WITHESS STATEMENT OF CHRISTOPHER MANNDER TAYLOR.

- 1. Curistopher Maunder Taylor will say:
- 1. 1 am a Chartered Surveyor, Fellow of The Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors.
- 1.2 1 was first elected as a Professional Associate of the lastitution in 1971
  - 1.3 1 am a Consultant to Maunda Taylor Services ltd, which practises as Maunda Taylor Chartered Surveyore, having joined that company as a consultant in long.
    - 1.4 My professional career has been as follows.

1966	Articled Clear	Hannelt Raffely . South Bucks.
1969		king > co. London Ecl
1973	Assistant to managing direction	r Interland Estates la. London co.
1975	Assistant Suveyor (temporary)	) Papper Angliss Darwood. London wit
1975	Suveya	Stock Page : Stock London N.1
1976	parker	Stock Page 2 Stock London N.1
1986	Social polher	
1990	Director (non-executive)	mountview Bolates Pie London
1992	Director Cexecutive)	mountview Estates Pic London
2006	Associate Director	baris Brown ltd. London W.T
2009	Consultant	Manuda Paylor London N.20
2016	Senior Surveyor (goly time)	Landoné Western Holdings pur Laudon WCZ

of The Institute of Continuing Professional Development until my retirement at the end of 2016

- a. Instructions.
- 2.1 On 16th Angust 2016 I was instructed by
  SAMANTHA VALECIA WRIGHT of 14 The Mount Square
  London NW3 GSX to advise her concerning
  a boundary orispute with her neighbour.
  ANTHONY PAUL MERDEN of 15 The Mount Square
  London NW3 GSX
- 2.2 1 advised Mr. Wright that I had been a Director of hountview Estates PLC who had been the owners of the freehold interests of both properties until January 1958.
- 8.3 On 8474. June 2016 use. Meaden wrote to his wright inferming her that he intended to measure and mark out the boundary lines between the two properties as accordately as possible in accordance with the plans (being the fited title plans attached to like transfers in 1958).
- 2.4. While meader stated in his letter of 2474 June 2016 that he intended to evert a fence, which with include a small gate, wholly on his land up to the general boundary.
- 2.5 W. Meaden attached a hand-drawn plan which states that it is drawn to a scale of 1:50 and onto which various metric dimensions we given.
- 2.4 The 1958 transfer plans give imperial olimensions.
- 2.7 The metric dimensions given by his headen do not correspond with the imperial dimensions, when

converted, shawn on the Wansfer plans.

2.8. The fence was subsequently exected on the line indicated on his. headen's hand-drawn plan.

## 3. Investigation

- 3.1 On 22nd August 2016 I made an inspection of lus. Wight's property and took measurements.
- 3.2 luy measurements were taken in imperial dimensions which I converted to metric so that I could compare the information of on the transfer plans, with his headen's hard-drawn plan.
- 3.3 I found that the imperial and metric alimensions do not correspond, as the consequence of which has breaden has excelled his fence within like outilize of his wright's property at 14 The mount square.
- 3.4. I reported to his. wright on 23rd Angust 2016 stating my concensions and making recommendations.
- 8.5 On he wright's instructions, I wrote to he headen on 38TH. Angust 2016. I pointed out liver ever, effected to meet an site (notifying his headen of mavailable dates due to pre-arranged horidays) and requiring the removal of the fence from his wright's property.

- 4. Negotiation.
- on the afternoon of 974 September 2016 I received an e-mail from MR. Terry Northwood FRICS, instructed by MR. Ineaden, who wanted to arrange a site meeting on the following working day (1274. September) before II. so am or on the day after (1374. September) at any time.
- 1.2 I had notified how meader on 30th Angust hat

  I was overseas from 19th. September. In the

  intervening period between my letter and live

  e-mail from how. Northweed, I had committed myself

  irrevocably to other appointments on the days offerred

  by how. Northwood.
- 4.3 There was an exchange of emails between unpost and har. Novithoood on the 1274. and 1374. September in like eowse of which I supplied captes of documents plans and correspondence.
- 4.4. On 218th October the two surveyors met on site to make a joint inspection of both properties.
- 4.5. A draft joint statement was prepared, amended and considered by the two suveyors. A plan was drawn by the Northwood following a measured survey, which was intended to be altached to the draft joint statement.
- 4.6. The survey plan was submitted to me by www. Northwood on 1574. December 2014, onto which had been superimposed the line of the 1958 boundary.

- 4.7 It had been noted by the two suveyors that
  the measurement given for hie west boundary
  of the contrard garden of No. 14 (the east
  boundary of the contrard garden of No. 15) is
  plainly wrong.
- 4.8 I issued a note to WR. Northwood on 77th January 2017 identifying my concerns about live plan which he had submitted for attachment to live ovally joint statement.
- 4.9 W. Northwood replied on 974. January 2017 requesting that I should said him a plan indicating where I consider that the correct boundary line should be.
- 4.10 I sent the plan to his. Morthwood by email on 1674 farmany 2017 with a further copy of the note referred to.
- 4.11 I have not subsequently heard from W. .
- 5. Statement of Tala.
- 5.1 I believe that the facts stated in his Witness Statement are true.
- 6. Signature and Date
- CHAISTOPHER MAUNDER TAYLOR.

  14TH. March 2017.

## 14 and 15 The Mount Square, Hampstead. NW3 6SX

It is important that the joint statement is based on an accurate and correct interpretation of the available information.

The Transfer of 15 The Mount Square, dated 15<sup>th</sup> January 1958, has an attached Transfer plan, which identifies the curtilage of No 15 coloured blue, green and brown. It states that the "ground floor of no. 15 extends under the first floor of no. 14". The area referred to is coloured green on the Transfer plan. The Transfer stipulates that the superstructure above the area coloured green including the joists on which the floor rests and all parts of the building on the land coloured green above the joists, are the property of the vendors (i.e. the owners of no. 14) and shall be maintained and repaired by them.

The Transfer also stipulates that all walls dividing the said premises (i.e. no. 15) from the building no. 14 The Mount Square shall be deemed to be party walls.

The curtilage of no. 14 is shown as being the entirety of the built structure at ground floor level together with the courtyard garden including the flight of steps from ground to first floor. The effect is that there are two vital fixed points for the purposes of this conversation, being the south-west and north-west corners of the building. The north-west corner is the junction of the west wall of the building (which faces the courtyard garden) with the north wall of the building (which divides no.14 from the undercroft at no. 15).

The physical boundary of no. 14 is the external faces of these two walls and also of the south wall. The Transfer directs that the walls dividing no. 15 from the building no.14 shall be deemed to be party walls, so that the north wall of the building no.14 is to be deemed to be a party wall, the line of junction being the centre of that wall.

The flight of steps which give access from the courtyard garden of no. 14 to the first floor of that building, which is offset from the physical boundary, does not divide no.15 from the building no. 14 and therefore is not deemed to be a party wall nor any other form of party structure. The flight of steps stands entirely on land within the curtilage of no.14.

The Transfer plan gives dimensions for the courtyard garden in particular around the boundaries between the courtyards of each of the two properties. The dimension east-west from the southwest corner of no. 14 is shown as 10 feet 6 inches (3200 mm); the west boundary measured southnorth is shown as 14 feet 6 inches (4420 mm) to the point where it changes direction west-east and - whilst this dimension is not shown on the Transfer plan - it can be extrapolated from the other measurements as being 2 feet 8 inches (812 mm). There is then a further change of direction and the next section of boundary runs south-north for a measured distance of 3 feet (914 mm) before changing direction again west-east for a measured distance of 7 feet 10 inches (2388 mm) to meet the other fixed point which is the north-west corner of the building no. 14.

What is apparent from the Transfer plan is that the various points at which the boundary of the courtyard garden changes direction are to be taken as being at right angles. The consequence is that the dimension given for the west boundary of the courtyard garden, namely 14 feet 6 inches (4420 mm) is manifestly incorrect. If that boundary had been a straight line its length would have been the same as the length of the west wall of the building no, 14, which measured from your colleagues

plan is 19 feet 3 inches (5880 mm) although the combined south-north dimensions shown add up to 17 feet 6 inches (5333 mm) - a difference of 1 foot 9 inches (44 mm).

The mistake made at our joint site meeting was to apply the dimension of 14 feet 6 inches - which we identified on site as being incorrect – to the west wall of the building no. 14 ignoring the fixed points to which I have referred. On that basis we concluded at that time that part of the building no. 14 does not belong within the curtilage of no. 14 and, on reflection, that is plainly wrong.

Your colleagues plan shows an SVP at both ground and first floor levels which is not in fact there. The SVP higher up the building changes direction above first-floor floor level, runs across the face of no. 14 to descend to ground level in the north-west corner of the courtyard garden of no.15 at the point where it meets the entrance to the undercroft. There is provision for this in the Transfer.

I suggest that we redraw the physical boundary on your colleagues plan, using all the dimensions shown on the Transfer plan with the exception of the west boundary. For this boundary we should adopt the length of the west wall of the building no.14 applying the changes of direction as they are shown and treating these as right angles.

I believe that this will confirm that the fence erected by Mr Meaden is on land belonging to my client in its entirety.

