



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

Case reference : LON/00AG/LAM/2025/0005

Property : Banff House, Glenmore Road,
London NW3 4DG

Applicants : Sanjay Parkash Sharma & Nirmal Kaur
Puwar (Flat 3)
Aida Keshavarzi (Flat 4)
Alex Scott-Malden and Charlotte Robbins
(Flat 6)
Andrew William Michael Reicher (Flat 8)

Representative : Brady Solicitors Ltd

Respondents : Banff House RTM Company Ltd
Clegtone Properties Ltd
Meredith Yates (Flats 1 & 5)
Nikolas Gilbert Bonellos (Flats 2 & 7)

Type of application : Appointment of Manager

Proposed Manager : Edelle Carr

Tribunal : Judge Nicol
Mr DI Jagger MRICS
Mr J Stead

**Date and venue of
Hearing** : 13th November 2025
10 Alfred Place, London WC1E 7LR

Date of order : 13th November 2025

DECISION

The Tribunal appoints Edelle Carr as the manager of the subject property from 1st December 2025 until 30th June 2029 on the terms of the order attached to this decision.

Reasons

1. The subject property is a 4-storey block containing 8 residential flats. The freehold is owned by the Second Respondent, Clegtone Properties Ltd. The Applicants are the lessees of 4 of the flats. The Third and Fourth Respondents, Mr Yates and Mr Bonellos, are the lessees of the other 4 flats, holding two each, and directors of both the First and Second Respondents (although their appointment is disputed).
2. The Applicants have applied for a management order under section 24 of the Landlord and Tenant Act 1987 (the “Act”) to appoint Ms Edelle Carr as the manager of the property.
3. The Tribunal inspected the property on the morning of 13th November 2025. The application was heard later the same day. The attendees were:
 - Ms Robyn Cunningham, counsel for the Applicants;
 - Two of the Applicants, Mr Reicher and Mr Scott-Malden;
 - Mr Chris Hawkins, a surveyor from Savills
 - Mr Luke Gibson, counsel for the Respondents;
 - One of the Respondents, Mr Meredith Yates; and
 - Ms Carr.
4. The documents before the Tribunal consisted of a bundle of 464 pages from the Applicant. The Respondents had sought permission to rely on a late bundle of documents but the Tribunal did not in the end need to consider that.

Appointing a manager

5. At the outset of the hearing, counsel for both parties reported that they had spent the time since the inspection discussing the case and the Respondents now supported the application. In the Tribunal’s view, this is a sensible outcome. It is clear to all that the property has not been managed as it should in recent years and could do with careful, professional management in order to address the consequent problems. The parties disagree strongly as to how they have ended up in this situation but the appointment of a Manager by the Tribunal is about looking to the future and providing ongoing solutions rather than allocating historical blame. The Tribunal is satisfied that it is just and convenient to appoint a Manager.
6. The Manager is the Tribunal’s appointee, answerable only to the Tribunal, not to the parties, and so the Tribunal needs to satisfy itself that the proposed manager is suitable as its appointee. The Tribunal had read Ms Carr’s management plan and relevant other information she provided, including about her professional indemnity insurance and experience as a property manager. Ms Carr expanded on this and answered questions from the Tribunal. Taking these matters into account, the Tribunal is satisfied that she is a suitable appointee.
7. In the circumstances, the Tribunal makes the Management Order attached hereto.

Name: Judge Nicol

Date: 13th November 2025

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).