



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

Case reference : **CAM/00ME/LVM/2025/0001**

Property : **Flat 60 Convent Court
Windsor, SL4 3QR**

Applicant : **Catherine Baulamon**

Respondents : **Cleavers Property Management
Salters Investments Ltd
Freehold Prime Investments Ltd**

Type of application : **Application for permission to appeal**

Tribunal members : **Mary Hardman FRICS IRRV (Hons)**

Date of decision : **15 October 2025**

DECISION REFUSING PERMISSION TO APPEAL

DECISION OF THE TRIBUNAL

1. The tribunal has considered the applicant's request for permission to appeal dated 6 October 2025 and determines that:
 - (a) it will not review its decision; and
 - (b) permission be refused.
2. You may make a further application for permission to appeal to the Upper Tribunal (Lands Chamber). Any such application must be made no later than 14 days after the date on which the First-tier Tribunal sent notice of this refusal to the party applying for permission to appeal.
3. Where possible, you should make your further application for permission to appeal on-line using the Upper Tribunal's on-line document filing system, called CE-File. This will enable the Upper Tribunal to deal with it more efficiently and will enable you to follow the progress of your application and submit any additional documents quickly and easily. Information about how to register to use CE-File can

be found by going to this web address: <https://www.judiciary.uk/wp-content/uploads/2023/09/20230927-PD-UT-Lands-Chamber-CE-File.pdf>

4. Alternatively, you can submit your application for permission to appeal by email to: Lands@justice.gov.uk.
5. The Upper Tribunal can also be contacted by post or by telephone at: Upper Tribunal (Lands Chamber), 5th Floor, Rolls Building, 7 Rolls Buildings, Fetter Lane, London EC4A 1NL (Tel: 020 7612 9710).

REASONS FOR THE DECISION

6. The substantive decision was made on 10 September 2025 (the “**Decision**”). On 6 October 2025, the Applicant applied for permission to appeal and sent further documents on 10 October 2025. I have taken those documents, and those described in the Decision, into account.
7. The tribunal considers that none of the grounds of appeal have any realistic prospect of success. I do not propose to comment in detail on each representation. However, for the benefit of the parties and of the Upper Tribunal (Lands Chamber) (if any further application for permission to appeal is made), I comment below on some of the points raised by the Applicant in their written representations. Please read this with the Decision.

GROUND OF APPEAL

8. It is not clear why the applicant says they were not notified of their appeal rights, when these were explained in the covering letter used by the case officer to send the Decision to the parties on 11 September 2025. In any event, the application for permission to appeal seems to be in time; it was made on 6 October 2025, within 28 days of the date the decision was sent to the parties. The applicant now has only 14 days in which to make any renewed application directly to the Upper Tribunal for permission to appeal, as explained above.
9. Generally, the grounds of appeal do not seem to correspond with the facts, but it is not proportionate to summarise these here. If the applicant wishes to pursue their application to the Upper Tribunal they should include with it in a single bundle copies of all substantive correspondence from the tribunal (which should be self-explanatory), the decision of 11 September 2025 and this refusal decision.
10. The applicant seems to be complaining about apparent problems with their own leasehold title, which was subject to an inappropriate restriction which prevented their re-mortgage. The applicant’s concerns about time-limited mortgage offers are understandable but the applicant has wasted resources by sending excessive volumes of contentious correspondence to the tribunal (and it seems the manager) while failing to comply with directions or, it seems, to co-operate.

11. The tribunal sought to assist, without advising, by warning of the apparent problems with the restriction on the applicant's title and ensuring the applicant was aware of their ability to apply to the Land Registry to deal with this. I gather the applicant then made such application and I am glad to hear they consider this was successful.
12. As requested, on a contingency basis, the tribunal also expedited the application to vary the management order. The resulting Decision gave an appropriate additional power to the manager in case, for example, the Land Registry agreed only to modify the restriction to terms which still necessitated some kind of certificate of compliance. It was important to make provision for charges/costs because this would be outside the scope of normal service charges or the work the manager was appointed to focus on and the current terms of the restriction(s) did not seem to correspond with the relevant provisions in the leases, so such requests for the benefit of selling or re-mortgaging leaseholder(s) might involve significant work.
13. It is not clear why any arrears have not been paid. The applicant had said that the reason for the urgency was that they needed the funds from their re-mortgage to pay their service charges. In any event, the applicant cannot use an appeal to litigate a new case disputing any arrears of service charges or any administration charges sought in respect of these. These would have to be the subject of an application under section 27A of the Landlord and Tenant Act 1985, or Schedule 11 to the Commonhold and Leasehold Reform Act 2002, or as appropriate, if the tribunal is to deal with them; please refer to the terms of the management order as varied.
14. The tribunal cannot give legal advice and is unlikely to respond to any further correspondence from the applicant. The applicant has already been referred to potential sources of advice. Any application for permission to appeal against the Decision must be made directly to the Upper Tribunal as set out above.