

	FIRST - TIER TRIBUNAL PROPERTY CHAMBER (RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY)
Case Reference	MAN/OOBR/MNR/2026/0228
Property	25 Empyrean, 1 Clarence Street (Block 1), Salford, Lancashire, M7 1BP
Tenant	Noora Al-Safani Humza Javed
Tenant's Representative	N/A
Landlord	The PRS Reit (LGIM) Investments LLP
Landlord's Address	Stafford Court, 145 Washway Road, Sale, M33 7PE
Landlord's Representative	Simple Life Homes
Date of Application	23 April 2026
Type of Application	Determination of a Market Rent sections 13 & 14 of the Housing Act 1988
Tribunal Members	Judge A. Arul David Hunt
Date of Decision	2 June 2026
Rent Determined	£1,020 per calendar month
Date the new rent takes effect	6 June 2026

REASONS FOR THE DECISION

Background

1. On 8 April 2026, the Landlord served a notice under Section 13(2) of the Housing Act 1988 which proposed a new rent of £1.020 per calendar month (pcm) in place of the existing rent of £885 pcm to take effect from 6 June 2026.
2. On 23 April 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 6 June 2025 for a term of 12 months. 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. There are no services provided by the Landlord to the Tenant. However, it is understood that the Property is furnished with a bed, sofa, side tables, dining table and chairs.

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 a first floor flat offering the following accommodation:

1 bedroom, 1 bathroom, 1 kitchen dining area which appears to be open plan leading to a living area, 1 shower room.

Outside: a small garden.

The Property is situated in the area of Salford, south of Manchester.

Evidence

10. Both the Tenant and the Landlord returned the Tribunal's Reply forms.

The Tenant.

11. The Tenant made the following comments. The Tenant asserted that different Tenants in the block pay different amounts in rent and that they were under the impression that there would be a modest increase of not more than £50 per year. It was asserted that a family member lives on the floor above in a 2-bedroom apartment and he is paying £960 pcm whereas the subject Property is smaller, being a 1-bedroom property. The Tenant referred to the surrounding area describing it as 'rough' and referring to some events that are said to have taken place such as a riot, a car blowing up in the parking area, thefts in the area and general antisocial behaviour. No further particulars were provided about these events. There were no specific allegations about the condition of the Property. However, it is said that there is a smell of smoke due to smoking in the Property by previous Tenants. It was also asserted that the bed and coffee table were broken with no replacements or repairs being carried out. No further particulars were provided.
12. In terms of rental evidence, the Tenant provided screenshots of properties which it is assumed were being advertised as available for let. It was unclear what website this was taken from or when. In the brief particulars provided it could be seen that there were several 1 bedroom flats, for example: City Link, Hessel Street, Salford at £825 pcm; Chapel Stret, M3 at £750 pcm; Whitsun Avenue, Lower Broughton at £900 pcm; and More End Court, M7 at £900 pcm

The Landlord.

13. The following comparables were provided by the Landlord (all one bedroom flats):

14. The Landlord provided a best price guide which shows a number of properties within a half mile radius of the subject Property with rents ranging from £1,050 pcm to £1,500 pcm. There are a large number of properties on different floors or different blocks within the same estate set out in a table, with rents ranging from between £1,030 pcm to £1,375 pcm.
15. The best price guide was accompanied by some screenshots of advertised properties. One was in Broughton Lane, M7, described as a 1-bedroom apartment but the let had been agreed and that was at a rent of £1,500 pcm. There were no other particulars by which to distinguish this from the subject Property. There were others which were no longer advertised for reasons unknown but these ranged from one in a block known as The Vibe in Broughton Lane, M7 with a rent of £1,200 pcm and a number in the same estate as the subject property all described as 1 bedroom apartments with rents of £1,070 pcm, £1,080 pcm, £1,090 pcm, £1,105 pcm and £1,130 pcm. In addition, there was a 1-bedroom apartment in Great Clowes Street with rent advertised at £1,050 pcm. What was apparent from all these comparables was that there were a number of apartments being let in the same block with an average price of about £1,070 pcm for a 1 bedroom property.

Determination and Valuation

16. Relying on its own expert, general knowledge of rental values in the area, and the comparables provided by the parties, the Tribunal considers that the market rental of the subject Property would be in the order of £1,020 pcm . This is the rent we would expect the Property to let for in the open market if it was in the same general condition as the comparable properties.
17. The Tribunal has considered the comparable evidence from both parties.
18. The first comparable from the Tenant at City Link for £825 pcm is considerably far out from the Property and in a different area for the purposes of assessing market rents. The second property at Chapel Street appeared to be a studio flat rather than a 1-bedroom flat. This was not therefore a helpful comparator. The third property at Whitsun Avenue was much closer and in the same area as the subject Property, however from the limited photographs available it appears to be a smaller property when compared with the floor plan of the subject Property provided by the Tenant. The final property at More End Court is also considerably distant from the subject Property and in a different postcode area.
19. The evidence from the Landlord showed several properties in the same block with advertised rents as above, from which the Tribunal assessed an average of £1,070 pcm.

20. There was insufficient evidence to say that this was the market rent for the subject Property because the Tribunal was not able to assess the condition of all of these properties in comparison to the condition of the subject Property.
21. On the basis of the comparables, however, the Tribunal was satisfied that £1,020 pcm is the market rent for the subject Property. No account of antisocial behaviour or crime in the area was taken account due to lack of evidence and the fact that comparables provided for the same area showed a slightly higher rent.

Market rent

£1,020 pcm

Undue hardship

22. The new rent takes effect from the date specified in the Landlord's Notice of Increase 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 the date a Tribunal makes its determination.
23. The Tenant has asked the Tribunal to fix the latest starting date in this case. They say that it will otherwise cause hardship because they work as a part time teacher who has become separated from their long term partner. The Tenant wishes for rent increase to be delayed until they go back to full time work. They also state that they are in receipt of Universal Credit and there was a cap on how much the local allowance allows. The Tenant asserts that they cannot afford a rent increase at the moment as it will cause hardship and would welcome an increase in the next 6 – 12 months when the situation is better. No supporting evidence of financial circumstances, such as Universal Credit entitlements or income and outgoings, was provided.
24. The Landlord did not respond to the Tenant's application for postponement due to hardship.
25. The Tribunal has considered the grounds asserted by the Tenant, but did not considered that any of these are sufficient to amount to undue hardship. There was no evidence provided in support of any financial difficulty. An increase in rent is rarely going to be welcomed by a Tenant however that does not mean undue hardship.
26. The Tribunal's assessment is that the market rent is higher that the Tenant is currently paying. The rent should be covered at least partially by Universal Credit adjustments. Even if that is not possible, there was no evidence put forward that the Tenant having to make up the difference would cause any hardship. The Tenant's inability to pay is not a factor which affects the market rent determination and the Tribunal was presented with no evidence that undue

hardship would be caused by an increase taking effect on the date specified in the Landlord's Notice.

27. As a result of the Tribunal's decision, the rent will increase by £135 a month. The date specified in the Landlord's notice was 6 June 2026. On the basis of the evidence supplied by the Tenant, the Tribunal considers that for the increase to take effect from the date in the Landlord's Notice would not cause undue hardship and accordingly sets the starting date for the new rent as 6 June 2026.

Decision

28. Therefore, the Tribunal determines the market rent at £1,020 per calendar month with effect from 6 June 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.