

## FLAG questions and responses to leaseholder enquiries re Haringey's Door Replacement plans.

A number of individual leaseholders, plus FLAG, have raised issues around the door replacement proposals. Below is a list of the issues raised and responses so far. It's worth noting that there are contradictions in the replies. The blue text or italicised text are Council responses. Black or red text is leaseholder/FLAG.

1. **Which properties:** We were provided with a list of properties by the project manager and have checked this with them several times. It appears that Leasehold Services are working from a different list. We have asked for clarification.
2. **Timeline.** We asked for the anticipated installation timeline for the estate. The response was: *the blocks on Ferry Lane as a whole will vary over 2027 and 2028, this has not yet been awarded so I cannot give any clearer timeline*
3. **External Funding.** We asked if there was any Government funding for the works as they are fire safety related. This was the response: *The door replacement programme for tenanted properties is funded through the Council's own capital budget for fire safety works. It was established following heightened fire safety requirements introduced after the Grenfell Tower incident, particularly around fire doors and compartmentation. To my knowledge, this programme is not funded by central government or external bodies such as the GLA. There is no specific central government grant attached to this programme; it is locally funded and managed as part of the wider fire safety capital programme.*
4. **Previous works.** We asked Haringey to provide the manufacturers name and model for the fire-retardant front doors installed in flats on our estate as Part of the Decent Homes programme during 2012 and 2013, together with their fire protection specifications and ISO standards they were expected to meet. Their response was: *We no longer hold data from works carried out in 2012 and therefore cannot provide the data you have requested.* We have submitted a further Freedom of Information request regarding records of all the major works done under the Decent Homes programme eg. new roofs
5. We asked 'Most of the existing doors were replaced as part of the Decent Homes Work in 2013. Have you checked the specification of the existing doors before deciding to replace hundreds of doors?' Answer: **Yes and requirements changed in the Fire Safety regulations 2022, hence the need for replacement.** (nb. **FLAG This appears to be wrong as the previous answer was that Haringey doesn't have any data on the existing doors**)
6. **Fire Risk Assessments (FRA):** Please confirm that the current doors have undergone an FRA and provide copy of the outcomes. **Please see the FRA attached for Kessock Close, we also had our surveyor attend in March last year to confirm which exact doors were to be replaced, this is also attached. The report states explicitly regarding the doors** "All other flats were fitted with composite flat entrance doors. This could allow smoke/fire to spread into the communal area if the doors are not appropriately Fire Resisting. Management to confirm that the composite flat entrance doors are

appropriately Fire Resisting." No surveyors have assessed the actual doors to confirm if they are fire resisting or not, which is the main argument our resident association was putting forward for the past few months. Please confirm that as per the FRA report a survey is conducted, inside and out of the doors (as this was not done by the surveyors to date) to determine if these are fire resistant or not, before the works being commissioned.

### **Fire Risk Assessment – responsibility to confirm compliance**

The Fire Risk Assessment states: "*Management to confirm that the composite flat entrance doors are appropriately Fire Resisting.*"

As both freeholder and management, the Council is responsible for maintaining accurate records of building components it has installed and for confirming compliance where this is uncertain. The FRA does not conclude that the doors are non-compliant, but instead **places the burden on management to confirm whether they are fire resisting**. Since the Council has confirmed that certification for the existing doors is no longer held, we have asked:

- a. what steps will be taken to assess and confirm whether the current doors are appropriately fire resisting, and
- b. how the outcome of that assessment will be used to determine whether replacement is in fact required, rather than proceeding by default due to missing records.

We asked for copies of any **certification** held and details of any applicable **warranties**. Response: **we have no certification for the composite doors currently installed.**

We understand the Council may no longer hold certification for the doors installed in 2013. If so, **please confirm this**. In those circumstances, it would be unreasonable for the absence of Council records to result in replacement by default or for costs to be passed to leaseholders. Where certification is missing, we would expect the **Council to commission an appropriate assessment** of the existing door before proposing replacement.

**7. Management Fee.** We asked for a brief breakdown of what is covered by the management fee included in the estimate. The response was: *the Home Ownership Team management fee, which is charged at 7.5% of the leaseholders' proportion of block cost, with a minimum charge of £50 and a maximum charge of £500. This management fee covers:*

- *the cost of issuing Section 20 Notices,*
- *dealing with consultation,*
- *calculating leaseholder apportionment,*
- *collating and raising the leaseholder charge and*
- *income recovery*

### **8. Questions about the tendering process and value for money:**

**Q.** A quick search on the internet shows that you can get a fire door installed for around £1,500, and that would be within the higher end of the price range.

Considering that council is "bulk buying" these fire doors for a high number of flats, how could a bid that reaches to £1669, 27 cost and can be called "value for money"? **A. We had a borough wide competitive tender which shows value for money.**

**Q.** Another quick search shows that, London Borough of Hounslow is also running the same exercise of replacing fire doors. And they charge their residents £250. [Flat entrance fire door upgrades | London Borough of Hounslow](#) in comparison to £1669,27 that you would like to charge- this is a cost difference that cannot be overlooked.

Have the costs in the Shellen Security bid been benchmarked against costs for similar works in other Local Authorities? If not, why not and when it would be done? If yes, please provide details how the quote received by Haringey compares to costs of similar door replacement projects (on a cost per door basis) in other London Authorities. **A. We have not benchmarked against other local authorities, but this was a borough wide competitive tender**

- **A. As above we held a borough wide competitive tender. We cannot comment on how other boroughs choose to recharge. We have done a competitive tender process to test against the market, not other local authorities.**

We are happy to share the pricing received in the 3 bids in person, we unfortunately cannot share this electronically as it contains commercially sensitive information. (note. FLAG committee members are arranging to view the documents in person).

**Q.** Noting that Haringey received only one compliant bid for the door replacement project raises a concern regarding the specification and scope of the procurement and the value for money from the outcomes. Please provide details of why Haringey received only three bids, two of which were deemed non compliant, for such a lucrative project and why this procurement was not rerun to get better VFM.

**A. We obtained 3 bids, however during the review of the tender submissions it was found that one contractor had not supplied a response to the social values requirement - why the supplier was not requested to resubmit the bid to maintain competitive tension. This doesn't sound like a critical area of service, which cannot be remedied. That had us with two compliant bidders. Unfortunately, after our financial assessments one of the bidders was not financially secure. It still doesn't explain why Haringey received only three bids for this contract. Has the market been warmed up to this procurement and was feedback sought why other suppliers of door and construction services didn't bid for this contract. Please confirm why this procurement was not rerun following market failure.**

#### **Procurement – social value**

**Q.** Please confirm whether the tender excluded on social value grounds was **more competitive on price** than the remaining compliant bids, and whether any price differential was considered in the value-for-money assessment.

## 9. Formula for calculating charges to leaseholders

Q. I would like to understand the rationale behind using the bedroom formula to distribute the costs. We have been informed previously that every resident will pay for their own door. Could you explain why this is different now? There are no communal doors in my estate. So what is the reason for this? And also, the use of bedroom formula seems quite random. For insurance you don't use it (and it doesn't make sense why you don't use it), for fire door replacement you do (and it doesn't make sense why you use it). A. **the bedroom formula is the calculation of costs in the lease. Our responsibility is to leaseholder and every leaseholder in the building would have received individual calculation of costs relating to the own dwelling. I am unsure why you refer to communal doors in the estate, the works being carried out is to the building & flat entrance doors plus riser/service doors are being replaced**

8. You stated a total cost of over 60k for the fire door upgrade work in my building. What does this cost include (how many fire doors for flat entrance, how many service doors etc) Also, There are residents who are leaseholders and those who are council tenants. Please can you confirm for the purposes of transparency: who is paying for the flats occupied by council tenants? Does the bedroom formula distribute their cost on to leaseholders too? – **the £60k is reflective of the cost of works to the 32 units in your block which is ARMADALE CLOSE xxx-xxx. Leaseholders only pay a proportional cost of the works**

Please provide a cost per door for my block and how it was calculated (I would expect to pay the cost of the door and installation in my flat and not a share of costs for tenants) – **the calculation of costs is provided in the estimate document sent to you. This is done on a proportional basis as per the terms of your lease. Please refer to this. This is not correct. The split of costs only applies if there are communal works, such as roof or insulation. For door replacement, the charges are expected to be per property. Please provide me relevant quote from my lease agreement where it states otherwise. The document provided also doesn't show how the apportioned figure was arrived at. Please provide the formula used and the data input into it (i.e. based on how many doors and communal door replacements per block).**

### Scope of works and communal door charges

Please provide a **clear breakdown of the doors proposed for replacement** in my block (flat entrance, communal, riser/cupboard).

If communal doors are included in the estimate, please explain how this applies to my block, particularly where there are no communal entrance doors serving leaseholders, and why leaseholders should bear a share of such costs. **Block xxx-xxx, 8 Flat entrance doors and 2 riser/service. No communal doors.**

### Cost methodology and absence of a fixed per-door cost

The estimate sets out a global building cost but does not identify a **fixed or indicative cost per flat entrance door**. Please explain:

- Why a **per-door cost** has not been provided **If you wish to see this, we can share this with you in person, I am unable to share it with you over email as it contains commercially sensitive information.**
- How leaseholders can assess **value for money** without this information **Please see above response**
- How costs are apportioned between leaseholder, tenant and communal cupboard doors – **the apportionment is done as per the terms of the lease, and this is on a proportional basis. The consultation document provides the method of calculation**