

	FIRST - TIER TRIBUNAL PROPERTY CHAMBER (RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY)
Case Reference	MAN/00BP/MNR/2026/0184
Property	20 Wyndale Road, Oldham, Greater Manchester OL8 3DB
Tenant	Barbara Rute De Gois Freitas
Tenant's Representative	N/A
Landlord	Places for People Homes Limited
Landlord's Address	305 Gray's Inn Road, London WC1X 8QR
Landlord's Representative	N/A
Date of Application	2 April 2026
Type of Application	Determination of an Open-Market Rent sections 13 & 14 of the Housing Act 1988
Tribunal Members	Judge L White Tribunal Member A Ramshaw FRICS
Date of Decision	23 September 2026
Rent Determined	£191.20 per week
Date the new rent takes effect	6 April 2026

REASONS FOR THE DECISION

Background

1. On 10 February 2026, the Landlord served a notice under Section 13 (2) (as amended) of the Housing Act 1988 which proposed a new rent of £226.02 per week in place of the existing rent of £215.67 per week to take effect from 6 April 2026.
2. On 2 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 tenancy commenced 15 January 2025. The rental period is weekly.

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. No service charges were identified as part of or separately from the rent.
6. The Tenant stated in the application form that no furniture was provided by the Landlord. The Tenant states she installed laminate flooring throughout the Property.

Liability for Council Tax

7. 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.

8. None.

Hearing

9. The Tenant requested an oral hearing and the Tribunal issued directions dated 5 June 2026 that a hearing would take place remotely. Attending the hearing was the Tenant. There was no attendance from the Landlord.
10. The Tribunal considered the Tribunal Procedure (First-tier Tribunal) (Property Chamber) Rules 2013 (“the Tribunal Rules”), in particular Rule 3 – Overriding objective and parties’ obligation to co-operate with the Tribunal and Rule 34 – Hearings in party’s absence.
11. The Tribunal considered Rule 34 of the Tribunal Rules and having been satisfied that the Landlord had been notified of the hearing and that it was in the interest of justice to proceed, ordered the hearing to go ahead in the Landlord’s absence.
12. The Tribunal has considered this case on the basis of evidence heard at the hearing from the Tenant, the papers provided by the parties and its own knowledge and specialist expertise.

The Property

13. The Property is a two bedroomed semi detached bungalow. The Property comprises two bedrooms (one master bedroom and one box bedroom), a bathroom, kitchen and living room. The Property benefits from a small patio area to the rear of the property and use of communal gardens.
14. The Property benefits from central heating and double glazing.

Evidence

15. The parties completed the relevant MR1 (tenant), Rents 1A (landlord) and Rent 1B (tenant’s reply).

The Tenant

16. The Tenant contends that the rent proposed in the section 13 notice, namely £226.00 per week, exceeds the market rent for the Property. The Tenant submits that the market rent should be the same as neighbouring properties which also have the same landlord. Within the evidence filed by the Tenant were two letters (both dated 10 February 2026) from the Landlord to the tenants at number 16 and 22 Wyndale Road which notify that the weekly charge would be £191.20. In her evidence to the Tribunal the Tenant advised that number 16 and 22 Wyndale Road were mirror images of the Property. The Tenant confirmed those properties had the same number of bedrooms and layout as the Property

and submits that these neighbouring properties provide a more realistic indication of the market level than the rent proposed for the subject property.

17. The Tenant also relied upon online rental valuation tools which suggested values in the region of £773 to £860 per calendar month, together with a number of Fair Rent Register determinations for properties in the Oldham area. The Tenant submits that the rent proposed by the landlord materially exceeds the market rent for the subject property and also relied upon the unfurnished nature of the Property and the absence of white goods and flooring.

The Landlord

18. The Landlord seeks to support the rent proposed in the section 13 notice, namely £226.02 per week with effect from 6 April 2026. Although the Landlord submitted a Rents 1A response they failed to provide evidence of any comparables. The Tribunal is therefore unable to summarise any specific valuation evidence advanced by the landlord beyond noting its support for the proposed rent.
19. The Landlord in its Rents 1A response that there are no title covenants or planning obligations which require the Property to be let at an affordable/social rent. The Landlord went on to state that it funded construction of no's 16-22 Wyndalle Road and there was no external grant funding. The Landlord's evidence was that the rent for those properties is set at market rent.

Determination and Valuation

20. In the absence of any evidence that the Property is subject to a planning obligation, section 106 agreement, grant funding condition, restrictive covenant or other legally enforceable restriction affecting occupation or marketability, the Tribunal is satisfied that the rent falls to be determined in accordance with the ordinary assumptions set out in sections 13 and 14 of the Housing Act 1988. The Tribunal's task is to determine the open-market rent of the Property and not whether the proposed increase is reasonable or affordable.
21. The Tenant relied upon a number of entries obtained from the Fair Rent Register. The Tribunal has considered that evidence but attaches little weight to it. The cited properties are subject to registered fair rents under the Rent Act 1977, which are assessed under a different statutory regime and by reference to different valuation principles from those applicable to the determination of an open market rent for an assured tenancy under sections 13 and 14 of the Housing Act 1988. Registered fair rents for protected and regulated tenancies are not determined on an open market basis and therefore do not provide

reliable comparables for the purpose of assessing the market rent of the subject property. Accordingly, the Tribunal has not relied upon those Fair Rent Register entries in reaching its determination.

22. The Tenant also relied upon online rental valuation tools, including estimates obtained from OpenRent and OnTheMarket. The Tribunal places limited weight on those estimates. Such tools are generated from automated valuation models and provide broad indicative ranges rather than evidence derived from an inspection of the property or a detailed assessment of its individual characteristics. Whilst they may provide general context, they are not a substitute for comparable market evidence and are of limited assistance in determining the market rent of the subject property.
23. The Tribunal attached significant weight to the evidence relating to the neighbouring properties at 16 and 22 Wyndale Road. The Tenant stated that those properties are materially identical to the subject property and confirmed that they share the same layout and accommodation. The Landlord's evidence confirmed that properties numbered 16 to 22 Wyndale Road are let on assured tenancies and that the rents charged for those properties are set at market rent. The Tribunal was provided with evidence that the rent for those properties is £191.20 per week. The Landlord did not provide any explanation as to why the market rent for the subject property should be materially higher than that charged for those neighbouring properties, nor did it identify any relevant distinction in terms of size, condition, accommodation, amenities or tenancy terms. In those circumstances, the Tribunal finds that the neighbouring properties provide the strongest comparable evidence before it.
24. In reaching its determination, the Tribunal has had regard to its own expertise and knowledge of rental values in the area together with the evidence relating to the neighbouring properties at 16 and 22 Wyndale Road. The Tribunal is satisfied that the best evidence of the market rent of the subject property is the rent charged for those neighbouring properties. Whilst the Tenant submits that she supplied flooring and white goods, the evidence does not establish what flooring, fittings or white goods were provided with the comparator properties and therefore does not permit any reliable adjustment to be made. The Tribunal therefore makes no adjustment and determines that the open-market rent of the Property is £191.20 per week.

Open-Market Rent

£191.20 weekly

Undue hardship

25. 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.
26. The Tenant has asked the Tribunal to fix a later starting date in this case. The Tenant contends that the proposed rent increase would cause undue hardship and relies upon matters including her health, personal circumstances and financial position. The Tenant has separately applied for sensitive details relating to her health and finances not to be included in the published decision. The Tribunal has granted that application in part and therefore does not set out those details in this determination.
27. In any event, the Tribunal does not consider that a postponement on the grounds of undue hardship is justified. The Tribunal has determined a market rent of £191.20 per week, which is lower than both the rent proposed in the section 13 notice and the existing rent of £215.67 per week. As a result, any postponement of the effective date would have the effect of requiring the Tenant to continue paying the higher existing rent for a longer period and would therefore operate to the Tenant's detriment rather than providing relief from hardship.
28. Further and in any event, the Tribunal is not satisfied that undue hardship has been established on the evidence before it. No documentary evidence was provided in support of the application. In particular, the Tribunal was not provided with evidence of income, expenditure, assets, liabilities, benefits entitlement, bank statements or medical evidence enabling it to assess the extent of any hardship said to arise. The Tribunal is therefore unable to make findings as to the Tenant's financial circumstances or the impact of the determined rent upon those circumstances.
29. For those reasons, the Tribunal is not satisfied that undue hardship has been established and the application is refused. The new rent shall take effect from 6 April 2026.

Tenant Application

30. The Tenant applied for her name, address, medical information, financial information and other personal details not to be published in the Tribunal's decision. The Tenant's evidence was that such information was private and that she did not wish it to appear in a published judgment. Whilst the Tribunal

accepts that information relating to the Tenant's health and personal finances is private and sensitive, no specific reason was advanced as to why the Tenant's name or the address of the Property should be withheld.

31. The Tribunal has considered the application in light of the principle of open justice and the Privacy Notice issued by the Lord Chief Justice. The publication of judicial decisions serves the public interest by promoting transparency in the administration of justice, enabling members of the public to understand their rights and obligations, and supporting the rule of law. The publication of decisions is also an important aspect of the constitutional principle of open justice.
32. Balancing those considerations against the Tenant's privacy rights, the Tribunal is satisfied that it is neither necessary nor proportionate to withhold publication of the Tenant's name or the address of the Property. However, the Tribunal accepts that the specific details of the Tenant's health conditions, medical history and personal financial circumstances are not material to the determination of the market rent and that publication of such information would add nothing to the public understanding of the decision. The application is therefore granted in part. The decision will be published in the usual way and will identify the parties and the Property, but the Tribunal has omitted detailed references to the Tenant's medical conditions, health information and financial circumstances except insofar as necessary to explain its findings.

Decision

33. The Tribunal determines the new rent amount at £191.20 per week with effect from 6 April 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 (rule 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.