	FIRST - TIER TRIBUNAL PROPERTY CHAMBER (RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY)
Case Reference	LON/OOBB/MNR/2026/0518
Property	67 Tavistock Road, London, E15 4EP
Tenant	Mohamed Kabir Hossain and Merun Nahar
Tenant's Representative	Shibli Rahman
Landlord	Major Singh
Landlord's Address	54 Windsor Road , London, E7 0QY
Landlord's Representative	None
Date of Application	25 June 2026
Type of Application	Determination of an Open-Market Rent sections 13 & 14 of the Housing Act 1988
Tribunal Members	R Waterhouse FRICS W Gibbs
Date of Decision	23 October 2026
Rent Determined	£1800.00 per calendar month
Date of Valuation	10 April 2026
Date the new rent takes effect	1 July 2026

© CROWN COPYRIGHT

REASONS FOR THE DECISION

Background

1. On 10 April 2026, the Landlord served a notice under Section 13 (2) (as amended) of the Housing Act 1988 which proposed a new rent of £1850 per calendar month (pcm) in place of the existing rent of £ 1300.00 pcm to take effect from 1 July 2026.

2. On 25 June 2026, under Section 14 (A3) of the Housing Act 1988, the Tenant referred the Landlord's notice proposing a new rent to the Tribunal for determination of an open-market rent.

3. The tenancy commenced on 1 April 2023. The rental period is monthly.

Allocation of Repairs between Landlord and Tenant.

4. As per section 11 of the Landlord and Tenant Act 1985.

Furnishing and white goods

5. The application [5/94] notes no furnishings included with the tenancy. The white goods that is the cooker, hob, fridge freezer and washing machine are supplied by the landlord.

Liability for Council Tax and Utilities

6. The application form [4/94] notes the tenant is responsible for the payment of Council Tax and Utilities in respect of the Property.

Hearing

7. A hearing was held on 30 September 2026 by video platform. Present at the hearing were the joint Applicant's supported by a translator. The Respondent was represented by counsel Mr Emil Lixandru with instructing solicitor.

8. The Applicant's submitted that the property was in disrepair and suffered from mould. They did not provide evidence of requesting the landlord to assist with the repairs. Although they conceded that repairs for mould, were carried out but that they were soon defective again. The tenants were concerned with the black mould. They submitted the water company had identified the presence of a leak showing up by 17 litres of water leaving the property per hour. After this was attended to be the landlord, the tenant said the rate of leak had reduced to 2 litres

per hour. The Applicant's contended that £1300 pcm was the correct figure to determine.

9. The Respondent submitted, that repairs had been carried out when requested but there were no outstanding requests. That the Applicant's had been offered alternative accommodation so more substantial repairs could be carried out. It was not clear whether the alternative accommodation was for the duration of any repairs or permanently. The Respondent submitted the rent proposed in the notice reflected the correct rent given the condition of the property.

The Inspection

10. The Tribunal was scheduled to inspect the property after the hearing. The inspection took place on 23 October 2026.Present at the inspection were the joint tenants. The landlord or representatives of were not present.

11. The Tribunal found the property to be an end of terrace Victorian property, built at the same time as the rest of the road. The properties in the road were in different levels of repair, some newly refurbished and others more dilapidated. The subject property has been pebble dashed. The front door leads to a small hall. Off the hall is the front room, the windows are double glazed and have trickle vents. There are also two non-closeable vents in the wall. The room has a radiator and sockets.

12. From the hall is reached the kitchen, the kitchen units, decor are functional but tired. The flooring is a form of vinyl which has significant tears in it.

13. Off the hall at the end of the house is a WC and shower room. From the hall between the WC/shower room and the kitchen is a door which leads to a small garden.

14. The stairs are carpeted and on the first floor are two double sized rooms. Both have central heating double glazing and electrical sockets. The flooring is old. The central heating system is functioning but old-style radiators. The decoration is fair.

15. There was no discernible mould present during the inspection which was carried out in October.

Evidence

16. The parties completed the relevant MR1 (tenant) and an MR2 (landlord).

The Tenant

17. The Tenant made the following comments:

    a) The Tenant in their application form stated "the proposed increase appears to reflect a property in good repair. This property is not. It is significantly affected by damp and black mould across several rooms- to ceilings, wall and ceiling junctions, window reveals and behind furniture- which is an HHSRS damp and mould hazard. The external door surround and boiler housing show rotten and rusting framing, failed and crumbling render and gaps crudely filled with expanding foam, and Thames Water's letter of 11 May 2026 records a flow of around 17 litres per hour consistent with a leak. Together these indicate water ingress and building defects rather than transient condensation. There is also a damaged kitchen base unit and [outstanding concerns about the electrical installation/ no valid EICR]. A willing tenant on the open market would pay materially less for a property in this state."

    b) Additionally, the tenant notes in their application form "a qualified electrician has inspected the electrical installation and confirmed very serious faults, advising that in its current state the property is not safe to live in. This is a major defect going to both the value and the basic habitability of the property. There is also a damaged kitchen unit. "

18. The Tenant did not provide comparable rental evidence. The Tenant provided the following comparables:

The Landlord

19. The Landlord made the following comments:

    a) The Landlord stated "[28/94] that the property is not in disrepair and has recently been refurbished pursuant to a s11, 12 and 16 notice under the Housing Act 2004 from the council. The council inspected the property on 25 September 2025 and revoked the improvement notice. The tenant never complained about mould and may have caused it themselves by covering the boiler with clothes. Further the imagines provided by the tenant have no time stamps therefore there is reason to believe that they were taken prior to the improvement notice."
    b) The Landlord says they proposed a rent of £1850 pcm which is still lower than market rent. The rent for similar properties on the same road is £2000 pcm.
    c) In respect of the EICR the landlord states the tenant has frustrated access to the engineer to visit the property and resolve the issue. That the EICR has now been carried out and that the property's electrics are satisfactory.

d) At [36/94] there is a letter from London Borough of Newham stating that as of 25 September 2025 following a visit the council issues a “Notice of Revocation". The letter noted torn lino in the kitchen and a lack of an extractor fan.
e) A number of comparables were supplied;
    a. Tavistock Road 2 bed let agreed at £2000 pcm asking
    b. Royal Crescent Newbury Park, IG2 1 bed, £1350 pcm asking
    c. Heighsam Road, East Ham, 5 bed, £3900 pcm asking
    d. Tavistock Road, 2 bed £2100 pcm asking,
    e. Vernon Road E15, 2 bedroom, £2200 pcm asking
    f. Veron Road E15, 2 bedroom £2250 pcm asking

Tribunal findings

20. The Tribunal finds the property to be in a tired condition overall but functional.

Determination and Valuation

21. Under section 14(1) of the Housing Act 1988 (as amended), the Tribunal is required to determine the rent at which the Property might reasonably be expected to let in the open market by a willing Landlord at the beginning of the new period specified in the Landlord’s notice. Relevant Tenant improvements or failure of the Tenant to comply with the terms of the tenancy are to be disregarded. Historic issues relating to the tenancy or the personal circumstances of the Landlord are not taken into account. The personal circumstances of the Tenant are only considered if an application for hardship has been made.

22. The Tribunal places greatest weight on let properties which require least adjustment. The Tribunal is presented with two properties in Tavistock Road one said to be let, but showing an asking figure of £2000 pcm and one to let asking £2100 pcm. There is no evidence whether the let property was let at the asking price or not. The other properties are useful as context given, they are geographically further away and or different in size in some cases.

23. Relying on its own expertise and general knowledge of rental values in the area, and the comparables provided by the Landlord, the Tribunal considers that the market rent of the subject Property modernised and in good order would be in the order of £2050.00 pcm. This is the rent we would expect the property to let for in the open market at the valuation date and if it was in the same general condition as the comparable properties including having the white goods provided by the landlord.

24. From this level of rent, the Tribunal has made adjustments in relation to the following:

a) Dated kitchen and bathroom
b) Dated flooring
c) Dated central heating

The full valuation is shown below:

Starting Rent	£2050.00 pcm
Less	
a) Items given under a) to c)	£ 250.00 pcm
Open-Market Rent	£1800.00 pcm

Decision

Undue Hardship

25. The Applicants have noted in their application form that a rent increase would result in undue hardship. There is no evidence supplied to support this point, so the Tribunal concludes in the absence of evidence that the case for undue hardship is not made.

26. The Tribunal determines the new rent amount at £1800.00 per calendar month with effect from 1 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 after 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.