



**FIRST - TIER TRIBUNAL
PROPERTY CHAMBER
(RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY)**

Case reference : **CHI/24UN/F77/2021/0038**

Tenant : **Mr A J and Mrs H L Toms**

Landlord : **Stonewater Ltd**

Property : **39 Vespasian Road, Andover,
Hampshire, SP10 5JP**

Date of Objection : **Referred to First-tier Tribunal
by Valuation Office Agency on
27th July 2021**

Type of Application : **Section 70 Rent Act 1977 (the Act)**

Tribunal : **Mr R T Brown FRICS
Mr S Hodges FRICS
Mr N Robinson FRICS**

Date of Decision : **21st September 2021**

REASONS FOR DECISION

Background

1. The Tribunal gave formal notice of its decision by a Notice dated 21st September 2021 that the rent would be **£177.61 per week** (including variable service charge £3.61) with effect from the same date.
2. On the 7th April 2021 the landlord of the above property applied to the Rent Officer for registration of a fair rent of £178.11 per week (including variable service charge of £3.61). The rent having been previously determined by the Rent Officer at £143.01 per week (including variable service charge £2.01) on and effective from the 12th January 2015.
3. On the 21st June 2021 the Rent Officer registered a fair rent of £177.11 per week (including services of £3.61) and effective from the same date.
4. The Tenant objected to the rent determined by the Rent Officer and the matter was referred to the First-tier Tribunal (Property Chamber) (Residential Property).
5. The tenancy commenced on 26th September 1977. No Tenancy agreement was provided to the Tribunal. The tenancy appears to be a statutory protected periodic tenancy. The tenancy (not being for a fixed periodic tenancy of 7 years or more) is subject to Section 11 of the Landlord and Tenant Act 1985 (the landlord's statutory repairing obligations).

Factual Background and Submissions

6. Following the Directions dated **10th August 2021** and the explanation contained therein, the Tribunal did not inspect the premises. A hearing was not requested in the current proceedings by either party.
7. Extracting such information as it could from the papers supplied to the Tribunal by the parties, by reference to information publicly available on the internet and with the benefit of its knowledge and experience, the Tribunal reached **the following conclusions and found as follows:**
8. The property is situated in an established residential area of mixed dwellings close to the town centre. Local amenities are available.
9. The property comprises a modernised terrace house comprising: 1 Living Room, 1 Kitchen/Diner, 1 Store, 4 Bedrooms and store. Outside car space and garden.
10. All mains services are assumed to be connected but there is no central heating. The windows are double glazed.
11. The property is assumed in tenantable decorative order.
12. The Tribunal noted during its consideration:
 - a) The property was let unfurnished and does not include carpets, curtains or white goods.

13. **The Tenant** completed the Reply Form the main points of which are summarised below:
 - a) A new porch constructed by landlord in 2020/2021
 - b) The rent is currently £113.36 and an increase to £178.11 (56.00%) is unrealistic and will cause hardship.
14. **The Landlord** made no representations.

The Law

15. When determining a fair rent the Tribunal, in accordance with section 70 of the Rent Act 1977, had regard to all the circumstances including the age, location and state of repair of the property. It disregarded the effect of (a) any relevant tenant's improvements and (b) the effect of any disrepair or other defect attributable to the tenant or any predecessor in title under the regulated tenancy, on the rental value of the property.
16. In *Spath Holme Ltd v Chairman of the Greater Manchester etc Committee (1995) 28 HLR 107* and *Curtis v London Rent Assessment Panel [1999] QB 92*, the Court of Appeal emphasised:
 - (a) that ordinarily a fair rent is the market rent for the property discounted for 'scarcity' (i.e. that element, if any, of the market rent, that is attributable to there being a significant shortage of similar properties in the wider locality available for letting on similar terms - other than as to rent - to that of the regulated tenancy) and
 - (b) that for the purposes of determining the market rent, assured tenancy (market) rents are usually appropriate comparables. (These rents may have to be adjusted where necessary to reflect any relevant differences between those comparables and the subject property).
17. The Rent Acts (Maximum Fair Rent) Order 1999 restricts the amount by which the rent may be increased to a maximum 5.00% plus RPI since the last registration.
18. The only exception to this restriction is provided under paragraph 7 of the Order where a landlord carries out repairs or improvements which increase the rent by 15% or more of the previous registered rent.

Tribunal's deliberations

19. The Tribunal considered the matter with the benefit of the tenant's submissions. The Tribunal notes it does not take into consideration the personal circumstances of the Landlord nor Tenant in making its determination (including issues between Landlord and Tenant which do not affect the rental value of the property itself).
20. The Tribunal checked the National Energy Performance Register and noted that there was no certificate for this property on the register. The minimum standard is Rating E (unless exempt) for offering a property to

let on the open market and the Tribunal considers that a rating below this level would have an adverse effect on the rent achievable.

21. The Tribunal, acting as an expert tribunal, determined what rent the landlord could reasonably be expected to obtain for the subject property in the open market if it were let today in the condition and subject to the terms of such a tenancy that is considered usual for such an open market letting. It did this by having regard to the evidence supplied by the parties and the Tribunal's own general knowledge of market rent levels in the wider area of **Hampshire**. Having done so, it concluded that such a likely market rent for a similar modernised property in fair condition with central heating, modern bathroom and kitchen facilities, floor coverings, curtains and an EPC Rating above F would be **£242.00 per week** (£1050.00 pcm rounded).
22. The Tribunal noted that the property, according to the evidence lacked central heating. Further the Tribunal noted that the rent actually being paid was below the rent previously registered on 15th January 2015.
23. However, the subject property is not in the condition considered usual for a modern letting at a market rent. It is therefore necessary to adjust that hypothetical rent of **£242.00 per week** (£1050.00 pcm rounded) to allow for the differences between the condition considered usual (including responsibility of tenants to maintain decorations as opposed to decorate) for such a letting and the condition of the actual property as stated in the papers (disregarding the effect of any disrepair or other defect attributable to this tenant or any predecessor in title), and any improvements carried out by the Tenant.
24. The Tribunal considers that to reflect these matters, deductions should be made to the hypothetical rent as follows:
 - a) Lack of central heating £30.00.
 - b) lack of modern bathroom £11.00.
 - c) Lack of carpets and curtains £11.00.
 - d) Lack of white goods £11.00.
 - e) Tenants decorating liability £5.00
25. The total deduction of £68.00 per week.
26. The Tribunal noted the Rent Officer allowed a total amount of £3.61 per week for services as requested by the Landlord. Neither party challenged this figure and the Tribunal adopts it without comment.
27. This leaves a fair rent of £177.61. per week (including variable charge service of £3.61 (£769.00 pcm rounded)).

Scarcity

28. The matters taken into account by the Tribunal when assessing scarcity were:-
 - a) The Tribunal interpreted the 'locality' for scarcity purposes as being the conurbation of Hampshire (i.e. a sufficiently large area to eliminate the effect of any localised amenity which would, in itself, tend to increase

or decrease rent).

b) Local Authority and Housing Association waiting lists.

c) House prices which could be an indicator of increased availability of housing and a reduction in scarcity.

d) Submissions of the parties.

e) The members of the Tribunal have between them many years of experience of the residential letting market and that experience leads them to the view that there is no substantial shortage of similar houses available to let in the locality defined above.

29. Assessing a scarcity percentage cannot be a precise arithmetical calculation because there is no way of knowing either the exact number of people looking for a particular type of house in the private sector or the exact number of such properties available. It can only be a judgment based on the years of experience of members of the Tribunal. However, the Tribunal did not consider that there was a substantial scarcity element and accordingly made no further deduction for scarcity.

Relevant Law

30. The Rent Act 1977.

31. Rent Acts (Maximum Fair Rent) Order 1999. In particular paragraph 7 which states:

This article does not apply in respect of a dwelling-house if because of a change in the condition of the dwelling-house or the common parts as a result of repairs or improvements (including the replacement of any fixture or fitting) carried out by the landlord or a superior landlord, the rent that is determined in response to an application for registration of a new rent under Part IV exceeds by at least 15% the previous rent registered or confirmed.

Rent Acts (Maximum Fair Rent) Order 1999

32. The rent to be registered is not limited by the Fair Rent Acts (Maximum Fair Rent) Order 1999 because it is below the maximum fair rent (see calculation on reverse of decision sheet) of **£178.11 per week including variable services of £3.61**. Accordingly the sum of **£177.61.00 per week** will be registered as the fair rent on and with effect from 21st September 2021 being the date of the Tribunal's decision.

RIGHTS OF APPEAL

1. A person wishing to appeal this decision (on a point of law only) to the Upper Tribunal (Lands Chamber) must seek permission to do so by making written application to the First-tier Tribunal at the Regional office which has been dealing with the case. Where possible you should send your application for permission to appeal by email to rpsouthern@justice.gov.uk as this will enable the First-tier Tribunal Regional office to deal with it more efficiently.

2. The application must arrive at the Tribunal within 28 days after the Tribunal sends to the person making the application written reasons for the decision.
3. If the person wishing to appeal does not comply with the 28 day time limit, the person shall include with the application for permission to appeal a request for an extension of time and the reason for not complying with the 28 day time limit; the Tribunal will then decide whether to extend time or not to allow the application for permission to appeal to proceed.
4. The application for permission to appeal must identify the decision of the Tribunal to which it relates, state the grounds of appeal, and state the result the party making the application is seeking.