



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

|                                   |          |                                                                                                                          |
|-----------------------------------|----------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Case reference</b>             | <b>:</b> | <b>CAM/12UE/LSC/2024/0033</b>                                                                                            |
| <b>Property</b>                   | <b>:</b> | <b>Buckden Marina, Mill Road, Buckden<br/>St. Neots, Cambridgeshire PE19 5QS</b>                                         |
| <b>Applicants</b>                 | <b>:</b> | <b>Victoria Browning and the other<br/>leaseholders named in the schedule to<br/>the decision dated 24 November 2025</b> |
| <b>Respondents</b>                | <b>:</b> | <b>1. Aquatime Limited<br/>2. Buckden Properties Limited</b>                                                             |
| <b>Type of<br/>application(s)</b> | <b>:</b> | <b>Remainder from application for<br/>permission to appeal</b>                                                           |
| <b>Tribunal</b>                   | <b>:</b> | <b>Judge David Wyatt</b>                                                                                                 |

---

**DECISION REFUSING PERMISSION TO APPEAL**

---

**DECISION OF THE TRIBUNAL**

1. The tribunal determines that:
  - (a) it will not review paragraphs [44] and [45] of the decision dated 24 November 2025 (the “**Decision**”); and
  - (b) permission to appeal these parts of the decision is also refused.
2. Buckden Properties Limited (“BPL”) may make a further application for permission to appeal to the Upper Tribunal (Lands Chamber) in relation to paragraphs [44] and [45] of the Decision. 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](mailto:Lands@justice.gov.uk). 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 THIS DECISION**

### **Management charge for 2021/22**

5. The background is described in the decision given on 6 February 2026, which (apart from the reserved matter dealt with below) refused to review or grant permission to appeal the substantive decision dated 24 November 2025.
6. I reserved consideration of the application for permission to appeal paragraphs [44] and [45] of the decision of 24 November 2025, which deal with the 2021/22 management fee. I did so because it seemed appropriate to explain more fully how the relevant tribunal had arrived at their figure(s), since that was not entirely clear to an uninformed reader of the decision of 24 November 2025, and allow the opportunity for representations if this explanation was not accepted.
7. I understand that none of the parties made any submissions in response. BPL's representative has been unwell, so I have waited before making this decision; the deadline for any response has long since expired. Further, Mr John McCartney, who is said now to represent BPL and to be the shareholder/in control of its parent company, has indicated that BPL has accepted the tribunal's decision.
8. Accordingly, I take it that the figure of £125 per Applicant is no longer disputed. In view of the explanation provided and absence of any dispute, I am not satisfied that any ground of appeal has been proposed which has any realistic prospect of success. I therefore cannot review paragraphs [44] and [45] of the decision and refuse permission to appeal in relation to them.

**Judge David Wyatt**

**21 May 2026**