



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

Case Reference

CAM/00MG/MRA/2026/0072

Property

**21 Triangle Building, Wolverton Park
Road, Wolverton, Milton Keynes,
MK12 5FJ**

Tenant

Ms Pragati Trivedi

Landlord

Wolverton Park Limited

Landlord's Address

60 Welbeck Street, London, W1G 9XB

Landlord's Representative

HCGB Services Limited

Date of Application

8 August 2026

Type of Application

**Determination of an Open-Market Rent,
sections 13 & 14 of the Housing Act 1988**

Tribunal Members

**Judge Virginia Lloyd
Mr Patrick McGreal, MRICS**

Date of Decision

23 September 2026

Rent Determined

£1,150 per calendar month

Date the new rent takes effect

23 September 2026

REASONS FOR THE DECISION

Background

1. On 22 June 2026, the Landlord served a notice under section 13(2) (as amended) of the Housing Act 1988 which proposed a new rent of £1,196 per calendar month (pcm) in place of the existing rent of £1,000 pcm to take effect from 23 August 2026.
2. On 8 August 2026, under section 14 (A3) of the Housing Act 1988, the Tenant referred the Landlord's notice proposing a new rent to the Tribunal for determination of an open-market rent.
3. The tenancy commenced on 23 August 2024. The rental period is monthly.

Application for an Anonymity Order

4. The Tenant applied for an Anonymity Order by Order 1 Form dated 15 September 2026. She requested that the Tribunal anonymise her name "*in any publicly available or published decision in these proceedings*"; did not object to the full property address being published and also requested that "*her current partner's name ... be withheld for the same reasons.*"
5. The Tenant explained that she sought the Order because of her concern "*that publication of my full name alongside my residential address could increase the risk of unwanted contact from former partners, including the possibility of unwanted contact at my home. This is something I have deliberately sought to avoid and could affect both my privacy and sense of safety, as well as those of my current partner*".
6. The Tenant did not include any supporting evidence with her Order 1 Form but had been advised by Regional Judge David Whitney in e-mail correspondence dated 9 September 2026 and included within the Tribunal hearing bundle "*to complete an Order 1 with any evidence she wishes to rely upon which must be copied to the Landlord... Generally we do not anonymise unless exceptional circumstances.*" At the hearing, the Tenant confirmed that she had not copied the Order 1 Form to the Landlord. She agreed that it did not contain any additional information that was not already included in the hearing bundle and this was therefore copied to the Landlord.
7. In respect of the supporting evidence, the Tenant advised that she wished to have her name and her partner's name anonymised to prevent partners attempting to contact her. She stated that nothing illegal had happened and there was no supporting evidence in the form of medical or police evidence or evidence relating to harassment, stalking, injunctions or safeguarding concerns. Neither

did the Tenant require additional time to file and serve any supporting evidence. The Tribunal enquired about the harm that was likely to arise if their names were published and the Tenant advised that it would result in “*undesirable contact*” in the form of “*flowers and gifts*” but there was no suggestion that “*violence or threatening behaviour*” would arise.

8. The Tribunal finds that the Tenant has not provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate a real and substantial risk of harm arising from publication of her name. The evidence relied upon amounts to concerns regarding privacy and the possibility of unwanted contact. Whilst the Tribunal understands those concerns, they do not amount to exceptional circumstances sufficient to justify derogation from the principle of open justice. Consequently, the Tenant’s application for an anonymity order is refused.

Validity Of Notice – Section 13 of the Housing Act 1988

9. In their application form, the Tenant has indicated that they consider the Landlord’s notice is invalid because a previous rent increase had occurred and the Landlord had entered “N/A” in sections 4.3 and 4.4 rather than identifying the previous increase.
10. In response, the Landlord stated that it considered the notice to be valid.
11. The Tribunal finds that the omission was a minor defect which did not invalidate the notice. The notice clearly identified the existing rent, proposed rent and effective date. The Tenant was not misled as to the nature or effect of the notice and was able to exercise her statutory right to refer the proposed increase to the Tribunal. The notice remained substantially compliant with the statutory requirements.

Allocation of Repairs between Landlord and Tenant.

12. The Landlord is responsible for those matters falling within section 11 of the Landlord and Tenant Act 1985. There was no dispute regarding repairing obligations.

Services Charges or furniture provided by Landlord (other than carpets and curtain and white goods specified below) and the costs relating to the same.

13. There are no service charges and no services provided by the Landlord. The Property is unfurnished and the Landlord provides white goods and carpeting.

Liability for Council Tax

14. The Tenant is responsible for the payment of Council Tax in respect of the Property. The rent determined is exclusive of Council Tax.

Inspection/Hearing

15. A hearing was held by video platform on 23 September 2026. Ms Trivedi attended and was supported by her partner, Mr Pavel Demidov. The Landlord was represented by Ms Claire Daley, Head of Lettings at HCG B Services Limited. Neither party requested an inspection. The Tribunal considered the oral and documentary evidence, including the 219-page hearing bundle and the Tenant's Order 1 application dated 15 September 2026, together with its own knowledge and specialist expertise.

The Property

16. The Property is a ground floor flat offering one bedroom, an open-plan kitchen/living room, bathroom and hallway. The floor area is estimated to be 70.7m² (761 square feet).

Outside: an allocated parking space.

The Property benefits from a gas boiler and double glazing.

The Property forms part of a residential development named "The Triangle" that includes the renovated former Wolverton railway works. The Property is situated a short walk from Wolverton mainline railway station which operates two trains an hour to Birmingham and to London Euston respectively. Social and retail facilities are close by, as is the Grand Union Canal.

Evidence

17. The parties completed the relevant MR1 (Tenant), MR2 (Landlord) and MR3 (Tenant's reply) forms.

The Tenant

18. The Tenant contends open market rent should be £1,050 pcm. The Tenant relies on the following issues:
 - a. Older condition, wear and tear, cracked tiles and basic fittings.
 - b. Proximity to communal refuse area.
 - c. Noise, litter and pigeon-related issues.
 - d. Lack of secure communal entrance.
 - e. Unsecured parking.

The Tenant argues that the Landlord's comparables are in superior locations (particularly those located in central Milton Keynes), more modern, have secure entry, balconies and better parking.

19. In terms of rental evidence, the Tenant has provided the following comparables:
 - a. Trevithick Court, MK12 - A one-bedroom flat of 54m² in the same development, initially advertised at £1,150 pcm and subsequently reduced to £1,125 pcm. The Tenant stated that the property had been re-advertised shortly before the hearing at £1,135 pcm. The property had allegedly been relied upon by the Landlord's agent during earlier negotiations but was not included in the subsequent MR2 evidence.
 - b. Hamilton House, MK12 - A two-bedroom flat of 58m² in a modern medium rise block available to let at £1,250 pcm. Situated in the same development and a very short distance from the subject Property.
 - c. Witan Gate, MK9 - A one-bedroom flat of 57m² in a modern medium rise building in central Milton Keynes available to let at £1,100 pcm. Situated over five miles from the subject Property.
 - d. Rillaton Walk, MK9 - A one-bedroom flat in a modern medium rise building in central Milton Keynes available to let at £1,100 pcm. Situated over five miles from the subject Property.
 - e. Carnegie House, MK9 - A one-bedroom furnished flat in a modern medium rise building in central Milton Keynes available to let at £1,150 pcm. Situated over five miles from the subject Property.
 - f. Merrivale Mews, MK9 - A one-bedroom flat of 48m² in a modern medium rise building in central Milton Keynes available to let at £1,200 pcm. Situated over five miles from the subject Property.
20. The Tenant considered that the Trevithick Court property was the best comparable as although it is smaller, it is in an almost identical area, newer, better quality and located in a more desirable part of the development compared to the subject Property. The Tenant did not consider that the comparable properties located in central Milton Keynes were persuasive.
21. In reply, the Landlord agreed that the properties located in MK12 provided the best comparables but explained that it had included some properties in central Milton Keynes because Wolverton, where the subject Property is located, is a "small town". The Landlord suggested that "*rents in central Milton Keynes are lower as there is more stock available*". Referring to Trevithick Court, the

Landlord stated that, whilst it was in the same development, it had a different layout from the subject Property.

22. The Tribunal enquired if both parties agreed that properties in central Milton Keynes were not ideal for determining the market rent for the subject Property. The Landlord agreed. The Tenant alleged that the Landlord had been selective in its selection of comparable properties but agreed that there were few comparable properties available in Wolverton.

The Landlord

23. The Landlord states that the Property is situated in a prime and desirable area. It contends that it currently lets comparable one-bedroom properties ranging from approximately £1,195-£1,250 pcm. The following comparables were provided by the Landlord:
 - a. Silbury Boulevard MK9 (£1,250pcm). A ground floor, one bedroom flat in a modern medium rise building in Central Milton Keynes available to let at £1,250 pcm. Situated over five miles from the subject Property.
 - b. Hamilton House MK12 (£1,185pcm). A one-bedroom flat of 48m² in a modern medium rise block available to let at £1,185 pcm. Situated in the same development as the Triangle, where the subject Property is located with the same amenities.
 - c. Lonsdale MK12 (£1,210pcm). A one-bedroom flat of 66m² in a modern medium rise block at £1,210 pcm. Situated in the same development as the Triangle, where the subject Property is located with the same amenities.
 - d. Teeswater Way MK8 (£1,195pcm). A one-bedroom flat of 49m² in a modern low rise block available at £1,195 pcm. Situated over four miles from the subject Property.
 - e. Witan Gate MK9 (£1,200pcm). A one-bedroom flat of 44m² in a modern medium rise building in Central Milton Keynes available to let at £1,200 pcm. Situated over five miles from the subject Property.
24. The Landlord advised that their best comparable properties were Lonsdale or Hamilton House as they were located within the same development as the subject Property.

The Tenant's Reply

25. The Tenant has made the following comments:
 - a. *"Silbury Boulevard, MK9 – £1,250 pcm. This property is in Central Milton Keynes, a materially different and more amenity-rich location than Wolverton/MK12, with immediate access to the shopping centre, restaurants, leisure facilities and other city-centre amenities. It is also*

within a brand-new development with gated/controlled access, parking and an on-site caretaker...

- b. Hamilton House, MK12 – £1,185 pcm. This is a relevant local comparable. However, it appears materially more modern and of a higher specification than the subject property. It is not on the ground floor, benefits from gated/controlled building access, and includes parking. Despite these advantages, it was advertised at £1,185 pcm, below the proposed rent of £1,196 pcm.*
- c. Lonsdale, MK12 – £1,210 pcm. This is also a relevant local comparable but appears materially superior to the subject property. It is a modern 66m² apartment, not on the ground floor, with gated/controlled access, parking, modern fittings, large windows and a large balcony. Its advertised rent of £1,210 pcm is only £14 above the proposed rent, despite these additional features.*
- d. Teeswater Way, Whitehouse, MK8 – £1,195 pcm. This property is located in Whitehouse, a different and newer residential development. Although it is within a broadly similar geographical distance, location should not be considered on distance alone. The property appears materially more modern than the subject property and benefits from gated access, parking and a balcony. Whitehouse also has a different local setting and amenity profile from Wolverton.*
- e. Witan Gate, MK9 – £1,200 pcm. This property is also in Central Milton Keynes, benefiting from the same significant city-centre location advantages and access to shops, restaurants, leisure and other amenities which are not available to the same extent in the subject property's immediate area. It is furnished and also benefits from a modern specification, gated access and included underground gated parking..."*

Determination and Valuation

- 26. Under section 14(1) of the Housing Act 1988 (as amended), the Tribunal is required to determine the rent at which the Property might reasonably be expected to let in the open market by a willing Landlord at the beginning of the new period specified in the Landlord's notice.
- 27. The property is some ten years old and there will inevitably, without refurbishment, be signs of wear and tear but this will be reflected in the general rent level for the building. The effect on value of the quality of fixtures and fittings is reflected in the general rent level. The location on the ground floor, in close proximity to the refuse store and bird droppings is considered value neutral. Noise may be a feature of urban living along with convenience for transport,

cultural and retail amenities, and is reflected in the general level of value for an area.

28. The best guide to value is properties of the same type and style in the same locality. Central Milton Keynes is over five miles from Wolverton and has a different level of supply and demand, different amenities including usage of a different railway station, with a more intense level of service and more travel options. For these reasons, Milton Keynes Central and Wolverton are considered different rental markets, so Milton Keynes comparables are not considered helpful in establishing the market rent of the subject property. Similarly, the Landlord's comparable in Whitehouse at Teeswater Way is less persuasive.

Open market rental value

29. For the reasons set out above, seven of the eleven comparables referred to by the Landlord and Tenant are given less weight. This leaves four that the Tribunal considers are of assistance. These are summarised below:

Comparable	Bedrooms	Area m²	Asking rent (pcm)	Comment
<i>21 Triangle</i>	1	71	£1,196	<i>Subject-proposed rent</i>
Trevithick Court	1	54	£1,125/£1,150	Tenant comparable
Hamilton Hse	2	58	£1,250	Tenant comparable
Hamilton Hse	1	48	£1,185	Landlord comparable
Lonsdale	1	66	£1,210	Landlord comparable

30. The Tribunal notes that the most persuasive comparables within the same development range from £1,125 pcm to £1,210 pcm. The Tribunal accepts that the subject Property is larger than several of those comparables but also accepts the Tenant's evidence that it has an older specification and lacks certain features found in the superior comparables, including controlled access, balconies and more modern fittings. Balancing those factors, the Tribunal is satisfied that the market rent lies above the Tenant's proposed figure of £1,050 pcm but below the Landlord's proposed rent of £1,196 pcm.
31. In spatial terms, the closest comparable is the property at Lonsdale. The properties at Trevithick Court and Hamilton House are considerably smaller in floor-area terms. Lonsdale is more modern than the Triangle and abuts, and has views over, the Grand Union Canal. It is nevertheless considered a reliable comparable. Having regard to the comparable evidence and the Tribunal's own general knowledge and specialist expertise concerning rental values in the area, the Tribunal determines the open-market rent at £1,150 pcm. This reflects the differences in condition, specification and amenities, whilst recognising that the subject Property is marginally larger than the Lonsdale comparable.

Decision

32. The Tribunal determines the new rent amount at **£1,150** per calendar month with effect from 23 September 2026 which is the beginning of the first new period of the tenancy which begins on or after the date of the determination.

APPEAL PROVISIONS

If either party is dissatisfied with this decision, they may apply for permission to appeal to the Upper Tribunal (Lands Chamber) on any point of law arising from this Decision. Prior to making such an appeal, an application must be made, in writing, to this Tribunal for permission to appeal. Any such application must be made within 28 days of the issue of this statement of reasons (rule 52 (2) of The Tribunal Procedure (First-tier Tribunal) (Property Chamber) Rules 2013) stating the grounds upon which it is intended to rely in the appeal.