or dirty. The sofa and chair were clean and in a satisfactory condition. There were now no separate cushions on the sofa and chair but the sofa and chair themselves did not smell musty. Neither of the toilet seats were loose, nor any of the bedroom door handles. All were in a reasonable state of repair and working properly. No odour of dampness was detected in the house. There was a slight musty smell noted in the en suite bathroom but this dissipated on the shower being run for a brief period. The Landlord's Agent explained that the house had been unoccupied since the Tenant had vacated several months ago and the shower would therefore not have been used.
- (b) The en suite bathroom, including the floor, was in a reasonable state of repair and proper working order. The Landlord's Agent advised that repair works had been carried out to fix the leak at the shower and replace the floor which had been damaged by the leak. There were no signs of water ingress and damp meter readings taken by the Tribunal detected no damp in the en suite bathroom. The floor in the en suite bathroom and also into the adjoining master bedroom appeared sound.
- (c) The mattress on the bed in the master bedroom was found to be slightly smaller than the bed frame, in that there was a gap of approximately five centimetres at either side of the mattress.
- (d) The vertical blinds in the master bedroom had two slats missing at the far left hand side. This was unsightly but the blinds were tested and found to be working properly and to adequately cover the whole patio door and block out light when closed. All other blinds in the house were examined and tested and found to be in satisfactory condition and working properly.
- (e) The seal on the exterior of the patio door of the master bedroom was examined and found to be compromised in parts. Older apparent repairs to the seal were visible. However, the draught proofing strip



and the tape apparently used to try and repair it had failed There was no wind on the day of the inspection but a slight draught could be felt coming through one particular section of the patio door on the inside when the door was closed. The Tribunal did not detect noise pollution when the patio door was closed in that ambient noise, including traffic, could clearly be heard when the door was open but could not be heard when the door was closed.

- (f) The ignition switch on the gas hob was found to be operational in that it ignited the burners on the hob. However, the cap on the switch was missing, such that the interior of the switch was exposed. In the Tribunal's view, this was awkward to operate and might pose a safety risk. The Landlord's Agent indicated that it is difficult to source such a part and that it would seem excessive to replace the whole hob in respect of a missing switch cap.

A report incorporating a schedule of photographs taken during the inspection is attached to this Statement of Decision and executed as relative hereto.

### **The Hearing**

- 7. At the Hearing, the Tribunal had before it a copy of the Application; a copy of the Tenancy Agreement, together with copy Form AT5, copy Tenant Information Pack, copy Gas Safety Certificate, copy Electrical Installation Condition Report, copy Portable Appliance Testing Certificate and copy email correspondence between the Tenant's solicitors, Anderson Strathern LLP ("the Tenant's Solicitor"), and the Landlord's Agent dated between 8 November 2016 and 13 December 2016 inclusive, which documents were submitted with the Application; copy letter from the Tribunal to the Tenant's Solicitor dated 9 January 2017 and copy letter in response from the Tenant's Solicitor dated 11 January 2017; a copy of the Land Certificate relative to the house; copy Response Form in respect of the Hearing submitted on behalf of the Tenant, including copy Written Representations, copies of further email correspondence between the Tenant's Solicitor and the Landlord's Agent dated between 17 and 29 December 2016 inclusive and photographs appearing to show the house, furniture and contents; and copy Response Form in respect of the Hearing from the Landlord's Agent, including copy Written Representations, copy Inventory (incorporating photographs) from Pinstripe Inventory Specialists dated 6 October 2016, copy Check-out Document (incorporating photographs) prepared by the Landlord's Agent dated 4 January 2017 and two copy invoices from W & C Plumbing and Heating Specialists Ltd dated 1 November 2016 and 1 January 2017 .

### **Preliminary Issue**

- 8. The Tribunal had noted the representations contained in the documentation before it concerning the termination of the tenancy and determined that this was an issue that required to be considered before the hearing of any evidence. The Tenant's Solicitor had made

representations to the effect that the tenancy had been void due to frustration from the very outset, due to the repairs issues. The commencement date of the tenancy was 24 October 2016. The Tenant had moved out of the house within a matter of days to reside elsewhere and had thereafter entered into a new tenancy in respect of another property on 19 December 2016. However, the Tenant's Solicitor had also submitted that, as the Landlord had refused to accept that the tenancy had been frustrated or to release the Tenant early from the tenancy on conditions acceptable to the Tenant, the tenancy was continuing. The Tenant had paid six months' rent up front to cover the six month period of the tenancy, due to expire on 24 April 2017. The Landlord's Agent's position according to the background documentation was that they did not agree that the tenancy had been frustrated from the outset. The Landlord would agree to release the Tenant early from the tenancy, but only on the basis that the Tenant would be liable for the rent, Council Tax, utility bills, etc up to the date of a new tenancy being entered into in respect of the house and also the Landlord's costs incurred in re-marketing the house.

9. Both Mr Strachan and Ms Scott gave evidence and answered questions from the Tribunal on this preliminary issue. Ms Scott advised that she regarded the tenancy as having terminated on 4 January 2017, the date that the Landlord's Agent had completed the "check-out" inspection of the house. The Tribunal noted that this date was conform to the date on the "check-out" document lodged by the Landlord's Agent. Ms Scott advised that it been mutually convenient to release the Tenant from the tenancy at that time and that this was the logical date for the tenancy to have ended. However, she conceded that there was no final written agreement between the parties to this effect. She explained that there were communications before Christmas with the Tenant's Solicitor but that the solicitor was then on holiday and an agreement was not reached. Ms Scott indicated that the Landlord's Agent was in the process of re-letting the house. Mr Strachan was asked by the Tribunal for his views on this matter. The Tribunal explained to Mr Strachan that, if it was the position that the tenancy had indeed mutually terminated, then the Application to the Tribunal would be treated as having been withdrawn. Mr Strachan confirmed that he and his wife had left the house on 29 October 2016 due to the repairs issues. They moved into temporary accommodation until they could secure another tenancy. They entered into a new tenancy on 19 December 2016. Mr Strachan confirmed that this was another Short Assured Tenancy for a period of 6 months. Mr Strachan advised that they had returned all keys to the Landlord's Agent on 29 December 2016. He confirmed that he and his wife have no intention of returning to live in the house, even if the repairs issues had all been resolved. Mr Strachan conceded that he and his wife have no ongoing interest in respect of the condition of the house. Mr Strachan had been under the impression that the Tribunal would be able to make an order in respect of the rent issue between the parties, in terms of whether the Tenant was liable to pay any rent, a proportion of the rent, etc. The Tribunal explained that its remit is limited at this stage to determining whether or not there is a breach of the Repairing Standard in respect of the house and, if so, to make a

Repairing Standard Enforcement Order requiring repairs to be carried out. Mr Strachan conceded that, had he known this, he would not have proceeded to the Hearing. He conceded that the tenancy had mutually terminated, although there was no written agreement in place and matters had rather been "left hanging".

10. The Tribunal adjourned to consider this preliminary issue. It considered firstly, the terms of Paragraph 7(1) of Schedule 2 to the Act:-

*A tenant may withdraw an application under section 22(1) at any time (and the tenant is to be treated as having withdrawn it if the tenancy concerned is lawfully terminated).*

The Tribunal noted the present position of both parties expressed at the Hearing in relation to termination of the tenancy. The Tribunal determined that the tenancy had been lawfully terminated by mutual agreement of the parties, as evidenced by both parties' actions, albeit that the financial aspects of the early termination may still be the subject of dispute between the parties. The Tribunal therefore treated the application as having been withdrawn.

The Tribunal then considered the terms of Paragraph 7(3) of Schedule 2 to the Act:-

*Where an application is withdrawn after it has been referred to the First-tier Tribunal, the First-tier Tribunal may-*

*(a) abandon its consideration of the application, or  
(b) despite the withdrawal-*

*(i) continue to determine the application, and*

*(ii) if it does so by deciding that the landlord has failed to comply with the duty imposed by section 14(1), make and enforce a repairing standard enforcement order.*

The Tribunal considered whether or not to continue to determine the application. The Tribunal noted that it was the Landlord's intention to re-let the property and indeed, was in the process of doing so. In the circumstances, the Tribunal was of the view that, in the interests of future tenants of the house, it should continue to determine the application.

The Hearing reconvened and the Tribunal gave its decision that the Application was being treated as having been withdrawn but that the Tribunal would continue to determine the Application. The Tribunal explained to Mr Strachan that he was no longer a Party to the Application and could leave the Hearing, which he did.



## **The remainder of the Hearing**

- 11.** Ms Scott and Mr Singh gave evidence and answered questions from the Tribunal. They conceded that, due to an oversight on the part of the Landlord's Agent, the house had not been cleaned prior to the Tenant taking entry on 24 October 2016. They advised that they had quickly sought to arrange the cleaning but that the Tenant had already arranged an alternative cleaner. They also conceded that, on the Tenant taking entry, there was discovered to be a leak in a pipe behind the shower in the en suite bathroom which had damaged the floor. This had not been reported by the previous tenant or picked up on the previous tenant's "check-out". They had a contractor inspect the en suite bathroom and provide a quote for the necessary repairs. The Tenant had raised various other repairs issues and other issues concerning the house. Ms Scott and Mr Singh advised that the Landlord's Agent had sought to make arrangements to rectify the various matters but that problems arose with the Tenant allowing access and matters stalled due to the legal dispute between the parties. After the Tenant had vacated the house and handed back the keys, the Landlord's Agent had arranged for the repairs to the en suite to be carried out and for other matters to be attended to. Reference was made to the copy Invoice from the contractor which had been produced in the sum of £1,410 plus VAT which Mr Singh advised was for fixing the pipe which was leaking and replacing the whole floor in the en suite. The Tribunal noted that from their Inspection of the house earlier that there were no current issues as far as the en suite bathroom and floor; the cleanliness of the house; the décor of the house, an odour of dampness; the toilet seats being loose; the bedroom door handle being loose; the service buzzer malfunctioning; the condition of the sofa and chair; and the crockery.
- 12.** As regards the mattress, Ms Scott and Mr Singh accepted that the mattress was slightly smaller than the bed frame in that there was a slight gap down either side of the mattress. They indicated that this was the position when the Tenant had viewed the house and they did not consider that it was a safety issue. As regards the blinds in the en suite bedroom, Ms Scott and Mr Singh accepted that two slats were missing.
- 13.** As regards the patio door in the master bedroom, the Tribunal made reference to their findings on Inspection that the seal was not working as it should be and that there was a slight draught coming in. Ms Scott indicated that this issue had not initially been reported by the Tenant but that, when it was raised, they tried to arrange access for a contractor to attend but to no avail. Ms Scott stated that they would bring it to the attention of the new tenants and if it is draughty, they will get it fixed.
- 14.** As regards the ignition switch on the gas hob, Ms Scott and Mr Singh accepted that the cap was missing and had been since the Tenant took entry. They conceded that this was a safety issue and admitted that they had recommended the use of a barbeque lighter as a temporary measure.

## **Findings in Fact**

- 15.**The house is a flat on the sixth floor of a modern block of flats located in the Finnieston area of Glasgow on Argyle Street.
- 16.**The Tenant occupied the house under a Short Assured Tenancy. The Tenancy Agreement is dated 24 October 2016, which was also the commencement date of the tenancy. The tenants are husband and wife.
- 17.**The Tenant first notified the Landlord of several of the repairs and other issues concerning the house at the very outset of the tenancy. The Tenant's Solicitor and the Landlord's Agent engaged in correspondence regarding the repairs issues and other matters. The repairs issues were not resolved due to a breakdown in relations between the parties, difficulties concerning access and the legal dispute between them concerning the termination of the tenancy.
- 18.**The Tenant ceased occupying the house on 29 October 2016 and entered into a tenancy in relation to another property on 19 December 2016. The Tenant handed in the keys to the house on 29 December 2016. The Landlord's Agent instructed repairs to the house and completed a "check out" in respect of the house on 4 January 2017.
- 19.**Although the Landlord has effectively recovered the house and had access to it since 29 December 2016, some repair issues remain outstanding.
- 20.**The blinds in the master bedroom are operational and working properly as blinds, despite two slats at the far left hand side of the blinds being missing. The mattress in the master bedroom is slightly smaller than the bed frame, leaving a slight gap on both sides between the mattress and bed frame.
- 21.**The seal on the patio door in the master bedroom is defective and lets in a draught.
- 22.**The cap on the ignition switch on the gas hob is missing, not in a reasonable state of repair and may pose a safety risk.

## **Reason for decision**

- 23.**The Committee considered the issues of disrepair set out in the Application and noted at the Inspection and Hearing.
- 24.**The missing two slats on the blinds in the master bedroom is unsightly but, in the Tribunal's view does not constitute a breach of the Repairing

Standard in that they are in a reasonable state of repair and in proper working order in terms of Section 13(1)(d) of the Act.

25. The mattress in the master bedroom being slightly smaller than the bed frame does not, in the Tribunal's view, breach the Repairing Standard in that the mattress provided by the Landlord is capable of being used safely for the purpose for which it is designed (Section 13(1)(e) of the Act).
26. The seal on the patio door in the master bedroom is not working effectively and lets in a draught in places. The house is not therefore wind and watertight in terms of Section 13(1)(a) of the Act. The seal requires to be repaired or replaced to ensure that the house meets the repairing standard.
27. The cap on the ignition switch on the gas hob is missing and the cooker is therefore not in a reasonable state of repair or proper working order (Section 13(1)(d) of the Act). This requires to be rectified by the Landlord to ensure that the house meets the repairing standard.
28. The Landlord's Agent did not dispute that the patio door seal and hob ignition switch had been notified to them by the Tenant early on in the tenancy. They advised that they sought to address these issues but had been unable to secure access from the Tenant in order to progress this. The Landlord's Agent appeared to have been of the view, however, that these particular matters did not require to be rectified after the Tenant had vacated, as they had had the keys to the house back since 29 December 2016 but had still not attended to these issues.
29. The Tribunal is accordingly of the view that it will require to make a Repairing Standard Enforcement Order in respect of the patio door seal and the gas ignition switch on the hob. Given the nature of these repairs, the Tribunal was of the view that a period of 21 days from service of the order was an adequate and reasonable timescale for the repairs to be completed.

## **Decision**

30. The Tribunal accordingly determined that the Landlord had failed to comply with the duty imposed by Section 14(1)(b) of the Act.
31. The Tribunal proceeded to make a Repairing Standard Enforcement Order as required by Section 24(1) of the Act.
32. The decision of the Tribunal was unanimous .

## **Right of Appeal**

**In terms of Section 46 of the Tribunals (Scotland) Act 2014, a party aggrieved by the decision of the tribunal may appeal to the Upper Tribunal for Scotland on a point of law only. Before an appeal can be made to the Upper Tribunal, the party must first seek permission to appeal from the First-tier Tribunal. That party must seek permission to appeal within 30 days of the date the decision was sent to them.**

Where such an appeal is made, the effect of the decision and of any order is suspended until the appeal is abandoned or finally determined by the Upper Tribunal, and where the appeal is abandoned or finally determined by upholding the decision, the decision and any order will be treated as having effect from the day on which the appeal is abandoned or so determined.

Signed **N Weir** ..... Date: 10 April 2017  
Nicola Weir, Legal Member of the Tribunal

This is the report incorporating schedule of photographs referred to herein

**N Weir**

Legal Member 10/4/2017

**Housing and Property Chamber  
First-tier Tribunal for Scotland**



Flat 6/3 1071 Argyle Street Glasgow  
Inspection 27<sup>th</sup> March 2017 10:00am



Front



Rear

Weather was warm and sunny

FTS/HPC/RP/16/1032  
Schedule of Photographs



## Inspection

The property is a modern two bedroom flat on the 6<sup>th</sup> floor, access is by secure entry to common lobby with elevator and stair access to upper floors.

The tenants Mr and Mrs Strachan had vacated the property. The landlords representative Fiona Scott (Senior Branch Manager) and Scott Singh (Property Manager, Countywide) were in attendance.

- 1) Ensuite shower room – leak at shower causing damage to floor boards requiring extensive repair works. All works to shower have been completed and no signs of water ingress was recorded.



- 2) No damp odours were noted within the property during the inspection.
- 3) Toilet seats were loose - all toilet seats were checked and found to be well fitted and secure
- 4) The property was unsanitary - the property was clean and tidy at the time of inspection.
- 5) Crockery chipped and dirty - the crockery was basic and clean at the time of inspection.



- 6) The seal to the patio door was causing a draft and noise pollution - All patio doors were checked and it was noted that the patio door in the master bedroom had a historic repair/maintenance.





This repair appears to have been carried out to the patio door to improve the seal however the draft proofing strip and tape has failed and a slight draft was noted during inspection.

The patio door to the bedroom is not draft free, however no noise pollution was noted within the flat.

- 7) The bed was ill fitting – bed frame appeared fine, mattress was approximately 50mm short all round however duvet was tucked under mattress and between frame giving it a clean finish.
- 8) The handle was loose on the bedroom door – all bedroom doors were checked and handles were fitted correctly.



- 9) The blinds were broken – all vertical blinds were checked two slats were missing from master bedroom.





10) Sofa and chair worn and dirty – sofa and chair were clean at time of inspection



11) The service buzzer was malfunctioning – this was working at time of inspection

12) The ignition on gas cooker was inoperative - the ignition button was missing at time of inspection this is a safety issue and requires to be repaired or replaced.





Signed.....Lori Charles 04/04/17