

	FIRST - TIER TRIBUNAL PROPERTY CHAMBER (RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY)
Case Reference	LON/00AP/MNR/2026/0284.
Property	Flat L, 4 Vicarage Parade, West Green Road, London N15. 3BL.
Tenant	James McKechnie.
Tenant's Representative	In person.
Landlord	Browndale Limited. Mr. Jacob Margulies.
Landlord's Address	32 Castle Road London N16 6DN.
Landlord's Representative	Rebecca London. Crownfield Management Limited.
Date Application Received	28 April 2026.
Type of Application	Determination of a Market Rent sections 13 & 14 of the Housing Act 1988
Tribunal Members	Tribunal Judge Hamilton-Farey LLB FRICS. Adam Spielman.
Date of Decision	27 July 2026.
Rent Determined	£1,254.00 per calendar month.
Date the new rent takes effect	27 July 2026.

REASONS FOR THE DECISION

Background

1. The applicant tenant occupies the subject property on a tenancy dating from August 2016. The property is a third floor flat comprising one bedroom, living room, kitchen and bathroom, and was let unfurnished, but with white goods.
2. On 20 April 2016 the Landlord served a Notice of Increase under S.13(2) of the Housing Act 1988, proposing a new rent of £1,475.00 in place of the existing rent of £1,030.00 per calendar month with effect from 25 May 2026.
3. On 28 April 2026 the tribunal received an application under Section 13(4)(a) of the Housing Act 1988, referring the Notice of Increase to the tribunal.
4. The application by the tenant was made before the coming into effect of the Renters' Rights Act 2026 and therefore the tribunal may consider the commencement date for the new rent and any 'hardship' that might be suffered by the tenant if the rent were to be backdated to the date on the Landlord's Notice of Increase.
5. Neither party requested a hearing. The tenant requested an inspection but following a decision dated 30 June 2026, a legal officer of the tribunal refused that request in the interests of proportionality and confirmed that the historic disrepair complained of by the tenant would not be taken into account by the tribunal. Both parties were asked to submit photographs of condition if they wished.
6. Photographs were provided, although these were not particularly clear, but showed the mould and damp complained of by the tenant.
7. The tribunal convened on 27 July 2026 and makes the following determination.

Determination

8. Having considered the papers provided the tribunal makes the following decision.

Valuation:

9. The landlord proposed a rental of £1,475.00 per calendar month with effect from 25 May 2026. The tenant proposed that the rent should increase to £1,100.00 per calendar month, and that hardship should be taken into consideration due to his loss of employment and his reliance on Universal Credit.
10. The landlords proposed rents of between £1400 and £1500 based on four comparable properties in the same block each with tenancy start dates in May or June 2026 and therefore directly comparable to the subject property. The also suggested one additional comparable in Tenterton Road at £1700.00 per calendar month.
11. The tenant said that the properties were not really comparable, his flat did not have a balcony (that some of the comparables did), he did not have wooden flooring and the EPC for the comparables was more favourable than his. He said that the EPC had changed over time, despite no works having been carried out in the flat, and that the final EPC was incorrect in that it suggested insulation had been installed in the flat, which he said it had not. He complained in particular that his flat suffered from mould and damp, although the landlord said this had been resolved, the tenant said that this was not the case, and that remedial works had been ineffective. He proposed a comparable one bedroomed, third floor flat in the same location at £1,350.00 per calendar month.
12. The tribunal considers that the directly comparable flats in the same block are the most relevant for our purposes. The tribunal considers that for a recent letting, with wooden flooring and a balcony a comparable property would let for £1,475.00 per calendar month. However, the tribunal is not satisfied that the subject property is in the same condition as the comparables, which would be in

a better condition for a new letting and that a deduction should therefore be made. We therefore consider the valuation of the property as follows:

13. **Comparable evidence:** **£1,475.00**

**Less 15% to reflect the current
Condition, lack of wooden flooring
and balcony. (say)**

£ 221.00

Market rent: **£1,254.00**
Decision

14. The tribunal determines the market rent at £1,254.00 per calendar month.

Hardship:

15. The tenant has said that he is unemployed and reliant on benefits. The increase represents a 14% increase in rent. The tribunal believes that this will cause hardship to the tenant, and therefore determines the new rent with effect from today's date, 27 July 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.