

---

**IN THE MATTER of the *Body Corporate and Community Management Act 1997* (“the Act”)**

**and**

**IN THE MATTER of a Specialist Adjudication**

BETWEEN:

**Mr James Skenderis**

**(“The Applicant”)**

**and**

**The Body Corporate for Atlantis West**

**(“The Respondent”)**

**ADJUDICATORS ORDER**

Pursuant to appointment by the Commissioner for Body Corporate and Community Management, dated 15 March 2006.

DELIVERED BY:

**WARREN D FISCHER**

Civil Engineer, Grade 2 Arbitrator, Registered Adjudicator and Accredited Mediator

30/69 Leichhardt Street,

SPRING HILL, QLD, 4000

Phone: (07) 3832 1701

Facsimile: (07) 3832 1471

Email: [warren@adrs.com.au](mailto:warren@adrs.com.au)

Web: [www.adrs.com.au](http://www.adrs.com.au)

---

**IN THE MATTER of a Specialist Adjudication**

MR JAMES SKENDERIS v  
THE BODY CORPORATE FOR ATLANTIS WEST

**ORDER OF WARREN FISCHER**  
**Specialist Adjudicator**

**CONTENTS**

<b>Section</b>	<b>Page</b>
Order	3
Parties and representatives	4
Recital of relevant events leading to the dispute	5
Reference to specialist adjudication	8
Procedural steps	9
Findings and reasons	11

**Adjudication regarding:**

Adjustment of Contribution Lot Entitlement Schedule

**Expert Conclave Date:**

12 May 2006

**Delivered as an adjudicators order:**

To the Commissioner for Body Corporate and Community Management on the Twenty Third day of May 2006.

**ORDER**

I, Warren Fischer, appointed specialist adjudicator, order as follows:

That the contribution schedule lot entitlement for each lot in the Atlantis West Community Titles Scheme 8790 be adjusted to be equal except to the extent that is just and equitable in the circumstances, such that the contribution schedule of lot entitlements is as follows:

<b>Lot No</b>	<b>Contribution Schedule Lot Entitlement</b>	<b>Lot No</b>	<b>Contribution Schedule Lot Entitlement</b>	<b>Lot No</b>	<b>Contribution Schedule Lot Entitlement</b>	<b>Lot No</b>	<b>Contribution Schedule Lot Entitlement</b>
1	55	52	61	107	58	150	58
2	55	53	60	108	61	151	56
3	56	54	58	109	60	152	58
4	58	55	56	110	58	153	61
5	56	56	58	111	56	154	60
6	58	57	61	112	58	155	58
7	60	58	60	113	61	156	56
8	60	59	58	114	60	157	58
9	58	60	56	115	58	158	61
12	58	61	58	116	56	159	60
13	60	62	61	117	58	160	58
14	60	63	60	118	61	161	56
15	58	64	58	119	60	162	58
16	56	65	56	120	58	163	61
17	56	66	58	121	56	164	60
18	58	67	61	122	58	165	58
19	60	68	60	123	61	166	56
20	60	69	58	124	60	167	58
21	58	72	58	125	58	168	61
24	58	73	60	126	56	171	56
25	60	74	60	127	58	172	58
26	60	75	58	128	61	173	61
27	58	78	58	129	60	174	65
30	58	79	60	130	58	175	57
31	60	80	60	131	56	176	65
32	60	81	58	132	58	177	65
33	58	84	58	133	61	178	57
36	58	85	60	134	60	179	65
37	60	86	60	135	58	180	69
38	60	87	58	136	56	181	69
39	58	92	60	137	58	182	58
40	56	93	58	138	61	183	58
41	58	96	58	139	60	184	58
42	61	97	60	140	58	185	58
43	60	98	60	141	56	186	58
44	58	99	58	142	58	187	58

Lot No	Contribution Schedule Lot Entitlement	Lot No	Contribution Schedule Lot Entitlement	Lot No	Contribution Schedule Lot Entitlement	Lot No	Contribution Schedule Lot Entitlement
45	56	100	56	143	61	188	58
46	58	101	56	144	60	189	58
47	61	102	58	145	58	190	58
48	60	103	60	146	56	191	65
49	58	104	60	147	58	192	65
50	56	105	58	148	61	AGGREGATE 10006	
51	58	106	56	149	60		

That in accordance with the provisions of Section 48(9) of the Act the body corporate as quickly as practicable lodge a request to record a new community management statement reflecting the adjustment ordered.

For the avoidance of doubt, pursuant to Section 284 of the Act, this Order is to have effect as a resolution without dissent.

That in accordance with the provisions of Section 63(3) of the Act the body corporate is responsible for the costs of preparing and recording the new community management statement.

That pursuant to Section 280(2) of the Act the Applicant and Respondent are jointly and severally liable for the cost of the adjudication. As between themselves the Applicant and Respondent are liable to pay the cost of the adjudication excluding the abandoned conference in equal shares, the cost of the abandoned conference to be paid by the Applicant.

Signed

Warren Fischer  
Specialist Adjudicator  
23 May 2006

Witnessed

Ann Winzar

**PARTIES AND REPRESENTATIVES****Parties****Representatives**

**Mr James Skenderis**  
**Registered Co-owner of Lot 177**  
**("Skenderis")**  
**Applicant**

**Represented by Mr Eric Muir Solicitor**  
**("Muir")**  
**and by Mr Kent O'Brien B.Bldg (Q.S.)**  
**of K&G Strata Consultants Pty Ltd**  
**("O'Brien")**  
**Expert**

**The Body Corporate for**  
**Atlantis West**  
**Community Titles Scheme 8790**  
**c/- The Body Corporate Headquarters**  
**Mr Conrad Beal**  
**("Beal")**  
**Respondent**

**Represented by Mr Clyde Maddock**  
**Body Corporate Treasurer**  
**("Maddock")**  
**and by Ms Kaylene Arkcoll**  
**BSc QS AAIQS AIMM MAppLaw**  
**of Leary & Partners Pty Ltd**  
**("Arkkoll")**  
**Expert**

**RECITAL OF RELEVANT EVENTS LEADING TO THE DISPUTE**

1. The scheme consists of the common property of Atlantis West Community Titles Scheme 8790 and lots 1 to 9, 12 to 21, 24 to 27, 30 to 33, 36 to 69, 72 to 75, 78 to 81, 84 to 87, 92, 93, 96 to 168 and 171 to 181 on Building Unit Plan No. 6435, lot 182 on Building Unit Plan No. 7492, lot 183 on Building Unit Plan No. 7466, lot 184 on Building Unit Plan No. 7453, lot 185 to 190 on Building Unit Plan No. 7485, lot 191 on Building Unit Plan No. 11226 and lot 192 on Building Unit Plan No. 11638 (“the Scheme”). Building Unit Plan 6435 was registered on 27 November 1984.
2. The Scheme is located at 2 Admiralty Drive, Paradise Waters, Queensland.
3. The Scheme common property includes facilities shared with Atlantis East such as the driveway and set down areas, tennis court facilities, recreation facility containing pool, sauna, gym, entertainment room and security office, external visitors parking area, extensive lawns, landscaping and paving as well as non-shared facilities such as lawns, gardens, entrance and lift lobbies, plant rooms, emergency stairs, a further swimming pool, etc.
4. There are one hundred and seventy (170) lots in the Scheme, all residential, the lot titled areas vary from 102 sqm (lots 16, 17, 100 and 101) to 530 sqm (lot 180). All lots have some attaching exclusive use rights over common property, typically for car parking, though some also for entry foyers (lots 72, 73, 117, 118, 164 & 165). There are four (4) one bedroom lots, one hundred and sixteen (116) two bedroom lots, forty eight (48) three bedroom lots, one (1) four bedroom lot and one (1) five bedroom lot.
5. With the exception of an apparent typographical error in respect of lot 55, the contribution and interest lot entitlement schedules contained in the current Community Management Statement (“CMS”) executed on 30 June 2004 are identical. Those schedules provide variations in lot entitlements between 124 (lot 16) and 688 (lot 180) with an aggregate of 37,000.
6. An annual general meeting of the Body Corporate for the Scheme was held on 28 February 2005. At that meeting a motion, proposed by Skenderis, was considered to record a new CMS that altered the contribution schedule lot entitlements such that the contribution schedule lot entitlements reflected in the expert report of O’Brien. That motion failed.
7. Section 227(1)(b) of the Act provides:  
*“227 Meaning of dispute*  
*(1) A dispute is a dispute between—*  
*(b) the body corporate for a community titles scheme and the owner or occupier of a lot included in the scheme”*
8. The failure of Skenderis’s motion at the annual general meeting of the Body Corporate for the Scheme, held on 28 February 2005, gives rise to a dispute as defined in Section 227(1)(b) of the Act between the owner of lot 177 and the body corporate for the Scheme.
9. Section 238(1) of the Act provides:  
*“238 Who may make an application*

- (1) *A person, including, if appropriate, the body corporate for a community titles scheme, may make an application if the person is a party to, or is directly concerned with, a dispute to which this chapter applies.*
10. From 28 February 2005, an application could be made by Skenderis pursuant to Section 238 of the Act.
11. Section 48(1)(b) of the Act provides:
- “48 Adjustment of lot entitlement schedule*
- (1) *The owner of a lot in a community titles scheme may apply [my underlining]*
- (b) *under chapter 6, for an order of a specialist adjudicator for the adjustment of a lot entitlement schedule.”*
12. Pursuant to Section 48(1)(b), any owner in a scheme is entitled to make an application for the adjustment of a lot entitlement schedule. I consider that the reference in Section 48(1)(b) to “*under chapter 6*” is only a reference to the provisions set out in that chapter as to the method and form of application and procedures to be adopted by the Commissioner and Specialist Adjudicator and not a reference to any specific requirement for the existence of a “dispute” as defined in Section 227 of the Act. I consider that the right to make an application for the adjustment of a lot entitlement schedule is provided by Section 48(1).
13. On 25 May 2005, Skenderis lodged a Dispute Resolution Application (“the Application”) for the adjustment of the contribution lot entitlement schedule for the Scheme with the Commissioner pursuant to the provisions of Section 48(1) and Chapter 6 of the Act.
14. These circumstances gave rise to the issue which I was required to consider, namely, “*Record a new Contribution Schedule in accordance with the report of K & G Strata Consultants Pty Ltd dated August 2004... The proposed new Contribution Schedule of Lot Entitlements is attached to this document and marked “B”*”

**REFERENCE TO SPECIALIST ADJUDICATION**

15. Section 48(1)(b) of the Act provides:

*“48 Adjustment of lot entitlement schedule*

*(1) The owner of a lot in a community titles scheme may apply—*

*(b) under chapter 6, for an order of a specialist adjudicator for the adjustment of a lot entitlement schedule.”*

16. Section 265(1)(c) of the Act provides:

*“265 Specialist adjudication of particular disputes*

*(1) The adjudication of a dispute must be specialist adjudication if—*

*(c) another provision of this Act requires the adjudication to be specialist adjudication.”*

17. Section 239(2)(d) of the Act provides:

*“239 How to make an application*

*(2) The approved form for the application must provide for each of the following matters to be stated in the form—*

*(d) for an order about a dispute mentioned in section 265—the name and address of 1 or more persons—*

*(i) considered by the applicant as having the appropriate qualifications, experience or standing for acting as a specialist adjudicator for the application; and*

*(ii) nominated by the applicant for appointment as the specialist adjudicator.”*

18. The Application, lodged on 25 May 2005, provided my name as nominee for appointment as the specialist adjudicator.

19. Section 265(2) of the Act provides:

*“265 Specialist adjudication of particular disputes*

*(2) The specialist adjudicator must be the person chosen by the commissioner, and need not be a person nominated by a party to the application.”*

20. I was nominated as specialist adjudicator by the Commissioner in a letter, copied to the parties, dated 15 March 2006.



## PROCEDURAL STEPS

21. Skenderis lodged the Application with the Commissioner, dated 25 May 2005, relying on a report produced by K&G Strata Consultants Pty Ltd. Subsequent amendments were made to the Application, on 27 July 2005 and 30 August 2005, pursuant to Section 245 of the Act.
22. By correspondence, dated 30 August 2005, the Commissioner notified all lot owners in the Scheme of receipt of the application and invited all lot owners to make submissions on the Application, which was attached to that notice, by 20 September 2005.
23. Included in correspondence from the Body Corporate Manager dated 6 September 2005 was a request for an extension of the closing date for submissions. On 13 September 2005, the Commissioner extended the closing date for submissions to 21 November 2005.
24. On 16 November 2005, by facsimile, the Body Corporate Chairman, Mr Ronald Kilner, requested a further extension of the closing date for submissions. On 17 November 2005, the Commissioner further extended the closing date for submissions to 15 December 2005.
25. On 14 December 2005, by facsimile, the Body Corporate Chairman requested a further extension of the closing date for submissions. By telephone on 14 December 2005, the Commissioner advised that the request for a further extension was refused and that the closing date for submissions remained 15 December 2005.
26. On 15 December 2005, by facsimile to the Minister for Tourism Fair Trading and Wine Industry Development, and 19 December 2005, by facsimile to the Commissioner, the Body Corporate Chairman requested that the Commissioner review the Commissioner's refusal to grant a further extension. On 4 January 2006, the Commissioner further extended the closing date for submissions to 28 February 2006.
27. Twenty (20) submissions were made including a submission by the Body Corporate Chairman on behalf of the Body Corporate. The Body Corporate submission enclosed a copy of an expert report produced by Leary & Partners Pty Ltd but provided no additional written submissions.
28. Section 48(2)(a) of the Act provides:  
*"48 Adjustment of lot entitlement schedule*  
*(2) Despite any other law or statutory instrument—*  
*(a) the respondent for an application mentioned in subsection (1) is the body corporate"*
29. By correspondence, dated 10 April 2006, Beal advised that *"at the recent Committee meeting it was resolved that 'It was agreed that no person be given the task of representing the Body Corporate, and that the matter be left in the adjudicator's hands'"*.
30. By subsequent correspondence, dated 13 April 2006, Beal advised that the *"Body Corporate have advised that Clyde Maddock will attend"*. Beal reconfirmed that advice in further correspondence, dated 27 April 2006.

31. Section 48(2)(b) of the Act provides:
- “48 Adjustment of lot entitlement schedule*
- (2) Despite any other law or statutory instrument—*
- (b) at the election of another owner of a lot in the scheme, the other owner may be joined as a respondent for the application”*
32. Section 48(3) of the Act provides:
- “48 Adjustment of lot entitlement schedule*
- (3) An owner who elects, under subsection (2)(b), to become a respondent for the application must give written notice [my underlining] of the election to the body corporate.”*
33. Following my instructions dated 21 March 2006, Beal, on 30 March 2006, confirmed that a copy of my process notes and directions for the further conduct of the matter had been forwarded to all lot owners in the scheme. Those notes and directions advised all owners that, if wishing to be joined as a Respondent for the application, a written notice of that election was to be provided in accordance with the provisions of Section 48(3) of the Act and that without such notice their submissions could not be considered. Furthermore, I also required that a copy of that notice was provided to me by 5 April 2006.
34. No notices were provided to me by 5 April 2006 in accordance with my directions and it was evident in correspondence, dated 10 April 2006, from Beal that the Body Corporate Manager was also not in the possession of any “lot joinder notices”.
35. By correspondence, dated 21 March 2006, the parties were advised that a conference would provisionally be conducted in conjunction with a view of the Scheme at 10:00 am on 28 April 2006 and that any experts should attend that conference.
36. On 28 April 2006 I duly attended the Scheme. The Respondent’s representative, Maddock, and expert, Arkcoll, also attended. Neither the Applicant nor their expert appeared. Following a telephone conversation with the Applicant, during which they advised that their expert was unable to attend the conference, the conference was adjourned.
37. Following subsequent correspondence the conference was reconvened on 12 May 2006. Maddock in correspondence, dated 1 May 2006, advised *“we will authorise Kaylene, the “expert” from Leary and Partners to be our Representative”*. Similarly, Muir in correspondence, dated 11 May 2006, advised *“that my client will not be personally appearing. He has authorised Mr Kent O’Brien to appear on his behalf.”* Both party’s experts attended the conference.
38. That conference became an expert conclave during which each of the experts reports were discussed and ultimately agreement was reached as to the correct method of assessment for the contribution lot entitlements at Admiralty West when considering the various features of the lots and the scheme.

**FINDINGS AND REASONS**

39. The documents considered in this adjudication include the relevant documentation included within the file forwarded to me by the commissioner and those documents subsequently supplied by Beal upon my request and bearing on the issues, namely:
- a. The Dispute Resolution Application including all attachments thereto;
  - b. The Body Corporate Submission including all attachments thereto;
  - c. The Statement of income and expenditure for the Administration Fund for the period ended 31/12/05;
  - d. The Statement of income and expenditure for the Sinking Fund for the period ended 31/12/05;
  - e. The Administration Fund budget for the period ending 31/12/06;
  - f. The Sinking Fund budget for the period ended 31/12/06;
  - g. The Letting Agreement, dated 4 January 1995;
  - h. The (Property) Management Agreement, dated 4 January 1995; and
  - i. The (Body Corporate Management) Management Agreement, undated.
40. O'Brien's report identifies that in producing that report the following documents were used as reference material:
- a. Statement of accounts for the Administration and Sinking Funds for the periods to 31/12/01, 31/12/02 and 31/12/03 and the budget to 31/12/04;
  - b. The sinking fund forecast prepared by Star Building Management Services in January 2004;
  - c. Extracts from Building Unit Plans 6435, 7485, 7492, 11226 and 11638;
  - d. Community Management Statement Schedule A, C – Bylaws, D and E – Allocated exclusive use areas; and
  - e. Sketch plans A1 to A3, B1 to B3, C, D and EB relating to the car parking spaces and exclusive use areas on several levels.
41. Arkcoll's report identifies that in producing that report the following documents were relied upon:
- a. Community Management Statement 8790;
  - b. Building Unit Plans 6435, 7453, 7466, 7485, 7492, 11226 and 11638;
  - c. Administrative Fund Expenditure for the periods to 31/12/02, 31/12/03 and 31/12/04 and the anticipated budget to 31/12/05;
  - d. The sinking fund forecast prepared by Star Building Management Services in January 2004;
  - e. The architectural plans for the development; and
  - f. Information collected during a site inspection of the development.
42. Following my instructions, dated 21 March 2006, Beal, on 30 March 2006, confirmed that my process notes and directions for the further conduct of the matter had been forwarded to all lot owners in the scheme. Those notes and directions advised all owners that I could not consider any submissions made without an election by that owner to be joined as a Respondent and provided directions for owners wishing to be joined as a Respondent for the application and their subsequent delivery of

submissions in respect to the application by 21 April 2006. No election notices or submissions were received.

43. The parties experts attended a conference which became an expert conclave, at which I remained present, to consider their respective reports and resolve the most appropriate method of assessment for the contribution lot entitlements at Admiralty West when considering the various features of the lots and the scheme in accordance with the requirements of Sections 48 and 49 of the Act. The most appropriate method of assessment and all of the various elements to be considered in that assessment were resolved during that conclave.
44. The outcome sought in the Application is:

*“Record a new Contribution Schedule in accordance with the report of K & G Strata Consultants Pty Ltd dated August 2004.... The proposed new Contribution Schedule of Lot Entitlements is attached to this document and marked “B””*

**Findings on the application for adjustment:**

- i. The existing contribution lot entitlement schedule is not equal.
- ii. The existing contribution lot entitlement schedule is not just and equitable in the circumstances.
- iii. An equal contribution lot entitlement schedule would not be just and equitable in the circumstances.
- iv. That contribution schedule lot entitlements that are equal, except to the extent that it is just and equitable in the circumstances, are as follows:

Lot No	Contribution Schedule Lot Entitlement	Lot No	Contribution Schedule Lot Entitlement	Lot No	Contribution Schedule Lot Entitlement	Lot No	Contribution Schedule Lot Entitlement
1	55	52	61	107	58	150	58
2	55	53	60	108	61	151	56
3	56	54	58	109	60	152	58
4	58	55	56	110	58	153	61
5	56	56	58	111	56	154	60
6	58	57	61	112	58	155	58
7	60	58	60	113	61	156	56
8	60	59	58	114	60	157	58
9	58	60	56	115	58	158	61
12	58	61	58	116	56	159	60
13	60	62	61	117	58	160	58
14	60	63	60	118	61	161	56
15	58	64	58	119	60	162	58
16	56	65	56	120	58	163	61
17	56	66	58	121	56	164	60
18	58	67	61	122	58	165	58
19	60	68	60	123	61	166	56
20	60	69	58	124	60	167	58
21	58	72	58	125	58	168	61
24	58	73	60	126	56	171	56
25	60	74	60	127	58	172	58
26	60	75	58	128	61	173	61
27	58	78	58	129	60	174	65
30	58	79	60	130	58	175	57
31	60	80	60	131	56	176	65
32	60	81	58	132	58	177	65
33	58	84	58	133	61	178	57
36	58	85	60	134	60	179	65
37	60	86	60	135	58	180	69
38	60	87	58	136	56	181	69
39	58	92	60	137	58	182	58
40	56	93	58	138	61	183	58
41	58	96	58	139	60	184	58
42	61	97	60	140	58	185	58

Lot No	Contribution Schedule Lot Entitlement	Lot No	Contribution Schedule Lot Entitlement	Lot No	Contribution Schedule Lot Entitlement	Lot No	Contribution Schedule Lot Entitlement
43	60	98	60	141	56	186	58
44	58	99	58	142	58	187	58
45	56	100	56	143	61	188	58
46	58	101	56	144	60	189	58
47	61	102	58	145	58	190	58
48	60	103	60	146	56	191	65
49	58	104	60	147	58	192	65
50	56	105	58	148	61	AGGREGATE 10006	
51	58	106	56	149	60		

## Reasons

### Legislative Considerations

45. Section 47(2) of the Act provides:

*“47 Application of lot entitlements*

*(2) The contribution schedule lot entitlement for a lot is the basis for calculating—*

*(a) the lot owner’s share of amounts levied by the body corporate, [my **underlining**] unless the extent of the lot owner’s obligation to contribute to a levy for a particular purpose is specifically otherwise provided for in this Act;<sup>1</sup> and*

*(b) the value of the lot owner’s vote for voting on an ordinary resolution if a poll is conducted for voting on the resolution.*

<sup>1</sup> *The regulation module applying to a community titles scheme might provide that a lot owner’s contribution to some or all of the insurance required to be put in place by the body corporate is to be calculated on the basis of the lot’s interest schedule lot entitlement.*

46. Consideration of Section 47(2) would suggest that, of those provisions set out, the only provision capable of quantitative assessment, rather than on some idiosyncratic basis, is that regarding a lot owner’s share of amounts levied by the body corporate.

47. It also makes some commercial sense for the value of a lot owner’s vote (if polled) to be proportional to that lot owner’s share of amounts levied by the body corporate.

48. On that basis, the proper determination of a lot owner’s share of amounts levied by the body corporate, in satisfaction of Section 47(2)(a), would also satisfy Section 47(2)(b).

49. Accordingly, I consider that Section 47(2) requires that when determining a contribution lot entitlement, unless specifically otherwise provided for in the Act (such as some components of insurance premiums), regard should only be had to relevant amounts for which the body corporate is liable.

50. Section 48 of the Act provides that, for the contribution schedule, the order of a specialist adjudicator must be consistent with the principle that the respective lot entitlements should be equal, except to the extent to which it is just and equitable in the circumstances for them not to be equal. Section 48 of the Act provides:
51. Section 48(4)(a) of the Act provides:
- “48 Adjustment of lot entitlement schedule*
- (4) The order of the court or specialist adjudicator must be consistent [my underlining] with—*
- (a) if the order is about the contribution schedule—the principle stated in subsection (5)”*
52. Section 48(4)(a) of the Act limits an adjudicators discretion as it requires that an adjudicators order must be consistent with the stated principles. It also implies that an adjudicator has a duty to ensure that any order made is consistent with the stated principles. For this reason an adjudicator may not, for example, make a consent order.
53. Section 48(5) of the Act provides:
- “48 Adjustment of lot entitlement schedule*
- (5) For the contribution schedule, the respective lot entitlements should be equal [my underlining], except to the extent to which it is just and equitable in the circumstances for them not to be equal.”*
54. Given the provision in Section 48(5) of the Act, once an Applicant has established a prima facie' case that the existing schedule is unjust and unequal the onus then is on the Respondent to place material before me to prove that any departure from equal is just and equitable in the circumstances.
55. Section 49 of the Act provides, inter alia:
- “49 Criteria for deciding just and equitable circumstances*
- (2) This section sets out matters to which the court or specialist adjudicator may, and may not, have regard for deciding—*
- (a) for a contribution schedule—if it is just and equitable in the circumstances for the respective lot entitlements not to be equal; and*
- (3) However, the matters the court or specialist adjudicator may have regard to for deciding a matter mentioned in subsection (2) are not limited to the matters stated in this section.*
- (4) The court or specialist adjudicator may have regard to—*
- (a) how the community titles scheme is structured; and*
- (b) the nature, features and characteristics of the lots included in the scheme; and*
- (c) the purposes for which the lots are used.*
- (5) The court or specialist adjudicator may not have regard to any knowledge or understanding the applicant had, or any lack of knowledge or misunderstanding on the part of the applicant, at the relevant time, about—*
- (a) the lot entitlement for the subject lot or other lots included in the community titles scheme; or*

(b) *the purpose for which a lot entitlement is used.*

(6) *In this section—*

*relevant time means the time the applicant entered into a contract to buy the subject lot.*

*subject lot means the lot owned by the applicant.”*

56. Section 49 provides some criteria for deciding just and equitable circumstances for contribution schedule lot entitlements not to be equal. It enables an adjudicator to have regard to how the community titles scheme is structured, the nature features and characteristics of the lots included in the scheme and the purposes for which the lots are used, but does not limit an adjudicator to have regard to only those matters. However, when considering the earlier analysis of Section 47(2) of the Act, those considerations set out in Section 49 can only be in respect of the impact of those criteria on relevant body corporate expenditure.
57. Section 49(5) specifically prevents an adjudicator from having regard to any knowledge or understanding that the Applicant's had with respect to lot entitlements when they contracted to buy their lot.
58. Consistent with these conclusions, *Fischer & Ors v Body Corporate for Centrepoint Community Title Scheme 7779 [2005] QCA 214* relevantly provides the following at paras 26 to 33:

*[26] Although the Act gives no clear indication one way or the other, the preferable view is that a contribution schedule should provide for equal contributions by apartment owners, except insofar as some apartments can be shown to give rise to particular costs to the body corporate which other apartments do not. That question, whether a schedule should be adjusted, is to be answered with regard to the demand made on the services and amenities provided by a body corporate to the respective apartments, or their contribution to the costs incurred by the body corporate. [my underlining] More general considerations of amenity, value or history are to be disregarded. What is at issue is the 'equitable' distribution of the costs.*

*[27] There are a number of reasons for this conclusion. The first is to be found in the terms of the Explanatory Notes which accompanied the 2003 Act and the content of the second reading speech when the Bill for it was debated. Because the meaning of the Act is unclear it is permissible to consult these materials.*

*[28] Section 10 of the 2003 Act inserted s 46(7) which is in these terms:*

*'(7) For the contribution schedule for a scheme for which development approval is given after the commencement of this subsection, the respective lot entitlements must be equal, except to the extent to which it is just and equitable in the circumstances for them not to be equal.'*

*This replaced an earlier provision, which was repealed by the 2003 Act, to the effect that upon registration a community titles scheme did not have to provide for equal contribution lot entitlements. Explaining the change the Note said:*

*'The change is intended to reinforce the concept that usually all lot owners are equally responsible for the cost of upkeep of common property and for the running costs of the community titles scheme. However, it is recognised that there are many valid instances where the contribution schedules do not have to be equal. The amendment provides that usually the numbers in this schedule are equal, unless it can be demonstrated that it is just and equitable for there to be inequality.'*



*The need for difference is best shown by examples.*

...

*Example 3 In a basic scheme, if all the lots are residential lots ranging in size from a small lot to a penthouse, the contribution schedule lot entitlements generally would be equal. However, the contribution schedule may be different if the penthouse has its own swimming pool and private lift. The contribution schedule should recognise this type of difference. The other lots in the scheme despite being of differing size or aspect would be expected to have equal contribution schedule lot entitlements.'*

[29] *In the Second Reading Speech it was said:*

*'The issue of the nature of the contributions schedule for a body corporate scheme has created some discussion. The guiding principle for both setting and adjusting the contributions schedule is that it involves the equitable sharing of the costs of operating and maintaining the common property. [my underlining and emphasis] These costs should be borne in proportion to the benefit, not in proportion to the unit's value. It is not a contribution linked to an ability to pay, but as a payment for services. [my underlining] ... There is not an argument ... against the fact that, in terms of costs related to a property's value – costs such as rates and insurance – owners whose properties are worth more should pay more. But when we are talking about those parts of a property where the benefits are shared more or less equally, we cannot apply the same formula.'*

[30] *These materials make it tolerably plain that the Act is intended to produce a contribution lot entitlement schedule which divides body corporate expenses equally except to the extent that the apartments disproportionately give rise to those expenses, or disproportionately consume services. That determination can only be made by reference to factors which have a financial impact or consequence on the body corporate. [my underlining] It cannot be affected by factors which go to an apartment's value or amenity.*

[31] *Secondly, the nature of a contribution lot entitlement schedule itself suggests that the allocation of lot entitlements is to be made on the basis of the impact that individual apartments make upon the costs of operating and running a community titles scheme. Contribution lot entitlements determine the apartment's share of the outgoings. The starting point is that the entitlements should be equal. A departure from that principle is allowable only where it is just, or fair, to recognise inequality. The departure must take as its reference point the proposition, from which it departs, that apartment owners should contribute equally to the costs of the building. The focus of the inquiry is the extent to which an apartment unequally causes costs to the body corporate. [my underlining]*

[32] *The third consideration is that if this principle not be the applicable one then there is no basis on which applications for adjustment of a contribution lot entitlement schedules can consistently be made. As the evidence in this application shows, if the inquiry is limited to the extent to which an apartment creates costs, or consumes services, above or below the average, one can readily determine what the contribution lot entitlement should be. The high degree of similarity in the reports of Mr Sheehan and Mr Linkhorn demonstrates this. If the inquiry be wider and include such nebulous criteria as the structure of the scheme, or the nature, features and characteristics of the apartments in the scheme, and the purposes for which they are used, there is no intelligible basis on which there could be a consistent and coherent determination of applications for adjustment of lot entitlements. Each case would be determined idiosyncratically and a vast variety of circumstances might be relied upon to depart from, and therefore erode, the principle said to be paramount, that*

*there should be an equality of entitlements.*

[33] Accordingly I would construe s 49 of the Act, and in particular subsection (4), as meaning that those identified matters to which a court may have regard are to be regarded only to the extent, if any, that they affect the cost of operating a community title scheme. [my underlining]

59. The Court of Appeal has stated that the Act is intended to produce a contribution lot entitlement schedule which divides body corporate expenses equally except to the extent that lots disproportionately give rise to those expenses, or disproportionately consume services. That determination can only be made by reference to factors which have a financial impact or consequence on the body corporate, this judgment is binding not only on me, but on any adjudicator or single judge in Queensland.

### **Scheme Considerations**

60. I now turn to consideration of the matters the legislation requires to be considered in respect of the Scheme.

61. The Applicant's grounds for the Application are set out as follows:

*"Grounds are set out in report of K & G Strata Consultants Pty Ltd dated August 2004.*

*I attach the following documents:-*

*"A" Report of K & G Strata Consultants Pty Ltd dated August 2004*

*"B" Notice of Motion*

*"C" Minutes of Annual General Meeting dated 28 February 2005."*

62. As set out earlier, the Applicant had confirmed by his agent, Muir, that he relied upon O'Brien as his agent at the conference. The Applicant by his agent, Muir, also provided advice, dated 4 May 2006, that he would accept the Arkcoll Report.
63. O'Brien, the author of the O'Brien Report, has tertiary qualifications in building (quantity surveying) and some experience with aspects of body corporate management. The Respondents did not in any submissions, including at conference through Arkcoll, make any submission as to why O'Brien should not be accepted as an expert.
64. I accept the O'Brien Report as that of an expert within their area of expertise for this application and therefore find that it is admissible as expert evidence. The O'Brien Report considers the cost burden of the lots within the scheme on the body corporate expenditure and concludes with a recommended contribution lot entitlement schedule which varies from the existing contribution lot entitlement schedule.
65. The Respondent Body Corporate, as set out earlier, confirmed by its agent, Maddock, that it relied upon Arkcoll as its agent at the conference.
66. Arkcoll, the author of the Arkcoll Report, has tertiary qualifications in quantity surveying and law along with significant experience with numerous aspects of body corporate planning and expenditure. The Applicant did not in his written submissions, or at hearing through O'Brien, make any submission as to why Arkcoll should not be accepted as an expert.

67. I accept the Arkcoll Report as that of an expert within their area of expertise for this application and therefore find that it is admissible as expert evidence. The Arkcoll Report considers the cost burden of the lots within the scheme on the body corporate expenditure and concludes with a recommended contribution lot entitlement schedule which varies from the existing contribution lot entitlement schedule.
68. Both the O'Brien and the Arkcoll Report consider the cost burden that the nature, features and characteristics of the lots within the Scheme place on the body corporate expenditure in extensive detail.
69. Both expert reports provide that the existing contribution lot entitlement schedule is not just and equitable in the circumstances and conclude with a recommended contribution lot entitlement schedule which varies from the existing contribution lot entitlement schedule.
70. For the purposes of determining the relevant body corporate expenditure, I reviewed the following information regarding the scheme;
- a. The sinking fund forecast, dated January 2004;
  - b. Statement of accounts for the Sinking Fund for the periods to 31/12/01, 31/12/02, 31/12/03, 31/12/04 and 31/12/05;
  - c. The current Sinking Fund Budget (to 31/12/06);
  - d. Statement of accounts for the Administration Fund for the periods to 31/12/01, 31/12/02, 31/12/03, 31/12/04 and 31/12/05;
  - e. The current Administrative Fund Budget (to 31/12/06); and
  - f. The O'Brien and Arkcoll reports.
71. For the purposes of determining the impact of the various criteria, for deciding just and equitable circumstances, I reviewed the following information regarding the scheme;
- a. The Community Management Statement;
  - b. The Building Unit Plans;
  - c. The Body Corporate Management, Building Management and Letting Agreements; and
  - d. The O'Brien and Arkcoll reports.
72. Section 49(4) of the Act provides:
- "49 Criteria for deciding just and equitable circumstances*
- (4) The court or specialist adjudicator may have regard to—*
- (a) how the community titles scheme is structured; and*
  - (b) the nature, features and characteristics of the lots included in the scheme; and*
  - (c) the purposes for which the lots are used."*
73. The CMS for the Scheme confirms that the Regulation Module applying to the Scheme is the Body Corporate and Community Management (Standard Module) Regulation 1997.

74. The Scheme is not part of a layered arrangement, neither body corporate has a lot allocation within the other, however the Scheme does share significant of the grounds and facilities with the adjoining Body Corporate for Atlantis East.
75. The by-laws for the scheme are set out in the CMS. By-law 25 provides that all lots shall only be used for residential purposes except lot 1 which may conduct the business of management of the building and for the sale and letting of lots in the building.
76. By-laws 32, 33, 34 and 36 set out various exclusive use entitlements attaching to lots in the Scheme.
77. The first matter addressed by the experts was which report to use as a base document. O'Brien disclosed that, in working for the applicant (as a lot owner), he had not had the same level of information access or opportunity to have queries answered as had Arkcoll, in working for the Body Corporate and having full access to the Body Corporate records. This was considered to have led to a better understanding and approach to numerous of the items in the Arkcoll report.
78. Furthermore it was identified that the Arkcoll Report (December 2005) was prepared sixteen (16) months after the O'Brien report (August 2004), thereby having the benefit of access to an additional year of financial reports and likely to be more accurate at the present time due to the more recent preparation. At the time of preparation of the O'Brien report the 2004 administration fund budget was \$602,500.00, the allowances made in the O'Brien report would have some basis in that budget. The 2004 administration fund actual expenditure was \$679,437.77 an increase of over 10% on the budget figures considered in the O'Brien report. At the time of preparation of the Arkcoll report the 2005 administration fund budget was \$637,320.00, the allowances made in the Arkcoll report would have some basis in that budget. The 2005 administration fund actual expenditure was \$626,629.10 a variation of only 1.7% on the budget figures considered in the Arkcoll report.
79. Therefore it was agreed between the experts, and I concur, that the better report to adopt as a base report was the Arkcoll report ("the Base Report").
80. Prior to the conference I had provided both parties with a list of issues which I wished to have addressed at the conference, that list included the following primary issues:
- Principles to be adopted in determining the apportionment of the 'lot owner' shares of the various costs
  - The basis of determination of each of the various cost to be considered
  - The basis of measurement of each of the items to be considered
81. The experts then turned to consider these issues, in regard to the first, "the Principles", I had identified in my list the following sub-topics:
- Administration Fund, administrative items
- Administration Fund, non-administrative items
- Sinking Fund items
82. Both expert reports provided that all administrative items (such as body corporate administration fees and property management fees) should be proportioned equally amongst all lot owners.

83. I have reviewed the expert reports and additionally the management, caretaking and letting agreements and find nothing in those agreements to conclude differently to the experts that all administrative expenses should be proportioned equally amongst all lots. Neither expert brought to my attention, nor could I locate, any provisions which would suggest that any lot owner(s) received any additional benefit to any other lot owner(s) in regard to the administrative items in the body corporate budget. I therefore concur with the apportionment of these costs equally between all lots.
84. Non administrative items in the “administration fund” (such as repair and maintenance of lifts, buildings and grounds) were treated differently by each expert. Arkcoll had considered each of these items and determined that they should each be apportioned equally between all lot owners, whereas O’Brien having considered these items determined that: Common Power, Fire Control, Contribution Shared Facilities, Repairs and Maintenance to the lifts, building, electrical and plant and equipment should all be apportioned on the basis of the lot area (including its exclusive use car park area) for each lot. Each of these items was discussed in isolation. Following further advice from Arkcoll, particularly in respect of the ‘contribution shared facilities’, O’Brien agreed with Arkcoll that each of these costs should be apportioned equally.
85. All of the items in question relate to common areas of the scheme (including in the instance of ‘Contribution Shared Facilities’ those shared with the adjoining scheme ‘Atlantis East’). O’Brien had apportioned on the basis of lot area considering that the occupancy of each lot would be a factor in the incursion of each of the costs considered. I am of the view that area (including its exclusive use car park area) is not an accurate measure of the occupancy of each lot. I am also of the view that the occupancy of a lot is not a relevant consideration to the cost of running common property lights, plant and equipment, or the servicing thereof, when those items operate for fixed periods irrespective of the occupancy of the building. Furthermore, where the incursion of a cost for the repair of an item is related to use of that item it is equally arguable that factors such of the treatment of those items by the user would be a factor in the incursion of the cost. Clearly, the manner and level of care with which a person treats common property is not related to the occupancy of a lot but rather individual factors which cannot be properly measured for consideration in circumstances such as these. I therefore concur with the apportionment of these costs equally between all lots.
86. With regard to items in the sinking fund, when each of the experts had considered that they should be apportioned other than equally they had typically apportioned them in a different manner. Arkcoll had done so in a quantitative manner (by measuring the quantities of each item) whereas O’Brien had done so by application of the lot area (including its exclusive use car park area) for each lot. O’Brien accepted that Arkcoll’s approach would be more accurate and accepted that was the more appropriate approach.
87. I am of the view that were a cost is incurred that is readily identified as being incurred in proportion to the size, or length or area or number of items, then if available, the most appropriate method of apportionment is in accordance with the measurement of that size, or length or area or number of items. Accordingly, I concur with the apportionment of such cost items in accordance with the measurement of each of those items beneficially to each lot (or where not beneficial to a lot then equally). These items will be considered further when turning to the third issue “the basis of measurement”.
88. In regard to the second issue, “the basis of cost”, I had identified in my list the following sub-topics:

## Adjustments to the Sinking Fund Forecast

## Averaging of Amounts

## Introduced / amended allowances

89. Both expert reports made adjustments to the Sinking Fund Report and both experts had indexed the sinking fund allowances to the date of their respective reports.
90. Although the sinking fund forecast made allowance for the capital cost of lift replacement, the Arkcoll report did not make any capital cost allowance for the future lift replacement. O'Brien argued that such an allowance should properly be included, Arkcoll conceded that such an allowance would be prudent. The amount to allow was then ventilated and it was concluded that an appropriate sinking fund allowance for lift replacement would be \$25,000 per annum. I concurred with and participated in those discussions and upon reaching the above conclusion I instructed Arkcoll to make that amendment to the Base Report.
91. The Arkcoll report made capital cost allowances for future lift carriage refurbishment and window frame replacement. The sinking fund forecast had made no allowance for these costs, O'Brien agreed that such allowances should properly be included in the sinking fund forecast. The amount to allow was then ventilated and it was concluded that the allowances made by Arkcoll in her report were appropriate. I accept the expert opinion as to the adjustments made.
92. The Arkcoll report adjusted the capital cost allowances in the sinking fund forecast for the entrance, foyer and lift lobby refurbishment as the existing areas were considered of such high quality that it was considered that wear and tear would only be a minor factor in any refurbishment and that refurbishment would more likely be voluntary rather than necessary. The adjustment amended the bulk allowances made for the three items to eleven more specific items that were identified would require refurbishment. The financial affect of that adjustment was to reduce the allowances from \$459,712 for the three bulk items to \$188,917 for the eleven specific items. O'Brien agreed that the adjustment was reasonable and the allowances made appropriate and more realistic then those in the sinking fund forecast. I accept the expert opinion as to the adjustments made.
93. Both expert reports, with the Administration fund items, used a combination of either averaged or budget allowances for the purposes of their assessments.
94. The use of appropriate allowances was discussed and it was concluded that where there is a cost item which has shown a progressive increase from year to year then the budget amount should be adopted for analysis where that budget amount is in line with the progressive year to year increase. Typically these costs are associated with contract increases in service contracts with the Body Corporate.
95. The one notable exception was "Repair and Maintenance – Lifts", this item had shown continued increase but the budget item was significantly below that progressive increase. Arkcoll advised that the reason for that change was that the Body Corporate had recently renegotiated that service contract and that the reduced budget allowance reflected the new contract terms, for this item the budget amount was therefore still adopted.
96. It was also concluded that where expenditure was sporadic in nature, the most accurate assessment that could be made would be to average the historical spending. To add to the correctness of an 'averaging' analysis it is necessary to ensure that all historical information considered has been appropriately indexed such that when averaging a truer reflection of the current day cost average is obtained. A

review of the items which would require such adjustment made evident that in the majority of instances those items were minor expenses and therefore any adjustment would be insignificant and of negligible impact on the assessment. Due to commercial considerations those items were not pursued, however there remained one item which was significant enough to index and for which the index itself was also not insignificant. That item was "Repair and Maintenance – Building and General" which, without indexing, averaged \$22,240.56 per annum. It was considered, and agreed by both Arkcoll and O'Brien, that the applicable index for this item would be the Building Price Index. I therefore instructed Arkcoll to make that further amendment to the Base Report. Having reviewed the amended Base Report, I make the observation that the averaged allowance used for "Repair and Maintenance – Building and General" item increased to \$27,003.01 per annum.

97. Although the Arkcoll report identifies that the Act provides that insurance, other than building replacement insurance, is to be shared on the basis of the contribution lot entitlement schedule it does not make any allowance for that insurance when undertaking the assessment. O'Brien had made an allowance of \$5,000 for Public Liability insurance when undertaking his assessment. This matter was discussed further, that discussion brought to light that while the Body Corporate do have public liability insurance the cost of that insurance is not itemised separately to the building replacement insurance on its renewal notice. It was agreed that the building replacement insurance would constitute the bulk of the \$70,000 insurance budget (\$63,051.06 cost year ending 31 December 2004). O'Brien advised that the allowance made in his report of \$5,000 did not take into account the advice from Arkcoll that the 'Contribution Shared Facilities' included the insurance costs for those shared facilities. The shared facilities, on Arkcoll's advice, are shared with 'Atlantis East' and include part of; the driveway and set down areas, tennis court facilities, recreation facility containing pool, sauna, gym, entertainment room and security office, external visitors parking area, extensive lawns, landscaping and paving. Arkcoll suggested that in her experience a more appropriate allowance would be \$1500, O'Brien concurred with this view. I accepted this as an estimate within their expertise and therefore instructed Arkcoll to make that further amendment to the Base Report.
98. In regard to the third issue, "the basis of measurement", I had identified in my list the following sub-topics:
- Lift Capital Cost
  - Tennis Court / Lobby Refurbishment / Facilities
  - Waterproofing / Balustrade / Concrete Repairs, Paint and Maintenance / Door Locks
  - Window Frames
  - Booster Pump / Jacking Pumps
  - A/C Pumps
  - CW Pumps
  - Smoke Detectors
99. These were all items which were not shared equally in at least one of the expert reports. The prima facie position set out in the Act is that all costs be equal, it is important therefore that recommended deviation from that position is reviewed.

100. The Lift Capital Cost, which had initially only appeared in the O'Brien Report (as discussed in the basis of cost above), was a cost which had been apportioned by O'Brien on a lot area basis. When this item was discussed it became evident that the most likely reason for this cost to be incurred was obsolescence of existing plant which ultimately prevents the ability to simply maintain and repair such plant as the parts become no longer available. Such an occurrence is not an event triggered by use but rather by age and changing technology. On this basis it was agreed by both experts that this cost should properly be equally apportioned, a view with which I concur.
101. O'Brien, in his report, had apportioned the Sinking Fund; Tennis Court, Lobby Refurbishment and Facilities, allowances on the basis of lot area considering that the occupancy of each lot would be a factor in the incursion of each of the costs considered. Arkcoll, in her report, had apportioned each of these allowances equally between all lots. At the conclave these items were discussed in further detail and agreement was reached that the driver for the incurrence of these expenses was more likely to be optional upgrading rather than necessary upgrading. In such circumstances, lot occupancy, is unlikely to be a significant factor (and I would note not a factor the consequence of which could be quantitatively determined in any event) in the incurrence of the expense and therefore the expense should be equally apportioned as there is no readily established basis for alternative apportionment.
102. O'Brien, in his report, had apportioned the Sinking Fund; Waterproofing, Balustrade, Door Locks and Concrete Repairs, Paint and Maintenance, allowances on the basis of lot area considering that best represented the benefit obtained by each of the lots from those expenditure items. Arkcoll, in her report, had apportioned each of these allowances equally between all lots where they were in common areas providing no benefit to a lot and quantitative in accordance with the measured benefit to each lot where benefit was provided. At the conclave these items were discussed in further detail and agreement was reached (as discussed in the Principles earlier) that the Arkcoll approach to apportionment was to be preferred as it provided the more accurate reflection of the benefit provided to each lot. Therefore it was confirmed that the method of apportionment of these items in the Arkcoll report was correct.
103. As discussed in the basis of cost above, Arkcoll introduced an additional item for the replacement of Window Frames. Arkcoll had apportioned that item on the basis of quantitative measurement. O'Brien concurred that this was an appropriate method of apportionment. I concurred that, as a quantitative determination of the benefit to each lot could be made, this was the most appropriate method of apportionment for this item.
104. O'Brien, in his report, had apportioned the Sinking Fund; Booster Pump and Jacking Pump, allowances on the basis of lot area considering that best represented the benefit obtained by each of the lots from those expenditure items. Arkcoll, in her report, had apportioned each of these allowances equally between all lots. These items were discussed in further detail at the conclave. It was agreed by all present that the pumps which service the fire hoses etc located in the common areas were of equal benefit to all lots and that no lots obtained any specific benefit over any other lot from these pumps. It was agreed that these allowances should therefore properly be apportioned on an equal basis between all lots and that on that basis that the method of apportionment of these items in the Arkcoll report was the most appropriate.
105. O'Brien, in his report, had apportioned the sinking fund item allowance for the air conditioning pumps on the basis of lot area considering that best represented the benefit obtained by each of the lots from that expenditure items. Arkcoll, in her report, had apportioned this allowance equally between all lots. This item was discussed in further detail at the conclave. All lots have an entitlement to connect to the system



- and the reticulation system runs irrespective of the number of systems connected or in operation. The replacement life of the pump would therefore be unaffected by the individual lot usage of any air conditioning system that may have connected and as the system infrastructure was available to all lots it was therefore considered equally beneficial to all lots. It was agreed that these allowances should therefore properly be apportioned on an equal basis between all lots and that on that basis that the method of apportionment of these items in the Arkcoll report was the most appropriate.
106. O'Brien, in his report, had apportioned the sinking fund item allowance for the cold water pressure pumps on the basis of lot area considering that best represented the benefit obtained by each of the lots from that expenditure items. Arkcoll, in her report, had apportioned this allowance equally between all lots. This item was discussed in further detail at the conclave. This discussion established that one of the pumps serviced only the upper three levels of the building, however it could not be ascertained which areas the other pump serviced. This discussion also established that each pump included one pressure cylinder but the function of the third cylinder, in respect of either of the pumps was unknown. It was agreed by all present that the pumps should therefore be apportioned such that the allowances for one pump should be apportioned equally among the upper three levels which it was known to exclusively service. The second pump to be apportioned equally between the remaining lots. With regard to the cylinder costs, it was agreed that the most appropriate apportionment in the circumstances was to equally apportion the costs to each of the pumps. I therefore instructed Arkcoll to make that further amendment to the Base Report.
107. The O'Brien and Arkcoll reports had both apportioned the sinking fund item allowance for smoke detectors on the basis of lot area considering that best represented the benefit obtained by each of the lots from that expenditure item. This item was discussed in further detail at the conclave. It was agreed by all present that the smoke detector allowance represented a significant number of detectors which were located on common property and equally beneficial to all lots. It was also agreed by all present that while the number of smoke detectors located within each unit might vary, that variation was not proportional to the area of each lot. Indeed it was agreed that variation between the (non-amalgamated) unit types was in the order of approximately four detectors, with the minimum number of detectors in a lot in the order of approximately eight. No detailed drawing were available to accurately determine these numbers. While it was accepted that there was a differing benefit for some units arising from this allowance it was considered to be marginal and it was agreed that an equal apportionment of these costs was at least as accurate as apportionment on an area basis. Considering the provisions of the Act that, prima facie, all costs be equally apportioned and the considering the cost of accurately determining the precise number of smoke detectors in each lot, it was agreed that the appropriate option in the circumstances was to adopt an equal apportionment for this item. I therefore instructed Arkcoll to make that further amendment to the Base Report such that the smoke detector replacement allowance was apportioned equally.
108. The amended pages of the Arkcoll Report are appended to this order. O'Brien has review the amendments and has provided advice that the amendments made reflect the agreements reached at the conclave.
109. Having given due consideration to the relevant matters pursuant to Section 49 of the Act, I consider that an adjustment to the contribution schedule lot entitlements that would reflect the just and equitable contribution of each lot to the ongoing administration and maintenance of the Scheme is set out in my findings on the application for adjustment above.

## COSTS

### Findings:

- i. That the Applicant is responsible for the cost of the abandoned conference.
- ii. Excluding the abandoned conference, that the Applicant and Respondent are equally responsible for the cost of the adjudication.

### Reasons:

### Legislative Considerations

110. Section 265(1)(c) of the Act provides:

*“265 Specialist adjudication of particular disputes*

*(1) The adjudication of a dispute must be specialist adjudication if—*

*(c) another provision of this Act requires the adjudication to be specialist adjudication.”*

111. Section 48(1)(b) of the Act provides:

*“48 Adjustment of lot entitlement schedule*

*(1) The owner of a lot in a community titles scheme may apply—*

*(b) under chapter 6, for an order of a specialist adjudicator for the adjustment of a lot entitlement schedule.”*

112. Section 280 of the Act provides:

*“280 Costs of specialist adjudication*

*(1) This section applies to an application dealt with by specialist adjudication mentioned in section 265.*

*(2) Unless the adjudicator otherwise orders, the applicant is responsible for the costs of the adjudication.”*

113. Thus the prima facie' position is that the applicant is responsible for the cost of the adjudication. There must exist some reason for the adjudicator to exercise their discretion to otherwise order.

### Application Considerations

114. Section 48(2)(a) of the Act provides:

*“48 Adjustment of lot entitlement schedule*

*(2) Despite any other law or statutory instrument—*

*(a) the respondent for an application mentioned in subsection (1) is the body corporate”*

115. No submission was been made that the Applicant had any involvement in or responsibility for the determination of the existing contribution lot entitlement schedule.
116. No submission was made that the Applicant had made any changes to the structure of the scheme which would give rise to a change in body corporate expenditure liabilities or benefits which were the cause of any basis for adjustment.
117. It is apparent that the scheme is a well established Scheme which was established prior to the introduction of the Act in 1997 and which was created under earlier legislation which had differing provisions for the determination of lot entitlement schedules.
118. When the Act was introduced in 1997, no adjustment was made to the schedules by the Body Corporate to bring them in line with the provisions contained in the Act when registering the new CMS following the introduction of the Act.
119. This appears to be a case where the Applicant has now sought to require adjustment to bring the Scheme in line with the provisions of the Act, a position that the Applicant could have potentially achieved at no cost to himself, but at Body Corporate expense, at the time the new CMS was proposed for adoption following the introduction of the Act.
120. While the amendment of the schedule in accordance with the Act might be viewed by some as beneficial to the Applicant and similarly effected lots, such a view would not be one which would properly consider the position of the Applicant and similarly effected lots since the commencement of the Scheme or those lots for which the converse position has applied. The same can be said for all lots in the scheme, the adjustment of the balance between lots is simply a reflection of the cost imposed of each of those lots upon the scheme, the scheme as a whole maintains its status quo.
121. It is apparent that the disparity stems from an inherent departure in the CMS schedules from the current legislative provisions, rather than from any act or omission of the Applicant.
122. In this instance a submission was made by the Body Corporate upon which significant time was spent in consideration and which report was ultimately largely adopted. Therefore it would be reasonable that the Body Corporate equally share in the cost of the adjudication with the exception of those costs thrown away and I exercise my discretion accordingly.

**Table 2 - Allocation Methodology for Administrative Fund Expense Items**

Expenditure Items	Analysis Budget Allowance	Budget / 170 lots	Allocation Method	Comment
Audit & Tax Agents Fee	\$2,600.00	\$15.29	Equal	Administrative expense - not affected by lot specific factors.
Bank Charges	\$4,000.00	\$23.53	Equal	Administrative expense - not affected by lot specific factors.
Body Corp. Administration	\$19,920.00	\$117.18	Equal	Administrative expense - not affected by lot specific factors.
Licenses & Permits	\$3,300.00	\$19.41	Equal	Administrative expense - not affected by lot specific factors.
Fire Control Expenses	\$12,000.00	\$70.59	Equal	Identical service provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected substantially by lot specific factors. (Most of the facilities are in the common areas and benefit all lots. The variation in lot testing times due to a 2 - 3 difference in smoke detectors would be an insignificant portion of this cost.)
Contribution Facilities A/C	\$29,540.14	\$173.77	Equal	See part A. Section 5.5.
Contribution - Security Guards	\$76,500.00	\$450.00	Equal	See part A. Section 5.5.
Cleaning windows	\$5,500.00	\$32.35	Equal	We are advised that this allowance does not include cleaning of any lot windows, as the individual lot owners are required to arrange and pay for this work.
Community Power	\$30,000.00	\$176.47	Equal	Identical service provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors that are quantifiable.
Insurance - Workers' Comp	\$2,000.00	\$11.76	Equal	Administrative expense - not affected by lot specific factors.
Legal Expenses	\$8,756.51	\$51.51	Equal	Administrative expense - not affected by lot specific factors.
Management	\$95,000.00	\$558.82	Equal	Administrative expense - not affected by lot specific factors.

Expenditure Items	Analysis Budget Allowance	Budget / 170 lots	Allocation Method	Comment
Printing Postage & Stationary	\$11,978.06	\$70.46	Equal	Administrative expense - not affected by lot specific factors.
Pest Control	\$5,000.00	\$29.41	Equal	Identical service provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors.
Rep & Maint - Plant & Equipment	\$723.48	\$4.26	Equal	Nature of expenditure not predictable and it is not possible to predict if or how it may be affected by lot specific factors.
Rep & Maint - Lifts	\$45,500.00	\$267.65	Equal	See Part A: Section 5.4.
Rep & Maint - Electrical	\$617.32	\$3.63	Equal	Nature of expenditure not predictable and it is not possible to predict if or how it may be affected by lot specific factors.
Rep & Maint - Air Conditioning	\$305.00	\$1.79	Equal	See Part A: Section 5.6.
Rep & Maint - Build & General	\$27,003.01	\$158.84	Equal	Nature of expenditure not predictable and it is not possible to predict if or how it may be affected by lot specific factors.
Rep & Maint - Gardens & Grounds	\$15,500.00	\$91.18	Equal	Identical service provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors.
Rep & Maint - Pool	\$741.16	\$4.36	Equal	Identical service provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors.
Rep & Maint - Plumbing	\$0.00	\$0.00	Equal	Nature of expenditure not predictable and it is not possible to predict if or how it may be affected by lot specific factors.
Security	\$2,500.00	\$14.71	Equal	Identical service provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors.
Superannuation	\$8,500.00	\$50.00	Equal	Identical service provided to all lots by employees and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors. (For gardeners etc.)
Sundry Expenses	\$1,103.44	\$6.49	Equal	Nature of expenditure not predictable and it is not possible to predict if or how it may be affected by lot specific factors.
Telephone Charges	\$4,000.00	\$23.53	Equal	Administrative expense - not affected by lot specific factors.

Expenditure Items	Analysis Budget Allowance	Budget / 170 lots	Allocation Method	Comment
Contract - Cleaning	\$50,000.00	\$294.12	Equal	Identical service provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors.
Wages	\$96,000.00	\$564.71	Equal	Identical service provided to all lots by employees and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors. (For gardeners etc.)
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$558,588.12</b>	<b>\$3,285.82</b>		

Allocation Summary		Total
Allocation Method	Analysis Budget Allowance	Budget / 170 lots
Equal	\$558,588.12	\$3,285.82
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$558,588.12</b>	<b>\$3,285.82</b>

Rep & Maint - Building & General	Indexed to 31/12/05	
At 31/12/02	10,276	15,868.95
At 31/12/03	22,100	27,702.39
At 31/12/04	34,346	37,437.69
Average cost		27,003.01

**Table 3 - Allocation Methodology for Sinking Fund Expense Items**

SF Location	Item	SF Replacement Cost		Amount Per Year	Amount / 170 lots	Allocation Method	Comment
		Cost	EOL				
Roof Areas	Waterproof membrane: Patch Repair waterproof membrane every 3 years	12,185.00	5	2,437.00	14.34	Unit Area	See Part A: Section 6.2.3.
Roof Areas	Extraction Fans: Replace toilet exhaust fans	25,466.00	20	1,273.30	7.49	Equal	Identical service provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors.
Roof Areas	Hydrant booster pumps: Replace the fire hydrant booster pumps in 22 years (listed for identification only)	25,500.00	40	639.75	3.76	Equal	Identical service provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors.
Roof Areas	Fire hydrant jacking pump: Replace the fire jacking pump	2,719.00	12	226.58	1.33	Equal	Identical service provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors.
Roof Areas	Cold water pressure pump: Replace the cold water pressure pump in 19 years (listed for identification only)	2,163.00	25	86.52	0.51	Pumps & cylinders	One of the cold water pressure pumps services only the top three levels. We are not certain which levels the other pump services. We have not investigated further as at a combined average annualised cost of \$1.15, the value is too small to affect our recommendations.
Roof Areas	Cold water pressure pump: Replace cold water pressure pump	2,163.00	20	108.15	0.64	Pumps & cylinders	One of the cold water pressure pumps services only the top three levels. We are not certain which levels the other pump services. We have not investigated further as at a combined average annualised cost of \$1.15, the value is too small to affect our recommendations.
Roof Areas	Cold water pressure cylinders: Replace cold water pressure cylinders	1,483.00	15	98.87	0.58	Pumps & cylinders	Identical service provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors.
Roof Areas	Cold water pressure cylinders: Replace small cold water pressure cylinders	1,916.00	15	127.73	0.75	Pumps & cylinders	Identical service provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors.
Roof Areas	Cold water storage tanks: clean internal surface of tank	1,909.00	25	76.36	0.45	Equal	Identical service provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors.
Main Entrance	Automatic door mechanisms: Replace automatic door mechanisms & running gear to both front doors	11,459.00	18	636.61	3.74	Equal	Identical service provided to all lots and cost not likely to be predictably affected by lot specific factors.
Foyer & Office	Intercom main panel: Replace intercom main panel to front door	3,968.00	10	396.80	2.33	Equal	Identical service provided to all lots and cost not likely to be predictably affected by lot specific factors.
Foyer & Office	Intercom console: Replace intercom console to reception area	5,093.00	10	509.30	3.00	Equal	Identical service provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors.
Foyer & Office	Mail boxes: Replace the bank of mail boxes (184)	14,389.00	30	479.63	2.82	Equal	Identical service provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors.
Foyer & Office	Telephone system: Replace commander telephone system (50% shared cost)	1,977.00	18	109.83	0.65	Equal	Identical service provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors.
Foyer & Office	Entrance: Refurbish the entrance/Porte Cochere with new tiles, carpet, painting, light fittings, etc.	0.00	10	0.00	0.00	Excluded	Lump sum item replaced by individual item costings, see Part A: Section 1.3.2.
Foyer & Office	Foyer & Floors G and I: Refurbish the foyer and floors G and I with new tiles, carpets, painting, light fittings, etc.	0.00	10	0.00	0.00	Excluded	Lump sum item replaced by individual item costings, see Part A: Section 1.3.2.

SF Location	Item	SF Replacement Cost		Amount Per Year	Amount / 170 lots	Allocation Method	Comment
		Cost	EOL				
Lift Lobbies 2-35	Lobby floors 2 to 35: Refurbish lobby floors 2 to 35 with new tiles, carpets, painting, light fittings, etc.	0.00	10	0.00	0.00	Excluded	Lamp sum: item replaced by individual item costings, see Part A, Section 1.3.2.
Lift Lobbies 2-35	Lobby floors 2 to 35: Replace wall paper	134,972.00	10	13,497.20	79.40	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors.
Main Foyer area	Replace carpet	4,527.00	10	452.70	2.66	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots, and cost not likely to be predictably affected by lot specific factors.
Main Foyer area	Paint walls, columns, ceilings, doors & door frames	10,280.00	8	1,285.00	7.56	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors.
Main Foyer area	Replace furniture, lamps, mirrors etc.	5,252.00	12	437.67	2.57	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots, and cost not likely to be predictably affected by lot specific factors.
Main Foyer area	Replace light fittings	6,375.00	20	318.75	1.88	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots - life may be affected by usage, but usage likely to be for set period not affected by lot specific factors.
Lounge	Replace carpet	4,024.00	10	402.40	2.37	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots, and cost not likely to be predictably affected by lot specific factors.
Lounge	Replace furniture, lamps & book units	11,264.00	12	938.67	5.52	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots, and cost not likely to be predictably affected by lot specific factors.
Lounge	Replace light fittings	2,495.00	20	124.75	0.73	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots - life may be affected by usage, but usage likely to be for set period not affected by lot specific factors.
Lounge	Replace ceiling fan	253.00	20	12.65	0.07	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors.
Typical lobbies	Replace carpet	83,045.00	10	8,304.50	48.85	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots, and cost not likely to be predictably affected by lot specific factors.
Typical lobbies	Paint ceilings, doors & frames etc.	28,413.00	8	3,551.63	20.89	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors.
Typical lobbies	Replace light fittings	32,989.00	20	1,649.45	9.70	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots - life may be affected by usage, but usage likely to be for set period not affected by lot specific factors.
Building General	Fire sprinkler heads: 20 year sprinkler test	1,854.00	20	92.70	0.55	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors. Not in unit areas.
Building General	Emergency lighting: Allow an amount each year towards replacement of emergency/exit light fittings and batteries	2,719.00	1	2,719.00	15.99	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots - life may be affected by usage, but usage likely to be for set period not affected by lot specific factors.
Building General	Smoke detectors: Replace quantity of smoke detectors each year	1,483.00	1	1,483.00	8.72	Equal	We are unable to directly count the number of detectors in each lot.
Building General	Landing valves: Overhaul fire landing valves	2,657.00	10	265.70	1.56	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors.
Building General	Stairwell pressurisation fans: (Place stairwell) pressurisation fans	8,900.00	30	296.67	1.75	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots - life may be affected by usage, but usage likely to be for set period not affected by lot specific factors.

Table 3 - Allocation Methodology for Sinking Fund Expense Items



SF Location	Item	SF Replacement Cost		Amount Per Year	Amount / 170 lots	Allocation Method	Comment
		Cost	EOL				
Building General	Magnetic readers: Upgrade the magnetic reader system	27,506.00	20	1,375.30	8.09	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors.
Building General	Security camera: Replace security cameras throughout building (3 every 3 years)	3,708.00	3	1,236.00	7.27	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors.
Building General	Video monitors: Replace security video monitors (lifts & external cameras)	1,520.00	6	253.33	1.49	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors.
Building General	Video monitors: Replace security video monitors (entrance cameras)	351.00	6	58.50	0.34	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors.
Building General	Alarm system: Replace NESS 8 zone alarm system	1,770.00	25	70.80	0.42	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors.
Building General	Video recorder: Replace slow record video recorder	2,088.00	5	417.60	2.46	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors.
Building General	Host link: Replace host link & controller for Impro security system	4,454.00	10	445.40	2.62	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors.
Building General	Computer: Replace computer for control of security system	2,596.00	5	519.20	3.05	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors.
Building General	Intercom handsets: Replace 5 intercom handsets per year	5,933.00	1	5,933.00	34.90	Equal	Assume all lots have one handset.
Building General	Unit door locks: Replace restricted locks to unit doors (15 per year)	2,781.00	1	2,781.00	16.36	Quantity per lot	Amalgamated lots allocated 2 locks as both doors remain, 2 locks also allocated to the 3 pairs of lots with exclusive use entry areas, as these could revert to separate entries at any time.
Building General	Allow an amount for 2006 for upgrading of lifts	0.00	50	0.00	0.00	Excluded	One-off upgrade replaced by carriage refurbishment, see Part A: Section 1.3.2.
Building General	Refurbish lift carriage interior	40,000.00	10	4,000.00	23.53	Equal	See Part A: Section 5.4.
Building General	TV cabling: Replace section of building TV cabling (2/3 of building)	170,353.00	20	8,517.65	50.10	Excluded	This expense is an allowance for the possibility of upgrading the current system for digital TV. If done it is a one-off style expense not an predictably cyclical occurrence.
Building General	TV amplifiers: Contribution each year towards the upgrade of the TV network system	1,854.00	1	1,854.00	10.91	Excluded	This expense is an allowance for the possibility of upgrading the current system for digital TV. If done it is a one-off style expense not an predictably cyclical occurrence.
Building General	Repairs: General ongoing repairs to balustrading	3,708.00	1	3,708.00	21.81	Quantity per lot	See Part A: Section 6.2.1.
Building General	Allow an amount every 15 years to replace balustrading	190,998.00	15	12,733.20	74.90	Quantity per lot	See Part A: Section 6.2.1.
Building General	Repair concrete spalling to ledges & balconies and paint all exterior surfaces of the building	178,883.00	8	22,360.38	131.53	Quantity per lot	See Part A: Section 6.2.2.

SF Location	Item	SF Replacement Cost		Amount Per Year	Amount / 170 lots	Allocation Method	Comment
		Cost	EOL				
Building General	Allow an amount each year towards an ongoing maintenance program	8,653.00	1	8,653.00	50.90	Quantity per lot	The painting is currently done under a long-term contract which includes an ongoing cleaning and touch-up component. This allowance is for the ongoing component. See Part A: Section 6.2.2.
Building General	Paint all fire doors and basements	8,653.00	8	1,081.63	6.36	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors.
Building General	Door closers: Replace 5% of door closers each year	1,186.00	1	1,186.00	6.98	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors.
Building General	Replace aluminium windows (15%)	215,833.91	10	21,583.39	126.96	Quantity per lot	Cost allocated based on area of body corporate maintained window per lot.
Basement	Basement 1 & 2: Refurbishment to basement lift lobbies adjacent to lift zones	44,281.00	11	4,025.55	23.68	Equal	Because of the work items covered, this allowance appears appropriate left as a lump sum amount.
Basement	Diesel booster pump: Replace the diesel booster pump (14.1 HP)	20,762.00	40	519.05	3.05	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots - life may be affected by usage, but usage likely to be for set period not affected by lot specific factors.
Basement	Batteries: Replace batteries to fire diesel pump	618.00	5	123.60	0.73	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors.
Basement	Electric booster pump: Replace the electric booster pump	9,271.00	40	231.78	1.36	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots - life may be affected by usage, but usage likely to be for set period not affected by lot specific factors.
Basement	Sprinkler line valves: Three year overhaul of sprinkler line valves	3,708.00	3	1,236.00	7.27	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors.
Basement	Jacking pump: Replace the jacking pump to sprinkler lines	3,028.00	30	100.93	0.59	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots - life may be affected by usage, but usage likely to be for set period not affected by lot specific factors.
Basement	FIB: Replace the electronic board to the FIB	1,545.00	30	51.50	0.30	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors.
Basement	Fire hoses: Replace 1 fire hose each year	494.00	1	494.00	2.91	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors.
Basement	Pumps 1 & 2: Replace the air conditioning pumps (30KW)	19,347.00	20	967.35	5.69	Equal	See Part A: Section 5.6.
Basement	Pump 3: Replace the air conditioning pump (11KW)	6,830.00	20	341.50	2.01	Equal	See Part A: Section 5.6.
Basement	Pump 4: Replace the air conditioning pump (1.5KW)	4,112.00	20	205.60	1.21	Equal	See Part A: Section 5.6.
Basement	Cold water booster pumps: Replace the cold water booster pumps	16,565.00	20	828.25	4.87	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots - life may be affected by usage, but usage likely to be for set period not affected by lot specific factors.

SF Location	Item SF Description	SF Replacement Cost		Amount Per Year	Amount / 170 lots	Allocation Method	Comment
		Cost	EOL				
Basement	Jacking pump: Replace the jacking pump (7.5KW)	3,016.00	12	251.33	1.48	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots - life may be affected by usage, but usage likely to be for set period not affected by lot specific factors.
Basement	Storm water pumps: Replace storm water pumps	2,225.00	10	222.50	1.31	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots - life may be affected by usage, but usage likely to be for set period not affected by lot specific factors.
Basement	Waste water pumps: Replace waste water pumps	2,225.00	10	222.50	1.31	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots - life may be affected by usage, but usage likely to be for set period not affected by lot specific factors.
Basement	Lift well pump: Replace lift well pump	1,174.00	18	65.22	0.38	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots - life may be affected by usage, but usage likely to be for set period not affected by lot specific factors.
Basement	Lighting: Replace 5 fluorescent light fittings each year	432.00	1	432.00	2.54	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots - life may be affected by usage, but usage likely to be for set period not affected by lot specific factors.
Basement	Allow an amount each year towards replacement of emergency/exit light fittings and batteries	2,472.00	1	2,472.00	14.54	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots - life may be affected by usage, but usage likely to be for set period not affected by lot specific factors.
Basement	Battery charger: Replace battery charger	519.00	20	25.95	0.15	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots - life may be affected by usage, but usage likely to be for set period not affected by lot specific factors.
Basement	Generator: Replace radiator to emergency generator	4,512.00	10	451.20	2.65	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors.
Basement	Batteries: Replace batteries to emergency power generator	803.00	5	160.60	0.94	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors.
Basement	Water storage tank: Clean internal surface to water storage tank	3,819.00	25	152.76	0.90	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors.
Basement	Car park extraction fans: Replace car park extraction fans	5,729.00	10	572.90	3.37	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots - life may be affected by usage, but usage likely to be for set period not affected by lot specific factors.
Basement	Fan framework & cowling: Treat rust & paint 5 ventilation covers & fan motor housings	9,580.00	7	1,368.57	8.05	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors.
Basement	Replace 6 ventilation covers & fan motor housings	24,724.00	20	1,236.20	7.27	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors.
Basement	Replace 5 ventilation covers and fan motor housings	20,583.00	20	1,029.15	6.05	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors.
Basement	Replace 1 car park ventilation fan each year	741.00	1	741.00	4.36	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots - life may be affected by usage, but usage likely to be for set period not affected by lot specific factors.
Basement	Carry out lifespan of main electrical switchboard	432.00	2	216.00	1.27	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors.

Table 3 - Allocation Methodology for Sinking Fund Expense Items

SF Location	Item	SF Replacement Cost		Amount Per Year	Amount / 170 lots	Allocation Method	Comment
		Cost	EOL				
Basement	Paint car park line markings	2,287.00	3	762.33	4.48	Equal	See Part A: Section 6.1.1.
Basement	Replace car park roller door (3m)	2,101.00	15	140.07	0.82	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots and cost not affected by lot specific factors. Doors for substitution, not common entry way.
Basement	Roller door mechanics: Replace motor & running gear to car park roller door	1,730.00	15	115.33	0.68	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots and cost not affected by lot specific factors. Doors for substitution, not common entry way.
Basement	Replace panel lift door to car park (5m)	6,181.00	10	618.10	3.64	Equal	See Part A: Section 6.1.1.
Basement	Panel lift door mechanics: Replace motor, guides & rollers etc	2,719.00	8	339.88	2.00	Equal	See Part A: Section 6.1.1.
Basement	Replace rubbish compactor (Edmonds)	19,112.00	25	764.48	4.50	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors.
Basement	Replace rubbish bins	1,890.00	16	118.13	0.69	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors.
Basement	Replace air freshener (Ercolo)	2,336.00	10	233.60	1.37	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors.
Basement	Inlets: Replace cistern to toilets	513.00	20	25.65	0.15	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors.
Basement	Showers: Replace shower rose and taps	228.00	20	11.40	0.07	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors.
Basement	Wash basins: Replace wash basins and taps	494.00	20	24.70	0.15	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors.
Basement	Replace hot water system	1,174.00	10	117.40	0.69	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors.
Basement	Gardener's equipment: Replacement of gardener's maintenance equipment	12,362.00	5	2,472.40	14.54	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors.
Basement	Electromic sensors: Replace electronic sensors to car park doors	4,839.00	18	268.83	1.58	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors.
Basement	Allow an amount every 10 years for waterproofing of the podium	25,466.00	10	2,546.60	14.98	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors.
External Areas	Renew pool surface (pebblecrete)	9,933.00	10	993.30	5.84	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots and cost not likely to be predictably affected by lot specific factors.
External Areas	Regroin tiles to pool	568.00	17	33.41	0.20	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors.

SF Location	Item	SF Replacement Cost		Amount Per Year	Amount / 170 lots	Allocation Method	Comment
		Cost	EOL				
External Areas	Replace pool pumps	3,523.00	12	293.58	1.73	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots - life may be affected by usage, but usage likely to be for set period not affected by lot specific factors.
External Areas	Replace filter sand	618.00	8	77.25	0.45	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots - life may be affected by usage, but usage likely to be for set period not affected by lot specific factors.
External Areas	Replace filter & sand complete (Tabatron HR31)	3,724.00	8	465.50	2.74	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots - life may be affected by usage, but usage likely to be for set period not affected by lot specific factors.
External Areas	Automatic chlorinators: Replace salt water chlorinator (1 every 4 years)	1,112.00	8	139.00	0.82	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots - life may be affected by usage, but usage likely to be for set period not affected by lot specific factors.
External Areas	Chlorinator cells: Replace chlorinator cells (1 every 4 years)	432.00	8	54.00	0.32	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots - life may be affected by usage, but usage likely to be for set period not affected by lot specific factors.
External Areas	Replace chlorine injection unit	494.00	8	61.75	0.36	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots - life may be affected by usage, but usage likely to be for set period not affected by lot specific factors.
External Areas	Pool furniture: Replace PVC tables, chairs and deck chairs	3,090.00	6	515.00	3.03	Equal	Identical service provided to all lots, and cost not likely to be predictably affected by lot specific factors.
External Areas	Replace umbrellas in pool area	1,578.00	8	197.25	1.16	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors.
External Areas	Transformers: Replace transformers in pool pump room	917.00	10	91.70	0.54	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots - life may be affected by usage, but usage likely to be for set period not affected by lot specific factors.
External Areas	Toilets: Replace cistern to toilets in external pool area	766.00	20	38.30	0.23	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors.
External Areas	Replace hot water system (Bremar 80L)	1,483.00	10	148.30	0.87	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors.
External Areas	Tiling: Replace section of wall tiles to ablation blocks (144Sqm)	766.00	20	38.30	0.23	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors.
External Areas	Replace pump to fountains and upgrade waterfall (one off)	24,724.00	50	494.48	2.91	Excluded	One-off non cyclical expense and ongoing pump replacement allowed for in next item.
External Areas	Fountain pumps: Allow for replacement of pumps after upgrade	2,223.00	12	185.42	1.09	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots - life may be affected by usage, but usage likely to be for set period not affected by lot specific factors.
External Areas	Lights & ballasts: Replace 3 light fittings & ballasts each year	494.00	1	494.00	2.91	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots - life may be affected by usage, but usage likely to be for set period not affected by lot specific factors.
External Areas	Replace concrete garden edging (250m)	927.00	5	185.40	1.09	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors.

SF Location	Item		SF Replacement Cost		Amount Per Year	Amount / 170 lots	Allocation		Comment
	SF Description		Cost	EOL			Method		
External Areas	Refurbish gardens every 3 years		6,799.00	3	2,266.33	13.33	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors.	
External Areas	Replace log retaining wall in pool area		10,809.00	20	540.45	3.18	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors.	
External Areas	Paint pool fencing (118m)		1,112.00	8	139.00	0.82	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors.	
External Areas	Cooling tower: Replace lattice work to cooling tower enclosure		729.00	19	38.37	0.23	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors.	
External Areas	Paint aluminium fencing above sports complex		216.00	22	9.82	0.06	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors.	
External Areas	Paint aluminium fencing around entrance to basement car park		451.00	22	20.50	0.12	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors.	
External Areas	Replace fan motor to cooling tower		1,761.00	7	251.57	1.48	Equal	See Part A: Section 5.6.	
External Areas	Replace circulating pump to cooling tower		3,090.00	15	206.00	1.21	Equal	See Part A: Section 5.6.	
External Areas	Replace illuminated building sign		3,708.00	15	247.20	1.45	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors.	
Shared Facility Complex	Entertainment area: Replace carpet		4,079.00	10	407.90	2.40	Equal	Identical service provided to all lots, and cost not likely to be predictably affected by lot specific factors.	
Shared Facility Complex	Gymnasium: Replace carpet		1,279.00	5	255.80	1.50	Equal	Identical service provided to all lots, and cost not likely to be predictably affected by lot specific factors.	
Shared Facility Complex	Allow for replacement of gym equipment		3,214.00	5	642.80	3.78	Equal	Identical service provided to all lots, and cost not likely to be predictably affected by lot specific factors.	
Shared Facility Complex	Replace oven (Chef 500)		463.00	15	30.87	0.18	Equal	Identical service provided to all lots, and cost not likely to be predictably affected by lot specific factors.	
Shared Facility Complex	Replace fridge (Kelvinator 480)		618.00	15	41.20	0.24	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots - life may be affected by usage, but usage likely to be for set period not affected by lot specific factors.	
Shared Facility Complex	Replacement of doors and partitions		6,181.00	15	412.07	2.42	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors.	
Shared Facility Complex	Renew pool surface (pebblecrete+G63) (13x3)		1,854.00	8	231.75	1.36	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots and cost not likely to be predictably affected by lot specific factors.	
Shared Facility Complex	Replace pool heater (Dricon)		3,201.00	5	640.20	3.77	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots - life may be affected by usage, but usage likely to be for set period not affected by lot specific factors.	

SF Location	Item	SF Replacement Cost		Amount Per Year	Amount / 170 lots	Allocation Method	Comment
		Cost	EOL				
Shared Facility Complex	Replace spa heater (Computheat)	1,409.00	6	234.83	1.38	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots - life may be affected by usage, but usage likely to be for set period not affected by lot specific factors.
Shared Facility Complex	Replace hot water system (125L)	556.00	8	69.50	0.41	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors.
Shared Facility Complex	Replace shower heater	587.00	12	48.92	0.29	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors.
Shared Facility Complex	Refurbish the sunnas	11,126.00	10	1,112.60	6.54	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots and cost not likely to be substantially affected by lot specific factors.
Shared Facility Complex	Replace extraction fans to pool area (2 every 5 years)	1,483.00	5	296.60	1.74	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors.
Shared Facility Complex	Internal surfaces: Repaint all surfaces	8,035.00	8	1,004.38	5.91	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors.
Shared Facility Complex	Entertainment area: replace PVC tables and chairs	1,112.00	10	111.20	0.65	Equal	Identical service provided to all lots, and cost not likely to be predictably affected by lot specific factors.
Shared Facility Complex	Transport: Purchase second hand Holden Ute	8,696.00	15	579.73	3.41	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors.
Shared Tennis Complex	Courts: Upgrade surfaces of 3 courts with a polyethylene surface	30,905.00	10	3,090.50	18.18	Equal	Identical service provided to all lots, and cost not likely to be predictably affected by lot specific factors.
Shared Tennis Complex	Courts: Upgrade surface of 1 court with a polyethylene surface (one off)	9,554.00	50	191.08	1.12	Excluded	This appears not to be a normal cyclical maintenance allowance.
Shared Tennis Complex	Fencing: Replaces fencing to 3 tennis courts	10,755.00	15	717.00	4.22	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors.
Shared Tennis Complex	Replace court lighting (one court only)	2,559.00	10	255.90	1.51	Equal	Identical service provided to all lots, and cost not likely to be predictably affected by lot specific factors.
Shared Tennis Complex	Replace tiling to gazebo	2,497.00	18	138.72	0.82	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors.
Shared Tennis Complex	Refurbishment of barbecue area	12,795.00	15	853.00	5.02	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors.
Shared External Areas	Retaining walls: Allow an amount every 10 years for the replacement of sections of the block retaining wall either side of the complex	6,181.00	10	618.10	3.64	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors.
Shared External Areas	Retaining walls: Allow an amount for repairs to the canal retaining wall	61,811.00	20	3,090.55	18.18	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors.
Shared External Areas	Walkways: Allow an amount every 10 years for repairs to the canal walkway	6,181.00	10	618.10	3.64	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors.

SF Location	Item SF Description	SF Replacement Cost		Amount Per Year	Amount / 170 lots	Allocation Method	Comment
		Cost	EOL				
Shared External Areas	Boundary gates: Replace motor and running gear to sliding gate (Gibbidi 600W)	2,559.00	18	142.17	0.84	Equal	Identical service provided to all lots, and cost not likely to be predictably affected by lot specific factors. (For external visitor's carpark where parking spaces not exclusive use)
Shared External Areas	Fencing: Replace powder coated fencing to the eastern side of the main entrance	3,708.00	25	148.32	0.87	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors.
Shared External Areas	Fencing: Replace chain wire mesh fence to boundary fence	6,181.00	25	247.24	1.45	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors.
Shared External Areas	Fencing: Replace chain wire fencing along side boundary (2m high) to Eastern car park	882.00	20	44.10	0.26	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots and cost not likely to be affected by lot specific factors.
Shared External Areas	Replace access control receivers to entrance gates	1,854.00	10	185.40	1.09	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots and cost not likely to be substantially affected by lot specific factors.
Shared External Areas	Replace paving outside main entrance complex	1,545.00	25	61.80	0.36	Equal	Identical benefit provided to all lots and cost not likely to be substantially affected by lot specific factors.
Shared External Areas	Refurbishment: Allow for upgrade of main entrance and driveway (one off)	80,355.00	50	1,607.10	9.45	Excluded	General maintenance for this area included elsewhere and timing or scope of future refurbishments not predictable.
<b>Totals</b>				<b>195,464.75</b>	<b>1,149.75</b>		

Allocation Method	Total	
	Amount Per Year	Amount Per Lot
Equal	108,123.20	635.98
Unit area	2,437.00	14.34
Quantity per lot	71,818.97	422.46
Pumps & cylinders	421.27	2.48
Excluded	12,664.31	74.49
<b>Totals</b>	<b>195,464.75</b>	<b>1,149.75</b>



**Table 4 - Additional Apportionment Calculations**

Lot No	Window replacement		Unit door locks		Roof membrane		Unit balustrading costs		External building painting area based costs		Total Costs in Table 4			
	Area of boundary windows	% of total	Lot No	No of locks per lot	Covered area of units	% of total area	Lot No	Length of unit balustrade	% of total balustrading	Lot No		% of total painting per lot	Cost per lot	Share of painting to exterior of common building areas
1	0.00	0.00%	1	1	177	0.63%	1	0.00	0.00%	1	0.48%	16,441.20	1,311.87	31,013.38
2	0.00	0.00%	2	1	177	0.63%	2	0.00	0.00%	2	0.48%	142.57	7.72	150.29
3	0.00	0.00%	3	1	153	0.55%	3	0.00	0.00%	3	0.61%	181.18	7.72	188.90
4	10.26	0.46%	4	1	177	0.63%	4	16.00	0.61%	4	0.55%	163.36	7.72	171.08
5	0.00	0.00%	5	1	138	0.49%	5	14.70	0.56%	5	0.30%	92.07	7.72	96.82
6	10.26	0.46%	6	1	173	0.62%	6	16.00	0.61%	6	0.55%	163.36	7.72	171.08
7	22.26	0.99%	7	1	154	0.55%	7	13.75	0.53%	7	0.67%	199.00	7.72	206.72
8	22.26	0.99%	8	1	153	0.55%	8	13.40	0.53%	8	0.67%	199.00	7.72	206.72
9	10.26	0.46%	9	1	140	0.50%	9	12.10	0.46%	9	0.49%	145.54	7.72	153.26
12	10.26	0.46%	12	1	140	0.50%	12	12.10	0.46%	12	0.49%	145.54	7.72	153.26
13	22.26	0.99%	13	1	153	0.55%	13	13.75	0.53%	13	0.67%	199.00	7.72	206.72
14	22.26	0.99%	14	1	153	0.55%	14	13.75	0.53%	14	0.67%	199.00	7.72	206.72
15	10.26	0.46%	15	1	140	0.50%	15	12.10	0.46%	15	0.49%	145.54	7.72	153.26
16	10.26	0.46%	16	1	102	0.36%	16	11.25	0.43%	16	0.28%	83.16	7.72	90.88
17	0.00	0.00%	17	1	102	0.36%	17	11.25	0.43%	17	0.28%	83.16	7.72	90.88
18	10.26	0.46%	18	1	140	0.50%	18	12.10	0.46%	18	0.49%	145.54	7.72	153.26
19	22.26	0.99%	19	1	153	0.55%	19	13.75	0.53%	19	0.67%	199.00	7.72	206.72
20	22.26	0.99%	20	1	153	0.55%	20	13.75	0.53%	20	0.67%	199.00	7.72	206.72
21	10.26	0.46%	21	1	140	0.50%	21	12.10	0.46%	21	0.49%	145.54	7.72	153.26
24	10.26	0.46%	24	1	140	0.50%	24	12.10	0.46%	24	0.49%	145.54	7.72	153.26
25	22.26	0.99%	25	1	153	0.55%	25	13.75	0.53%	25	0.67%	199.00	7.72	206.72
26	22.26	0.99%	26	1	153	0.55%	26	13.75	0.53%	26	0.67%	199.00	7.72	206.72
27	10.26	0.46%	27	1	140	0.50%	27	12.10	0.46%	27	0.49%	145.54	7.72	153.26
30	10.26	0.46%	30	1	140	0.50%	30	12.10	0.46%	30	0.49%	145.54	7.72	153.26
31	22.26	0.99%	31	1	153	0.55%	31	13.75	0.53%	31	0.67%	199.00	7.72	206.72
32	22.26	0.99%	32	1	153	0.55%	32	13.75	0.53%	32	0.67%	199.00	7.72	206.72
33	10.26	0.46%	33	1	140	0.50%	33	12.10	0.46%	33	0.49%	145.54	7.72	153.26
36	10.26	0.46%	36	1	140	0.50%	36	12.10	0.46%	36	0.49%	145.54	7.72	153.26
37	22.26	0.99%	37	1	153	0.55%	37	13.75	0.53%	37	0.67%	199.00	7.72	206.72
38	22.26	0.99%	38	1	153	0.55%	38	13.75	0.53%	38	0.67%	199.00	7.72	206.72
39	10.26	0.46%	39	1	173	0.62%	39	16.00	0.60%	39	0.55%	163.36	7.72	171.08
40	0.00	0.00%	40	1	132	0.47%	40	15.50	0.60%	40	0.30%	89.10	7.72	96.82
41	4.38	0.19%	41	1	152	0.54%	41	16.00	0.61%	41	0.55%	163.36	7.72	171.08
42	28.14	1.25%	42	1	175	0.63%	42	13.75	0.53%	42	0.67%	199.00	7.72	206.72
43	22.26	0.99%	43	1	153	0.55%	43	13.40	0.53%	43	0.67%	199.00	7.72	206.72
44	10.26	0.46%	44	1	173	0.62%	44	15.11	0.61%	44	0.55%	163.36	7.72	171.08
45	0.00	0.00%	45	1	132	0.47%	45	15.50	0.60%	45	0.30%	89.10	7.72	96.82
46	4.38	0.19%	46	1	152	0.54%	46	16.00	0.61%	46	0.55%	163.36	7.72	171.08
47	28.14	1.25%	47	1	175	0.63%	47	13.75	0.53%	47	0.67%	199.00	7.72	206.72
48	22.26	0.99%	48	1	153	0.55%	48	13.40	0.53%	48	0.67%	199.00	7.72	206.72
49	10.26	0.46%	49	1	173	0.62%	49	15.11	0.61%	49	0.55%	163.36	7.72	171.08

Lot No	Window replacement		Unit door locks		Roof membrane & smoke detectors		Unit balustrading costs		External building painting: area based costs			Total Costs in Table 4					
	Area of boundary windows	% of total lot area	Lot No	No of locks per lot	Lot No	Area of tower units	% of total lot area	Lot No	Length of unit balustrade	% of total balustrading	Cost per lot		Lot No	% of total painting per lot	Cost per lot	Share of painting to exterior of common building areas	Total painting
50	0.00	0.00%	50	1	50	132	0.47%	50	15.50	0.60%	98.65	50	0.30%	89.10	7.72	96.82	223.28
51	4.38	0.19%	51	1	51	152	0.54%	51	16.00	0.61%	100.29	51	0.55%	163.36	7.72	171.08	341.90
52	28.14	1.25%	52	1	52	175	0.63%	52	13.75	0.53%	87.14	52	0.67%	199.00	7.72	206.72	595.36
53	22.26	0.99%	53	1	53	153	0.55%	53	13.75	0.53%	87.14	53	0.67%	199.00	7.72	206.72	537.30
54	10.26	0.46%	54	1	54	173	0.62%	54	16.00	0.61%	100.29	54	0.55%	163.36	7.72	171.08	402.12
55	0.00	0.00%	55	1	55	132	0.47%	55	15.50	0.60%	98.65	55	0.30%	89.10	7.72	96.82	223.28
56	4.38	0.19%	56	1	56	152	0.54%	56	16.00	0.61%	100.29	56	0.55%	163.36	7.72	171.08	341.90
57	28.14	1.25%	57	1	57	175	0.63%	57	13.75	0.53%	87.14	57	0.67%	199.00	7.72	206.72	595.36
58	22.26	0.99%	58	1	58	153	0.55%	58	13.75	0.53%	87.14	58	0.67%	199.00	7.72	206.72	537.30
59	10.26	0.46%	59	1	59	173	0.62%	59	16.00	0.61%	100.29	59	0.55%	163.36	7.72	171.08	402.12
60	0.00	0.00%	60	1	60	132	0.47%	60	15.50	0.60%	98.65	60	0.30%	89.10	7.72	96.82	223.28
61	4.38	0.19%	61	1	61	152	0.54%	61	16.00	0.61%	100.29	61	0.55%	163.36	7.72	171.08	341.90
62	28.14	1.25%	62	1	62	175	0.63%	62	13.75	0.53%	87.14	62	0.67%	199.00	7.72	206.72	595.36
63	22.26	0.99%	63	1	63	153	0.55%	63	13.75	0.53%	87.14	63	0.67%	199.00	7.72	206.72	537.30
64	10.26	0.46%	64	1	64	173	0.62%	64	16.00	0.61%	100.29	64	0.55%	163.36	7.72	171.08	402.12
65	0.00	0.00%	65	1	65	132	0.47%	65	15.50	0.60%	98.65	65	0.30%	89.10	7.72	96.82	223.28
66	4.38	0.19%	66	1	66	152	0.54%	66	16.00	0.61%	100.29	66	0.55%	163.36	7.72	171.08	341.90
67	28.14	1.25%	67	1	67	175	0.63%	67	13.75	0.53%	87.14	67	0.67%	199.00	7.72	206.72	595.36
68	22.26	0.99%	68	1	68	153	0.55%	68	13.75	0.53%	87.14	68	0.67%	199.00	7.72	206.72	537.30
69	10.26	0.46%	69	1	69	173	0.62%	69	16.00	0.61%	100.29	69	0.55%	163.36	7.72	171.08	402.12
70	0.00	0.00%	70	1	70	132	0.47%	70	15.50	0.60%	98.65	70	0.30%	89.10	7.72	96.82	223.28
71	4.38	0.19%	71	1	71	152	0.54%	71	16.00	0.61%	100.29	71	0.55%	163.36	7.72	171.08	341.90
72	28.14	1.25%	72	1	72	175	0.63%	72	13.75	0.53%	87.14	72	0.67%	199.00	7.72	206.72	595.36
73	22.26	0.99%	73	1	73	153	0.55%	73	13.75	0.53%	87.14	73	0.67%	199.00	7.72	206.72	537.30
74	10.26	0.46%	74	1	74	173	0.62%	74	16.00	0.61%	100.29	74	0.55%	163.36	7.72	171.08	402.12
75	0.00	0.00%	75	1	75	132	0.47%	75	15.50	0.60%	98.65	75	0.30%	89.10	7.72	96.82	223.28
76	4.38	0.19%	76	1	76	152	0.54%	76	16.00	0.61%	100.29	76	0.55%	163.36	7.72	171.08	341.90
77	28.14	1.25%	77	1	77	175	0.63%	77	13.75	0.53%	87.14	77	0.67%	199.00	7.72	206.72	595.36
78	22.26	0.99%	78	1	78	153	0.55%	78	13.75	0.53%	87.14	78	0.67%	199.00	7.72	206.72	537.30
79	10.26	0.46%	79	1	79	173	0.62%	79	16.00	0.61%	100.29	79	0.55%	163.36	7.72	171.08	402.12
80	0.00	0.00%	80	1	80	132	0.47%	80	15.50	0.60%	98.65	80	0.30%	89.10	7.72	96.82	223.28
81	4.38	0.19%	81	1	81	152	0.54%	81	16.00	0.61%	100.29	81	0.55%	163.36	7.72	171.08	341.90
82	28.14	1.25%	82	1	82	175	0.63%	82	13.75	0.53%	87.14	82	0.67%	199.00	7.72	206.72	595.36
83	22.26	0.99%	83	1	83	153	0.55%	83	13.75	0.53%	87.14	83	0.67%	199.00	7.72	206.72	537.30
84	10.26	0.46%	84	1	84	173	0.62%	84	16.00	0.61%	100.29	84	0.55%	163.36	7.72	171.08	402.12
85	0.00	0.00%	85	1	85	132	0.47%	85	15.50	0.60%	98.65	85	0.30%	89.10	7.72	96.82	223.28
86	4.38	0.19%	86	1	86	152	0.54%	86	16.00	0.61%	100.29	86	0.55%	163.36	7.72	171.08	341.90
87	28.14	1.25%	87	1	87	175	0.63%	87	13.75	0.53%	87.14	87	0.67%	199.00	7.72	206.72	595.36
88	22.26	0.99%	88	1	88	153	0.55%	88	13.75	0.53%	87.14	88	0.67%	199.00	7.72	206.72	537.30
89	10.26	0.46%	89	1	89	173	0.62%	89	16.00	0.61%	100.29	89	0.55%	163.36	7.72	171.08	402.12
90	0.00	0.00%	90	1	90	132	0.47%	90	15.50	0.60%	98.65	90	0.30%	89.10	7.72	96.82	223.28
91	4.38	0.19%	91	1	91	152	0.54%	91	16.00	0.61%	100.29	91	0.55%	163.36	7.72	171.08	341.90
92	28.14	1.25%	92	1	92	175	0.63%	92	13.75	0.53%	87.14	92	0.67%	199.00	7.72	206.72	595.36
93	22.26	0.99%	93	1	93	153	0.55%	93	13.75	0.53%	87.14	93	0.67%	199.00	7.72	206.72	537.30
94	10.26	0.46%	94	1	94	173	0.62%	94	16.00	0.61%	100.29	94	0.55%	163.36	7.72	171.08	402.12
95	0.00	0.00%	95	1	95	132	0.47%	95	15.50	0.60%	98.65	95	0.30%	89.10	7.72	96.82	223.28
96	4.38	0.19%	96	1	96	152	0.54%	96	16.00	0.61%	100.29	96	0.55%	163.36	7.72	171.08	341.90
97	28.14	1.25%	97	1	97	175	0.63%	97	13.75	0.53%	87.14	97	0.67%	199.00	7.72	206.72	595.36
98	22.26	0.99%	98	1	98	153	0.55%	98	13.75	0.53%	87.14	98	0.67%	199.00	7.72	206.72	537.30
99	10.26	0.46%	99	1	99	173	0.62%	99	16.00	0.61%	100.29	99	0.55%	163.36	7.72	171.08	402.12
100	0.00	0.00%	100	1	100	132	0.47%	100	15.50	0.60%	98.65	100	0.30%	89.10	7.72	96.82	223.28
101	4.38	0.19%	101	1	101	152	0.54%	101	16.00	0.61%	100.29	101	0.55%	163.36	7.72	171.08	341.90
102	28.14	1.25%	102	1	102	175	0.63%	102	13.75	0.53%	87.14	102	0.67%	199.00	7.72	206.72	595.36
103	22.26	0.99%	103	1	103	153	0.55%	103	13.75	0.53%	87.14	103	0.67%	199.00	7.72	206.72	537.30
104	10.26	0.46%	104	1	104	173	0.62%	104	16.00	0.61%	100.29	104	0.55%	163.36	7.72	171.08	402.12
105	0.00	0.00%	105	1	105	132	0.47%	105	15.50	0.60%	98.65	105	0.30%	89.10	7.72	96.82	223.28
106	4.38	0.19%	106	1	106	152	0.54%	106	16.00	0.61%	100.29	106	0.55%	163.36	7.72	171.08	341.90
107	28.14	1.25%	107	1	107	175	0.63%	107	13.75	0.53%	87.14	107	0.67%	199.00	7.72	206.72	595.36

Table 4 - Additional Apportionment Calculations

Window replacement		Unit door locks		Roof membrane & smoke detectors		Unit balustrading costs		External building painting area based costs				Total Costs in Table 4						
Lot No	Area of boundary windows	% of total lot area	Cost per lot	No of locks per lot	Cost per lot	Lot No	Area of lower units	% of total lot area	Cost per lot	Lot No	Length of unit balustrade	% of total balustrade	Lot No	% of total painting per lot	Cost per lot	Share of painting to exterior of common building areas	Total painting	Total Costs in Table 4
108	28.14	1.25%	269.79	1	16.36	108	175	0.63%	15.35	108	13.75	0.53%	108	87.14	199.00	7.72	206.72	595.36
109	22.26	0.99%	213.68	1	16.36	109	153	0.55%	13.40	109	13.75	0.53%	109	87.14	199.00	7.72	206.72	537.30
110	10.26	0.46%	99.28	110	16.36	110	173	0.62%	15.11	110	16.00	0.61%	110	100.29	163.36	7.72	171.08	402.12
111	0.00	0.00%	0.00	111	16.36	111	132	0.47%	11.45	111	15.90	0.60%	111	98.65	163.36	7.72	96.82	223.28
112	4.38	0.19%	41.01	112	16.36	112	152	0.54%	13.16	112	16.00	0.61%	112	100.29	163.36	7.72	171.08	341.90
113	28.14	1.25%	269.79	113	16.36	113	175	0.63%	15.35	113	13.75	0.53%	113	87.14	199.00	7.72	206.72	595.36
114	22.26	0.99%	213.68	114	16.36	114	153	0.55%	13.40	114	13.75	0.53%	114	87.14	199.00	7.72	206.72	537.30
115	10.26	0.46%	99.28	115	16.36	115	173	0.62%	15.11	115	16.00	0.61%	115	100.29	163.36	7.72	171.08	402.12
116	0.00	0.00%	0.00	116	16.36	116	132	0.47%	11.45	116	15.50	0.60%	116	98.65	163.36	7.72	96.82	223.28
117	4.38	0.19%	41.01	117	16.36	117	152	0.54%	13.16	117	16.00	0.61%	117	100.29	163.36	7.72	171.08	341.90
118	28.14	1.25%	269.79	118	16.36	118	175	0.63%	15.35	118	13.75	0.53%	118	87.14	199.00	7.72	206.72	595.36
119	22.26	0.99%	213.68	119	16.36	119	153	0.55%	13.40	119	13.75	0.53%	119	87.14	199.00	7.72	206.72	537.30
120	10.26	0.46%	99.28	120	16.36	120	173	0.62%	15.11	120	16.00	0.61%	120	100.29	163.36	7.72	171.08	402.12
121	0.00	0.00%	0.00	121	16.36	121	132	0.47%	11.45	121	15.50	0.60%	121	98.65	163.36	7.72	96.82	223.28
122	4.38	0.19%	41.01	122	16.36	122	152	0.54%	13.16	122	16.00	0.61%	122	100.29	163.36	7.72	171.08	341.90
123	28.14	1.25%	269.79	123	16.36	123	175	0.63%	15.35	123	13.75	0.53%	123	87.14	199.00	7.72	206.72	595.36
124	22.26	0.99%	213.68	124	16.36	124	153	0.55%	13.40	124	13.75	0.53%	124	87.14	199.00	7.72	206.72	537.30
125	10.26	0.46%	99.28	125	16.36	125	173	0.62%	15.11	125	16.00	0.61%	125	100.29	163.36	7.72	171.08	402.12
126	0.00	0.00%	0.00	126	16.36	126	132	0.47%	11.45	126	15.50	0.60%	126	98.65	163.36	7.72	96.82	223.28
127	4.38	0.19%	41.01	127	16.36	127	152	0.54%	13.16	127	16.00	0.61%	127	100.29	163.36	7.72	171.08	341.90
128	28.14	1.25%	269.79	128	16.36	128	175	0.63%	15.35	128	13.75	0.53%	128	87.14	199.00	7.72	206.72	595.36
129	22.26	0.99%	213.68	129	16.36	129	153	0.55%	13.40	129	13.75	0.53%	129	87.14	199.00	7.72	206.72	537.30
130	10.26	0.46%	99.28	130	16.36	130	173	0.62%	15.11	130	16.00	0.61%	130	100.29	163.36	7.72	171.08	402.12
131	0.00	0.00%	0.00	131	16.36	131	132	0.47%	11.45	131	15.00	0.60%	131	98.65	163.36	7.72	96.82	223.28
132	4.38	0.19%	41.01	132	16.36	132	152	0.54%	13.16	132	16.00	0.61%	132	100.29	163.36	7.72	171.08	341.90
133	28.14	1.25%	269.79	133	16.36	133	175	0.63%	15.35	133	13.75	0.53%	133	87.14	199.00	7.72	206.72	595.36
134	22.26	0.99%	213.68	134	16.36	134	153	0.55%	13.40	134	13.75	0.53%	134	87.14	199.00	7.72	206.72	537.30
135	10.26	0.46%	99.28	135	16.36	135	173	0.62%	15.11	135	16.00	0.61%	135	100.29	163.36	7.72	171.08	402.12
136	0.00	0.00%	0.00	136	16.36	136	132	0.47%	11.45	136	15.50	0.60%	136	98.65	163.36	7.72	96.82	223.28
137	4.38	0.19%	41.01	137	16.36	137	152	0.54%	13.16	137	16.00	0.61%	137	100.29	163.36	7.72	171.08	341.90
138	28.14	1.25%	269.79	138	16.36	138	175	0.63%	15.35	138	13.75	0.53%	138	87.14	199.00	7.72	206.72	595.36
139	22.26	0.99%	213.68	139	16.36	139	153	0.55%	13.40	139	13.75	0.53%	139	87.14	199.00	7.72	206.72	537.30
140	10.26	0.46%	99.28	140	16.36	140	173	0.62%	15.11	140	16.00	0.61%	140	100.29	163.36	7.72	171.08	402.12
141	0.00	0.00%	0.00	141	16.36	141	132	0.47%	11.45	141	15.50	0.60%	141	98.65	163.36	7.72	96.82	223.28
142	4.38	0.19%	41.01	142	16.36	142	152	0.54%	13.16	142	16.00	0.61%	142	100.29	163.36	7.72	171.08	341.90
143	28.14	1.25%	269.79	143	16.36	143	175	0.63%	15.35	143	13.75	0.53%	143	87.14	199.00	7.72	206.72	595.36
144	22.26	0.99%	213.68	144	16.36	144	153	0.55%	13.40	144	13.75	0.53%	144	87.14	199.00	7.72	206.72	537.30
145	10.26	0.46%	99.28	145	16.36	145	173	0.62%	15.11	145	16.00	0.61%	145	100.29	163.36	7.72	171.08	402.12
146	0.00	0.00%	0.00	146	16.36	146	132	0.47%	11.45	146	15.50	0.60%	146	98.65	163.36	7.72	96.82	223.28
147	4.38	0.19%	41.01	147	16.36	147	152	0.54%	13.16	147	16.00	0.61%	147	100.29	163.36	7.72	171.08	341.90
148	28.14	1.25%	269.79	148	16.36	148	175	0.63%	15.35	148	13.75	0.53%	148	87.14	199.00	7.72	206.72	595.36
149	22.26	0.99%	213.68	149	16.36	149	153	0.55%	13.40	149	13.75	0.53%	149	87.14	199.00	7.72	206.72	537.30
150	10.26	0.46%	99.28	150	16.36	150	173	0.62%	15.11	150	16.00	0.61%	150	100.29	163.36	7.72	171.08	402.12
151	0.00	0.00%	0.00	151	16.36	151	132	0.47%	11.45	151	15.50	0.60%	151	98.65	163.36	7.72	96.82	223.28
152	4.38	0.19%	41.01	152	16.36	152	152	0.54%	13.16	152	16.00	0.61%	152	100.29	163.36	7.72	171.08	341.90
153	28.14	1.25%	269.79	153	16.36	153	175	0.63%	15.35	153	13.75	0.53%	153	87.14	199.00	7.72	206.72	595.36

Window replacement		Unit door locks		Roof membrane & smoke detectors		Unit balustrading costs		External building painting area based costs			Total Costs in Table 4			
Lot No	Area of boundary windows	% of total lot area	Cost per lot	Lot No	Area of tower units	% of total lot area	Cost per lot	Lot No	Length of unit balustrade	% of total balustrading	Cost per lot	Lot No	Share of painting to exterior of common building areas	Total painting
154	22.26	0.99%	213.68	154	153	0.55%	13.40	154	13.75	0.53%	87.14	154	7.72	206.72
155	10.26	0.46%	99.28	155	173	0.62%	15.11	155	16.00	0.61%	100.29	155	7.72	171.08
156	0.00	0.00%	0.00	156	132	0.47%	11.45	156	15.50	0.60%	98.65	156	7.72	96.82
157	4.38	0.19%	41.01	157	152	0.54%	13.16	157	16.00	0.61%	100.29	157	7.72	171.08
158	28.14	1.25%	269.79	158	175	0.63%	15.35	158	13.75	0.53%	87.14	158	7.72	206.72
159	22.26	0.99%	213.68	159	153	0.55%	13.40	159	13.75	0.53%	87.14	159	7.72	206.72
160	10.26	0.46%	99.28	160	173	0.62%	15.11	160	16.00	0.61%	100.29	160	7.72	171.08
161	0.00	0.00%	0.00	161	132	0.47%	11.45	161	15.50	0.60%	98.65	161	7.72	96.82
162	4.38	0.19%	41.01	162	152	0.54%	13.16	162	16.00	0.61%	100.29	162	7.72	171.08
163	28.14	1.25%	269.79	163	175	0.63%	15.35	163	13.75	0.53%	87.14	163	7.72	206.72
164	22.26	0.99%	213.68	164	153	0.55%	13.40	164	13.75	0.53%	87.14	164	7.72	206.72
165	10.26	0.46%	99.28	165	173	0.62%	15.11	165	16.00	0.61%	100.29	165	7.72	171.08
166	0.00	0.00%	0.00	166	132	0.47%	11.45	166	15.50	0.60%	98.65	166	7.72	96.82
167	4.38	0.19%	41.01	167	152	0.54%	13.16	167	16.00	0.61%	100.29	167	7.72	171.08
168	28.14	1.25%	269.79	168	175	0.63%	15.35	168	13.75	0.53%	87.14	168	7.72	206.72
171	0.00	0.00%	0.00	171	132	0.47%	11.45	171	15.50	0.60%	98.65	171	7.72	96.82
172	4.38	0.19%	41.01	172	152	0.54%	13.16	172	16.00	0.61%	100.29	172	7.72	171.08
173	28.14	1.25%	269.79	173	175	0.63%	15.35	173	13.75	0.53%	87.14	173	7.72	206.72
174	32.52	1.44%	310.80	174	339	1.21%	29.49	174	29.75	1.14%	187.43	174	7.72	370.08
175	0.00	0.00%	0.00	175	132	0.47%	11.45	175	15.50	0.60%	98.65	175	7.72	96.82
176	32.52	1.44%	310.80	176	335	1.20%	29.24	176	29.75	1.14%	187.43	176	7.72	370.08
177	32.52	1.44%	310.80	177	339	1.21%	29.49	177	29.75	1.14%	187.43	177	7.72	370.08
178	0.00	0.00%	0.00	178	132	0.47%	11.45	178	15.50	0.60%	98.65	178	7.72	96.82
179	32.52	1.44%	310.80	179	335	1.20%	29.24	179	29.75	1.14%	187.43	179	7.72	370.08
180	32.52	1.44%	310.80	180	426	1.52%	37.04	180	37.10	1.42%	233.47	180	7.72	592.84
181	32.52	1.44%	310.80	181	423	1.51%	36.80	181	37.10	1.42%	233.47	181	7.72	592.84
182	0.00	0.00%	0.00	182	204	0.73%	17.79	182	22.50	0.86%	141.39	182	7.72	174.05
183	0.00	0.00%	0.00	183	204	0.73%	17.79	183	22.50	0.86%	141.39	183	7.72	174.05
184	0.00	0.00%	0.00	184	204	0.73%	17.79	184	22.50	0.86%	141.39	184	7.72	174.05
185	0.00	0.00%	0.00	185	204	0.73%	17.79	185	22.50	0.86%	141.39	185	7.72	174.05
186	0.00	0.00%	0.00	186	204	0.73%	17.79	186	22.50	0.86%	141.39	186	7.72	174.05
187	0.00	0.00%	0.00	187	204	0.73%	17.79	187	22.50	0.86%	141.39	187	7.72	174.05
188	0.00	0.00%	0.00	188	204	0.73%	17.79	188	22.50	0.86%	141.39	188	7.72	174.05
189	0.00	0.00%	0.00	189	204	0.73%	17.79	189	22.50	0.86%	141.39	189	7.72	174.05
190	0.00	0.00%	0.00	190	204	0.73%	17.79	190	22.50	0.86%	141.39	190	7.72	174.05
191	32.52	1.44%	310.80	191	326	1.16%	28.27	191	29.75	1.14%	187.43	191	7.72	370.08
192	32.52	1.44%	310.80	192	293	1.05%	25.59	192	29.75	1.14%	187.43	192	7.72	352.26
170	2,254.14	100.23%	21,633.04	170	28,000.00	100.19%	2,441.43	170	2,604.75	99.90%	16,424.86	170	1,312.40	31,025.83
														74,306.36

**Table 5 - Cost Impact Assessment & Recommended Entitlement Schedule**

Lot No	Admin costs allocated equally	SF costs allocated equally	Table 4 Costs	Lift (25,000) & insurance (1,500)	Cold water pumps & cylinders	Total expenses allocated	Lot No	% of total to each lot	Recom. contribution schedule	Change
	558,588.12	108,123.20	74,255.97	26,500.00	421.27	767,888.56				
1	3,285.81	636.02	182.00	155.88	1.30	4,261.01	1	0.55%	55	0
2	3,285.81	636.02	182.00	155.88	1.30	4,261.01	2	0.55%	55	0
3	3,285.81	636.02	218.66	155.88	1.30	4,297.67	3	0.56%	56	0
4	3,285.81	636.02	402.36	155.88	1.30	4,481.37	4	0.58%	58	0
5	3,285.81	636.02	217.19	155.88	1.30	4,296.20	5	0.56%	56	0
6	3,285.81	636.02	402.12	155.88	1.30	4,481.13	6	0.58%	58	0
7	3,285.81	636.02	537.30	155.88	1.30	4,616.31	7	0.60%	60	0
8	3,285.81	636.02	537.30	155.88	1.30	4,616.31	8	0.60%	60	0
9	3,285.81	636.02	356.72	155.88	1.30	4,435.73	9	0.58%	58	0
12	3,285.81	636.02	356.72	155.88	1.30	4,435.73	12	0.58%	58	0
13	3,285.81	636.02	537.30	155.88	1.30	4,616.31	13	0.60%	60	0
14	3,285.81	636.02	537.30	155.88	1.30	4,616.31	14	0.60%	60	0
15	3,285.81	636.02	356.72	155.88	1.30	4,435.73	15	0.58%	58	0
16	3,285.81	636.02	186.71	155.88	1.30	4,265.72	16	0.56%	56	1
17	3,285.81	636.02	186.71	155.88	1.30	4,265.72	17	0.56%	56	1
18	3,285.81	636.02	356.72	155.88	1.30	4,435.73	18	0.58%	58	0
19	3,285.81	636.02	537.30	155.88	1.30	4,616.31	19	0.60%	60	0
20	3,285.81	636.02	537.30	155.88	1.30	4,616.31	20	0.60%	60	0
21	3,285.81	636.02	356.72	155.88	1.30	4,435.73	21	0.58%	58	0
24	3,285.81	636.02	356.72	155.88	1.30	4,435.73	24	0.58%	58	0
25	3,285.81	636.02	537.30	155.88	1.30	4,616.31	25	0.60%	60	0
26	3,285.81	636.02	537.30	155.88	1.30	4,616.31	26	0.60%	60	0
27	3,285.81	636.02	356.72	155.88	1.30	4,435.73	27	0.58%	58	0
30	3,285.81	636.02	356.72	155.88	1.30	4,435.73	30	0.58%	58	0
31	3,285.81	636.02	537.30	155.88	1.30	4,616.31	31	0.60%	60	0
32	3,285.81	636.02	537.30	155.88	1.30	4,616.31	32	0.60%	60	0
33	3,285.81	636.02	356.72	155.88	1.30	4,435.73	33	0.58%	58	0
36	3,285.81	636.02	356.72	155.88	1.30	4,435.73	36	0.58%	58	0
37	3,285.81	636.02	537.30	155.88	1.30	4,616.31	37	0.60%	60	0
38	3,285.81	636.02	537.30	155.88	1.30	4,616.31	38	0.60%	60	0
39	3,285.81	636.02	402.12	155.88	1.30	4,481.13	39	0.58%	58	0
40	3,285.81	636.02	223.28	155.88	1.30	4,302.29	40	0.56%	56	0
41	3,285.81	636.02	341.90	155.88	1.30	4,420.91	41	0.58%	58	0
42	3,285.81	636.02	595.36	155.88	1.30	4,674.37	42	0.61%	61	0
43	3,285.81	636.02	537.30	155.88	1.30	4,616.31	43	0.60%	60	0
44	3,285.81	636.02	402.12	155.88	1.30	4,481.13	44	0.58%	58	0
45	3,285.81	636.02	223.28	155.88	1.30	4,302.29	45	0.56%	56	0
46	3,285.81	636.02	341.90	155.88	1.30	4,420.91	46	0.58%	58	0
47	3,285.81	636.02	595.36	155.88	1.30	4,674.37	47	0.61%	61	0

Original recommended entitlements

Lot No	Admin costs allocated equally	SF costs allocated equally	Table 4 Costs	Lift (25,000) & insurance (1,500)	Cold water pumps & cylinders	Total expenses allocated	Lot No	% of total to each lot	Recom. contribution schedule	Change
48	3,285.81	636.02	537.30	155.88	1.30	4,616.31	48	0.60%	60	0
49	3,285.81	636.02	402.12	155.88	1.30	4,481.13	49	0.58%	58	0
50	3,285.81	636.02	223.28	155.88	1.30	4,302.29	50	0.56%	56	0
51	3,285.81	636.02	341.90	155.88	1.30	4,420.91	51	0.58%	58	0
52	3,285.81	636.02	595.36	155.88	1.30	4,674.37	52	0.61%	61	0
53	3,285.81	636.02	537.30	155.88	1.30	4,616.31	53	0.60%	60	0
54	3,285.81	636.02	402.12	155.88	1.30	4,481.13	54	0.58%	58	0
55	3,285.81	636.02	223.28	155.88	1.30	4,302.29	55	0.56%	56	0
56	3,285.81	636.02	341.90	155.88	1.30	4,420.91	56	0.58%	58	0
57	3,285.81	636.02	595.36	155.88	1.30	4,674.37	57	0.61%	61	0
58	3,285.81	636.02	537.30	155.88	1.30	4,616.31	58	0.60%	60	0
59	3,285.81	636.02	402.12	155.88	1.30	4,481.13	59	0.58%	58	0
60	3,285.81	636.02	223.28	155.88	1.30	4,302.29	60	0.56%	56	0
61	3,285.81	636.02	341.90	155.88	1.30	4,420.91	61	0.58%	58	0
62	3,285.81	636.02	595.36	155.88	1.30	4,674.37	62	0.61%	61	0
63	3,285.81	636.02	537.30	155.88	1.30	4,616.31	63	0.60%	60	0
64	3,285.81	636.02	402.12	155.88	1.30	4,481.13	64	0.58%	58	0
65	3,285.81	636.02	223.28	155.88	1.30	4,302.29	65	0.56%	56	0
66	3,285.81	636.02	341.90	155.88	1.30	4,420.91	66	0.58%	58	0
67	3,285.81	636.02	595.36	155.88	1.30	4,674.37	67	0.61%	61	0
68	3,285.81	636.02	537.30	155.88	1.30	4,616.31	68	0.60%	60	0
69	3,285.81	636.02	356.72	155.88	1.30	4,435.73	69	0.58%	58	0
72	3,285.81	636.02	356.72	155.88	1.30	4,435.73	72	0.58%	58	0
73	3,285.81	636.02	537.30	155.88	1.30	4,616.31	73	0.60%	60	0
74	3,285.81	636.02	537.30	155.88	1.30	4,616.31	74	0.60%	60	0
75	3,285.81	636.02	356.72	155.88	1.30	4,435.73	75	0.58%	58	0
78	3,285.81	636.02	356.72	155.88	1.30	4,435.73	78	0.58%	58	0
79	3,285.81	636.02	537.30	155.88	1.30	4,616.31	79	0.60%	60	0
80	3,285.81	636.02	537.30	155.88	1.30	4,616.31	80	0.60%	60	0
81	3,285.81	636.02	356.72	155.88	1.30	4,435.73	81	0.58%	58	0
84	3,285.81	636.02	356.72	155.88	1.30	4,435.73	84	0.58%	58	0
85	3,285.81	636.02	537.30	155.88	1.30	4,616.31	85	0.60%	60	0
86	3,285.81	636.02	537.30	155.88	1.30	4,616.31	86	0.60%	60	0
87	3,285.81	636.02	356.72	155.88	1.30	4,435.73	87	0.58%	58	0
92	3,285.81	636.02	537.30	155.88	1.30	4,616.31	92	0.60%	60	0
93	3,285.81	636.02	356.72	155.88	1.30	4,435.73	93	0.58%	58	0
96	3,285.81	636.02	356.72	155.88	1.30	4,435.73	96	0.58%	58	0
97	3,285.81	636.02	537.30	155.88	1.30	4,616.31	97	0.60%	60	0
98	3,285.81	636.02	537.30	155.88	1.30	4,616.31	98	0.60%	60	0
99	3,285.81	636.02	356.72	155.88	1.30	4,435.73	99	0.58%	58	0
100	3,285.81	636.02	186.71	155.88	1.30	4,265.72	100	0.56%	56	1
101	3,285.81	636.02	186.71	155.88	1.30	4,265.72	101	0.56%	56	1
102	3,285.81	636.02	356.72	155.88	1.30	4,435.73	102	0.58%	58	0
103	3,285.81	636.02	537.30	155.88	1.30	4,616.31	103	0.60%	60	0

Table 5 - Cost Impact Assessment Recommended Entitlement Schedule

Lot No	Admun costs allocated equally	SF costs allocated equally	Table 4 Costs	Lift (25,000) & insurance (1,500)	Cold water pumps & cylinders	Total expenses allocated	Lot No	% of total to each lot	Recom. contribution schedule	Change
104	3,285.81	636.02	537.30	155.88	1.30	4,616.31	104	0.60%	60	0
105	3,285.81	636.02	402.12	155.88	1.30	4,481.13	105	0.58%	58	0
106	3,285.81	636.02	223.28	155.88	1.30	4,302.29	106	0.56%	56	0
107	3,285.81	636.02	341.90	155.88	1.30	4,420.91	107	0.58%	58	0
108	3,285.81	636.02	595.36	155.88	1.30	4,674.37	108	0.61%	61	0
109	3,285.81	636.02	537.30	155.88	1.30	4,616.31	109	0.60%	60	0
110	3,285.81	636.02	402.12	155.88	1.30	4,481.13	110	0.58%	58	0
111	3,285.81	636.02	223.28	155.88	1.30	4,302.29	111	0.56%	56	0
112	3,285.81	636.02	341.90	155.88	1.30	4,420.91	112	0.58%	58	0
113	3,285.81	636.02	595.36	155.88	1.30	4,674.37	113	0.61%	61	0
114	3,285.81	636.02	537.30	155.88	1.30	4,616.31	114	0.60%	60	0
115	3,285.81	636.02	402.12	155.88	1.30	4,481.13	115	0.58%	58	0
116	3,285.81	636.02	223.28	155.88	1.30	4,302.29	116	0.56%	56	0
117	3,285.81	636.02	341.90	155.88	1.30	4,420.91	117	0.58%	58	0
118	3,285.81	636.02	595.36	155.88	1.30	4,674.37	118	0.61%	61	0
119	3,285.81	636.02	537.30	155.88	1.30	4,616.31	119	0.60%	60	0
120	3,285.81	636.02	402.12	155.88	1.30	4,481.13	120	0.58%	58	0
121	3,285.81	636.02	223.28	155.88	1.30	4,302.29	121	0.56%	56	0
122	3,285.81	636.02	341.90	155.88	1.30	4,420.91	122	0.58%	58	0
123	3,285.81	636.02	595.36	155.88	1.30	4,674.37	123	0.61%	61	0
124	3,285.81	636.02	537.30	155.88	1.30	4,616.31	124	0.60%	60	0
125	3,285.81	636.02	402.12	155.88	1.30	4,481.13	125	0.58%	58	0
126	3,285.81	636.02	223.28	155.88	1.30	4,302.29	126	0.56%	56	0
127	3,285.81	636.02	341.90	155.88	1.30	4,420.91	127	0.58%	58	0
128	3,285.81	636.02	595.36	155.88	1.30	4,674.37	128	0.61%	61	0
129	3,285.81	636.02	537.30	155.88	1.30	4,616.31	129	0.60%	60	0
130	3,285.81	636.02	402.12	155.88	1.30	4,481.13	130	0.58%	58	0
131	3,285.81	636.02	223.28	155.88	1.30	4,302.29	131	0.56%	56	0
132	3,285.81	636.02	341.90	155.88	1.30	4,420.91	132	0.58%	58	0
133	3,285.81	636.02	595.36	155.88	1.30	4,674.37	133	0.61%	61	0
134	3,285.81	636.02	537.30	155.88	1.30	4,616.31	134	0.60%	60	0
135	3,285.81	636.02	402.12	155.88	1.30	4,481.13	135	0.58%	58	0
136	3,285.81	636.02	223.28	155.88	1.30	4,302.29	136	0.56%	56	0
137	3,285.81	636.02	341.90	155.88	1.30	4,420.91	137	0.58%	58	0
138	3,285.81	636.02	595.36	155.88	1.30	4,674.37	138	0.61%	61	0
139	3,285.81	636.02	537.30	155.88	1.30	4,616.31	139	0.60%	60	0
140	3,285.81	636.02	402.12	155.88	1.30	4,481.13	140	0.58%	58	0
141	3,285.81	636.02	223.28	155.88	1.30	4,302.29	141	0.56%	56	0
142	3,285.81	636.02	341.90	155.88	1.30	4,420.91	142	0.58%	58	0
143	3,285.81	636.02	595.36	155.88	1.30	4,674.37	143	0.61%	61	0
144	3,285.81	636.02	537.30	155.88	1.30	4,616.31	144	0.60%	60	0
145	3,285.81	636.02	402.12	155.88	1.30	4,481.13	145	0.58%	58	0
146	3,285.81	636.02	223.28	155.88	1.30	4,302.29	146	0.56%	56	0
147	3,285.81	636.02	341.90	155.88	1.30	4,420.91	147	0.58%	58	0

Table 5 - Cost Impact Assessment Recommended Entitlement Schedule

Lot No	Admin costs allocated equally	SF costs allocated equally	Table 4 Costs	Lift (25,000) & insurance (1,500)	Cold water pumps & cylinders	Total expenses allocated	Lot No	% of total to each lot	Recom. contribution schedule	Change
148	3,285.81	636.02	595.36	155.88	1.30	4,674.37	148	0.61%	61	0
149	3,285.81	636.02	537.30	155.88	1.30	4,616.31	149	0.60%	60	0
150	3,285.81	636.02	402.12	155.88	1.30	4,481.13	150	0.58%	58	0
151	3,285.81	636.02	223.28	155.88	1.30	4,302.29	151	0.56%	56	0
152	3,285.81	636.02	341.90	155.88	1.30	4,420.91	152	0.58%	58	0
153	3,285.81	636.02	595.36	155.88	1.30	4,674.37	153	0.61%	61	0
154	3,285.81	636.02	537.30	155.88	1.30	4,616.31	154	0.60%	60	0
155	3,285.81	636.02	402.12	155.88	1.30	4,481.13	155	0.58%	58	0
156	3,285.81	636.02	223.28	155.88	1.30	4,302.29	156	0.56%	56	0
157	3,285.81	636.02	341.90	155.88	1.30	4,420.91	157	0.58%	58	0
158	3,285.81	636.02	595.36	155.88	1.30	4,674.37	158	0.61%	61	0
159	3,285.81	636.02	537.30	155.88	1.30	4,616.31	159	0.60%	60	0
160	3,285.81	636.02	402.12	155.88	1.30	4,481.13	160	0.58%	58	0
161	3,285.81	636.02	223.28	155.88	1.30	4,302.29	161	0.56%	56	0
162	3,285.81	636.02	341.90	155.88	1.30	4,420.91	162	0.58%	58	0
163	3,285.81	636.02	595.36	155.88	1.30	4,674.37	163	0.61%	61	0
164	3,285.81	636.02	537.30	155.88	1.30	4,616.31	164	0.60%	60	0
165	3,285.81	636.02	402.12	155.88	1.30	4,481.13	165	0.58%	58	0
166	3,285.81	636.02	223.28	155.88	1.30	4,302.29	166	0.56%	56	0
167	3,285.81	636.02	341.90	155.88	1.30	4,420.91	167	0.58%	58	0
168	3,285.81	636.02	595.36	155.88	1.30	4,674.37	168	0.61%	61	0
171	3,285.81	636.02	223.28	155.88	1.30	4,302.29	171	0.56%	56	0
172	3,285.81	636.02	341.90	155.88	1.30	4,420.91	172	0.58%	58	0
173	3,285.81	636.02	595.36	155.88	1.30	4,674.37	173	0.61%	61	0
174	3,285.81	636.02	914.16	155.88	26.33	5,018.20	174	0.65%	65	0
175	3,285.81	636.02	297.54	155.88	26.33	4,401.58	175	0.57%	57	0
176	3,285.81	636.02	913.91	155.88	26.33	5,017.95	176	0.65%	65	0
177	3,285.81	636.02	914.16	155.88	26.33	5,018.20	177	0.65%	65	0
178	3,285.81	636.02	297.54	155.88	26.33	4,401.58	178	0.57%	57	0
179	3,285.81	636.02	913.91	155.88	26.33	5,017.95	179	0.65%	65	0
180	3,285.81	636.02	1,190.51	155.88	26.33	5,294.55	180	0.69%	69	0
181	3,285.81	636.02	1,190.27	155.88	26.33	5,294.31	181	0.69%	69	0
182	3,285.81	636.02	349.59	155.88	1.30	4,428.60	182	0.58%	58	0
183	3,285.81	636.02	349.59	155.88	1.30	4,428.60	183	0.58%	58	0
184	3,285.81	636.02	349.59	155.88	1.30	4,428.60	184	0.58%	58	0
185	3,285.81	636.02	349.59	155.88	1.30	4,428.60	185	0.58%	58	0
186	3,285.81	636.02	349.59	155.88	1.30	4,428.60	186	0.58%	58	0
187	3,285.81	636.02	349.59	155.88	1.30	4,428.60	187	0.58%	58	0
188	3,285.81	636.02	349.59	155.88	1.30	4,428.60	188	0.58%	58	0
189	3,285.81	636.02	349.59	155.88	1.30	4,428.60	189	0.58%	58	0
190	3,285.81	636.02	349.59	155.88	1.30	4,428.60	190	0.58%	58	0
191	3,285.81	636.02	912.94	155.88	1.30	4,991.95	191	0.65%	65	0
192	3,285.81	636.02	892.44	155.88	1.30	4,971.45	192	0.65%	65	0
170	558,587.70	108,123.40	74,306.36	26,499.60	421.24	767,938.30	170	100.02%	10002	0
								100.06%	10006	

Table 5 - Cost Impact Assessment Recommended Entitlement Schedule