



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

Case reference : HAV/23UG/PHI/2025/0793

Property : 9 Green Meadows Park, Bamfurlong Lane,
Staverton, Cheltenham, Gloucestershire, GL51
6SN

Applicant : Turners Regency Parks Limited

Respondent : The Executors of Anthony Morgan

Representative : Christopher Davidson LLP

Type of application : Review of Pitch Fee: Mobile Homes Act 1983
(as amended)

Tribunal members : Tribunal Judge H. Lumby

Date of decision : 27 May 2026

DECISION

Decisions of the tribunal

- (1) The tribunal determines that the proposed increase in the pitch fee is reasonable. Further the tribunal determines a pitch fee of £123.01 per month with effect from 1 April 2025.

The reasons for the decision are set out below.

Background

1. The Applicant is the park site owner and operator of Green Meadows Park, a static mobile homes site. The Respondent is the executor of Mr Anthony Morgan, who died on 22 March 2025. Mr Morgan occupied 9 Green Meadows Park pursuant to a written statement commencing prior to 2015.
2. On 30 June 2025 the Applicant site owner sought a determination of the pitch fee of £123.01 per month payable by the Respondent from 1 April 2025.
3. A Pitch Fee Review Notice dated 19 February 2025 served on the occupier proposing to increase the pitch fee by an amount which the site owner says represents only an adjustment in line with the Consumer Prices Index, an increase of 3%. The Applicant stated that the Review Date was 1 April each year.
4. The Applicant has provided copies of the relevant notices to the Respondent.
5. Directions were issued on 18 December 2025 setting a timetable for the exchange of documents preparatory to a determination on the papers. The Directions required the Respondent to submit a response to the application by 19 January 2026. The Respondent replied on 19 December 2025, confirming agreement to the proposed increase. The Tribunal emailed the Applicant on 27 February 2026 attaching an application to withdraw to be completed if the matter was settled, of which the Applicant has not responded.. By Directions dated 8 April 2026, the tribunal confirmed that the application is still suitable to be dealt with on the papers.
6. This has been a paper determination which has not been objected to by the parties. The documents that were referred to are the Applicant's application and the tribunal's Directions dated 19 December 2025 and 8 April 2026, the contents of which have been recorded.

Pitch fee review

7. Green Meadows Park is a protected site within the meaning of the Mobile Homes Act 1983 (the '1983 Act').
8. The Respondent's right to station his mobile home on the pitch at Green Meadows Park is governed by the terms of the Written Agreement with the Applicant and the provisions of the 1983 Act.
9. The Written Agreement provides for the pitch fee review date to be 1st April in each year.
10. The Applicant served the Respondent with the prescribed pitch review form proposing the new pitch fee effective from 1 April 2025 on 20 February 2025 which was more than 28 days prior to the effective review date. The Application to the Tribunal to determine the pitch fee was made on 30 June 2025 which was within the period starting 28 days to three months after the review date of 1 April 2025. The Applicant explained that it applied the CPI of 3 per cent as published in January 2025 being the last index published prior to service of the notice.
11. Having regard to its findings above, the Tribunal is satisfied that the Applicant had complied with the procedural requirements of paragraph 17 of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the 1983 Act to support an application for an increase in pitch fee in respect of the pitch occupied by the Respondent.
12. The Tribunal is required to determine whether the proposed increase in pitch fee is reasonable. The Tribunal is not deciding whether the level of pitch fee is reasonable.
13. Pitch fee is defined in paragraph 29 of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the 1983 Act as:

"The amount which the occupier is required by the agreement to pay to the owner for the right to station the mobile home on the pitch and for use of the common areas of the protected site and their maintenance, but does not include amounts due in respect of gas, electricity, water, sewerage or other services, unless the agreement expressly provides that the pitch fee includes such amounts."
14. The Tribunal is required to have regard to paragraphs 18, 19 and 20 of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the 1983 Act when determining a new pitch fee. Paragraph 20(1) introduces a presumption that the pitch fee shall increase by a percentage which is no more than any percentage increase or decrease in the RPI since the last review date. The Mobile Homes (Pitch Fees) Act 2023 changed RPI to CPI.
15. The Applicant has restricted the increase in pitch fee to the percentage increase in the CPI.

16. The tribunal considered the decision of the Upper Tribunal in *Vyse v Wyldecrest Parks (Management) Ltd*, [2017] UKUT 24 (LC), where the increase sought was above RPI.
17. In *Vyse*, HHJ Alice Robinson said as follows:

“There are a substantial number of mobile home sites in England occupied pursuant to pitch agreements which provide for relatively modest pitch fees. The legislative framework for determining any change in pitch fee provides a narrow basis on which to do so which no doubt provides an element of certainty and consistency that is of benefit to site owners and pitch occupiers alike. The costs of litigating about changes in pitch fee in the FTT and in the Tribunal are not insubstantial and will almost invariably be disproportionate to any sum in issue. I accept the submissions...that an interpretation which results in uncertainty and argument at many pitch fee reviews is to be avoided and that the application of RPI is straightforward and provides certainty for all parties”
18. The tribunal’s starting point is that the pitch fee should be increased in line with CPI. In determining whether the presumption applies, the Tribunal must have regard to the matters identified in paragraphs 18 and 19 Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the 1983 Act. In this case paragraph 19 did not apply because there was no evidence that the increase in the pitch fee included costs which were specifically excluded by that paragraph. Similarly, the Applicant was not including costs of any improvements within the proposed increase.
19. The tribunal has not identified any issues identified that individually or taken as a whole are sufficient to displace the presumption that the pitch fee should be increased in line with CPI. It is noted that the Respondent has agreed the increase.
20. The tribunal therefore confirms the increase.

Rights of appeal

1. A person wishing to appeal this decision to the Upper Tribunal (Lands Chamber) must seek permission to do so by making written application by email to rpsouthern@justice.gov.uk
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.
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.