



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

Case Reference	: CHI/00HE/PHI/2024/ 0213 – 0218, 0220 – 0235, 0237, 0238, 0240 – 0244, 0246 – 0249.
Property	: Various properties at Meadowlands Court, Poundstock, Bude, Cornwall. EX23 0FF listed in the Schedule.
Applicant Representative	: AR (Meadowlands) Limited. : Knights - John Clement (Solicitor).
Respondents	: The occupiers of the properties listed in Parts 1 and 2 of the Schedule.
Type of Application	: Review of Pitch Fee: Mobile Homes Act 1983 (as amended) “the Act”.
Tribunal Members	: Judge C A Rai (Chairman) Mr M C Woodrow MRICS Chartered Surveyor Mr M Jenkinson .
Date type and venue of Hearing	: 15 May 2025 and 16 May 2025 In person at Barnstaple County Court, Civic Centre, North Walk, Barnstaple. EX31 1DX.
Date of Decision	: 27 May 2025

DECISION

1. The Tribunal determined that the pitch fees for the pitches listed in Part 1 of the Schedule shall be increased by 4.6 % from 1 January 2024, (the Pitch Fee review date).
2. The Tribunal determined that the pitch fees for the pitches listed in Part 2 of the Schedule shall be increased by 4.6% from 1 February 2024.

Background

3. The Pitch Fee review date in all of the Respondents written statements for pitches on Meadowlands Park is 1 January.
4. The Applicant served pitch fee review notices before the end of November 2023, on the Respondents listed in Part 1 of the Schedule to review their pitch fees on 1 January 2024.
5. Later, on or about 22 December 2023, the Applicant served pitch fee review notices on the other Respondents (listed in Part 2 of the Schedule) to review their pitch fees on 1 February 2024.
6. Copies of all of the review notices have been provided to the Tribunal but are not in the bundle.
7. It is accepted by the Respondents that the notices of the proposed increase of 4.6% of the current pitch fees were correctly served. None of the correspondence or documents in the bundle disclose any Respondent's actual pitch fee as some Respondents expressed sensitivity about the public disclosure of their individual pitch fees. The Tribunal has therefore not referred to the actual pitch fees payable by any Respondent in its decision.
8. The Tribunal received two applications both dated 28 March 2025, from the Applicant for the determination of the new level of pitch fee for those respondents named on the two lists which accompanied those applications. The two lists identified 33 Respondents. By the date of the hearing 23 Respondents remained. It was confirmed by the Applicant that the Tribunal has consented to the withdrawal of 10 applications.
9. The occupiers of 10 Foxglove Crescent, 17 and 20 Apple Blossom Way, 1 Camelia Crescent, 3 Catkin Close and 3 Primrose Bank have not engaged with the Tribunal. None of them returned the "form for Respondents" issued with the Tribunal Directions dated 16 May 2024, which the original respondents to both applications were asked to complete [121]. (Those Directions, including the reply form, were served on the original 33 respondents , by the Applicant before 30 May 2024.
10. The Tribunal decided that it was necessary to have a hearing to determine the pitch fees. None of the Respondents appointed a representative. The parties were directed that the hearing would be listed for 2 consecutive days, and that the Tribunal would inspect the site on the morning of the first day of the Hearing [130].
11. The Tribunal inspected Meadowlands Park (the Park) at 10 o'clock on the 15 May 2025. It was accompanied by Mr Clement, the solicitor representing the Applicant, Mrs Sharon Reach, the Park Manager, and Mr Richard Palmer, the Area Manager and three Respondents, Ms Lucas, Mrs Develin and Mr Brown. The Tribunal entered the Park through the electrically operated entrance gate. A notice board is located outside the boundary wall which shows the park layout and roads.

- 12.** During its inspection the Tribunal looked at the other three Park boundaries which are defined by a mixture of natural boundaries and fencing. It was shown some staining visible on a few parts of the road. It looked at the surface water drains, and ongoing drainage works. It noted the gradient of the roads and the grassed areas of the Park.
- 13.** A new site office, (a portacabin), is located immediately inside the entrance gates to the left of the road. The house (the Old House) and garage, formerly used as the Park office and for storage and which are no longer in use, are located next to Mr and Mrs Ford's pitch, 1 Foxglove Crescent. The defibrillator was originally located on the external wall of the Old House but has been relocated.
- 14.** Phase 2 of the Park is on the corner of the site farthest away from the entrance. It contains a mixture of vacant pitches and some newly located homes. Adjacent to Phase 2 at the back of the Park, the sewerage plant and a compound which will be used to locate a storage container for gardening and maintenance machinery is located at the top of the adjacent field.
- 15.** The Tribunal was shown the swimming pool site which is a central discrete area enclosed by a low brick wall in which there is a partly constructed swimming pool and brick building which, it was told, had been intended to house the pool machinery. A former park home adjacent to the swimming pool site has been converted into the Park office.
- 16.** The Tribunal found that the Park was in a clean and tidy condition on the day of its inspection. It was told that the visible drainage works related to a new pitch. There were no other building materials or machinery visible on the Park.
- 17.** The Tribunal was told by Mr Palmer that new street lighting had been recently installed on the Park but that the lighting in phase 2 of the Park is of a different type to that in phase 1.
- 18.** Signage on the outside wall at the entrance to the Park suggests that CCTV cameras are in operation but those Respondents who attended the inspection and the hearing, stated that there had been one camera attached to the outside of the old sales office (a container which was removed and replaced by the new portacabin) and another on the outside of the Old House. Mrs Reach agreed that there had been one camera but said she was unaware that there had ever been a second camera. She confirmed that the camera which had been removed from the Old House would be relocated to the outside of the new Park office.
- 19.** From conversations between residents during and immediately after the inspection, it became apparent that some residents were anticipating that the hearing would take place on the day after the inspection. Mr Clement said that the letter he received from the Tribunal was confusing and he had telephoned the office to clarify whether the hearing would be held on both days. The Judge told those Respondents who were present that the hearing would commence on 15 May 2025 as scheduled but that the Tribunal would reconvene on the 16 May 2025 so that any Respondent

unable to attend the first day could attend and would be given an opportunity to speak on the second day. She asked that those Respondents who had attended the inspection inform the other Respondents that they could attend the hearing on either, or both days.

- 20.** Prior to the hearing the Tribunal received a hearing bundle comprising 196 pages. This included copies of comments or submissions made by the Respondents, a sample copy of a written statement and a sample copy of a pitch fee review notices with the Applicant's reply to the objections to the pitch fee increase and all submissions or forms completed and received from the Respondents. References to numbers in square brackets in this decision are to the pdf page numbers of documents or photographs in the bundle. None of those photographs is date stamped. Those Respondents who attended the hearing said all would have been taken after they were directed to respond to the Tribunal (after April 2024).

The Law

- 21.** All agreements to which the Act applies incorporate standard terms implied by the Act. Those that apply to protected sites in England are contained in Chapter 2 of the Part 1 of Schedule 1 to the Act. The principles governing changes in pitch fees are in paragraphs 16 to 20.
- 22.** A review of the pitch fee can be undertaken annually on the review date. (Paragraph 17(1)). The owner must serve on the occupier a written notice setting out the proposals in respect of the new pitch fee.
- 23.** Paragraph 16 of Chapter 2 of Schedule 1 to the Act provides that the pitch fee can only be changed in two ways:-
- a.** with the agreement of the occupier of the pitch, or
 - b.** if the Tribunal, on the application of the owner or occupier, considers it reasonable for the pitch fee to be changed and makes an order determining the amount of the new pitch fee.
- 24.** If the pitch fee is agreed by the occupier, it will be payable from the pitch fee review date (17(3)). If the occupier does not agree the change in the pitch fee the owner can apply to the Tribunal for an order determining the amount of the new pitch fee which will be determined in accordance with paragraph 16(b). The occupier will continue to pay the current pitch fee until such time as the new pitch fee is agreed by the occupier, or an order is made by the Tribunal.
- 25.** The new pitch fee will be payable from the review date, but an occupier will not be treated as being in arrears until 28 days after either the date on which the new pitch fee is agreed, or the Tribunal makes an order determining it. (17(4)).
- 26.** There is a time limit within which an application to the Tribunal must be submitted but the Respondents have not disputed the procedural validity of the pitch fee notices and so it is unnecessary in these proceedings for this Tribunal to say more about that.
- 27.** In summary, paragraph 18 provides that on a pitch fee review "particular regard" is to be had to:-

- a. sums expended by the owner on improvements since the last review date;
 - b. any deterioration in the condition and any decrease in the amenity of the site or adjoining land owned or controlled by the owner since 26 May 2013 “insofar as regard has not previously been had to that deterioration or decrease for the purposes of this subparagraph” ;
 - c. any reduction in, or deterioration in the quality of services supplied by the owner since 26 May 2013 to which regard has not previously been had; and
 - d. any direct effect of legislation which has come into force since the last review date on the costs payable by the owner on the maintenance or management of the site.
28. Paragraph 20 is the starting point for the Tribunal’s jurisdiction when considering what order it should make. That paragraph provides that **unless this would be unreasonable**, there is a presumption that a pitch fee will increase, or decrease, in line with the change in CPI during the last 12 months (Tribunal’s emphasis)
29. CPI increased by 4.6% during the relevant 12 month period applicable for the reviews which are the subject of these applications [155].
30. The Tribunal can refer to paragraph 18(1) of Chapter 2 of Schedule 1 to the Act and decide if it would be unreasonable to apply the presumption.
31. The matters referred to, in relation to which the Tribunal can have particular regard include both improvements made to the site by the owner since the last review date and deterioration in the condition, and any decrease in the amenity of the site or any adjoining land occupied or controlled by the owner since the date the paragraph came into force.
32. Therefore, the presumption of the increase in the pitch fee can be displaced if anything in paragraph 18 is relevant, or if there are other factors of “sufficient weight”.
33. Case law suggests that the starting point is that the Tribunal must decide if it is reasonable for the amount of the pitch fee to change (paragraph 16(1)) but thereafter it is within its discretion to determine the increase proposed.
34. The Upper Tribunal has given guidance to this Tribunal in a number of cases. In **Britaniacrest Limited v Bamborough [2016] UKUT 144 (LC)** it identified three basic principles which it said shaped the statutory approach to pitch fee review in paragraph 19 of its decision.
35. **Firstly** the pitch fee can only be changed either (a) with the agreement of the occupier, or (b) if the appropriate judicial body, following an application by either party, considers it reasonable for the pitch fee to be changed and makes an order determining the amount of the new pitch fee; **secondly** if Para 17(1) is followed so the machinery for the proposed increase has been correctly undertaken on the correct dates using the prescribed form of notice; and **thirdly** when the statutory presumption

has been taken into account (Para 20), and the proposed increase is in line with the change in RPI (up or down) and calculated by reference to the latest published index for the month which was 12 months before that to which the latest index relates.

36. The decision stated that “The FTT is given a very strong steer that a change in RPI the previous 12 months will make it reasonable for the pitch fee to be changed by that amount but is provided with only limited guidance on what other factors it ought to take into account” (paragraph 22). The Upper Tribunal went on to decide that the increase or decrease in RPI only gives rise to a presumption, not an entitlement or a maximum, and that in some cases, it would only be a starting point to the determination.
37. In other words, if the presumption that the change limited by RPI produced an unreasonable result, the Tribunal could rebut it. “It is clear, however, that other matters are relevant and that annual RPI increases are not the beginning and end of the determination because paragraphs 18 and 19 specifically identify matters which the FTT is required to take into account or to ignore when undertaking a review”. [Since 2 July 2023 the RPI has been substituted with the CPI.]

The Hearing

38. The Tribunal heard from the Applicant on the 15 and 16 May 2025 and from different Respondents on both hearing days.
39. Mr Clement represented the Applicant with Mrs Reach who attended on both hearing days and Mr Palmer, who attended on the first hearing day.
40. For the Respondents Mr and Mrs Brown, Mrs Develin, and Ms Lucas attended on the first day and Mr Ford attended on the second hearing day.
41. Mr Clement confirmed that the Tribunal is asked to determine the pitch fees for 23 of the original respondents to the two applications. Of those 23, 6 have not responded to the Tribunal Directions, or provided any reasons, verbally or in writing as to why they object to the proposed increase in the pitch fee.
42. Mrs Develin suggested that some or all of those six, sought to rely upon the submissions of the other Respondents. The Judge explained that in the absence of any written authorisation from those Respondents for other occupiers to represent them, she could not accept that. However, she suggested to Mrs Develin and the other occupiers attending the first day of the hearing that they could speak with those occupiers after the end of the day and encourage them to attend the second hearing day, if they now wished to make submissions.

- 43.** The following facts were established during the Hearing. The Park was originally a touring holiday park. The Old House and the site of the unfinished swimming pool were part of the development of the old park. No-one present at the hearing appeared to know the history of the Old House. Royale (the previous park owner) developed the Park after obtaining a planning certificate of “established use”.
- 44.** Mr Ford said he was one of the first occupiers of the Park. He told the Tribunal that he moved on to the Park during 2020 when Phase 1 of the Park being developed. He said he had chosen his pitch because of the orientation to the road. Whilst he said he had understood that the Old House would be developed for a community use he did not aver that he relied upon that representation or that it influenced his decision to reserve his pitch.
- 45.** There were some problems with drainage during the development of Phase 1, but this had not affected Mr Ford. He acknowledged that conditions on the Park had reflected that it was a development site at that time and he said he had expected and anticipated that it would be until the completion of the development of the first phase. Whilst the condition of the Old House may have deteriorated during the development of Phase 1, he suggested that it had never been in very good condition. However, he said it was fit for occupation by the resident Park manager. When that manager left, it was used as offices and at one stage to house some builders working on the Park. Mr Ford was aware of complaints from other residents about vermin but said he had not seen this, despite his pitch being close to the Old House.
- 46.** No evidence was given by either of the parties about annual pitch fee reviews during the development of Phase 1. The Tribunal had previously heard the application made by the administrators of Budemeadows Country Park Limited in November 2023 for the determination of the 2023 pitch fee review. In its decision, dated 20 December 2023, (a copy of which is in the bundle) the Tribunal determined that the pitch fees should be increased by 10.1% from 1 January 2023, (the Previous Decision). It is recorded in the Previous Decision that the pitch fees had not previously been increased until that review, so the Tribunal concluded that until the 2023 pitch fee review all park occupiers would still have been paying the pitch fees agreed when they purchased their homes.
- 47.** The current Applicant purchased the Park from the Administrator of Budemeadows Country Park Limited in January 2024. The pitch fee review forms and the letters which accompanied them, had been served by Budemeadows Country Park Limited (in administration) [163] before completion of the purchase. The application to the Tribunal to determine the pitch fees was made by the Applicant on 28 March 2024 [12, 21].

48. In its written response to the various objections received from Respondents, the Applicant referred to the statutory presumption that the pitch fee will change in accordance with the change in CPI and referred to paragraph 20 of schedule 1 of the Act. It stated that in order for the presumption to be rebutted the Respondents' objections would need to refer to and demonstrate evidence of the existence of factors listed in paragraph 18 which would persuade a tribunal to rebut the presumption. Mr Clement also referred to some case law in that statement which, he submitted, has established that for the presumption to be rebutted the factors identified had to be "sufficiently weighty".
49. As recorded in the Previous Decision Budemeadows Country Park Limited was a "specific purpose vehicle company" (SPV) which had operated under the banner of the Royale Life Group. The group, together with some (but not all) of its associated companies went into administration in August 2023.
50. Mr Clement submitted that none of the objections put forward by the Respondents contained any evidence of deterioration in the condition of the Park. He said that since the Respondents have failed to provide any evidence which would enable the Tribunal to rebut the statutory presumption, the Applicant is entitled to increase the pitch fee by the amount sought.
51. Mr Clement went further, saying that even if the Tribunal considered that any of the Respondents' evidence was sufficient to demonstrate deterioration, it was not suggested that the deterioration between 1 January 2023 and 1 January 2024. Relying on **Henderson v Henderson [1843 – 1860] All ER 378**, he said complaints about deterioration of the Park and its maintenance which had existed before the 2023 review should have been raised by the respondents then. Those respondents could not raise such complaints now. Mr Clement conceded that should the Tribunal accept his submissions, his case was less persuasive in relation to those 7 Respondents not party to the Previous Decision (because they had paid the increase sought in 2023). (These are the Respondents listed part 1 of the Annexe).
52. The Tribunal was told that following the administration of the previous Park owner, staffing levels on the Park remained constant. Maintenance was carried out by the same members of staff who worked for the same number of hours. However, the general perception of the Respondents, which is reflected by their evidence and written objections to the proposed increase, was that the staff were less motivated because of uncertainty about the future of the Park, and concerns about the security of their employment. The Respondent's perception was that there had been less supervision and control.
53. Mr Clement said that the majority of the Respondent's objections to the proposed increase in the pitch fees related to the conduct of the former owner. He summarised the collective reasons in paragraph 15 of the Applicants Response [115] as:-
- a. General lack of maintenance
 - b. Poor condition of the sales office and the Old House

- c. The lack of promised facilities
 - d. The Park being “a building site”.
 - e. Inadequate foul and surface water drainage
 - f. The absence of street lighting on Phase 2
 - g. A lack of security stemming from the entrance gates working intermittently, an absence of CCTV cameras on site and the lack of secure perimeter fencing.
- 54.** The newest homes on the Park are located in Phase 2 of the Park. From the inspection it was apparent that works on the Park are almost complete. Although the Old House may not be sound it appeared reasonably tidy. The old sales office (a container) has recently been replaced with a smart new portacabin. However, the site of the partly constructed swimming pool remains an eyesore. The pool contains stagnant water, looks unattractive and will inevitably attract insect life. The Tribunal concluded that it must impact adversely on those pitches located next to it. Mr Palmer suggested that the Applicant now intends to remove the partly built construction and replace it with a café. No timescale for such works was suggested.
- 55.** In summary the objections made by the Respondents were that:
- a. The different pitch fees payable in September 2023 was not disclosed.
 - b. It was inaccurate to blame the previous owner when the current staff had been employed by that owner.
 - c. No-one currently employed by the Applicant has been entered as the Fit and Proper Person on Cornwall Councils’ Register.
 - d. There has been no resident Park manager or supervisor which resulted in reporting failures with regard to the a lack of gas and overflowing cess pit.
 - e. The inadequate surface water drainage led to waterlogging of some grassed areas.
 - f. The swimming pool collects stagnant water posing a health hazard because it attracts biting insects.
 - g. The deterioration of the Old House and the old sales office.
 - h. The general anxieties which resulted from the administration of the previous owner.
 - i. Abandoned building materials including rubble, unfinished homes and unsightly skips on the Park.
 - j. Lack of maintenance of flower beds, an absence of new planting; failure to replace light bulbs.
 - k. The absence of a gym café or other communal facilities including the swimming pool.
 - l. Non-functioning front gates and lack of security because gate codes have been shared openly and boundaries are not fully fenced.
 - m. Snagging issues not rectified for new homeowners.
 - n. Drainage inadequate leading to overflows and staining of roads.
 - o. Partial CCTV.
 - p. Unregistered park rules, lack of speed regulation on Park roads.
 - q. Inadequate response to maintenance calls.

56. In response to questions from those Respondents who were present, Mr Clement said that some issues which he termed contractual, related to the deal agreed when pitches and homes were purchased from the previous owner. These are not relevant to the determination of the pitch fee. The Tribunal said that it has no jurisdiction to revisit the terms of those contracts in the context of the current application.
57. Mr Clement said that the Park drainage is perfectly adequate. Although some objections refer to flooding, no Respondent has provided actual evidence. He confirmed that the Applicant commissioned a drainage survey and has undertaken drainage works to facilitate the installation of the new homes; if problems are identified during the course of such works, these are or will be rectified at the same time.
58. Mr Clement said that the Park is secure. He said it is not, and was never intended to be, fully enclosed by perimeter fencing. Some boundaries are natural. The mix of fencing, trees and banks is deliberate although there was an underlying suggestion, never clearly enunciated, that some occupiers may have cut back the natural vegetation and hedging at the back of their pitches.
59. Although the Respondent claimed there was only ever a single CCTV camera located on the outside of the sales office, which Mr Clement said will be installed outside the new office, the Respondents referred to photographs in the bundle which showed another camera located on the outside of the Old House. No-one present appeared to know if it was ever in working order.
60. The parties discussed the delay in replacing the fit and proper person named on the Cornwall Council register. The application has been made but the Applicant is unable to control when Cornwall will update the register.
61. Street lighting has been installed throughout the Park now but the lighting in Phase 2 is different from the lighting on Phase 1.
62. Mr Clement said many of the Respondents objections to the increase in their pitch fee are not matters to which the tribunal should have particular regard (Paragraph 18 of Schedule 1 to the Act).

Reasons for the Tribunal's Decision

63. The Tribunal cannot rebut the presumption that the Pitch Fee will change on the pitch fee review date unless it is reasonable to do so.
64. In this application the Applicant stated that it is not. The evidence apparent from the inspection is that the Park is now, albeit more than a year after the date of the pitch fee review date, (1 January 2024), in a good condition. Much has been improved on the Park since that date. A new sales office is located at the entrance. The Old House is no longer in use and although in poor condition is tidy. Both surface water and foul drainage have been improved. There is street lighting throughout the Park. There is a manager on the Park. Whilst there was no agreement

about the CCTV cameras, there is no evidence that both cameras previously located in the Park were ever in working order.

65. None of the Respondents has presented compelling evidence of a deterioration in the amenity of the Park, with regard to condition or maintenance, during the period of administration which would amount to a factor sufficient to displace the presumption that the Pitch Fee should change by the percentage change in the CPI index.
66. The Tribunal also explained that it has no jurisdiction to consider those complaints which related to Park Rules. It is also outside the control of the Applicant to force Cornwall Council to update the Fit and Proper Persons' register to include Mr Palmer despite the Applicant having applied to it some months previously.
67. Mr Ford acknowledged, as had those Respondents who attended on the first day of the Hearing, that the current condition of the Park has improved. Mr Ford said that he would not have objected to the 2024 increase had it been proposed now.
68. In the absence of any evidence of a deterioration in the condition of the Park, any decrease in the amenity of the site or any reduction in the services or any of the other factors loosely termed "paragraph 18 factors" by Mr Clement, the Tribunal finds that there is no reason to rebut the presumption that the pitch fee should increase by 4.6%.
69. The Tribunal determines that all of the Respondent's pitch fees shall be increased by 4.6% from the dates referred to in the pitch fee review notices. (That will be from 1 January 2024 for the pitches listed in Part 1 of the Schedule and from 1 February 2024 for the pitches listed in Part 2 of the Schedule).
70. Having determined that the applications succeed, it is unnecessary for the Tribunal to deal separately with the 6 Respondents (referred to in paragraph 41 and 42 above) who failed to respond to the applications.
71. Whilst not part of its decision, the Tribunal accepts that following the Upper Tribunal decision in **Teignbridge District Council v. Francis Clarke [2024] UKUT 00279**, to which Mr Clement referred during the hearing, the reasons it gave for reducing the proposed pitch fee increase sought in 2023, in the Previous Decision have been found to be incorrect.
72. In another, more recent, Upper Tribunal decision, **Southern Country Parks v. Bird 2025 UKUT 00018 (LC)** the Deputy President Martin Rodger KC said that nothing in paragraphs 18A or 20A of the implied terms provides that the pitch fee must either increase by a rate equal to the change in (the relevant index) or stay the same with no other outcome being possible. He continued by saying that the Tribunal may identify a loss of amenity which entitles it to set a new pitch fee which reflects the changed circumstances. Whilst those circumstances include a reduction in amenity, they will also include a change in the value of money, i.e. inflation since the last review took place. What he suggested that meant was that for a Tribunal to justify finding that there should be no change in

the pitch fee at all, it would be necessary for the factors identified as justifying the reduction to cancel out inflation and any other factors justifying an increase. That decision underlines that any review of a proposed increase which is referred to this Tribunal effectively requires a balancing act on the part of the Tribunal whereby it weighs up the increase and whether any of the objections would justify displacing the presumption that the increase will apply.

73. For all of those reasons it is helpful when Respondents supply written objections and are willing to explain those to the Tribunal, as occurred in these proceedings, as it offers an opportunity for both parties to hear consider and understand the others competing requirements and reasons.

Judge C A Rai (Chairman)

ANNEXE

**Property Part 1
January 1, 2024, increase**

Case Numbers	Pitch address	Occupiers
CHI/ooHE/PHI/2024/0222	32 Honeysuckle Way	Mr and Mrs Develin
CHI/ooHE/PHI/2024/0225	1 Foxglove Crescent	Mr and Mrs Ford
CHI/ooHE/PHI/2024/0232	12 Foxglove Crescent	Ms Burton
CHI/ooHE/PHI/2024/0238	3 Primrose Bank	Mr and Mrs Siers
CHI/ooHE/PHI/2024/0240	7 Apple Blossom Way	Mr and Mrs Gerety
CHI/ooHE/PHI/2024/0243	17 Apple Blossom Way	Mr Stanley and Ms Glesinger
CHI/ooHE/PHI/2024/0246	6 Catkin Close	Ms Allard

**Property Part 2
February 1, 2024, increase**

CHI/ooHE/PHI/2024/0213	13 Honeysuckle Way	Mr and Mrs Kestell
CHI/ooHE/PHI/2024/0217	20 Honeysuckle Way	Mr Oates
CHI/ooHE/PHI/2024/0218	22 Honeysuckle Way	Mr and Mrs Scorrer
CHI/ooHE/PHI/2024/0220	28 Honeysuckle Way	Ms Sanders
CHI/ooHE/PHI/2024/0223	42 Honeysuckle Way	Ms Lucas
CHI/ooHE/PHI/2024/0224	44 Honeysuckle Way	Mr and Mrs Callegari
CHI/ooHE/PHI/2024/0227	4 Foxglove Crescent	Mr and Mrs Downes
CHI/ooHE/PHI/2024/0228	5 Foxglove Crescent	Mr and Mrs Brown
CHI/ooHE/PHI/2024/0229	7 Foxglove Crescent	Mr and Mrs Sims
CHI/ooHE/PHI/2024/0230	8 Foxglove Crescent	Ms Hunter
CHI/ooHE/PHI/2024/0231	10 Foxglove Crescent	Mr and Mrs Bower
CHI/ooHE/PHI/2024/0234	2 Orchid Avenue	Mr and Mrs Tapping
CHI/ooHE/PHI/2024/0235	3 Orchid Avenue	Ms Barnett
CHI/ooHE/PHI/2024/0237	6 Orchid Avenue	Mr and Mrs Price
CHI/ooHE/PHI/2024/0242	15 Apple Blossom Way	Mr Parnell
CHI/ooHE/PHI/2024/0249	1 Camelia Close	Mr and Mrs Hodkinson

Appeals

1. A person wishing to appeal this decision to the Upper Chamber must seek permission to do so by making written application to the First-tier Tribunal at the Regional office which has been dealing with the case.
2. The application must arrive at the Tribunal within 28 days after the Tribunal sends to the person making the application written reasons for the decision. Where possible you should send your further application for permission to appeal by email to **rpsouthern@justice.gov.uk** as this will enable the First-tier Tribunal to deal with it more efficiently.
3. If the person wishing to appeal does not comply with the 28-day time limit, the person shall include with the application for permission to appeal a request for an extension of time and the reason for not complying with the 28-day time limit; the Tribunal will then decide whether to extend time or not to allow the application for permission to appeal to proceed.
4. The application for permission to appeal must identify the decision of the Tribunal to which it relates, state the grounds of appeal, and state the result the party making the application is seeking.