Over the last few years, Peter has purchased several properties in Manchester as 'buy to let' investments.

5 Whitby Ave is let out furnished at £500 per month. A tenant moved in on 1 March 2016 but left unexpectedly on 1 May 2017 having paid rent only up to 31 December 2016. The tenant left no forwarding address.

17 Bolton Rd has been let furnished to the same tenant for a number of years at £800 per month.

A recent purchase, 27 Turner Close has been let unfurnished since 1 August 2016 at £750 per month. Before then it was empty whilst Peter redecorated it after its purchase in March 2016.

Peter's expenses during 2016/17 are:

Insurance	No 5 £ 250	No 17 £ 250	No 27 £ 200
Letting agency fees Repairs	300	40	100
Redecoration			500
Curtains	130		
Washer-dryer		600	
Dining table and chairs		350	

No 27 was in a fit state to let when Peter bought it but he wanted to redecorate the property as he felt this would allow him to achieve a better rental income.

The new curtains for No 5 were replacements for old curtains. Peter sold the old curtains for £15.

The washer-dryer for No 17 was a replacement for a washing machine, it would have cost him £475 The washer-dryer for No 17 was a dryer, similar to the old machine, it would have cost him £475 The washer-dryer for No 17 was a dryer, similar to the old machine, it would have cost him £475 The washer-dryer for No 17 was a dryer, similar to the old machine, it would have cost him £475 The washing machine without a dryer. The washer-dryer for No 17 was a replacement for a washing the washing it would have cost him £475. The old a new washing machine without a dryer, similar to the old machine, it would have cost him £475. The old a new washing machine without a dryer, similar to the old machine, it would have cost him £475. The old new washing machine without a dryer, similar to the old machine, it would have cost him £475. The old new washing machine without a dryer, similar to the old machine, it would have cost him £475. The old new washing machine without a dryer, similar to the old machine, it would have cost him £475. The old new washing machine without a dryer, similar to the old machine, it would have cost him £475. The old new washing machine without a dryer, similar to the old machine, it would have cost him £475. The old new washing machine without a dryer, similar to the old machine, it would have cost him £475. The old new washing machine without a dryer, similar to the old machine, it would have cost him £475. The old new washing machine without a dryer, similar to the old machine, it would have cost him £475. The old new washing machine without a dryer, similar to the old machine, it would have cost him £475. The old new washing machine with the cost of the old new washing machine. a new washing machine without a dryer, similar to the old had not previously provided a dining table and washing machine was scrapped with no proceeds. Peter had not previously provided a dining table and chairs in No 17.

Peter made a UK property business loss in 2015/16 of £30	0.		
Peter made a UK property business income for 2016/17? What is Peter's taxable property income for 2016/17?	No 5	No 17 £	No 27
2016/17			
Accrued income	6,000		
12 × £500		9,600	
12 × £800			6,000
8 × £750			0,000
Less:	(250)	(250)	/^^^
Insurance	(230)		(200)
Letting agency fees			(100)
Impairment loss (irrecoverable rent)	/4 E001		
$3 \times £500$	(1,500)		
Repairs	(300)	(40)	
Redecoration (N)			(500)
Replacement domestic items relief			
Curtains £(130 – 15)	(115)		
Washer dryer (limited to cost of washing machine			
without dryer)		(475)	
Dining table and chairs (no relief for initial			
expenditure)		(0)	
Property Income	3,835	(0)	
	====	8,835	5,200
Total property income			2
Less loss b/fwd			17,870
Taxable property income for 2016/17			(300)
			17.570
Noto. The readers - 1.			1/.5/0

Note: The redecoration of No.27 is an allowable expense. This is an example of the application of the case of Odeon Associated Theatres Ltd v Jones 1971 (covered in more detail later in this Text) which showed that the cost of initial repairs to remedy normal wear and tear of a recently acquired asset was an allowable expense. This contrasts with the case of Law Shipping v. CIR 1921 where the cost of initial repairs to improve an asset recently acquired to make it fit to earn profits was disallowable capital expenditure. The key point in relation to No. 27 is that it was fit state to let when acquired.