FIRST-TIER TRIBUNAL
PROPERTY CHAMBER
(RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY)

Case Reference	**:**	**LON/00AT/MRA/2026/0200**
Property	**:**	**17 Claremont Grove Chiswick London W4 2TL**
Applicant	**:**	**Amy Wright, Rebecca Farris, Alice Gant (Tenants)**
Representative	**:**	**Lynn Wright**
Respondent	**:**	**BBCC Chiswick Ltd. (Landlord)**
Representative	**:**	**Fraser Allen Residential Ltd. (Agent)**
Date of Application	**:**	**29 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	**:**	**16 November 2026**
Rent Determined	**:**	**£2600 per calendar month**
Date of new rent start	**:**	**1 December 2026**

REASONS FOR DECISION

Background

1 A landlord's notice, dated 21 May 2026, was served under Section 13(2) Housing Act 1988 proposing a new rent of £2600 per calendar month replacing a passing rent of £1979 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 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 Furniture – none. There were no 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.

Property

9 There was no inspection. The Property consists of a second floor flat in a purpose built wholly residential block (the Building), dating from the 1990's. The Building is of brick, low rise 3 storey, with a double pitched tiled roofing. The exterior appears to be in good condition. There are several other flats and communal internal hallways and landings shared with others in the Building.

10 The Property appears to have a living room, 3 bedrooms, bathroom/wc and kitchen, floor area unspecified. The Building is in a cul-de-sac location, Meadow Park, Chiswick near the River Thames. The Property is opposite a similar but slightly older residential flatted development near older Victorian houses. (Google Streetview September 2026).

Evidence

11 The Tribunal received completed Form MR1 of 29 July 2026, with the landlord's notice and later Form 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

12 The tenants did not contest the form or content of the landlord's Notice but, did contest the new rent and felt it should be £2300 pcm. The tenant did not make particular references to Property condition.

13 The tenants referred to other similar sized flats nearby including: 1. An unnamed 3 bedroom 1 bathroom flat of 628' let at £2300 pcm and 2. A flat in Western Avenue of 3 bedrooms and 2 bathrooms of 871' let at £2400. The tenants challenged the landlord's lettings in the Building. They also referred to the anticipated noise and other nuisance to the tenants at the Property in the Building when proposed works are commenced to extend the latter, it to create additional dwellings.

Landlord

14 The landlord referred to 2 flats with the same accommodation, of the same size, recently let supported by copies of the redacted completed leases of each case. 1. No.4 Claremont Gardens let 30.4,2026 for £2600 pcm. 2. No.2 Claremont Gardens let 1.8.2026 for £2575 pcm. Both were reportedly in similar condition to the Property.

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 From the Tribunal's own general knowledge of market rent levels in the London Borough of Hounslow, for a Property of this type and location, in particular of the landlords confirmed comparables, it determines that the subject Property would let on normal Assured Periodic Tenancy (APT) terms, for £2600 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.

18 The Tribunal found no particular shortcomings at the Property sufficient to reduce the rental value. The Tribunal determines the new market rent at £2600 pcm.

Undue Hardship

19 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 not sought by the tenants in their application and no documents were provided. No change to the effective date of the new rent is made by the Tribunal.

Decision and effective start date

20 The new rent of £2600 pcm is to be levied from the next rent date after the date of this decision, which will be 1 December 2026.

21 **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, is a matter between the parties, only.**

Chairman N Martindale FRICS Date 16 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).