

	FIRST - TIER TRIBUNAL PROPERTY CHAMBER (RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY)
Case Reference	MAN/00BS/MRA/2026/0001
Property	Apartment 3, Edward House, 30 Edward Street, Stockport, SK1 3DQ
Tenants	Adrienne Ama Jonathan
Tenant's Representative	
Landlord	Tomer Harel, Guy Elshar, Niv Tubal and Carmel Gur-Ari
Landlord's Address	113–115 Brownhill Road, London, SE6 2HF
Landlord's Representative	South London Estate Ltd
Date of Application	17 May 2026
Type of Application	Determination of a Market Rent sections 13 & 14 of the Housing Act 1988
Tribunal Members	Mr S Wanderer MRICS – Chair Ms J Chisholm
Date of Decision	25 June 2026

Decision

The Tribunal finds it does not have the necessary jurisdiction to consider the Application. Accordingly, the Tribunal strikes out the Application.

REASONS FOR THE DECISION

Background

1. On 14 May 2026, the Landlord's agent purported to serve a notice under Section 13(2) of the Housing Act 1988 which proposed a new rent of £925.00 per calendar month(pcm) in place of the existing rent of £850.00 pcm to take effect from 1 August 2026.
2. On 17 May 2026, under Section 13(4)(a) of the Housing Act 1988, the Tenants referred the Landlord's notice proposing a new rent to the Tribunal for determination of a market rent.
3. The assured shorthold tenancy commenced on 5 August 2025 for a term of 12 months. The rental period is monthly.

Inspection/Hearing

4. 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.

Evidence

5. Both the Tenant and the Landlord returned the Tribunal's Reply forms.
6. The Tenant submits that the Landlords notice is invalid because, when providing the address of the Property, it incorrectly identifies the town as London.
7. The Landlord responded arguing that this was a minor typographical error which did not cause any prejudice to the Tenant.

Directions

8. On 28 May 2026, a legal officer of the Tribunal issued directions stating, inter alia, that:

2. ...it appears the Tribunal may not have jurisdiction to determine a market rent for the above-named property.

3. This is because the landlord's notice proposing a new rent may be defective, as it:

- *is not signed by the joint landlord's or the representative,*
- *does not include contact information for the landlord,*
- *does not appear to take effect at the commencement of a new period of the tenancy.*

Determination

9. As detailed above, the Landlord's notice contained a number of errors and irregularities, and the Tribunal had to consider whether any of these invalidate the notice.
10. The Tribunal considered first the question of the date from which the increased rent is proposed to take effect (box 4.6 of the notice form). The tenancy commenced on 5 August 2025 for a term of 12 months. The date given in box 4.6 is 1 August 2026.
11. The proposed date of the rent increase is not in accordance with the requirements of the legislation as it is neither the beginning of a tenancy period (which would be from the 5th of each month), nor is it at least 52 weeks from the start of the tenancy. As such, the notice is invalid on its face and the Tribunal need not consider any of the other errors and irregularities.
12. The Tribunal, therefore, has no alternative but to strike out the application in accordance with Rule 9(2)(a) of the Tribunal Procedure (First-tier) Tribunal (Property Chamber) Rules 2013.

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.