



LON/NL/3394/05

**LEASEHOLD VALUATION TRIBUNAL FOR THE**  
**LONDON RENT ASSESSMENT PANEL**

**DECISION OF THE LEASEHOLD VALUATION TRIBUNAL  
ON AN APPLICATION UNDER SECTION 48 OF THE LEASEHOLD REFORM,  
HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT ACT 1993**

---

<b>Property:</b>	3 Leo Court, 32 Augustus Close, Brentford Dock, Brentford, TW8 8QX
<b>Applicant</b>	Royal Bank of Canada Trustees Limited as Trustees of the Radcliffe Unit Trust
<b>Represented by:</b>	Mr G. Stevenson, Solicitor, Messrs Stevensons
<b>Respondent</b>	The Mayor & Burgess of the London Borough of Hounslow
<b>Hearing:</b>	9 January 2007
<b>Tribunal:</b>	Mrs J S L Goulden JP Mrs E Flint DMS FRICS IRRV

## **DECISION**

At the hearing held on 9 January 2007 Mr G Stevenson, solicitor, of Messrs Stevensons appeared on behalf of the Applicant, The Royal Bank of Canada Trustees Limited as Trustees of the Radcliffe Unit Trust. There were no other appearances.

The only matter in issue before the Tribunal was in respect of the terms of the proposed new lease.

The existing lease is dated 24 August 1992 and made between The Mayor and Burgess of the London Borough of Hounslow (1) and A and P J Laxton (2). That lease had been assigned to the Applicant tenant, Royal Bank of Canada Trustees Limited on or about 4 June 2004. Accordingly the parties to any new lease could only be the Respondent and Applicant. It is therefore not clear why Brentford Dock Limited were named as the Second Respondent in the application to the Tribunal which was dated 13 January 2005.

A letter from the London Borough of Hounslow dated 9 January 2007 was faxed to the Tribunal on the same date confirming the agreement to the proposed new lease terms. There are therefore no issues in respect of which the Tribunal is required to make a determination.

The application before the Tribunal is dismissed. Although the Tribunal was considering requesting written submissions in respect of penal costs against Brentford Dock Limited in respect of delay and disregard of the Tribunal's directions (including an order to attend), in view of information received during the hearing as to the serious illness of the solicitor with conduct of the case on behalf of Brentford Dock Limited, the Tribunal does not consider it appropriate to consider the question of penal costs in these particular circumstances and the solicitor appearing on behalf of the Applicant was so advised at the hearing.

CHAIRMAN ..... 

DATE ..... 12 January 2007