	**FIRST - TIER TRIBUNAL** **PROPERTY CHAMBER** **(RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY)**
Case Reference	**LON/00AT/MRA/2026/0231**
Property	**50 Kew Bridge Court, London, W4 3AE**
Tenant	**Thomas Gray and Rachel Binnie**
Tenant's Representative	**None**
Landlord	**GRIP UK Property Investments Limited**
Landlord's Address	**Citygate, St James Boulevard, Newcastle Upon Tyne, Tyne and Wear, NE1 4JE**
Landlord's Representative	**Jemma Herring, Grainger Residential Management Limited**
Date of Application	**1 August 2026**
Type of Application	**Determination of an Open-Market Rent sections 13 & 14 of the Housing Act 1988**
Tribunal Members	**R Waterhouse FRICS** **M Lynch**
Date of Decision	**4 November 2026**
Rent Determined	**£2275 per calendar month**
Date of Valuation	**7 August 2026**
Date the new rent takes effect	**7 November 2026**

© CROWN COPYRIGHT

REASONS FOR THE DECISION

Background

1. The Landlord served a notice under Section 13 (2) (as amended) of the Housing Act 1988 which proposed a new rent of £2335.00 per calendar month(pcm) in place of the existing rent of £2275.00 pcm to take effect from 7 August 2026.

2. On 1 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 7 July 2025. The rental period is monthly.

The tenancy

4. The terms of the tenancy are those expected to be found in the tenancies of the comparable rents drawn from the market. The Property is let furnished. The rent is exclusive of Council Tax and utilities. Wi-Fi is provided by the Landlord and is included in the rent.

Hearing

5. 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

6. The Property is a third floor, two-bedroom one bathroom property, the property has central heating and double glazing with no outdoor space.

Evidence

7. The parties completed the relevant MR1 (tenant), MR2 (landlord) and MR3 (tenant's reply). The Landlord also filed a supplementary response to the MR3, which the Tribunal admitted on 7 October 2026.

The Tenant

8. The Tenant provided a number of comparables and statements concerning the condition of the property which the Tribunal has carefully reviewed.

The Landlord

9. The Landlord provided a number of comparables which the tribunal has carefully reviewed. The Tenant asked the Tribunal to direct disclosure of further details of the Landlord's internal comparables, or to give them reduced weight. The Landlord's supplementary response supplied a table which they said to show the four months before the valuation date, including the aspect of each unit. In weighing those comparables, the Tribunal has borne in mind that they are anonymised and that their condition and specification are not in evidence.

Determination and Valuation

10. 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.

11. The tribunal considered the contentions of the tenant that there was a distinction between rents agreed or set as part of a section 13 process and those set at the start of a tenancy, the latter the tribunal considered had most weight (because a rent fixed on review with a sitting tenant has not been tested by offering the flat on the open market).

12. The tribunal also agrees with the tenant that properties with balconies are more attractive and so would gain a higher bid.

13. Some comparables, as was the subject property, were let with varying degrees of furniture. The tribunal has not received evidence as to what extent the furniture impacts the rent.

14. For the tenant the tribunal gave most weight to Apartment 6 where the property was said to be the same size as the subject property and a new letting. [SUGGESTED: The Tenant relied in particular on three one-bathroom flats outside the development, let at £2,000 to £2,200 pcm. The Tribunal has given these less weight than the new lettings within Kew Bridge Court, which share the Property's building, location and services. Two of the three are smaller than the Property and the size of the third is not known.]

15. For the landlord the tribunal gives most weight to the new letting [p. 215] on the first floor for a slightly larger property of 785 sq feet at £2375 pcm, the subject property being 750 sq feet. This flat has a second bathroom and outside space, which the Property lacks, and the Tribunal has allowed for those differences in arriving at its starting rent. The Tribunal has also had regard to the letting of a smaller one-bathroom flat in the development, also with a rail and courtyard aspect and no outside space, at £2,395 pcm on 12 August 2026. That letting was agreed shortly after the valuation date and its condition is not in evidence.

16. Relying on its own expertise and general knowledge of rental values in the area, and the comparables provided by the Landlord and the Tenant, the Tribunal considers that the market rent of the subject Property modernised and in good order would be in the order of £ 2350.00 pcm. This is the rent we would expect the property to let for in the open market at the valuation date and if it was in the same general condition as the comparable properties.

17. From this level of rent, the Tribunal has made adjustments in relation to the following:

    a) Failed glass leading to predisposition of mould

    The full valuation is shown below:

Starting Rent		£ 2350.00 pcm
Less		
a) Items given under a) above	£75.00 pcm	
Open-Market Rent		**£ 2275.00 pcm**

18. [SUGGESTED: The Tenant also relied on the Property's aspect onto the railway line, on its bathroom being original, and on limits to the Wi-Fi and on-site management. The Tribunal has given most weight to lettings within the same development, which have the same services and several of which share the rail and courtyard aspect, so these matters are already reflected in it. The bathroom is in good condition and serviceable (photograph, p. 18). The Tribunal makes no separate deduction for them.]

Decision

19. The Tribunal determines the new rent amount at £2275.00 pcm with effect from 7 November 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 after 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.