



**FIRST-TIER TRIBUNAL  
PROPERTY CHAMBER  
(RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY)**

**Case Reference** : **LON/00AY/LRM/2013/0015**

**Property** : **Brixton Hill Court, Brixton Hill  
London SW2 1QX, 1QY, and 1QZ**

**Applicant** : **Springquote Limited**

**Representative** : **Adrian Carr instructed on behalf of the  
Applicant by JP Leitch LLP**

**Respondent** : **Brixton Hill Court RTM Company  
Limited**

**Representative** : **Compton Solicitors LLP- Represented  
by Mr Compton**

**Type of Application** : **For the determination of liability to  
pay costs under s88(2) of CLARA 2002  
and the reasonableness of costs  
incurred.**

**Tribunal Members** : **Ms M W Daley LLB (hons)  
Mr I Thompson FRICS  
Mr A Ring**

**Date and venue of  
Hearing** : ***14 January 2014 at 10 Alfred Place,  
London WC1E 7LR and Reconvened on  
25 February 2014***

Appendix one

IN THE FIRST-TIER TRIBUNAL (PROPERTY CHAMBER)

Case No: LON/00AY/LCP/2013/0015

B E T W E E N :

SPRINGQUOTE LIMITED

Costs Applicant

- and -

BRIXTON HILL COURT RTM COMPANY LIMITED

Costs Respondent

---

APPLICANT'S COSTS SCOTT SCHEDULE  
(for hearing on Tuesday 14/1/14 at 10:00am)

---

**Note: References to numbers in square brackets below are conventional references to the Bundle, Tab and Page numbers of the Trial Bundles.**

Item No.	L's description of work & Bundle Ref to narrative	Amount claimed	Time spent	Grade/Rate	RTM Co's comments/Landlord's submissions	Tribunal Comments & Decision
1.	Telephone attendance on L: JBL contacted by L, stating that it was concerned that there may be a RTM application, explaining nature of development [2,22,357, para 7]	48.30 <i>sum disallowed by Tribunal</i>	0.3	C/£161	The Respondents objection to this item was that the work was carried out prior to claim notice being served. The Applicant states that this work would have had to be carried out, in any event, and although pre action it was work carried out pursuant to the claim notice.	The Tribunal agrees with the submissions of the Respondent as this work was undertaken prior to the claim notice the sum claimed is not reasonable
2.	Drafting	112.70	0.7	C/£161	The	The Tribunal accepts

	emailed advice – Advice to L explaining the RTM process [2,22,357, para 8]	<i>sum disallowed by Tribunal</i>			Respondent repeats its objection. The Applicant repeats its response.	the submissions of the Respondent
3.	Email and telephone advice discussing the emailed advice and providing clarification [2,22,357, para 9]	80.50 <i>sum disallowed by Tribunal</i>	0.5	C/£161	The Respondent repeats its objection. The Applicant repeats its response.	The Tribunal accepts the submissions of the Respondent
4.	Perusing letter enclosing NITP and advising L on implications of the same [2,22,357, paras 10 – 11]	112.70 <i>sum disallowed by Tribunal</i>	0.7	C/£161	The Respondent objects on the grounds that the solicitor and managing agent had no authority at that stage to undertake this work. The Applicant repeats the response above.	The Tribunal accepts the submissions of the Respondent
5.	Disbursements : Obtaining OCEs from HMLR	352.00	-	-	This item is not disputed	The Tribunal finds this sum reasonable and payable
6.	Obtaining OCEs for all 144 flats in the Buildings, printing out and filing to enable JBL to advise on first 5 Claim Notices [2,22,358, paras 16 -17]	790.60 <i>sum claimed reduced to £354.00</i>	6.7 <i>3.5</i>	D/£118	The Respondent objects on the basis that this was not legal work and should be factored in to the overheads. The Applicant does not accept this it was perfectly	The Tribunal accepts the Applicant's submission, however the Tribunal notes that as this was undertaken by a fee-earner it was incumbent on the fee earner to add value and hence carry out the task quicker than an admin clerk . The Tribunal determine that the time allowed

					legitimate work for a grade D fee earner to undertake	should be reduced to half the time claimed
7.	Taking instructions on first 5 claim notices dated 19/2/13 and 20/2/13, advising L in relation to Title Plan, extent of development, whether there were any commercial units in the development, whether there had been any other RTM Co formed in respect of the development, inspecting photos in relation to the question of whether the development consists of one building or two [2,22,358, paras 18-19]	949.90 <i>See below</i>	5.9 <i>see below</i>	C/£161	The Respondent objects to items 7 & 8, and does not think that the time claimed is reasonable, the Applicant offers one hour for each notice. The Applicant submits that detailed checking of the title, plan etc was necessary and that the work was undertaken by a grade C fee-earner as appropriate.	The Tribunal having carefully considered the items specified in items 7 & 8 considers that given that this task was undertaken by a fee- earner, who was legally qualified that the time claimed is excessive the Tribunal finds that a qualified fee-earner should have taken no more than one day for items 7 & 8
8.	Considering first 5 claim notices dated 19/2/13 and 20/2/13, cross checking details disclosed in OCEs against schedules attached to the 5 claim notices and checking whether the claim notices	3,187.80 <i>The Tribunal find the sum of £1288 reasonable and payable</i>	19.8 <i>Time for 7 &amp; 8 allowed at 8 .00</i>	C/£161		

	complied with the legislation [2,22,358, paras 20-21]					
9.	Obtaining and inspecting RTM Co's Articles and Memorandum of Association and considering [2,22,359, para 22]	241.50	1.5	C/£161	The Respondent states that this work could have been carried out within 0.5 hours. The Applicant asserts that the time taken was reasonable	The Tribunal notes that the Respondent gave no basis for the submissions. The Tribunal finds the time taken and the sum charged reasonable and payable
10.	Drafting email advice to L on the grounds available to L to challenge the validity of the first 5 claim notices [2,22,359, para 23]	193.20	1.2	C/£161	The Respondent says that there is a lack of detail on the length of the advice	The Tribunal notes the complexity of the issues raised in the notice. Accordingly the Tribunal finds that the time taken was reasonable and the sum claimed payable.
11.	Drafting counter-notices to each of the first 5 claim notices [2,22,359, para 24]	2,270.10 <i>reduced by the Tribunal to £1127.00</i>	14.1 <i>total time allowed 7 hours</i>	C/£161	The Respondent says that the drafting for both items 11 & 12 was largely proforma and accordingly that the time claimed was excessive for this drafting.	The Tribunal notes that there were 5 notices, and that as such this would have taken more time, however
12.	Considering second 3 Claim Notices dated 12/3/13 [2,22,359, paras 25-27]	1,529.50 <i>reduced by the Tribunal to £483.00</i>	9.5 <i>total time allowed 3 hours</i>	C/£161	The Applicant state that they attempted to reduce the number of notices that they needed to respond to, and as this	the Tribunal considers that the first notices would have taken the most time and subsequent notices would have been quicker, as there was an element of duplication, accordingly the total

					was not possible the time taken was reasonable.	time allowed is 7 hours for item 11 and one hour per notice for item 12
13.	Composing letter dated 26/3/13 to RTM Co's solicitors, inviting them to withdraw second set out Claim Notices [2,22,360, para 28]	32.20	0.2	C/£161	Items 13 & 14 accepted as reasonable and payable by the Respondent	Sums claimed for items 13 & 14 are determined to be reasonable and payable
14.	Taking instructions on and advising L in relation to the second set out Claim Notices [2,22,360, para 29]	273.70	1.7	C/£161		
15.	Drafting second 3 counter-notices [2,22,360, para 30]	1,400.70 <del>£483.00</del>	8.7 <del>3.00</del>	C/£161	The Respondent did not consider that the time claimed was reasonable, as much of the information needed had already been drafted, as such there would have been a degree of duplication. The Applicant did not accept this, stating that the time taken was reasonable	The Tribunal having seen the counter notices considers that a reasonable time, for drafting of these notices was three hours.

16.	Considering RTM Co Solicitors' letter dated 27/3/13 and enclosures [2,22,360, para 32]	193.20	1.2	C/£161	The Respondent considered that a reasonable time for this should be no more than 1 unit. The Applicant stated that this was a "dense" letter which required the consideration of authorities	The Tribunal notes that the Respondent's solicitor wrote this letter fully expecting it to be read. Accordingly the Tribunal allows the sum claimed in full.
17.	Taking instructions from L and drafting letter dated 18/4/13 to RTM Co's solicitors [2,22,360, para 33]	322.00 <b>£80.50</b>	2.0 <b>0.5</b>	C/£161	The Respondent considered that the sum allowed for this ought to be reduced to 1/3 to reflect the fact that issues were found in the RTM Company's favour. The Applicant rejected these submissions	The Tribunal noted that the Applicant was not required to respond to each of the issues in detail, and in so doing they were effectively rehearsing the litigation in correspondence. The Applicant ought to have taken a more prudent approach. The sum allowed as reasonable is £80.50
18.	Considering RTM Co's solicitors' letter dated 22/4/13 [2,22,360, para 34]	48.30	0.3	C/£161	Both parties accepted this sum as reasonable	The Tribunal determines that this sum is reasonable and payable
19.	Taking L's instructions in respect of RTM Co's solicitors' letter dated 22/4/13 and drafting reply dated 30/4/13	322.00 <b>£161.11</b>	2.0 <b>1.0</b>	C/£161	Both parties accepted this sum as reasonable	The Tribunal determines that this task should have taken no longer than 1 hour and reduces the amount allowed to £161

	[2,22,60, para 35]					
20.	Considering RTM Co's solicitors' letter dated 7/5/13 enclosing the substantive application [2,22,361, para 36]	134.40	0.7	B/£192	Both parties accepted this sum as reasonable	The Tribunal determines that this sum is reasonable and payable
21.	Considering LVT directions dated 10/5/13 [2,22,361, para 37]	76.80	0.4	B/£192	The Respondent considered that the time taken was excessive, and that it should be capped at 1 unit. The Applicant asserts that the time taken was reasonable	Tribunal accepts that it was reasonable for the Applicant to take some time in considering the directions and what was required. The time taken was reasonable. The time is allowed.
22.	Advising L by email and subsequently over the telephone in relation to the application [2,22,361, para 37]	134.40 <del>£96.00</del>	0.7 <del>0.5</del>	B/£192	The Respondent considers that no more than 2 units should be allowed for this item. The Applicant asserts that the time taken was reasonable	The Tribunal considers that a reasonably competent grade B solicitor ought to have taken no more than 30 minutes to undertake this work.
23.	Drafting instructions to counsel to draft L's Statement of Case, referring to the 8 claim notices and 8 counter-notices and explaining grounds of L's	384.00	2.0	B/£192	The Respondent considered that the time taken was excessive and suggests that the sum claimed be limited to 0.5 hours. The	The Tribunal accepted the submissions of the Applicant on this issue. The sum claimed is reasonable and payable.



	opposition to application [2,22,361, paras 38-39]				Applicant asserts that this was a complicated RTM application and that the time taken was reasonable	
24.	Liaising with counsel's clerk, receiving counsel's advice by telephone and relaying counsel's advice to L [2,22,361, para 40]	518.40 <i>£192.00</i>	2.7 <i>1.00</i>	B/£192	The Respondent considered that the time taken was excessive and suggests that the sum claimed be limited to 0.5 hours. The Applicant asserts that the time taken was reasonable	The Tribunal considers that a reasonably competent grade B solicitor ought to have taken no more than one hour
25.	Disbursements : Counsel's fees for advice and drafting Statement of Case, Justin Bates, called 2003 [2,22,361, para 40]	750.00	-	-	This item was agreed as reasonable	The Tribunal finds that the sum claimed is agreed as reasonable
26.	Considering and checking Statement of Case drafted by counsel [2,22,361, para 40]	230.40 <i>£192.00</i>	1.2 <i>1.00</i>	B/£192		The Tribunal noted that counsel had been paid at some expense to draft it and accordingly the Tribunal considers that one hour would have been sufficient.
27.	Considering LVT's letter dated 10/5/13 and enclosed directions. Liaising with counsel in				The Respondent considered that the time taken for items 27-30 one unit per	The Tribunal does not accept that these matters should be considered on the basis put forward by the Respondent. However the Tribunal

	relation to directions. Drafting letter to LVT dated 30/5/13 [2,22,362, paras 42-43]				letter in and one unit per letter out.	noted that
28.	Considering RTM Co's solicitors' long letter dated 31/5/13 [2,22,362, para 44]				The Applicant asserts that the time taken in respect of items 27-30 was reasonable	these matters were dealt with by an experienced fee-earner and accordingly limits the time to 1 hour for items 27-30
29.	Writing letter to LVT and RTM Co's solicitors dated 4/6/13 [2,22,362, para 45]					See above
30.	Considering letter from LVT dated 3/6/13 [2,22,362, para 46]	326.40 <i>£192</i>	1.7 <i>1 hour</i>	B/£192		See above
31.	Considering RTM Co's lengthy Statement of Case in Reply [2,22,362, para 48]	633.60 <i>See below</i>	3.3 <i>See below</i>	B/£192	The Respondent objects on the grounds that counsel was instructed and given this, they query whether a detailed consideration of this document was necessary.	The Tribunal considers that it was perfectly proper for the Applicant's solicitor to consider this document, however the Tribunal does see a distinction between a solicitor who
32.	Liaising with and receiving advice from counsel and taking	787.20 <i>£288.00</i>	4.1 <i>Total time allowed 1.5</i>	B/£192	The Respondent considered that item 31	is instructed to represent the Applicant at the hearing, and one who

	instructions from L [2,22,363, paras 49-51]		<i>hours</i>		& 32 should be considered together. The Applicant state that it was perfectly proper for the solicitor to consider the documents, and further it was a “dense statement” which required detailed consideration .	will be instructing counsel. In accordance with this, the Tribunal determines that an experienced fee-earner who has had conduct of this matter from the outset should be able to consider the statement and instruct Counsel in one and a half hours. The Tribunal notes that the Solicitor had instructed counsel in this matter. The Tribunal determines that the time claimed should be limited to one half hours for both heads of charge
33.	Considering and checking hearing bundle and index upon receipt from RTM Co’s solicitors and taking instructions from L on photographs included in the Bundle [2,22,363, paras 52-53]	1,056.00 <i>£576.00</i>	<i>3.00</i>	B/£192	The Respondent stated that there was an element of duplication in this matter with the time taken above. The Applicant asserts that the time taken was reasonable	The Tribunal determines that the time taken was excessive. This work was undertaken by an experienced Grade B fee earner accordingly he should have been able to undertake this work in 3 hours
34.	Considering WS of James Compton in relation to NITPs, taking instructions from L on contents of WS and passing L’s comments on to counsel [2,22,363, para 54]	153.60 <i>£96.00</i>	0.8 <i>0.5</i>	B/£192	The Respondents stated that it was necessary to do a witness statement as the Applicant raised issues at a late stage. The Applicant denies this	The Tribunal having seen the statement considers that although it was reasonable to consider the statement, the time taken should not have taken more than 0.5 hours.

					stating that these issues relate to matters that were in the statement.	
35.	Drafting and filing L's Statement of Costs dated 20/6/13 [2,22,363, para 55]	192.00 <b>£118.00</b>	1.0	B/£192 <b>Grade D fee earner appropriate</b>	The Respondent considers that this matter relates to "... cost on cost". The Applicant asserts that the sum claimed is reasonable.	The Tribunal determines that cost are payable, however the that this task was about compiling information held by the Applicant's solicitor and as such this could have been undertaken by a grade D fee-earner
36.	Considering and checking Skeleton Argument prepared by counsel [2,22,364, para 56]	787.20 <b>£96.00</b>	4.1 <b>0.5</b>	B/£192	The Respondent objects on the grounds that counsel was instructed and given this, they query whether a detailed consideration of this document was necessary, and note that J B Leitch has not provided any evidence to support the time taken. The Applicant's stated that it was necessary for the instructing solicitor to check for	The Tribunal noted that the Applicant had instructed counsel to prepare this on the Applicant's behalf. Having considered this document in detail, the Tribunal consider that the Applicant has not satisfied it that the time taken was reasonable. In the absence of an explanation, the Tribunal considers that a reasonable time for this task was 0.5 hours

					accuracy.	
37.	Considering Skeleton Argument prepared by RTM Co's solicitors [2,22,364, para 56]	787.20 <b>£96.00</b>	4.1 <b>0.5</b>	B/£192	The parties repeated their reasoning set out in item 36 in relation to the Respondent's skeleton argument	The Tribunal determines for the reasons set out above that as Counsel was instructed the Applicant's solicitor did not need to consider this document for 4 hours. The time determined as reasonable is 0.5 hours
38.	Liaison with counsel up to final hearing [2,22,364, paras 57-59]	652.80 <b>£192.00</b>	3.4 <b>1.00</b>	B/£192	The Respondent stated that there was no evidence as to the impact that the solicitor had or why such lengthy liaison was necessary. The Applicant stated, that the time taken and the degree of liaison was proportionate and appropriate.	The Tribunal noted that there was no witness statement from the Applicant's solicitor setting out in any detail the issues which lead to the time taken. In the absence of such detailed information the Tribunal considers that 1 hours liaison is reasonable
39.	Liaison with Mr Heimann up to final hearing [2,22,364, paras 57-59]	768.00 <b>£192.00</b>	4.0 <b>1.00</b>	B/£192	The parties repeated the arguments set out above	The Tribunal determined this matter on the same basis as set out above.
40.	Liaison with RTM Co's solicitors and LVT up to final hearing [2,22,364, paras 57-59]	480.00 <b>£192.00</b>	2.5 <b>1.00</b>	B/£192	The parties repeated the arguments set out above	The Tribunal determined this matter on the same basis as set out above. The Tribunal has allowed a total of 1 hour for liaison with counsel which we consider is appropriate and proportionate

41.	Disbursement: Brief to Counsel for final hearing (Adrian Carr, called 1999)	2,500.00	-	-	Agreed as reasonable	Determined as reasonable
42.	Disbursement: Attendance of Mr S Heimann FRICS (Chartered Surveyor and Consultant in employ of L's managing agent) at final hearing - 8 hours including 2 hours' travelling time at £150 per hour [2,22,364, para 57]	1,200.00 <b>£900.00</b>	-	-	The Respondent stated that it was not necessary for the managing agent to come to the hearing. The Applicant stated that in the absence of the Applicant it was necessary to have the agent in attendance to provide detailed instructions	The Tribunal determines that it was necessary for the managing agent to attend, however the Tribunal does not consider that time should be paid for travel The Tribunal has disallowed the Travel time
43.	Disbursement: Brief to counsel to draft Written Closing Submissions [2,22,365 paras 63-65]	1,000.00	-	-	The Respondent did not accept that an additional fee should be paid to counsel. The Applicant stated that this fee was incurred as a result of a wrong time estimate from the Respondent which resulted in the Applicant having to provide written	The Tribunal accepts the argument advanced by the Applicant

					closing submissions.	
44.	Drafting instructions counsel to draft Written Closing Submissions, liaison with counsel's clerk and counsel, considering and checking Written Closing Submissions [2,22,365, paras 63-65]	748.80 <i>sum disallowed in full</i>	3.9	B/£192	The Respondent stated that no solicitor had attended and counsel who was at the hearing knew what was required. The Applicant repeated that this was reasonable	The Tribunal accepted the argument advanced by the Respondent. The instructing solicitor only needed to telephone and confirm that counsel was asked to settle the closing submissions.
45.	Considering RTM Co's Written Closing Submissions [2,22,365, para 66]	192.00 <i>£96.00</i>	1.0 <i>0.5</i>	B/£192		The Tribunal considers that as counsel was instructed to settle the closing argument the total allowed for this item should not exceed 0.5 hours
46.	Drafting L's costs Costs Application under s.88(4) dated 28/6/13	748.80 <i>£192.00 for items 46 and 47</i>	3.9	B/£192	The Respondent did not accept that items 46-47 were payable as it was "cost on cost"	The Tribunal allowed items 46-47, however the time is limited to 1 hour for items 46-47
47.	Preparing L's Costs Schedule dated 28/6/13	134.40 <i>disallowed: cost included in item 46</i>	0.7	B/£192	The Applicant repeated the argument on this issue	
48.	Advising L that Mr Heimann should attend physical Inspection, considering plan produced by RTM Co at the Inspection, writing to the FTT to complain	499.20 <i>sum disallowed in full</i>	2.6	B/£192	The Respondent considered that the time taken was not necessary. The Applicant asserts that the time taken was reasonable	The Tribunal was concerned that no plan was produced at the hearing. This was an oversight on the Applicant's behalf. The Applicant as landlord to the premises should have had a plan. The Tribunal considers that, in the

	about the plan being adduced as evidence at the Inspection, considering FTT's invitation to make submissions in respect of the new plan [2,22,365, paras 67-73 and 75]					circumstances it was wrong for the Applicant to take issue with the plan given by the Respondents to the tribunal. The sum claimed is disallowed.
49.	Disbursement: Mr Heimann attendance at Inspection: 3 hours including travel at £150 per hour [2,22,366, para 77]	450.00 <del>£150.00</del>	-	-	The Respondent stated that it was not necessary to attend the inspection. The Applicant considered that it was reasonable and proportionate	The Tribunal considers that it was necessary for the managing agent to attend, however the Tribunal does not consider the travelling time to be reasonable, on the same basis as set out above
50.	Drafting written submissions in relation to the new plan [2,22,365, paras 67-74]	288.00 <del>£0.00</del>	1.5	B/£192		The Tribunal did not consider any additional submissions from the Applicant, in any event the plans should in the tribunal's view have been non-controversial, given this, the Tribunal considers that the work undertaken by the Applicant was not reasonable.
51.	Liaison with FTT and updating L in relation to determination [2,22,366, paras 78-80]	652.80 <del>£384.00</del>	3.4 <del>2.00</del>	B/£192	The Respondent considered that the time taken, in relation to items 51-52	The Tribunal considers that these items should be considered together, and that although it was appropriate to liaise with the Landlord in



					was excessive, and suggests that the sum claimed be limited to 0.5 hours. The Applicant asserts that the time taken was reasonable	relation to the decision, a grade B fee-earner should have been able
52.	Considering determination and advising L of implications of determination [2,22,367, para 80]	460.80 <i>See above</i>	2.4	B/£192		to undertake this task in 2 hours. The Tribunal has accordingly limited the time considered reasonable to 2hours for both items
53.	Considering FTT directions dated 25/9/13	76.80	0.4	B/£192	The Respondent noted that he had no letter before action or other opportunity to consider settling the cost prior to directions being given.	The Tribunal notes the wide ranging objections raised by the Respondents in relation to the costs schedule which in the Tribunal's opinion mean that the Application would have been necessary in any event.
54.	Preparation of costs Schedule dated 10/10/13	115.20 <i>£96.00</i>	0.6 <i>0.5</i>	B/£192	The Applicant did not accept the criticism made in relation to items 53 and 54	The Tribunal considers that the sum claimed in item 53 was reasonable and that the time claimed in relation to item 54 ought to be limited to 0.5 hours
55.	Perusal and consideration of other documents not covered above	1,127.00 <i>Disallowed in full</i>	7.0	C/£161	The Respondent criticises items 55 & 56 on the grounds that there is no detailed information on what was	The Tribunal noted that there was no witness statement from the Applicant's solicitor setting out in any detail the issues which lead to this work being undertaken, or why it was necessary for the

					done and why this work was considered to be necessary	length of time taken. In the absence of such detailed information the Tribunal considers the sum claimed to be not reasonable or payable.
56.	Perusal and consideration of other documents not covered above	1,363.20 <i>Disallowed in total</i>	7.1	B/£192	The Applicant asserts that the sums claimed for items 55 & 56 were reasonable.	See above
57.	Consideration of RTM Co's Reply dated 23/10/13 to L's Costs Application	614.40 <i>£192.00</i>	3.2 <i>1.00</i>	B/£192	The Respondent considered that the time taken in relation to items 57-58, was excessive. The Applicant asserts that the time taken was reasonable	The Tribunal accepts the submissions of the Respondent in relation to items 57-58, in the absence of detailed information from the Applicant's solicitor the Tribunal considers that 2 hours total for these items are
58.	Drafting L's Further Comments on Costs Application	1,824.00 <i>£192.00</i>	9.5 <i>1.00</i>	B/£192	The Respondent considers that this was not reasonable the Applicant claims that these expenses were reasonable and payable	payable. The Tribunal has reviewed this document and considers that the time taken was excessive, the Tribunal have allowed one hour for this task.
59.	Reviewing documents and preparing draft costs application bundle index	1,670.40 <i>£768.00</i>	8.7 <i>4.00</i>	B/£192	The Respondent considered that the time taken in relation to this item, excessive. The Applicant asserts that the time	This work was undertaken by an experienced Grade B fee earner who had conduct of this matter through- out accordingly he should have been able to undertake this task in 4.00 hours

					taken was reasonable	
60.	Copying and pagination of costs bundle	2,006.00 <i>£736.00</i>	17.0 4.00	D/£118 <i>At £192.00</i>	The Respondent considered that the time taken in relation to this item, excessive. The Applicant asserts that the time taken was reasonable. The Applicant referred to the bundle in evidence.	The Tribunal noted the bundle and having considered whether an Applicant would consider this reasonable, the Tribunal considers that a paying party would have expected the firm to have paid for a professional printing . The Tribunal have made an allowance for this in the sum of £500.00 as disbursement plus 2 hours of time at the £118.00 rate for overseeing this collation.
61.	Supervising copying and preparation of Costs Application Bundle	518.40 <i>£118.00</i>	2.7 <i>1.00</i>	B/£192	The Respondent considered that the time taken in relation to this item, excessive. The Applicant asserts that the time taken was reasonable. The Applicant referred to the bundle in evidence.	The Tribunal considers that it was appropriate for a grade D fee-earner to undertake this work. The Tribunal has allowed 1 hour for this work
62.	Drafting brief to counsel	403.20	2.1	B/£192	No objection to this item	This item is allowed
63.	Consideration of Miscellaneous documents not covered above	614.40 <i>disallowed in full</i>	3.2	B/£192	See the parties response	See the Tribunal's response in relation to 55 above
64.	Brief to counsel (Adrian Carr,	1,750.00	-	-	This was agreed as reasonable	The Tribunal determines that this sum is reasonable and

	called 1999) for costs application				and payable	payable
	<b>Total:</b>	<b>42,271.1 0 claimed</b>  <i>Total amount allowed by Tribunal : £18,727. 80</i>				