

Boyce, Evens & Carpenter

Chartered Surveyors

Established 1847

Kevin J. Savage BSc MRICS
Derek M. Isaacs MRICS MBEng

Your Ref:

Our Ref: D3265

EMRA Ltd.
C/o Rendall & Rittner,
Gun Court,
70 Wapping Lane,
LONDON E1W 2RF

Dear Sirs,

10 Genotin Terrace,
Enfield,
Middlesex, EN1 2AF

Tel: 020 8367 5100

Fax: 020 8366 3056

Date: 16th January 2007

Eagle Mansions, Salcombe Road, London N16 – 10 Year Major Works Programme

In accordance with your recent instructions for us to prepare a 10 Year Major Works Programme for Eagle Mansions and following inspections of the building on 7th and 18th December 2006, we now have pleasure in reporting, as follows. Our terms of engagement were as detailed in our e-mailed letter dated 13th September 2006.

General Description

You are already familiar with the building but, briefly, this comprises a four storey purpose built block of 48 mansion flats, constructed some 100 years ago. The flats are arranged off six common staircase enclosures, each of the stairwells having an entrance doorway from one of the three recessed entrance pathways at the front of the building. Further doorways lead from the rear of each stairwell to a communal rear yard area which runs the full length of the rear elevation.

Construction

The construction of the building is fairly typical for its age, size and type, comprising loadbearing brick external and internal main walls, supporting a timber framed flat main roof structure and timber joisted upper floors. From inspection within the common parts and previous inspection within several of the flats on the ground storey, non-loadbearing partitions within the building appear to be constructed in a mix of brickwork and timber

studwork and the ground storey floor structures appear to be of traditional suspended timber construction.

As we have mentioned, the main roof over the building is flat and appears to be of timber joisted construction although, without opening up, we are unable to fully confirm the details. Over each of the internal stairwells above the line of the front entrances there are shallow pitched lean-to type roofs. We suspect that the various parts of the roof were previously covered with asphalt, although a torch-on felt type overlay system has now been applied, with lead cover flashings to the upstands at the abutments with chimney stacks and so forth and with the felt having a silver reflective paint finish. Above the front and flank elevations, there are dwarf parapet walls, one brick in thickness, where the felt coverings have been extended up the inside face and over the copings and are finished at the external edge with aluminium angle trims.

Above each of the internal stairwells, there is a timber framed rooflight, glazed with Georgian wired glass. These are generally fixed, with the exception of the rooflight over Block 1-8 which is openable and provides the only means of access onto the roof.

There are a total of some eighteen chimney stacks extending above the main roof, these presumably raised originally in a mix of red brickwork or London stock brickwork to match the external elevations. However, eight of the stacks have now been taken down and rebuilt using non-matching fletton brickwork and, with the exception of the stack above the extreme South end of the rear elevation which remains in stock brickwork, a rendered finish has been applied to the remaining stacks.

The external elevations at the front of the building, together with the South end elevation facing Trumans Road, are finished in a red facing brick at ground, first and second storey level, there being a rendered and painted finish at third storey level. This is with the exception of the end elevations facing onto the recessed front entrance pathways where the facing brickwork extends to full height. There are a total of six projecting three storey bays at intervals along the front elevation, these also raised in red facing brickwork, the bays having flat roofs with rendered and painted balustrades walls to the edges, capped with stone copings. The window openings at ground and first storey level (and also at second storey level to the projecting bays) are spanned by painted stone lintels, whilst the

remainder of the second storey windows have flat red brick arches and those at third storey level segmental red brick arches. All of the windows have painted stone sub-cills to the base of the openings. Along the base of the rendering at third storey level, there is a continuous moulded stone cornice on moulded stone brackets, with a further continuous stone band course above the first storey window openings and a moulded red brick band course above the ground, first and second storey window openings.

It would appear that the various elevations at the rear of the building were originally raised in London stock brickwork, with stock brick segmental arches to the various window openings. However, to most of the elevations for the full height of the building, a roughcast rendered and painted external finish has now been applied, with the exception of the rear elevation to Block 1-8 which remains in London stock brickwork. The various window openings at the rear of the building again have painted stone sub-cills to the base of the openings.

Most of the windows to the building are of softwood double hung sash type, although we noted that a number of the windows have been replaced in the past with PVCu framed double glazed units. We understand that individual flat lessees are responsible for the cost of repair to their own windows under the terms of their Leases. Accordingly, although the costings given later in this report include allowances for repairs to doors/windows serving the internal common parts, no allowance has otherwise been made for any repair/replacement of the windows to the building.

Rainwater from the rear edges of the main roof is collected by means of uPVC square section guttering, fixed to softwood fascias. There are also uPVC half round gutters at the head of some of the elevations facing onto the front entrance pathways, whilst the parapet walls along the front edges of the roof incorporate outlets discharging into uPVC hoppers. The various gutters and hoppers discharge into uPVC rainwater pipes, fixed to the outside face of the external elevations, the pipes discharging into gulleys at ground level in the usual way. The rainwater pipes along the front elevation also receive branches from the various bay roofs.

The rainwater pipes to the elevations on either side of the recessed front entrance pathways and also those along the rear facing elevations also act as waste stacks, with hoppers

receiving branch wastes from fittings within the individual flats on each storey. Regarding the soil branches from WCs within the various flats, these connect into cast iron soil vent pipes, again located on the elevations facing the front entrance pathways and also the elevations at the rear of the building.

Regarding the external areas, the three entrance pathways at the front of the building are generally surfaced with red tarmac, with painted concrete steps leading up to the main entrance doorways. The rear yard area is also surfaced with red tarmac throughout its length, there being several brick built planters and a number of proprietary bicycle stands along the rear boundary.

As regards the internal common parts, with the exception of the passageways leading to the external rear doorways at ground storey level, the various enclosing walls generally have glazed tiled dados. Above this, the wall surfaces are plastered and emulsion painted, as are the various ceilings/soffits. The doors, staircase handrails and other joinery and metal surfaces are generally gloss painted. All of the floors are finished with linoleum type coverings, with PVC inset type aluminium nosings to the staircase treads and landings.

The electrical intake equipment and landlords meters and distribution equipment for each block are located within the internal common parts at ground storey level, with pyro sub-mains run from the intake positions into each individual flat via modern galvanised steel trunking. Common parts lighting within each block is provided by a single wall mounted bulkhead type fitting at each main landing level, operated by push button type timer switches.

Although plumbing services within the building appear to have been fed originally from cold water storage tanks on the main roof, these have now been removed and plumbing services within all of the flats are now mains fed. The main distribution pipework is generally run externally up the external elevations and across the main roof, with all of the pipework insulated with modern type PIB sheathed insulation.

The building also has a gas supply, with the majority of the gas riser pipework to the various flats again run on the various elevations externally.

As regards the below ground drains on the property, the building appears to be served by a combined soil and surface water system. The various soil stacks and waste/rainwater gulleys at the rear of the building connect via branch drains into a series of access manholes below the rear yard area on the line of glazed stoneware soil drains which run beneath each block towards the front boundary. These receive further branch drains from the soil stacks and gulleys at the front of the building and then pass through interceptor manholes before connecting to a public sewer below Salcombe Road. The pavings to the rear yard area and front entrance pathways drain to yard gulleys at intervals, some of which were added during the resurfacing programme undertaken during 2006. These connect via branch drains into the various manholes at the front and rear of the building, with the pipework to the recently added gulleys run in modern uPVC.

Condition

Note:- the following brief comments are only intended to give an outline guide as to the general overall condition of the various parts of the building sufficient for the purposes of preparing the 10 Year Major Works Programme. Our comments are not intended to provide a detailed building survey report on the condition of the property and should not be relied upon by any vendor or purchaser or any potential vendor or purchaser in connection with the sale or potential sale of any flats within the building. These third parties should be advised to obtain their own independent professional advice on the condition of the building.

Main Roof

From information you have provided, it would appear that the felt overlay system applied to the main roof was undertaken some four or five years ago. Although we do not have any details of this work, we would normally expect overlay systems of this type to have a serviceable life of perhaps 20 years or so. However, in addition to some general ponding where the roof falls are inadequate, we also noted a number of places where the coverings are blistered, indicating the presence of moisture beneath the membrane. Whilst we understand that you are not aware of widespread leakage into the top storey flats, we also understand that there is evidence of water ingress affecting the front part of Flat 33.

It would appear that the water penetration, at least in part, is due to deficiencies in the weathering details around metal pipe brackets which support sections of plumbing pipework run above the roof surface. Whilst some of the pipe brackets are fixed to concrete blocks laid flat on the roof surface in the correct manner, a number of the brackets penetrate the roof membrane where no attempt has been made to provide any form of proper seal. In our opinion, these pipe support details should be amended/improved and all of the perforated, blistered and lifting sections of the felt overlay system stripped and relaid. At that time, re-application of the solar reflective paint finish should also be undertaken and we would also recommend replacement of the roof access trap from Block 1-8, which is extremely heavy and difficult to use and is also loose/failing at the joints. We have no information as to whether the roof overlay system is covered by any form of guarantee and you will no doubt wish to investigate this further. However, for the purposes of preparing the 10 Year Plan, we have assumed that the costs of repairing the roof membrane are not recoverable under guarantee and will need to be met from the service charge.

As regards the various chimney stacks, the rebuilt stacks should generally remain satisfactory for the foreseeable future although, in our opinion, the use of fletton brickwork to rebuild the stacks was not entirely appropriate for the age/style of the building and this type of brickwork is also somewhat susceptible to spalling/frost damage which is evident in one or two localised places. Regarding the remaining stacks, the rendered finishes are generally cracked, loose and off key in places, a number of the chimney pots are cracked or spalled and general repairs are required, including repointing of the remaining stock brick stack above the extreme South end of the rear elevation. Given that the rendered finishes applied to these stacks will always tend to be prone to shrinkage cracking, it may also be worthwhile applying a reinforced waterproof decorative coating system to these stacks to help limit the rate of further deterioration.

Front Elevations (Including South End Elevation to Trumans Road)

Although we understand that a repair/redecoration programme was undertaken to the external elevations during 2001/2002, our inspection has revealed various matters of disrepair which were not fully dealt with at that time, presumably due to funding constraints.

In particular, there are still fairly widespread areas where repointing of weak and eroded brickwork joints is required and face repairs are required to numerous individual bricks, where the relatively soft red brickwork has been affected by spalling/frost damage over the years. There is also considerable erosion to the continuous high level stone cornice and to the stone copings to the bay roof parapets where, in our opinion, it would be worth cladding the tops of the cornices and copings with properly detailed lead sheeting to help protect the stonework against further weathering and deterioration.

Regarding the rendered finishes at third storey level, these show general evidence of shrinkage cracking in places, which is a common problem with rendered surfaces. The rendering will need to be closely examined and all loose and cracked areas properly repaired, following which we would recommend the application of a proprietary waterproof decorative coating system in lieu of a normal masonry paint finish. In this regard, this firm often specifies the Liquid Plastics Monolastex RE coating system which, in addition to being waterproof, also has a degree of flexibility giving the coating system crack bridging qualities.

As regards the bay roofs, we have not been able to gain any close view of these, but we noted that the arches and brickwork above the top window openings to each of the bays has previously been rebuilt. We are not certain whether this was due to a dry rot problem affecting the bay roofs and timber backing lintels to the windows or due to general structural movement. However, we note that there are a number of cracked stone lintels and cracked/dropped brick arches to window openings elsewhere, where the building has suffered from a certain amount of structural movement over the years and where some further repair or rebuilding of the lintels and arches will be required during the next external repair/redecoration programme.

Regarding the pipework at the front of the building, whilst all of the rainwater/waste pipework has been previously replaced in modern uPVC, there is evidence of an ongoing problem with regard to the combined waste/rainwater pipes on the elevations facing the three recessed entrance pathways, where there is general damp staining on the adjacent brickwork due to hopper heads becoming blocked and overflowing. Most of the hoppers are taking two or three waste branches from fittings within the flats and it is clear that the existing arrangements have insufficient capacity and are unable to cope. In our opinion,

the existing combined arrangements should be altered, with the waste branches connected direct to a waste stack rather than via hoppers and with the rainwater pipes run separately. Our inspection of the building would suggest that this should be reasonably straightforward to achieve.

Rear Elevations

Again, we understand that an external repair/redecoration programme to the rear elevations was last undertaken in 2001/2002. More recently, adaptations to the base of the rendered external finishes and replacement of airbricks immediately above ground level has been undertaken, this work carried out in conjunction with the resurfacing of the rear yard area during 2006 and administered by this firm. The latter works have been undertaken in relation to rising dampness affecting the flats along the rear of the ground storey.

Although there is evidence of some repairs having been undertaken to the rear elevation rendering during the last major works programme, there remain a number of areas where, from inspection at ground level, the rendering appears cracked, loose or otherwise defective and where further repairs will be required when scaffolding is next erected at the rear of the building. Following essential further repairs to the rendering, we would again recommend that a proprietary waterproof decorative coating system be applied to the rendered surfaces in lieu of a standard masonry paint.

In addition to rendering repairs, we also noted a number of cracked and damaged stone sub-cills to the window openings where repair or replacement will be required, whilst rebuilding of one or two of the window arches and some repointing will also be needed to the stock brick faced rear elevation to Block 1- 8.

Regarding the pipework to the rear elevations, there are again combined uPVC waste/rainwater pipes with hoppers taking waste branches from fittings within the flats. Although again not an ideal arrangement, from inspection at ground level, it would appear that each hopper is generally taking only a single waste branch and we found no particular evidence to suggest that the problems occurring with the combined waste/rainwater pipes at the front of the building are also occurring at the rear.

External Areas

As we have mentioned, the resurfacing of the front entrance pathways and rear yard area, together with building of planters and provision of bicycle stands, was undertaken during the course of 2006 under the direction of this firm. We do not anticipate that further major expenditure on repairs to the pavings and so forth will be required within the next 10 years, but you may wish to consider some improvements to the boundary walls along the front of the building in due course, where most of these are in fletton brickwork and of relatively poor appearance.

Internally

As we have mentioned, the flats along the rear of the ground storey (Flats 8, 15, 24, 32, 40 & 48) are affected by rising dampness to varying degrees, on which we prepared a comprehensive report in May 2006. Our report included recommendations for remedial works, including within the adjacent internal common parts which are also affected by rising dampness in some areas. Although we are currently awaiting your further instructions, we understand that you will probably decide to implement the necessary remedial works to Flats 8, 40 and 48 and adjacent common parts during 2007 and to carry out the works to the remaining three flats and common parts during 2008. We have therefore prepared the 10 Year Plan on this basis.

Regarding the flats along the front of the ground storey, we have not gained access into any of these and are unable to confirm whether or not these flats are similarly affected by rising dampness. We understand, however, that you are currently not aware of any significant problems with dampness at the front of the building and, accordingly, we have made no provision for possible damp proofing works within these flats in the 10 Year Plan.

We understand that redecoration of the internal common parts was last undertaken during 2003. The decorations have since suffered from some degree of wear and tear as would be expected in a building of this type. We noted that the linoleum type floor coverings are generally old and worn and, when redecoration is next undertaken, we presume that you will wish to consider replacement of the floor finishes.

Common Services Installations

We have not arranged for any specialist inspection or testing of the common services installations and, if more comprehensive advice is required in this regard, we would recommend that you instruct a consulting services engineer. However, from our brief visual inspection, we would comment as follows.

The electrical intake equipment, landlords distribution boards, sub-main risers and common parts wiring all appear reasonably modern and, within the limitations of our inspection, we consider it unlikely that major improvements/upgrading will be required within the foreseeable future. There is, however, an issue with the timer switches to the common parts lighting which switch off the lights after only some 30 seconds. We also noted that there are currently no provisions for emergency lighting within the internal common parts and would recommend that this be considered when redecoration of the common parts is next undertaken.

Although we were unable to examine the external mains plumbing pipework without removing sections of insulation, we understand from you that all of the pipework was replaced during the last major works programme. We would not, therefore, envisage any major works being necessary to the common plumbing services within the foreseeable future and the pipework insulation also appears modern and in reasonable condition from inspection at roof and ground level. We have, however, commented on the poor detailing of some of the pipework supports at main roof level where we have recommended improvements.

From inspection at ground level and from within the internal common parts, the main gas riser pipework to the building also appears in satisfactory condition at the present time.

As regards the below ground drainage, we have not arranged for any testing or CCTV survey to be undertaken. You have, however, provided us with a report on the drains prepared following a previous CCTV survey by Unbloc Drainage Engineers Ltd. We note that, whilst referring to much previous repair/relining work, Unbloc's report concludes that the drains are generally in good order, although reference is made to one or two obstructions and also 'bellying' in several drain runs and they have recommended regular

maintenance/cleaning. Accordingly, on the basis of the Unbloc report and subject to normal periodic cleaning, we have assumed that major repairs on the below ground drains are unlikely to be required within the foreseeable future.

Recommended Phasing of Works & Budget Costings

The budget costings given in the following section of this report are based on present day costs and make no allowance for inflation. The costings also exclude professional fees and VAT, which will need to be added.

YEAR 1 (2007)

For year 1 of the programme, we would recommend the following work:-

Phase 1 damproofing works (Flat Nos. 8, 40, 48 & adjoining common parts).	£53,000
---------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------

YEAR 2 (2008)

For year 2 of the programme, we would recommend the following work:-

Phase 2 damproofing works (Flat Nos. 15, 24, 32 & adjoining common parts).	£30,000
----------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------

Works to main roof including:-	£23,000
--------------------------------	---------

- essential repairs to roof membrane
- repairs and application of specialist coating system to chimney stacks
- improvements to pipework supports
- re-application of solar reflective paint coating to roof membrane

YEAR 3 (2009)

No major works envisaged.

YEAR 4 (2010)

For year 4 of the programme, we would recommend the following work:-

Repair/redecoration programme to front elevations and Trumans Road elevation. £130,000

Works to include:-

- brickwork repairs and repointing
- repair or rebuilding of defective window arches/lintels
- rendering and stonework repairs
- renewal of defective window sub-cills
- lead cladding to high level stone cornice and bay parapet copings
- essential repairs to common parts windows/doors
- mastic work to window/door frames
- full redecoration including application of waterproof decorative coating system to high level rendering
- adaptations to combined rainwater/waste pipes
- miscellaneous/sundry repairs

YEAR 5 (2011)

For year 5 of the programme, we would recommend the following work:-

Repair/redecoration programme to rear elevations £80,000

Works to include:-

- rendering repairs
- renewal of defective window sub-cills

- repointing and rebuilding of defective window arches (Block 1-8 only)
- mastic work to window/door frames
- full redecoration including application of waterproof decorative coating system to rendered surfaces
- essential pipework repairs
- miscellaneous/sundry repairs

YEAR 6 (2012)

For year 6 of the programme, we would recommend the following work:-

Redecoration programme to internal common parts	£45,000
-------------------------------------------------	---------

Works to include:-

- full redecoration
- renewal of floor coverings
- provision of emergency lighting

YEAR 7 (2013)

No major works envisaged.

YEAR 8 (2014)

Works to main roof including:-	£18,000
--------------------------------	---------

- any further essential repairs to roof membrane
- allowance for any further essential repairs and re-application of specialist coating system to chimney stacks
- re-application of solar reflective paint coating to roof membrane

YEAR 9 (2015)

No major works envisaged.

YEAR 10 (2016)

For year 10 of the programme, we would recommend the following work:-

Repair/redecoration programme to front elevations and Trumans road elevation	£95,000
------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------

Works to include:-

- any further essential brickwork repairs and repointing
- any further essential rendering and stonework repairs
- any further essential repairs to common parts windows/doors
- mastic work to window/door frames
- full redecoration
- any essential pipework repairs
- miscellaneous/sundry repairs

Please note that the aforementioned costings are not based on estimates from building contractors and are intended to provide only an approximate guide for budget purposes. Accordingly, the figures provided should be treated with due caution. In due course, for each phase of the recommended work, it will be necessary to undertake more detailed inspection of the relevant parts of the building in order to prepare detailed specifications for the purposes of obtaining competitive tenders from selected contractors.

As we have mentioned, the costings given are exclusive of professional fees and VAT. However, as a guide, for works of this type, this firm would typically charge scale fees of 12½ of the net final cost of the works for organising and administering projects with net contract values of less than £100,000, reducing to 11% for projects with contract values exceeding £100,000. These fee scales would include for provision of Planning Supervisor services under the CDM Regulations.

Summary

Within this report, we have set out our recommendations regarding the scope and sequencing of work to be undertaken to the exterior and internal common parts of the building over the next 10 years. We have also provided budget costings for the various works recommended, but have made no allowance for day to day cleaning and maintenance or any allowance for unforeseen and emergency repairs which are likely to be required from time to time with a building of this nature.

Having briefly seen a copy of the lease for one of the flats in the building, we note that this does not appear to be specific regarding the frequency at which either external or internal common parts redecoration should be undertaken although, in our opinion, external redecoration on a six year cycle would normally be appropriate for a building of this age and type, increasing to perhaps seven years in respect of internal common parts redecoration.

As regards the exterior of the building, we note that a repair/redecoration programme was last carried out in 2001/2002. However, it is apparent that the works undertaken were not as comprehensive as we would prefer to have seen, presumably due to financial constraints at the time and the extent of disrepairs which had accumulated in the years preceding the work being undertaken. Given the extent of repairs still required to put the exterior of the building into good repair and also previously unforeseen expenditure required to deal with rising dampness affecting the six flats at the rear of the ground storey, from the information you have provided, it would appear that sufficient funds will probably not be available to repair and redecorate the whole of the outside of the building again in 2008, which we would normally have recommended. Although later than ideal, we have therefore suggested a comprehensive repair/redecoration programme to the front and Trumans Road elevations in 2010, followed by the rear elevations in 2011. Beyond this, we would recommend reverting to a six year external repair/redecoration cycle if possible.

As regards the main roof, we have suggested undertaking certain works in 2008 and an allowance for further works in 2014. However, depending on the extent of any water ingress which may be affecting the building at the present time (we are only aware of any

problem within Flat 33), you may consider it preferable to bring forward at least some of the recommended work into this year.

Regarding the internal common parts, we understand that redecoration was last undertaken in 2003. Although we would ideally recommend redecoration again in 2010, we consider that priority should be given to dealing with the repair/redecoration of the external fabric of the building. Accordingly, we have suggested that common parts redecoration (including replacement of floor coverings) next be carried out in 2012, following which we would recommend reverting to a seven year redecoration cycle.

We trust that the above is satisfactory for your purposes but, if you require clarification of any of the points we have raised, we shall be pleased to hear from you.

Yours faithfully,

Boyce, Evens & Carpenter

c.c Saran Sohi Esq., Emra Ltd.