



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

**Case Reference** : LON/00BG/HMF/2020/0084 V

**Property** : Flat 43 Iron Works, 58 Dace Road,  
London E3 2NX

**Applicant** : Suzanne Mayes

**Representative** : Mr Muhammed Williams, London  
Borough of Tower Hamlets

**Respondent** : Denis Cambridge

**Type of Application** : **Application for a rent repayment order  
by tenants**  
Sections 40, 41, 43, & 44 of the Housing and  
Planning Act 2016

**Tribunal** : **Judge Nicol**  
**Mr SF Mason BSc FRICS**

**Date and Venue of  
Hearing** : **10<sup>th</sup> February 2021;**  
**By video conference**

**Date of Decision** : **11<sup>th</sup> February 2021**

---

**DECISION**

---

**The Respondent shall pay to the Applicant a Rent Repayment Order in the total sum of £2,447.98.**

The relevant legislative provisions are set out in an Appendix to this decision.

**Reasons**

1. The Applicant was a tenant at the subject property at Flat 43 Iron Works, 58 Dace Road, London E3 2NX from 22<sup>nd</sup> April 2019 until 12<sup>th</sup> August 2019, paying a monthly rent of £671.66 for a bedroom and shared bathroom and kitchen facilities. According to the Land Registry entry, the Respondent is the freeholder. The Applicant seeks a rent

repayment order against the Respondent in accordance with the Housing and Planning Act 2016 (“the 2016 Act”) for a total of £2,447.98, the rent having been apportioned to the time period she was actually in occupation.

2. This matter was delayed by the restrictions on the Tribunal’s work arising from the COVID-19 pandemic. Eventually, directions were issued on 23<sup>rd</sup> October 2020. Unfortunately, the Applicant was mistakenly referred to in the directions as the London Borough of Tower Hamlets. Mr Muhammed Williams, a Rent Repayment Project Officer with the Council, is actually representing the tenant, Ms Suzanne Mayes, who is the real Applicant.
3. Mr Williams purported to provide a witness statement in support of the application. A witness statement is a written statement signed by a person which contains the evidence which that person would be allowed to give orally. In fact, Mr Williams’s statement contains nothing which is from his own knowledge but rather hearsay about what the Applicant has experienced and colleagues at the Council have found out. Such a statement is not prohibited in the Tribunal but hearsay evidence can never carry the same weight as evidence directly from the actual witness. Applicants to the Tribunal are better advised to give their own evidence themselves rather than to rely on such hearsay statements.
4. The Tribunal heard the matter on 10<sup>th</sup> February 2021 by remote video conference. The only attendee was Mr Williams.
5. The Respondent had agents managing the property on his behalf, originally Flintons Ltd but, by the time the application had been issued, Charles Hamilton Estates. They too are no longer acting for the Respondent but, before that happened, they corresponded with the Tribunal on the Respondent’s behalf. They also told Mr Williams that they would contact the Respondent to inform him of the proceedings. Therefore, the Tribunal is satisfied that the Respondent is aware of these proceedings and his lack of participation is his choice.
6. The documents available to the Tribunal consisted of a bundle compiled by Mr Williams.

#### *The offence*

7. The Tribunal may make a rent repayment order when the landlord has committed one or more of a number of offences listed in section 40(3) of the Housing and Planning Act 2016. The Applicant has alleged that the Respondent was guilty of having control of or managing an HMO (House in Multiple Occupation) which is required to be licensed but is not so licensed, contrary to section 72(1) of the Housing Act 2004.
8. The property was licensable as an HMO under the Additional Licensing Scheme of the London Borough of Tower Hamlets. It was originally a 3-bedroom flat but one bedroom had been divided to create a fourth.

Each of the bedrooms was occupied by tenants living as separate households under what purported to be licence agreements but clearly granted exclusive possession. However, the Respondent did not even seek to licence it as an HMO until after the Applicant had left the property.

9. Therefore, it is beyond any reasonable doubt that the Respondent committed a relevant offence, namely having control of or managing a property which should have been licensed as an HMO but was not.

#### *Rent Repayment Order*

10. Therefore, the Tribunal is satisfied that it has the power under section 43(1) of the Housing and Planning Act 2016 to make Rent Repayment Orders on this application. The RRO provisions were considered by the Upper Tribunal (Lands Chamber) in *Parker v Waller* [2012] UKUT 301 (LC). Amongst other matters, it was held that an RRO is a penal sum, not compensation.

11. The law has changed since *Parker v Waller* and was considered in *Vadamalayan v Stewart* [2020] UKUT 0183 (LC) where Judge Cooke said:

9. In *Parker v Waller* ... the President (George Bartlett QC) had to consider the provisions of sections 73 and 74 of the 2004 Act, which gave the FTT jurisdiction to make rent repayment orders; but they have been repealed so far as England is concerned and now apply only in Wales.

10. Section 74(5) of the 2004 Act provided that a rent repayment order in favour of an occupier had to be “such amount as the tribunal considers reasonable in the circumstances”. ... With regard to orders made in favour of an occupier, therefore, he said at paragraph 26(iii):

“There is no presumption that the RRO should be for the total amount received by the landlord during the relevant period unless there are good reasons why it should not be. The RPT must take an overall view of the circumstances in determining what amount would be reasonable.”

11. But the statutory wording on which that paragraph is based is absent from the 2016 Act. There is no requirement that a payment in favour of the tenant should be reasonable. ...

12. That means that there is nothing to detract from the obvious starting point, which is the rent itself for the relevant period of up to twelve months. Indeed, there is no other available starting point, which is unsurprising; this is a rent repayment order so we start with the rent.

13. In *Parker v Waller* the President set aside the decision of the FTT and re-made it. In doing so he considered a number of sums

that the landlord wanted to be deducted from the rent in calculating the payment. The President said at paragraph 42:

I consider that it would not be appropriate to impose upon [the landlord] an RRO amount that exceeded his profit in the relevant period.

14. It is not clear to me that the restriction of a rent repayment order to an account of profits was consistent with Parliament's intention in enacting sections 74 and 75 of the 2004 Act. The removal of the landlord's profits was – as the President acknowledged at his paragraph 26 – not the only purpose of a rent repayment order even under the provisions then in force. But under the current statutory provisions the restriction of a rent repayment order to the landlord's profit is impossible to justify. The rent repayment order is no longer tempered by a requirement of reasonableness; and it is not possible to find in the current statute any support for limiting the rent repayment order to the landlord's profits. That principle should no longer be applied.
15. That means that it is not appropriate to calculate a rent repayment order by deducting from the rent everything the landlord has spent on the property during the relevant period. That expenditure will have repaired or enhanced the landlord's own property, and will have enabled him to charge a rent for it. Much of the expenditure will have been incurred in meeting the landlord's obligations under the lease. The tenants will typically be entitled to have the structure of the property kept in repair and to have the property kept free of damp and pests. Often the tenancy will include a fridge, a cooker and so on. There is no reason why the landlord's costs in meeting his obligations under the lease should be set off against the cost of meeting his obligation to comply with a rent repayment order.
16. In cases where the landlord pays for utilities, as he did in *Parker v Waller*, there is a case for deduction, because electricity for example is provided to the tenant by third parties and consumed at a rate the tenant chooses; in paying for utilities the landlord is not maintaining or enhancing his own property. So it would be unfair for a tenant paying a rent that included utilities to get more by way of rent repayment than a tenant whose rent did not include utilities. But aside from that, the practice of deducting all the landlord's costs in calculating the amount of the rent repayment order should cease.
17. Section 249A of the 2016 Act enables the local housing authority to impose a financial penalty for a number of offences including the HMO licence offence, as an alternative to prosecution. A landlord may therefore suffer either a criminal or a civil penalty in addition to a rent repayment order. ...
18. The President deducted the fine from the rent in determining the amount of the rent repayment order; under the current statute,

in the absence of the provision about reasonableness, it is difficult to see a reason for deducting either a fine or a financial penalty, given Parliament's obvious intention that the landlord should be liable both (1) to pay a fine or civil penalty, and (2) to make a repayment of rent.

19. The only basis for deduction is section 44 itself and there will certainly be cases where the landlord's good conduct, or financial hardship, will justify an order less than the maximum. But the arithmetical approach of adding up the landlord's expenses and deducting them from the rent, with a view to ensuring that he repay only his profit, is not appropriate and not in accordance with the law. I acknowledge that that will be seen by landlords as harsh, but my understanding is that Parliament intended a harsh and fiercely deterrent regime of penalties for the HMO licensing offence.
53. The provisions of the 2016 Act are rather more hard-edged than those of the 2004 Act. There is no longer a requirement of reasonableness and therefore, I suggest, less scope for the balancing of factors that was envisaged in *Parker v Waller*. The landlord has to repay the rent, subject to considerations of conduct and his financial circumstances. There may be a case, as I said at paragraph 15 above, for deducting the cost of utilities if the landlord pays for them out of the rent (which was not the case here). But there is no justification for deducting other expenditure. ...
12. On the basis of the decision in *Vadamalayan*, when the Tribunal has the power to make an RRO, it should be calculated by starting with the total rent paid by the tenant within time period allowed under section 44(2) of the Housing and Planning Act 2016, from which the only deductions should be those permitted under section 44(3) and (4).
13. In accordance with paragraph 16 of the judgment in *Vadamalayan*, the Tribunal can deduct the cost of utilities included in the rent but the Respondent provided no evidence of any such costs. Similarly, under section 44(4) of the Housing and Planning Act 2016, in considering the amount of the RRO, the Tribunal must take into account the conduct of the landlord and of the tenants and the landlord's financial circumstances but the Respondent provided no relevant evidence. Therefore, the Tribunal has no basis for making any deductions.
14. The Tribunal sees no reason to reduce the amount of the RRO below the maximum amount and awards to the Applicant the full amount of £2,447.98.

**Name:** Judge Nicol

**Date:** 11<sup>th</sup> February 2021

## **Appendix of relevant legislation**

### **Housing Act 2004**

#### **Section 72 Offences in relation to licensing of HMOs**

- (1) A person commits an offence if he is a person having control of or managing an HMO which is required to be licensed under this Part (see section 61(1)) but is not so licensed.
- (2) A person commits an offence if—
  - (a) he is a person having control of or managing an HMO which is licensed under this Part,
  - (b) he knowingly permits another person to occupy the house, and
  - (c) the other person's occupation results in the house being occupied by more households or persons than is authorised by the licence.
- (3) A person commits an offence if—
  - (a) he is a licence holder or a person on whom restrictions or obligations under a licence are imposed in accordance with section 67(5), and
  - (b) he fails to comply with any condition of the licence.
- (2) In proceedings against a person for an offence under subsection (1) it is a defence that, at the material time—
  - (a) a notification had been duly given in respect of the house under section 62(1), or
  - (b) an application for a licence had been duly made in respect of the house under section 63,and that notification or application was still effective (see subsection (8)).
- (3) In proceedings against a person for an offence under subsection (1), (2) or (3) it is a defence that he had a reasonable excuse—
  - (a) for having control of or managing the house in the circumstances mentioned in subsection (1), or
  - (b) for permitting the person to occupy the house, or
  - (c) for failing to comply with the condition,as the case may be.
- (4) A person who commits an offence under subsection (1) or (2) is liable on summary conviction to a fine.
- (1) A person who commits an offence under subsection (3) is liable on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding level 5 on the standard scale.
- (7A) See also section 249A (financial penalties as alternative to prosecution for certain housing offences in England).
- (7B) If a local housing authority has imposed a financial penalty on a person under section 249A in respect of conduct amounting to an offence under this section the person may not be convicted of an offence under this section in respect of the conduct.
- (2) For the purposes of subsection (4) a notification or application is “effective” at a particular time if at that time it has not been withdrawn, and either—

- (a) the authority have not decided whether to serve a temporary exemption notice, or (as the case may be) grant a licence, in pursuance of the notification or application, or
  - (b) if they have decided not to do so, one of the conditions set out in subsection (9) is met.
- (3) The conditions are–
- (a) that the period for appealing against the decision of the authority not to serve or grant such a notice or licence (or against any relevant decision of the appropriate tribunal) has not expired, or
  - (b) that an appeal has been brought against the authority's decision (or against any relevant decision of such a tribunal) and the appeal has not been determined or withdrawn.
- (4) In subsection (9) “relevant decision” means a decision which is given on an appeal to the tribunal and confirms the authority's decision (with or without variation).

## **Housing and Planning Act 2016**

### **Chapter 4 RENT REPAYMENT ORDERS**

#### **Section 40 Introduction and key definitions**

- (1) This Chapter confers power on the First-tier Tribunal to make a rent repayment order where a landlord has committed an offence to which this Chapter applies.
- (2) A rent repayment order is an order requiring the landlord under a tenancy of housing in England to–
  - (a) repay an amount of rent paid by a tenant, or
  - (b) pay a local housing authority an amount in respect of a relevant award of universal credit paid (to any person) in respect of rent under the tenancy.
- (3) A reference to “*an offence to which this Chapter applies*” is to an offence, of a description specified in the table, that is committed by a landlord in relation to housing in England let by that landlord.

<b>Act</b>	<b>section</b>	<b>general description of offence</b>
1 Criminal Law Act 1977	section 6(1)	violence for securing entry
2 Protection from Eviction Act 1977	section 1(2), (3) or (3A)	eviction or harassment of occupiers
3 Housing Act 2004	section 30(1)	failure to comply with improvement notice
4	section 32(1)	failure to comply with prohibition order etc
5	section 72(1)	control or management of unlicensed HMO
6	section 95(1)	control or management of unlicensed house

- (4) For the purposes of subsection (3), an offence under section 30(1) or 32(1) of the Housing Act 2004 is committed in relation to housing in England let by a landlord only if the improvement notice or prohibition order mentioned in that section was given in respect of a hazard on the premises let by the landlord (as opposed, for example, to common parts).

**Section 41 Application for rent repayment order**

- (1) A tenant or a local housing authority may apply to the First-tier Tribunal for a rent repayment order against a person who has committed an offence to which this Chapter applies.
- (2) A tenant may apply for a rent repayment order only if —
- (a) the offence relates to housing that, at the time of the offence, was let to the tenant, and
  - (b) the offence was committed in the period of 12 months ending with the day on which the application is made.
- (3) A local housing authority may apply for a rent repayment order only if—
- (a) the offence relates to housing in the authority's area, and
  - (b) the authority has complied with section 42.
- (4) In deciding whether to apply for a rent repayment order a local housing authority must have regard to any guidance given by the Secretary of State.

**Section 43 Making of rent repayment order**

- (1) The First-tier Tribunal may make a rent repayment order if satisfied, beyond reasonable doubt, that a landlord has committed an offence to which this Chapter applies (whether or not the landlord has been convicted).
- (2) A rent repayment order under this section may be made only on an application under section 41.
- (3) The amount of a rent repayment order under this section is to be determined in accordance with—
- (a) section 44 (where the application is made by a tenant);
  - (b) section 45 (where the application is made by a local housing authority);
  - (c) section 46 (in certain cases where the landlord has been convicted etc).

**Section 44 Amount of order: tenants**

- (1) Where the First-tier Tribunal decides to make a rent repayment order under section 43 in favour of a tenant, the amount is to be determined in accordance with this section.
- (2) The amount must relate to rent paid during the period mentioned in the table.

<b><i>If the order is made on the ground that the landlord has committed</i></b>	<b><i>the amount must relate to rent paid by the tenant in respect of</i></b>
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

an offence mentioned in <a href="#">row 1 or 2 of the table in section 40(3)</a>	the period of 12 months ending with the date of the offence
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------

an offence mentioned in <a href="#">row 3, 4, 5, 6 or 7 of the table in section 40(3)</a>	a period, not exceeding 12 months, during which the landlord was committing the offence
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

- (3) The amount that the landlord may be required to repay in respect of a period must not exceed—
  - (a) the rent paid in respect of that period, less
  - (b) any relevant award of universal credit paid (to any person) in respect of rent under the tenancy during that period.
- (4) In determining the amount the tribunal must, in particular, take into account—
  - (a) the conduct of the landlord and the tenant,
  - (b) the financial circumstances of the landlord, and
  - (c) whether the landlord has at any time been convicted of an offence to which this Chapter applies.