	FIRST - TIER TRIBUNAL PROPERTY CHAMBER (RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY)
Case Reference	CAM/00MX/MRA/2026/0028
Property	4 Oldhouse Close, High Wycombe, Buckinghamshire HP11 1TP
Tenant	Harry Tibbey and Karla Robinson
Tenant's Representative	N/A
Landlord	Bensar Property Rentals Ltd
Landlord's Address	76 Candlemas Mead, Beaconsfield, Buckinghamshire HP9 1AR
Landlord's Representative	Bovingdons Real Estate (Lettings) Ltd
Date of Application	9 July 2026
Type of Application	Determination of a Market Rent sections 13 & 14 of the Housing Act 1988
Tribunal Members	Judge A. Arul Dr. Janet Wilcox FRICS
Date of Decision	4 November 2026
Rent Determined	£1,600 per calendar month
Date of Valuation	4 November 2026

© CROWN COPYRIGHT

Date the new rent takes effect	11 November 2026

REASONS FOR THE DECISION

Background

1. On 5 May 2026, the Landlord served a notice under Section 13(2) of the Housing Act 1988, which proposed a new rent of £1,675 per calendar month (pcm) in place of the existing rent of £1,595 pcm, to take effect from 11 July 2026.

2. On 9 July 2026, under Section 13(4)(a) of the Housing Act 1988, the Tenant referred the Landlord's notice proposing a new rent to the Tribunal for determination of a market rent.

3. The assured tenancy commenced on 11 July 2025. The rental period is monthly.

Allocation of Repairs between Landlord and Tenant.

4. As per section 11 of the Landlord and Tenant Act 1985.

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

5. None.

Liability for Council Tax

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

Any other terms of the tenancy taken into consideration in determining the rent.

7. None.

Inspection/Hearing

8. Neither party requested an oral hearing. The Tribunal has considered this case on the basis of the papers provided by the parties and its own knowledge and specialist expertise.

The Property

9. The Property is an end of terrace house. The Tribunal noted that the Tenant had described it as semi-detached, however the description in the EPC dated 17 July 2023 is that it is an end of terrace. It offers the following accommodation:

   2 bedrooms, a living room, a kitchen and a bathroom.

   Outside: garden (said by the Tenant to be small, but no measurements supplied), off street parking (which is noted in the tenancy agreement as one allocated space), and a garage said to be on a separate service road.

   The Property is situated southwest of the town centre of High Wycombe, and north of junction 4 of the M40 motorway and nearby amenities.

Evidence

10. The parties completed the relevant MR1 (Tenant) and MR2 (Landlord) forms although there was no MR3 (Tenant's reply) form submitted.

The Tenant.

11. The Tenant considered the proposed rent of £1,675 to be high and contended that the market rent was £1,550 pcm.

12. In relation to rental evidence, the Tenant stated that they believed that they were already paying the highest rent on the road, based on conversations with neighbours, and that the market was seeing less demand and lower rents. They believed that three-bedroom houses were being let for the rent they were currently paying and two-bedroom houses were being let for £1,450 to £1550; some with a driveway, which they did not have.

13. The Tenant provided screen shots of three comparables as follows:

    a. Denewood – a two-bedroom, one-bathroom end of terrace house in postcode Hp13 advertised at £1,450 pcm.

    b. Milton Place – a three-bedroom, one-bathroom semi-detached house in postcode Hp13 advertised at £1,600 pcm.

    c. 5 Oldhouse Close – a two-bedroom, one-bathroom end of terrace house in the same cul-de-sac as the subject Property advertised at £1,550 pcm. It is advertised as having private parking, a garage and garden. The Tenant contended that this property was larger than the subject Property

and is to the same standard. The particulars include room sizes but there were none available for the Property to compare.

The Landlord.

14. The Landlord maintained that the proposed rent of £1,675 pcm reflected market rates.

15. In relati0n to rental evidence, the Landlord pointed to the local area, being within half a mile of several local amenities as well as the M40 motorway and other major road networks. It was said that the area is desirable and the Landlord's own searches in July and August 2026 revealed no directly comparable two-bedroom houses available to rent in the immediate area.

16. The Landlord relied upon one comparator, which was a two-bedroom two-bathroom end of terrace house in Cressex Close in the same 'Cressex' neighbourhood about 0.16 miles from the subject Property. This was advertised in July 2025 for £1,700 pcm although the achieved rent was not known.

17. The Landlord also referred to a two-bedroom duplex/maisonette flat in nearby Marlow Road advertised in August 2026 at £1,550 pcm. The Landlord said this was less desirable than a two-bedroom house but indicated that £1,550 pcm was too low for a house. The duplex/maisonette is stated, in the Landlord's comparison table, to have a larger floor area of 765 sq.ft (71 sq.m.) (compared to the 646 sq.ft. (60 sq.m.) of the subject Property. The EPC size provided in the details provided is however given at a slightly smaller 721 sq.ft. (70 sq.m.). Whichever measurement is correct, the property is larger than that of the subject Property.

18. There were other factors which the Landlord relied upon a demonstrating a general increase in market rates. Firstly, the Landlord produced tenancy agreements for previous tenants in respect of the subject Property from December 2023 and December 2024. The first was a 12-month let at £1,600 pcm and the second was a discounted six-month let to a former letting agent for personal use based on that agent's assessment of a gross rent of £1,660 pcm. In both cases, these were historical rents and, it was argued, would reasonably be expected to increase. The Office for National Statistics recorded a 4.9% annual increase in average Buckinghamshire terraced-property rents from June 2025 to June 2026 which, from the current £1,595 rent gives £1,673.16; within £1.84 of the proposed rent.

19. Finally, the Landlord commented on the Tenant's comparables, saying that these were not reliable comparators to the subject Property due to insufficient particulars. In respect of 5 Oldhouse Close, advertised at £1,550, the Landlord

stated that not all listing photographs had been provided and internal measurements and condition, garden size, parking arrangements and achieved rent could not be tested.

Determination and Valuation

20. The Tribunal noted that there did not appear to be any dispute about the condition of the subject Property. The Tribunal took account of the submissions and evidence of both parties including as to the local area and comparable properties.

21. 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. Relevant Tenant improvements or failure of the Tenant to comply with the terms of the tenancy are to be disregarded. Historic issues relating to the tenancy or the personal circumstances of the Landlord are not taken into account. The personal circumstances of the Tenant are only considered if an application for hardship has been made.

22. The Tenant referred to three rental comparators but has not provided full particulars for all of them so the information available to the Tribunal is difficult to verify. Denewood has very few particulars, so room sizes cannot be compared, and the parking provision (if any) is not clear. The subject Property benefits from allocated parking and a nearby garage and the absence of these could well explain a rent at £1,450 pcm. Importantly, this property is in a different postcode, which is some way northeast of the subject Property, near the train station but not near other amenities. Likewise, few particulars were provided for Milton Place and, although it has an additional bedroom, other room sizes were not given. It appears to be some 3.4 miles away from the subject Property on the other side of the town. Without further evidence of size and condition, these two comparables are of limited assistance but would suggest that a property with parking and garage facilities and closer to amenities and the arterial roads would on average achieve a higher rental. 5 Oldhouse Close is in the same cul-de-sac and has a similar description to the subject Property, being an end of terrace house with allocated parking and garage. The Tribunal has exercised some caution in treating this as a close match to the subject Property due to the absence of details about parking arrangements and of the room sizes in the subject Property so that a closer comparison can be made. However, the Tribunal did note that the particulars suggested an overall floor size of 60 sqm, which is the same as the subject Property according to the EPC.

23. In relation to the Landlord's comparables, Marlow Road is a different type of Property but does suggest that houses in the locality would attract a market rent

of above £1,550 pcm depending on closer comparison of size and other amenities. Cressex Close is larger than the subject Property at 70/71 sq.m. rather than 60 sqm. It also benefits from two bathrooms. There is no garage, but it does have allocated parking. This property seemed to have a higher specification overall, for example four front facing windows allowing more light and a higher quality finish such as flooring and kitchen worktops. This would justify a downward adjustment to £1,650 pcm.

24. The Tribunal treated the evidence of historical rent for the subject Property with some caution. The December 2024 was a specific private arrangement to a special purchaser, and for a shorter six-month period, which would be expected to attract a premium. The December 2023 was for a 12-month period, however details of the arrangements are not known, such as the condition of the Property at that time and status of the tenant. The ONS information is a broad average and does not in itself suggest that rental values for two-bedroom end of terrace houses in the 'Cressex' area have increased in the preceding year.

25. The Tribunal was mindful that there was no dispute between the Landlord and the Tenant over a rent of £1,595 pcm for the subject Property in the preceding year since July 2025. There was mixed evidence of a range between £1,550 for a property in the same cul-de-sac and £1,650 for 0.16 miles away after adjustments for that property. Historical rents for the subject Property may have been £1,600 pcm or over, however this has limited weight without knowing the circumstances which existed at those times.

26. Having regard to the size and location of the Property and relying on its own expert, general knowledge of rental values in the area, the comparables provided by both parties, and the existing rent, the Tribunal considers that the market rent of the subject Property would be in the region of £1,600 pcm. This is the rent we would expect the Property to be let for in the open market.

Market rent	£1,600 pcm

Undue hardship

27. The new rent takes effect from the date which is the beginning of the first new period of the tenancy which begins on or after the date of the determination unless that would cause undue hardship to the tenant. In cases of undue hardship, the Tribunal has a discretion to fix a later starting date up to two months after it makes its determination.

28. The Tenant has asked the Tribunal to fix a later starting date in this case. They assert hardship but provide no details or evidence in support. The threshold for demonstrating undue hardship is high. The Tenant did not provide any

information about affordability nor evidence in support however the Tribunal noted in any event that the rent would not be substantially increasing following its market rent determination (being £5 pcm higher). The Tribunal did not therefore consider that the claim of undue hardship was made out.

29. On the basis of the evidence provided, the Tribunal considers that for the increase to take effect from the date the Tribunal makes its determination would not cause undue hardship and does not fix a later starting date.

30. The Tribunal determines the new rent amount at £1,600 per calendar month with effect from 11 November 2026 which is the beginning of the first new period of the tenancy which begins on or after the date of the determination.

Decision

31. Therefore, the Tribunal determines the market rent at £1,600 per calendar month with effect from 11 November 2026.

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 (regulation 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.