FIRST-TIER TRIBUNAL
PROPERTY CHAMBER
(RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY)

Case Reference	**:**	**LON/00BD/MRA/2026/0069**
Property	**:**	**40 Clifford Road, Ham Richmond TW10 7EA**
Applicant	**:**	**Murat Guvene Sibel Guvene (Tenants)**
Representative	**:**	**None**
Respondent	**:**	**Soeren Grimm (Landlord)**
Representative	**:**	**Dexters Ltd. (Agent)**
Date of Application	**:**	**3 July 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	**:**	**£4000 per calendar month**
Date of new rent start	**:**	**1 December 2026**

REASONS FOR DECISION

Background

1 A landlord's notice FORM 4A, dated 28 May 2026, was served under Section 13(2) Housing Act 1988 proposing a new rent of £4195 per calendar month in replacing a passing rent of £4000 pcm, with effect from 1 August 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.

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 No furniture included. Landlord's white goods and a variety of other fixed floor finishes and coverings 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 online oral video hearing.

Property

9 There was no inspection. The Property is a mid terrace 1950's former Council House, with a hipped mono-pitched porch roof. The Property has since been extended into the roof space, with a ground floor back addition. Fair faced brick walls, hipped double pitched plain tile roof. Front external appears in good condition (Google Streetview June 2025).

10 The original accommodation would have been - first floor, 3 bedrooms bathroom wc and ground floor, living room and kitchen. The additions are ground floor extension; roof space bedroom & shower room. There is gas fired central space and water heating and double glazed windows.

11 There is a rear garden and front garden but no off road parking behind the low front garden wall. There are no on street parking restrictions. Few if any of the original houses appear to have been sub-divided. The Property is in an established residential road in LB Richmond.

Evidence

12 The Tribunal received completed Form MR1 of 3 July 2026 from the tenant, with the landlord's notice in Form 4a. Later the reply Form MR2 came from the landlord. Both documents providing some additional background to the Property and the letting. The tenant replied through Form MR3. The Tribunal is grateful for such information as was provided by one or both of the parties. Both parties attended or were represented at an online hearing.

Tenant

13 The tenant did not contest the form and/or content of the landlord's S.13 Notice but did challenge the new rent. The tenant felt that the rent should stay at £4000 or reduce to £3900 pcm. The tenants included a some photographs, mainly of the Property interior in the back addition. They reported some minor items of disrepair, there had been historic flooding to a rear patio, boiler failure, and there remained noisy heaters. The quality of additions to rear and loft were said to be poor. The loft shower was too small for adults, the loft room not well thermally insulated, nor too the back addition extension. The carpets were old and worn.

14 The tenants did not refer to any of their own comparables. They felt that the landlord's evidence though indicative of higher values than the tenant contended for, considered them to be of a better quality and/or larger. The tenant felt these rents were for superior properties, in better condition, larger gardens, often with better facilities.

Landlord

15 The landlord disputed that the additions had been added poorly or that historic repairs had been effected only slowly, or not at all.

16 The landlord's agent referred to comparables of other terraced and detached homes let or to let in the first part of 2026. They considered that the tone was for a new rent of £4200 to £4400 pcm. They felt this supported the modest increase in their notice, to £4195 pcm.

17 They provided brief details of Properties including: 1. 64 Meadowlands Drive TW10 7EE of 1409ft2 4 beds 2 baths rented at £4146pcm. The house is very similar to the Property, a former 1950's Council house on the same housing estate, also extended, also without off street parking. 2. 12 Arlington Road TW10 7BY a 1930's detached privately built house of some character with 4 bedrooms and 2 bathrooms let for £6350 pcm.

Law

18 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.

Valuation

19 From the Tribunal's own general knowledge of market rent levels in LB Richmond and having regard for the landlord's comparables, for a Property of this type and location, it determines that the subject Property would let on normal Assured Periodic Tenancy (APT) terms, for £4000 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.

20 The Tribunal noted that the Property had experienced a series of minor defects some of which had been remedied by the landlord. The loft and back additions appeared to be of a basic specification not offering the same quality of space that the original house did, even if they added to the overall floor area. The Tribunal considered these deficiencies were already reflected in an over-extended 4 bedroom house as here and no further end allowance was required. The Tribunal determines the new market rent at £4000 pcm.

Undue Hardship

21 If undue hardship were shown then at most, the start date for the new rent could be delayed by a Tribunal up to 2 months, effective from the beginning of the next rent period following. Allowance for hardship from the rent increase, was sought by the tenant in their application but there was no supporting documentation to consider further. No change to the effective date of the new rent is made by the Tribunal.

Decision and effective start date

22 The new rent of £4000 pcm is to be levied from and including the start date of the next rent period falling due, which is 1 December 2026.

23 **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).