



**FIRST-TIER TRIBUNAL
PROPERTY CHAMBER
(RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY)**

Tribunal Case reference	:	CHI/OOHN/LSC/2024/0123
Property	:	Keverstone Court Manor Road Bournemouth Dorset BH1 3BZ
Applicant	:	Keverstone Court Residents Society Limited
Representative	:	Mr Robert Weatherley, Counsel instructed by Coles Miller Solicitors
Respondent	:	Leaseholders set out in the attached schedule
Representative	:	Mr Sherif El-Alfy for himself and Mrs Termos and Mr Neagu
Type of application	:	Section 27A(3) Landlord and Tenant Act 1985
Tribunal Members	:	Mr C Norman FRICS Mr M Woodrow MRICS Mr L Packer
Date of Hearing	:	14 August 2025
Date of Decision	:	12 November 2025

DECISION

DECISION

(1) The Tribunal finds, under section 27A(3) of the Landlord and Tenant Act 1985 (“the 1985 Act”) that the following works if carried out would be recoverable under the service charge, subject to a future assessment as to the reasonableness of cost:

- i. Stripping the surface tiling of the balconies and underlying asphalt**
- ii. Provide a new waterproofing system**
- iii. Renewal and adjustment of rainwater outlets and rainwater goods serving the balconies**
- iv. Concrete repairs to the slab where needed**
- v. Replacement of lead flashings where needed**
- vi. Treatment and decoration of the metal railings**
- vii. Provision of replacement balcony tiles**
- viii. Scaffolding required to effect the repairs**

(2) The application for orders under section 20C of the 1985 Act are refused.

REASONS

Background

1. This application concerns the reasonableness and payability of future expenditure in respect of balcony repairs to Keverstone Court (“the property”). Keverstone Court was constructed about 40 years ago and comprises 9 purpose-built blocks of flats comprising 131 flats together with a separate bungalow.
2. Directions were issued on 17 January and 10 March 2025. These set the matter down for determination on the papers without a hearing or inspection. Subsequently on 10 June 2025 Mr Sherif El-Alfy requested an oral hearing, and this was directed by the tribunal on 2 July 2025.

The Hearing

3. The Hearing took place on 14 August 2025 via CVP video conferencing, with all parties and the tribunal attending remotely.
4. The applicant was represented by Mr Robert Weatherley of counsel instructed by Coles Miller solicitors, of whom Mr Charlie Edge attended. Ms Diana Barden and Mr Matthew Owens (of the managing agents) also attended. Of the respondents, Mr Sherif El-Alfy attended and

represented himself, Mrs Rosie Termos and Mr Gabiel Neagu. The Respondents Mr Alan Wilson and Mr Robert Martin also attended as well as two observers. The tribunal received a hearing bundle of 211 pages together with a skeleton argument from Counsel. Prior to the hearing the tribunal directed that better photographs of the subject balconies be obtained, and these were provided in a further document of 54 pages.

5. The applicant relied on an experts' report from a building surveyor, Mr Karl Grover BSc MCIOB MRICS of Bennington Green Ltd, Poole Road Bournemouth. However, Mr Grover did not attend the hearing to give evidence.

Jurisdiction

6. The Tribunal raised with the parties the issue that it does not have power to give declarations, as the application had been framed in such terms. It was also concerned that the expert's report appeared insufficiently detailed on costs to make any reliable assessment of the likely costs of the balcony works. However, the Tribunal has jurisdiction under section 27A(3) of the Act to make a determination as to whether, if costs were incurred for repairs of a specified description, a service charge would be payable.
7. Counsel submitted that there was no specific rule about the amount of detail required. There was sufficient detail available to the Tribunal, but the determination would need to be carefully phrased. The evidence was imperfect. The Bennington Green report gave a description of the works. The other alternative was a split trial.
8. Mr El-Alfy disagreed. His submission was that the applicant had not discharged its burden under section 20 [of the 1985 Act] nor justified the scope of work. He accepted that the Tribunal may have jurisdiction, but he had wanted to cross examine the applicant's expert. The proposed work was to cost in the region of £1.5m [according to Bennington Green] and the scaffolding was hugely expensive.
9. Following a short adjournment, the Tribunal announced that it would accept jurisdiction. It was satisfied that the Bennington Green report did contain sufficient detail to describe in general terms the required works and that it could make a determination under section 27A(3). However, it would make no findings in relation to the reasonableness of any costs to be incurred as part of the present application.

The applicant's case

10. The applicant sought a determination from the tribunal as to (i) whether landlord or tenant is responsible for repairing maintaining and renewing the balconies (ii) a determination as to whether landlord or the tenants are obliged to repair maintain and renew the waterproof membrane layer of the balconies of each type and (iii) whether the applicant can charge

leaseholders for the cost of balcony repairs irrespective of whether the applicant is responsible for repair maintenance or renewal [13].

11. There were four balcony types which were described by the applicant as follows: type A is a penthouse terrace of which a very small section extends beyond the building line and is cantilevered. Type B is a cantilevered balcony being an extension of the floor slab. Type C is a balcony extending from the kitchen of flats. These balconies are cantilevered being an extension of the floor slab. Type D are ground floor terraces which are cantilevered [having garages below]. Each balcony type was constructed of an asphalt waterproof membrane sitting under decorative tiles. This was to protect the structure of the building and ensure weather tightness. The bungalow did not have a balcony.
12. The freehold of the property is owned by Keverstone Court Freehold Limited. The applicant Keverstone Court Residents Society is registered with the FCA and run in accordance with Rules. The applicant is a party to the lease and responsible for carrying out certain maintenance and repair obligations. Each flat and the bungalow had been let on substantially the same terms.
13. Since its construction in the 1990s, the applicant and the leaseholders had understood that all balcony repair works were the applicant's responsibility under the lease, and this has been approved by leaseholders at annual general meetings. A leaseholder had now challenged this and asserted that each leaseholder is responsible for repairs to their own balcony. Urgent and extensive works are required to the balconies. The asphalt is approximately 40 years old and has started to craze and there has been some water ingress into flats.
14. The applicant commissioned an expert building surveyor to assess the condition of the balconies and works required, Mr Karl Grover BSc MCIOB MRICS of Bennington Green Ltd. He produced a report dated 17 April 2025. The proposed works included:
 - a. Stripping the existing surfaces comprising the promenade tiling and asphalt down to the concrete deck;
 - b. Providing a new waterproofing system in replacement of the old;
 - c. Renewal and adjustment of the rainwater outlets and goods serving the balconies;
 - d. Repairing the underlying concrete as appropriate;
 - e. Replacing the lead flashings and treatment and decorations to the metal railings;
 - f. Replacement of new walkway tiles.

The Lease

15. Counsel's skeleton argument helpfully set out the salient provisions which the Tribunal adopts out as follows.

Clause 4(2) of the Lease states that:

"The Leaseholder covenants with the Landlord and with the Society as follows:

....From the Takeover Date [which has passed] for the remainder of the term of this Lease to pay to the Society the Subscription at the times and in the manner specified in the Particulars".

The Subscription is defined at clause 1 (14) to mean the "*sum specified in the Particulars*" [p.126]. The Particulars then state that the Subscription is (from the "Takeover Date" – which has passed):

"....*such sum as may from time to time be determined by the Society in accordance with its Rules....*"

The Rules (a copy of the most recent Rules appear at p.164-182), provide materially that:

a. [at para 1] The objects of the Applicant "*shall be the maintenance and management of the estate occupied by its members at Keverstone Court...*" [p.165, para 1 of the Rules]; and

b. [at para 20] "*Every member of the Society shall pay an annual subscription (known informally as the service charge) per share held by the members. At any Annual General Meeting or at a Special General Meeting called for this purpose a three-fourths majority of the members present and entitled to vote is required to agree the amount of the said annual subscription*". [p.167].

The lease more particularly defines which parts of the entire estate the Applicant is responsible for maintaining (and therefore which costs they can pass on). Clause 6(2) sets out the obligations on the Applicant. It materially provides:

"*The Society Covenants with the Landlord and separately with the Leaseholder that from the Takeover date it will comply with its obligations set out in sub-clause (3) to (10) of this clause and henceforth it will comply with the obligations set out in sub-clause (11) to (13) of this clause.*" [pp.131-132]

12. The part which is particularly relevant to this application is then set out at clause 6(6) which states that the obligations include obligations on the Applicant [p.133]:

“To repair renew and maintain:-

*(i) The **roof foundations exterior main structure** boundary walls and all other walls of the Buildings (except in so far as they are repairable by a leaseholder of an apartment or lodge in the Buildings or would be if all leases of apartments or lodge in the Buildings were in a similar form to this Lease)*

(ii) ...

(iii) The Common Parts

(iv) The Basement Level Parking Space (v) The Basement Garage

(vi) The Carport Block.”

[emphasis added] [...]

15. The Premises are defined to mean:

“...the apartment or lodge specified in the Particulars (showed edged red on the annexed plan) and includes:

....

(ii) all interior partition walls of the apartment or lodge and the inner half (severed medially) of the other walls of the apartment or lodge except the structural walls and excepting also any structural columns or piers

(iii) the floors of the apartment or lodge down to (but excluding) the material of the main structure

(iv) the ceiling of the apartment or lodge down to (but excluding) the material of the main structure

(v) the plaster of the inner faces of structural walls columns or piers

...

(vii) The balcony or terrace outside the apartment or lodge

....”

16. Counsel also submitted that the Applicant’s responsibility included obligations to repair the roof and the main structure but excluding those parts of the buildings which are repairable by individual leaseholders. By clause 4, the tenant was obliged to “keep the Premises clean and in good repair and to keep the windows clean”.

17. As to the approach to construction of the covenants, counsel submitted that ordinary principles of construction apply. From *Arnold v Britton* [2015] UKSC 36, service charge provisions are not to be construed particularly restrictively. Counsel also referred to *Investors*

18. From [para 15 of *Arnold v Britton*] [t]he tribunal should be concerned with assessing the meaning of the lease to a reasonable person “(i) the natural and ordinary meaning of the clause, (ii) any other relevant provisions of the lease, (iii) the overall purpose of the clause and the lease, (iv) the facts and circumstances known or assumed by the parties at the time that the document was executed, and (v) commercial common sense, but (vi) disregarding subjective evidence of any party's intentions.” In *Arnold v Britton* it was also held that commercial common sense is “a very important factor to take into account when interpreting a contract”, but “a court should be very slow to reject the natural meaning of a provision as correct simply because it appears to be a very imprudent term for one of the parties to have agreed.”
19. Counsel submitted that how the parties have historically treated the balconies or understood the lease to function was irrelevant. Whether other persons had undertaken repairs to the balconies subsequently to the lease being signed was irrelevant; building standards and regulations were irrelevant as was legal advice historically provided.
20. The applicants' primary case is that the waterproofing and structures below it are matters that fall within the repairing obligation of the applicant. This was because Clause 1 defines the premises to include only those things which the tenant can rationally use. “Balcony” is not defined in the lease nor the depth of the balcony. As further factors are the structure of the building and that the balcony is not just a balcony but also the roof of the premises below in the case of balconies A, C and D.
21. Under the lease tenants are under an obligation to repair the demised “premises”. “Premises” at clause 1 are defined to include the balcony. Balcony depth is undefined but forms an extension to the roof slab, a roof for some of the floors below and the applicant is responsible to maintain the structure and roof of the building. It is obvious that the entire balcony is not demised to individual tenants because each balcony includes structural parts and roofs that serve other premises. Therefore, the balconies are not only used by the apartment they serve. There is a material ambiguity in the lease as to the extent of the balcony demised and the tribunal needs to determine that. The tribunal must take into account the other terms of the lease. These are consistent with the applicant's interpretation.
22. By clause 1 the premises are defined to include (i) the interior partition walls and the inner half severed medially of the other walls, (ii) the floors of the apartment but excluding the material of the main structure and (iii) the plaster of the inner faces of the structural walls. This is an internal only demise with those parts of the building that could be used by the tenants having been demised to them. Everything that either impacts on others or on the estate or which cannot be used by the tenant is reserved to the applicant. The balconies are covered by tiling with the

waterproof membrane underneath. The surface of the balcony namely tiles are demised to tenants and the parts below being the waterproof membrane is part of the applicant's responsibility.

23. The construction of the building is also relevant. The asphaltic layer is beneath the tiles, and its purpose is to protect the premises below. Tenants can use the upper tiling, but the asphalt membrane is otherwise inaccessible. The balconies are part of the structure and have a wider impact on the building. This was supported by the Bennington Green report.
24. As to commercial common sense, the respondent's position is that all elements above the main structural slab would be the tenant's responsibility. However, this does not make commercial common sense. It can be difficult to trace leaks, and the onus would then be on the applicant to ascertain the source which may be outside the respective demise. The repair of waterproofing may involve considerable expense. The expert evidence suggested a figure of £1.3 million plus VAT for the building as a whole. On the respondents' case some lessees will be facing large bills whereas others will avoid contributing. This runs contrary to the principle of the service charge which involves fair distribution across residents of an entire building. The applicant is in a better position to achieve quality control. The applicant benefits from economies of scale.
25. The effect of rule 69 in the society's rules which are incorporated into the lease provides that the service charge can be used to contribute towards a reserve fund. By rule 67B this can be applied to structural repairs to buildings. Therefore, the applicant should be entitled to pass on costs of structural repairs to each tenant.

The Respondents' Case

26. The respondents' case may be summarised as follows. The plain meaning of the lease includes the balconies. Principles of interpretation and the ejusdem generis rule [of the same kind] assists the respondent. There are also architectural and technical reasons supporting the respondents.
27. Under the leases the balconies are demised. Leaseholders must repair. The applicant's obligation is for structure. The respondents say that the lease is ambiguous and the lease must therefore be construed against the applicant. Clause 1 (10)(vii) deliberately includes balconies in the demised premises. The parties cannot change that meaning. Clause 4(5) requires the lessee to keep the premises in good repair. Under clause 4(5)(c) the lessee must avoid water damage to any other part of the Building
28. Under Clause 6(6) [covenants by the applicant to repair] balconies are not mentioned. The balcony being an "amenity platform" is not a main structure.

29. The contra preferentum rule assists the respondents. In terms of principals of interpretation, Mr El-Alfy also referred to *Investor Comp Scheme v West Bromwich Building Society* and *Arnold v Britton*. He also referred to *Rainy Sky v Kookmin* [2011] UKSC 50 and *Wood v Capita Insurance Services Limited* [2017] UKSC 24.
30. The balconies are not all also roofs, such as those for penthouses. All balconies are to be treated the same. The tiles are the responsibility of leaseholders. The main slab is that of the applicant. The waterproof membrane does not support anything, and the tiles are also part of the main structures as are flashings and drainage on the balconies. If the membrane is the applicants but tiles are responsibility of the tenant, the leaseholder would have to protect the membrane.
31. British Standard BS8579 states that for fire safety purposes balconies are not roofs. Balconies add value. The lessees do not benefit from the membrane protecting the slab. The lease does not carve out waterproofing. Mr El-Alfy submitted that the respondents do not accept the quality control argument because the lessee was already responsible for boiler and plumbing repairs within flat. These were matters that could lead to hazards affecting the building. The applicant had refused to disclose legal advice.
32. Mr El-Alfy submitted that the proposed cost of the works was unreasonable. The individual cost to leaseholders should be £4,000 and not the much higher figures given in the application.
33. Further the urgency and nature of the proposed works have changed over time. The applicant's statement of case of 8 May 2025 describes the works as urgent and gave a cost of £1.3m plus VAT.

Expert Evidence

34. The report of Mr Karl Grover BSc MCIOB MRICS was prepared as an experts' report and contained appropriate declarations including that required under the RICS Practice Statement on Surveyors Acting as Expert Witnesses. From his CV Mr Grover is a Chartered Building Surveyor with wide experience in both private and public sectors commencing in 1994. He was instructed to give evidence on the following matters (i) a description of the composition and location of the different balcony types (ii) a clear description of specific works to be undertaken (iii) Whether the works will differ upon the type of balcony (iv) whether there is any dampness evident in the property (v) the proposed cost of works.
35. He inspected the estate externally but did not enter the building or individual flats. He also relied on drone photography, a planned maintenance report undertaken by his Firm dated 28 November 2023 and a specification for balcony repairs prepared in 2023. He was supplied with a copy of the lease.

36. In his opinion the balconies were not independent of the main building, but a continuation of the floor slab. The balcony decks form part of the roof of flats below and therefore requires waterproofing. He stated at 3.2.2:

“In basic summary, the works involve stripping the existing surfaces comprising of the promenade tiling and asphalt down to the concrete deck of the balconies and terraces, and the providing of a new waterproofing system. In conjunction, ancillary works involving renewal and adjustment of the rainwater outlets and goods serving the balconies to improve the overall performance of the rainwater goods to discharge water off the balconies, any identified associated concrete repairs as required following stripping of the existing covering, replacement of lead flashings, treatment and decorations to the metal railings, and the provision of new walkway tiles on completion of the main waterproofing works are included.

3.2.3. The purpose of these works is to prevent or stop the ingress of water into the concrete slab. Penetrating water into the concrete slab will cause deterioration and spalling of the concrete and corrosion to the metal reinforcement within resulting in spalling of the concrete. To balcony types A, C and D the water will continue through the slab eventually manifesting itself within the flats below, and in the case of Type D will drip onto cars parked below subsequently causing damage to their paintwork.

3.2.4. In addition to the that described above, water can penetrate horizontally tracking along the slab to enter the flats that they serve. Ensuring adequate waterproofing details including the renewal of lead flashings at the junction of the balconies and walls will assist in preventing this occurring.

3.2.5. The current asphalt system is approximately 40 years old and as such is starting to craze and slump subsequently losing its effectiveness as a waterproofing system. This has occurred to a number of balconies over the past few years; therefore, the proposed works is planned preventative maintenance rather than acting on a purely reactive basis following damage to a resident's flat. I understand that at least five flats are currently affected comprising of two penthouse flats, one ground floor terrace and two other types of balconies, thus a fair spread of the types of balconies found within the Estate. These are the known reported balcony issues, and the quantity of balconies affected is likely to be higher than this and will only increase in number in the future.”

37. At 3.4.1 Mr Grover stated that dampness as a result of water ingress had occurred. As to the costs of the works he added:

:

“3.5.1 The works have yet to be subject to competitive tender, however, our budget estimate for the works to all blocks is for the sum of £1.3m excluding VAT.

3.5.2. Proposed works to the balconies and terraces of the Penthouse Flat within Block D were tendered with a resultant lowest tender return of circa £108,000.00 plus Vat in 2023. Approximately £45,000.00 of these costs were for scaffold access, approximately 41% of the cost of the works, a disproportionate amount to the overall cost. Thus, by undertaking works to the whole block economies of scale can be achieved with the use of the scaffolding to access more than one balcony, thus reducing the overall cost of the works to each individual balcony. There will be a single planned one-off cost rather than a series of unplanned costs on an ad hoc basis following damage to leaseholders’ flats that will cost a greater sum over time.”

Discussion

38. The issue of the Tribunals jurisdiction has been addressed above. The Tribunal is concerned that there is no detailed specification of works. However, it finds that the level of detail in Mr Grover’s report is adequate for this section 27A(3) application, because the nature of the repairs required is sufficiently clear to enable the Tribunal to make findings as to the elements of repair that are required. The tribunal accepts Mr Grover’s evidence on those matters. It does not however accept his evidence in relation to the likely cost of works for the entire building, because there is no detailed specification against which cost estimates have been made, or any tender responses obtained.

39. In terms of the rival contentions as to the construction of the lease, the tribunal has considered the decided cases referenced above. It finds that the critical issue is the depth of the balcony demised to the lessee. The Tribunal prefers the applicant’s case. It finds that the waterproof membrane is part of the “exterior main structure” of the building under clause 6(6). This is because the purpose of the waterproof membrane is to protect the underlying slab from water ingress. This has structural implications for other flats. This is the case whether or not a balcony forms a roof for another part of the building.

40. The Tribunal finds that surface tiling is analogous to the uppermost surface of floors within the flat. These fall within the definition of Premises under clause 1(10)(iii). Therefore, the Tribunal finds that the surface tiling is within the demise and the responsibility of the lessee. However, if the tiling has to be taken up by the applicant to enable the applicant to perform its covenant to maintain the structure, the costs of

so doing and making good also fall to the applicant as works ancillary to the performance of its covenant.

41. For the same reasons the Tribunal finds that other ancillary work such as flashings and drainage in the balconies also form part of the exterior main structure and are the applicant's responsibility to repair replace or renew.
42. In interpreting the lease, the Tribunal also agrees with Mr Weatherley's submissions in relation to commercial common sense. In particular, if the landlord is responsible there will be economies of scale, especially in relation to scaffolding. It would be highly impractical for individual leases to erect tower scaffolds to repair balconies individually. Further, identifying the source of leaks is frequently difficult and may well involve investigating more than one flat.
43. The Tribunal does not consider that the rule 69 point (reserve fund) assists the applicant because the provision of a reserve fund does not directly assist in construing the lease. Further, the balconies are part only of the structural elements in the building.
44. In terms of the respondent's case, the tribunal does not see force in the points made in terms of lease construction. Whether a balcony does or does not also form part of a roof is not directly relevant to construction of the lease. The real issue is the depth of the demise in the balcony and what it includes. For the reasons given above, the Tribunal is unable to accept the respondents' submissions on that point. The Tribunal also finds that British Standards are also not relevant. The Tribunal agrees that the surface tiles are within the demise for the reasons given above. The lessee is required to maintain the tiles in good condition because they are within the demise, but the waterproof membrane is not. As explained above, in the event that works are needed to the membrane, the landlord is required to replace the tiles as works necessary for the performance of the landlord's covenant.
45. The applicant is not required to disclose legal advice, which is privileged. The contra preferentum rule does not apply because the applicant did not grant the leases.
46. The Tribunal does accept that the expert evidence does not include a precise specification of work, and also that tender documents have not been prepared.

Determination

47. The Tribunal finds that the following works if carried out would be recoverable under the service charge, subject to a future assessment as to the reasonableness of cost:

Stripping the surface tiling of the balconies and underlying asphalt;
Provide a new waterproofing system;

Renewal and adjustment of rainwater outlets and rainwater goods serving the balconies;
Concrete repairs to the slab where needed;
Replacement of lead flashings where needed;
Treatment and decoration of the metal railings;
Provision of replacement balcony tiles;
Scaffolding required to effect the repairs.

Section 20C application

48. The applicants have been the more successful party. The vast majority of the day was concerned with challenges to the interpretation of the lease. For these reasons the application is refused.

Rights of appeal

By rule 36(2) of the Tribunal Procedure (First-tier Tribunal) (Property Chamber) Rules 2013, the tribunal is required to notify the parties about any right of appeal they may have.

If a party wishes to appeal this decision to the Upper Tribunal (Lands Chamber), then a written application for permission must be made to the First-tier Tribunal at the regional office which has been dealing with the case.

The application for permission to appeal must arrive at the regional office within 28 days after the tribunal sends written reasons for the decision to the person making the application.

If the application is not made within the 28-day time limit, such application must include a request for an extension of time and the reason for not complying with the 28-day time limit; the tribunal will then look at such reason(s) and decide whether to allow the application for permission to appeal to proceed, despite not being within the time limit.

The application for permission to appeal must identify the decision of the tribunal to which it relates (i.e. give the date, the property and the case number), state the grounds of appeal and state the result the party making the application is seeking.

If the tribunal refuses to grant permission to appeal, a further application for permission may be made to the Upper Tribunal (Lands Chamber).

Schedule of Respondents

NAME	Flat No
Mr R & Mrs J Shackell	1 Keverstone Court, Manor Road, Bournemouth BH1 3EX
Mrs C J White	9 Keverstone Court, Manor Road, Bournemouth BH1 3EX
Ms S Boyadjian	13 Keverstone Court, Manor Road, Bournemouth BH1 3EX
Ms F Baig & Mr Becker	17 Keverstone Court, Manor Road, Bournemouth BH1 3EX
Mr & Mrs P Krieger	21 Keverstone Court, Manor Road, Bournemouth BH1 3EX
Mrs 1 Batchelor	23 Keverstone Court, Manor Road, Bournemouth BH1 3EX
Mrs J Parrack	24 Keverstone Court, Manor Road, Bournemouth BH1 3EX
Colin Lakey	34 Keverstone Court, Manor Road, Bournemouth BH1 3BY

Executors of the Late Mr A B Lawrence	38 Keverstone Court, Manor Road, Bournemouth BH1 3BY
Dr M K Thomas	40 Keverstone Court, Manor Road, Bournemouth BH1 3BY
Mr & Mrs N Termos	42 Keverstone Court, Manor Road, Bournemouth BH1 3BY
Mr S Vallis & Mr M Jeremiah	47 Keverstone Court, Manor Road, Bournemouth BH1 3BY
Mr C Mason & Ms J Wiltshire	49 Keverstone Court, Manor Road, Bournemouth BH1 3BY
Mrs Shahnaz Salem	52 Keverstone Court, Manor Road, Bournemouth BH1 3BY
Executors of the Late Mr B J & Mrs A E Escott	53 Keverstone Court, Manor Road, Bournemouth BH1 3BY
Mr J Owens	54 Keverstone Court, Manor Road, Bournemouth BH1 3BY
Mr D & Mrs V Newman	55 Keverstone Court, Manor Road, Bournemouth BH1 3BY
Mr M Lovatt & Mrs Galley	56 Keverstone Court, Manor Road,

	Bournemouth BH1 3BY
Veronica Pizer	58 Keverstone Court, Manor Road, Bournemouth BH1 3BY
Ms C Mayhew	63 Keverstone Court, Manor Road, Bournemouth BH1 3BY

Mr S Elalfy	64 Keverstone Court, Manor Road, Bournemouth BH1 3BY
Mr and Mrs M Owen	66 Keverstone Court Manor Road Bournemouth BH1 3BY
Judith Walters	68 Keverstone Court, Manor Road, Bournemouth BH1 3BY
Mr and Mrs D Lewin	69 Keverstone Court, Manor Road, Bournemouth BH1 3BY
Rosalie Talisman	70 Keverstone Court, Manor Road, Bournemouth BH1 3BY
Mr A Reade & Mr R Martin	71 Keverstone Court, Manor Road, Bournemouth BH1 3BY
Mr M Grosz	75 Keverstone Court, Manor Road, Bournemouth BH1 3BZ
Messrs Blakemore	80 Keverstone Court, Manor Road, Bournemouth BH1 3BZ
	83 Keverstone Court,

Ms J Heyworth	Manor Road, Bournemouth BH1 3BZ
Ms J M Goldthorpe	88 Keverstone Court, Manor Road, Bournemouth BH1 3BZ
Mrs Munday	89 Keverstone Court, Manor Road, Bournemouth BH1 3BZ
Mrs D Neufeld	90 Keverstone Court, Manor Road, Bournemouth BH1 3BZ
Mr S Wagner	91 Keverstone Court, Manor Road, Bournemouth BH1 3BZ

Lorna and Catherine Doubleday Janet Pearson	92 Keverstone Court, Manor Road, Bournemouth BH1 3BZ
Peter and Nuala Gordon	93 Keverstone Court, Manor Road, Bournemouth BH1 3BZ
Mr M Silver and Ms J Webb	97 Keverstone Court, Manor Road, Bournemouth BH1 3BZ
Mr A L Beeke	102 Keverstone Court, Manor Road, Bournemouth BH1 3BZ
Mr and Mrs M Price	105 Keverstone Court Manor Road, Bournemouth BH1 3BZ
Mr and Mrs F Hanley	107 Keverstone Court, Manor Road, Bournemouth BH1 3BZ

Arcbridge Limited	108 Keverstone Court, Manor Road, Bournemouth BH1 3BZ
Mrs L Skeels	109 Keverstone Court, Manor Road, Bournemouth BH1 3BZ
Mr MJ White	117 Keverstone Court, Manor Road, Bournemouth BH1 3BZ
Mr D J and Mrs A Clark	The Lodge, Keverstone Court, Bournemouth BH1 3EX