FIRST-TIER TRIBUNAL
PROPERTY CHAMBER
(RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY)

Case Reference	**:**	**LON/00AH/MNR/2026/0503**
Property	**:**	**Flat 31, Bishops Court, Radcliffe Road, Croydon CR0 5QH**
Applicant	**:**	**Nasreen Khan Mohammed Khan (Tenants)**
Representative	**:**	**Cameron Khan (Agent)**
Respondent	**:**	**Bishops Croydon Sub 2 Ltd. (Landlord)**
Representative	**:**	**Freshview Ltd (Agent)**
Date of Application	**:**	**28 May 2026**
Type of Application	**:**	**Determination of a Market Rent sections 13 &14 Housing Act 1988**
Tribunal Members	**:**	**N. Martindale FRICS S. King**
Date of Decision	**:**	**3 November 2026**
Rent Determined	**:**	**£1550 per calendar month**
Date of new rent start	**:**	**1 June 2026**

REASONS FOR DECISION

Background

1 A landlord's notice, dated 6 April 2026, was served under Section 13(2) Housing Act 1988 proposing a new rent of £1950 per calendar month replacing a passing rent said to be of £1550 pcm by the tenant, or £1400 pcm by the landlord, with effect from 1 June 2026.

© CROWN COPYRIGHT 2013

2 At a date, prior to the effective date, under S.13(4)(a) Housing Act 1988 the tenant referred the landlord's notice proposing a new rent, to the Tribunal for determination before the start date.

3 The assured tenancy is now periodic calendar monthly.

Allocation of Repairs between Landlord and Tenant

4 As per S.11 Landlord and tenant Act 1985.

Landlord's Service Charges and Furniture provided and costs.

5 There was no furniture or services or service charges. Landlord's provisions of White goods and floor finishes is assumed.

Liability for Council Tax

6 Tenant.

Other relevant terms of tenancy

7 None.

Inspection and Hearing

8 An inspection is not routinely carried out. The Tribunal is content that it has sufficient information on the Property, its condition and on comparables, from a combination of the written and any photographic representations received and from its own knowledge and specialist expertise. There was an oral hearing via online video.

Property

9 There was no inspection. The Property consists of a ground floor flat in a purpose built wholly residential block (the Building), dating from the 1960's. The Building is of brick with a flat roof. The exterior appears to be in good condition. There are 3 levels of accommodation and many other flats in the Building. There is a communal internal hallway shared with the other 5 flats. The Property appears to have a living room, 2 bedrooms, bathroom/wc and kitchen. The Building is in an established residential area of LB Croydon. The road contains many similar aged blocks of flats to the Building. (Google Streetview March 2025).

Evidence

10 The Tribunal received completed Form Rents 1 of 28 May 2026, with the landlord's notice and later the tenant's MR3. Form MR2 was received from the landlord by the Tribunal. The Tribunal is grateful for

such information in the Forms with attachments as were provided by one or both of the parties.

Tenant

11 The tenant did not contest the form or content of the landlord's Notice but, did contest the new rent and felt it should be £1600 pcm. The tenant also contested the late filings of the landlord which were said to place the tenant in a difficult position to respond to them. These filings were allowed prior to this Tribunal's involvement.

12 The tenant referred to poor ventilation and mould growth bathroom. Former parking that had been available at the Building had been withdrawn. They referred to other similar flats nearby that were available to rent, or recently let; including a modernised flat to let in Lyndon Hyrst Radcliffe Road (opposite the Building), for £1695 pcm. A flat in Fleetwood Lane had let with 2 bedrooms and 2 bathroom for £1700 pcm. They referred in passing to rents in purpose built 1930's flats in Park Hill Court Addiscombe Road at £1650 to £1750 pcm.

13 The tenant maintained that older unimproved flats commanded rents ranging from £1375 to £1450 pcm, refurbished flats in a range from about £1550 to £1650 pcm. The Property was described as unimproved but the tenant was prepared to concede a new rent of £1600 pcm. The flat had no balcony being on the ground floor. Though there had been off street parking, this had recently been withdrawn.

Landlord

14 The landlord filed slightly late and referred to a flat in Addiscombe Road 2 bedroom and 2 bathrooms modernised with a floor area of 72m2 as letting for £1950 pcm. It was said to be in a gated estate. The landlord felt that the proposed rent was very reasonable for the tenants.

Law

15 In accordance with the terms of S.14 of the Act we are required to determine the rent at which we consider the property might reasonably be expected to let in the open market, by a willing landlord, under an assured tenancy, on the same terms as the actual tenancy; ignoring any increase in value attributable to tenant's improvements and any decrease in value due to the tenant's failure to comply with any terms of the tenancy. Thus the Property falls to be valued as it stands; but assuming that the Property to be in a reasonable internal decorative condition.

Validity

16 The tenant did not question the validity of the landlord's notice.

Valuation

17 The landlord's filings were slightly late but, this had no material effect on the tenants' ability to respond to anything added. The landlord's representations were brief and focused.

18 From the Tribunal's own general knowledge of market rent levels in the London Borough of Croydon, for a Property of this type and location, ranging from a construction in the 1930's to 1970's, they might be expected to rent from between £1550 to £1750 pcm, it determines that the subject Property would let on normal Assured Periodic Tenancy (APT) terms, for £1600 pcm, fully fitted and in good order. This is the rent we would expect the Property to let for in the open market, if it was in the same condition as comparable properties including landlord's white goods and floor coverings.

19 The Tribunal found that the kitchen units were dated and defective in place and the ventilation system to the bathroom was not repaired at the valuation date. It makes a small end allowance of £50 pcm from the rent to reflect these issues. The Tribunal determines the new market rent at £1550 pcm.

Undue Hardship

20 At most, the start date for the new rent could be delayed by a Tribunal by up to 2 months, effective from the beginning of the next rent period following, if undue hardship were shown by the tenant. The Tribunal cannot reduce the market rent level itself. Allowance for hardship from this increase in the rent was sought by the tenant in their application. The tenant mentioned they were in their 80's with Government financial support and an increase would mean foregoing essentials such as food and heating. They provided no supporting documents in support however. No change to the effective date of the new rent is made by the Tribunal.

Decision and effective start date

21 The new rent of £1550 pcm is to be levied from the next rent date after the date of this decision, which will be 1 June 2026.

22 **Although the landlord is not obliged to charge this rent and may charge a significantly lower rent as a result of their own choice, policy, or governmental regulation; they may not charge more than this figure. Otherwise any further reduction in this figure on what is levied, is a matter between the parties, only.**

Chairman N Martindale FRICS Date 3 November 2026

Rights of appeal

By rule 36(2) of the Tribunal Procedure (First-tier Tribunal) (Property Chamber) Rules 2013, the tribunal is required to notify the parties about any right of appeal they may have.

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 decision to the person making the application (regulation 52 (2) of The Tribunal Procedure (First-tier Tribunal) (Property Chamber) Rule 2013).

If the application is not made within the 28-day time limit, such application must include a request for an extension of time and the reason for not complying with the 28 day time limit; the tribunal will then look at such reason(s) and decide whether to allow the application for permission to appeal to proceed, despite not being within the time limit.

The application for permission to appeal must identify the decision of the tribunal to which it relates (i.e., give the date, the property, and the case number), state the grounds of appeal and state the result the party making the application is seeking.

If the tribunal refuses to grant permission to appeal, a further application for permission may be made to the Upper Tribunal (Lands Chamber).