



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

Case reference : **LON/00BD/LAM/2025/0036**

Property : **75 White Hart Lane, London SW13 0PW**

Applicants : **Symon Hughes
Jacqueline Madigan-Hughes**

Respondent : **Arora Property Developments Limited**

Type of application : **Appointment of a Manager**

Tribunal : **Judge Tagliavini**

Date of Decision : **30 March 2026**

DECISION & MANAGEMENT ORDER

The application

1. This is an application seeking the tribunal's appointment of a manager of the subject property at **75 White Hart Lane, London SW13 0PW** ('the property') under section 24 of the Landlord and Tenant Act 1987 (the '1987 Act').

Background

2. A preliminary notice under section 22 of the Act dated 15 July 2025 was served on the respondent alleging a failure to maintain/keep in repair the property.
3. The applicant informed the tribunal that there are 4 leasehold titles registered under the freehold title including Anchor Cottage at 77 White Hart Lane (ground and first floor), 75 White Hart Lane (second floor flat), 75 White Hart Lane (first floor flat) and 75-77 White Hart Lane (ground floor and basement), which is currently a commercial unit let as a gym.

The hearing

4. An oral hearing was held on 30 March 2026 at which Mr Hughes appeared in person on behalf of both applicants. Mr Sanjeev Arora (Director) and Mr Roop Arora (Agent) appeared on behalf of the respondent.

Preliminary issues

5. The tribunal was provided with a digital bundle of 214 pages. However, at the hearing it appeared this was not the Final Bundle relied upon by the applicant, as this comprised 287 pages in hard copy. Unfortunately, neither the tribunal, nor the respondent had been provided with a copy of this Final Bundle although the applicant confirmed it had been sent to the tribunal on 12 March 2026.
6. Notwithstanding this lack of provision of the Final Bundle to the respondent, the applicant sought to pursue its application to debar the respondent from playing any further part in the proceedings. However, as Mr S Arora indicated at the outset that he did not, in principle, object to a manager being appointed, the tribunal considered there was little prejudice to the applicant in refusing the application to debar the respondent and unhelpful to the parties in the circumstances and to the tribunal to do so.
7. As the parties indicated there was an agreement in principle, they were provided with an opportunity (in private) to discuss and agree the terms of a Management Order the applicants wished the tribunal to make.
8. Notwithstanding the parties' agreement as to the appointment and the majority of the terms of the proposed Management Order, the tribunal nevertheless questioned the proposed manager Mr Jamie Fisk on his

witness statement, in order to satisfy itself of the suitability of his appointment. In particular, the tribunal queried Mr Fisk's personal indemnity insurance provision, the scope and duration of the Management Plan; the collection of service charges in advance for the payment of major works; the collection of a reserve fund; any need for the inclusion of the commercial premises due to its contribution to the service charges in respect of the maintenance of the structure of the property and the duration of ny Management Order.

9. The parties having agreed to the appointment of a manager and the tribunal having satisfied itself of the suitability of Mr Fisk to be the Tribunal appointed managed, the tribunal makes the Management Order attached to this decision with effect from the date of this Decision for a period of **four years i.e. 31 March 2026 to 30 March 2030.**

S.20 L&T 1985 and para 5 Sch. 11 CLARA 2002

10. The applicant made an application seeking to limit the respondent's costs of this application. The respondent did not object to this application. Therefore, the tribunal determines it is just and equitable to make an order under s.20 Landlord and Tenant Act 1985 and para. 5 of Schedule 11 Commonhold and Leasehold Reform Act limited the respondent's ability to add its costs of this application to the service charges.

Name: Judge Tagliavini

Date: 31 March 2026

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 should be made on Form RP PTA available at <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/form-rp-pta-application-for-permission-to-appeal-a-decision-to-the-upper-tribunal-lands-chamber>

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).