



**FIRST-TIER TRIBUNAL
PROPERTY CHAMBER
(RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY)**

Case Reference : **LON/00AQ/F77/2025/0017**

Property : **15 Mary Close
Stanmore
Middx HA7 1HG**

Applicant : **Mr & Mrs Ladha (Tenants)**

Representative : **None**

Respondent : **Home Group Ltd (Landlord)**

Representative : **None**

Type of Application : **S.70 Rent Act 1977 – Determination
of a new fair rent**

Tribunal Members : **Mr N. Martindale FRICS**

Date and venue of Meeting : **19 March 2025
First Tier Tribunal (London)
HMCTS 10 Alfred Place, London
WC1E 7LR**

Date of Decision : **19 March 2025**

REASONS FOR DECISION

Background

- 1 By an application of 1 October 2024 the landlord applied to the Rent Officer for registration of a fair rent. The rent stated as payable at the time of the application was said to be £547.23 pcm. There was a service charge of £103.24 pcm included. The registered fair rent at this time was £956 pcm including the service charge wef 24 November 2022.

- 2 With effect from 24 November 2024, the Rent Officer registered a fair rent of £1013.00 pcm including a service charge of £150.12 pcm. There was an objection to the new fair rent from the tenants. The First Tier Tribunal was notified of this objection and a request for a fresh determination of the rent.

Directions

- 3 Directions dated 25 January 2025 were issued by the Tribunal, for case progression. Neither party requested a hearing.

Representations

- 4 Standard Reply Forms were issued by the Tribunal prior and both parties invited to complete and return them. The Tribunal did not receive representations from the landlord. The tenants completed and returned their form.

Inspection

- 5 The Tribunal did not inspect the Property. The Tribunal was however able to externally view the Property from Google Streetview (@ July 2014) albeit an old record. The Property appeared to be part of a 1970's block of low rise 3 storey, purpose built block of flats arranged in groups of 6 around a shared entrance and internal staircase. There are communal gardens to the front sides and rear. The block is located on a residential housing estate of similar age and condition.
- 6 Externally the building of which the Property forms part, appeared to be in fair condition, with rendered finishes to the 3 levels and 2 double pitched 'butterfly' internal drainage, main roofs, over the combined block of flats. The Property had 3 rooms, kitchen and bathroom/wc. There were communal parking areas by permit which appear to be off the public road.
- 7 There was no record of double glazing but there is full central heating. The bathroom is assumed of basic functionality only, while the kitchen was reportedly replaced by the landlord in 2024. Carpets and curtains and white goods are provided by the tenants. No landlord furniture.
- 8 The Tribunal noted the tenants' various issues raised, including: that this was a rundown block of flats; that there was a leaking open sewer to the side of the estate road near the block, there was an external water leak making the ground wet near to the entrance area; that the bathroom had not been updated by the landlord since the start of the tenancy; that the new kitchen provided by the landlord still had some minor defects; that no furniture was included in the letting.

Law

- 9 When determining a fair rent the Committee, in accordance with the Rent Act 1977, section 70, had regard to all the circumstances including the age, location and state of repair of the property. It also disregarded the effect of (a) any relevant tenant's improvements and (b) the effect of any disrepair or other defect attributable to the tenant or any predecessor in title under the regulated tenancy, on the rental value of the property.
- 10 In *Spath Holme Ltd v Chairman of the Greater Manchester etc. Committee* (1995) 28 HLR 107 and *Curtis v London Rent Assessment Committee* [1999] QB 92 the Court of Appeal emphasized
 - (a) that ordinarily a fair rent is the market rent for the property discounted for 'scarcity' (i.e. that element, if any, of the market rent, that is attributable to there being a significant shortage of similar properties in the wider locality available for letting on similar terms - other than as to rent - to that of the regulated tenancy) and
 - (b) that for the purposes of determining the market rent, assured tenancy (market) rents are usually appropriate comparables. (These rents may have to be adjusted where necessary to reflect any relevant differences between those comparables and the subject property).
- 11 Where the condition of a property is poorer than that of comparable properties, so that the rents of those comparables are towards twice that proposed rent for the subject property, it calls into question whether or not those transactions are truly comparable. Would prospective tenants of modernized properties in good order consider taking a tenancy of an un-modernised house in poor repair and with only basic facilities or are they in entirely separate lettings markets? The problem for the Tribunal is that the only evidence of value levels available to us is of modernised properties. We therefore have to use this but make appropriate discounts for the differences, rather than ignore it and determine a rent entirely based on our own knowledge and experience, whenever we can.
- 12 On the evidence of the comparable lettings and our own general knowledge of market rent levels in and around Stanmore, the Tribunal accepts that the Property would let on normal Assured Shorthold Tenancy (AST) terms, for £1,750 pcm. This then, is the appropriate starting point from which to determine the rent of the Property as it falls to be valued.
- 13 A normal open market letting would include carpets, curtains and "white goods", but the tenant provides these here. The Tribunal assumed that bathroom whilst functional, was basic. There is no record of double glazing. The Tribunal noted the short list of small but

longstanding defects to the Property, the building and estate. Deduction for these various shortcomings amounts to £300 pcm, leaving the adjusted market rent at £1450 pcm.

- 14 The Tribunal also has to consider the element of scarcity and whether demand exceeded supply. The Tribunal found that there was scarcity in the locality of Stanmore for this type of property and makes a further deduction of 20% from the adjusted market rent, leaving an uncapped fair rent of £1160 pcm.
- 15 The fair rent to be registered on this basis alone would be £1160 pcm, but, the new rent is limited by the statutory Maximum Fair Rent Cap calculation. The MFRC limits any increase to the change in RPI (set two months prior at each date), between the date of the last registration of a fair rent and the current, plus 5%. The calculations are shown in the MFR form and this caps the new fair rent at £1118.12 pcm including the service charge of £150.12 pcm. However as the MFR cap is below the uncapped fair rent above, the new fair rent will be capped at £1118.12 pcm. The new fair rent is therefore registered at this figure.
- 16 The Rent Act makes no allowance for the Tribunal to take account of hardship arising from the new rent payable compared with the existing rent registered. The landlord is entitled but, not compelled, to charge the tenants rent at the registered figure from the effective date below. The landlord may not charge more than the fair rent but may charge less if it wishes to, or is otherwise required to, under other regulations which may limit its increases in rent as a landlord.

Chairman N Martindale FRICS

Dated 19 March 2025

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).