

Government policy on the private rented housing sector (PRS) since 2010

January 2016

Introduction

This paper contains details and analysis of two of the main central government policies on PRS housing since 2010:

1. A fund local authorities could apply to for funding to tackle 'rogue landlords' and 'beds in sheds'.
2. Support for new private rented housing through low cost loans to developers (Build to Rent) and loan guarantees.

See the appendix A for details of other central government PRS policy since 2010.

1. Funding for councils to tackle 'rogue landlords' and 'beds in sheds'

Around 2011 there were growing amounts of media coverage about landlords housing people in atrocious accommodation, including in outbuildings or sheds for which they didn't have planning permission for people to live in. The government responded by adopting the narrative (promoted by groups like Shelter) that there is a minority of rogue landlords who need to be forced out of operation because they're giving the sector a bad reputation (despite the fact that anyone who's lived in the PRS for any length of time knows that there a lot more bad landlords than this) and setting up two pots of money to which local authorities could apply to for funding to tackle the problem.

In May 2012, £1.8m was provided to 9 councils (7 in London plus Peterborough and Slough) to tackle 'beds in sheds'.ⁱ In December 2013 a further £4m was given to 23 councils around England, including 5 in London) to help them tackle 'rogue landlords'.ⁱⁱ In both cases, rather than taking a systematic approach to eliminating the terrible conditions many private tenants are forced to live in across the country, it was an tokenistic exercise that at best would benefit renters living in areas targeted by councils who considered them a priority.

But even before the second tranche of this funding was announced, it was clear that the government's adoption of the 'rogue landlord' narrative had less to do with cracking down on the many landlords providing poor quality, unsafe or unhealthy housing and more about using the housing budget to fund enforcement work in working class and ethnic minority communities, including immigration raids with UKBA. In August 2012, in a highly publicised media stunt to which many journalists report being invited to, housing and immigration ministers Grant Shapps and Damian Green joined a dawn raid on 6 'rogue landlord' properties in Ealing with UKBA. As a result of these raids, more than half the tenants were detained (or in the case of a family with a young child, required to report to a reporting centre) for being irregular migrants. In the press release publicising the raid there was no detail of any action taken against the landlords, yet the funding for tackling 'beds in sheds' was mentioned explicitly, with Shapps stating: "I want to see all agencies from councils to the police and the UK Border Agency using the full range of powers at their disposal to work together on a national clampdown towards ridding our communities of this problem once and for all"ⁱⁱⁱ – without being clear exactly what the considered 'the problem' to be.

Further alarm bells started ringing when, in a meeting in October 2014 between Lambeth Renters (which subsequently merged with their Southwark sister group to form [South London Renters](#)) and Lambeth Council officers about what the council was doing to help private tenants in the borough, it was casually mentioned that UKBA were accompanying Lambeth council staff on visits to properties identified as part of their DCLG-funded 'rogue landlords' project.

So in early 2015 I submitted a series of Freedom of Information (FOI) requests to the councils who had received 'beds in sheds' or 'rogue landlord' funding from DCLG. The aim was to find out how councils were using the money, and how widespread its use for raids with UKBA (or other agencies) was.

The councils contacted, and the amount of funding they received, were as follows:

Local authority	Amount of 'beds in sheds' funding ¹	Amount of 'rogue landlord' funding ²
<i>London boroughs:</i>		
Brent	£162,000	
Croydon		£82,000
Ealing	£551,000	
Hillingdon	£333,141	
Hounslow	£540,000	£260,000
Lambeth		£82,000
Lewisham		£125,000
Newham	£280,000	£1,106,435 ³
Redbridge	£271,368	
Southwark	£163,000	
<i>Rest of England:</i>		
Barnsley		£230,000
Blackpool		£293,000
Bolton		£56,000
Boston		£109,000
Bournemouth		£134,000
Derby		£238,000
Fenland		£179,000
Hastings		£204,000
Herefordshire		£54,000
Leeds		£125,000
Medway		£64,000
Nottingham		£124,000
Oxford		£150,000
Pennine Lancashire		£109,000
Peterborough	£70,000	
Plymouth		£68,000
Rochdale		£111,000
Rosendale		£79,000
Sheffield		£145,000
Slough	£220,000	

One third of the 30 councils receiving funding from either pot were in London, and only two councils (both in London: Hounslow and Newham) received money from both. The amount of funding received by different councils varied widely, from £54,000 (Herefordshire) to £1,386,435 (Newham).

Findings

A summary of the findings can be found in appendix B (gaps indicate that information was not provided by the local authority).

With the exception of Plymouth, all the councils used the funding to carry out visits to properties suspected of having 'rogue landlords' or 'beds in sheds', with the majority of the money being used for staff costs. The number of reported visits varied widely, from less than 50 (Herefordshire) to over 10,000 (Ealing). But despite the resources that went into the projects and the number of visits carried out, it appears that the action against landlords was fairly limited. While the information provided by the councils is not detailed enough to provide a full picture, it appears that one of the most common responses where landlords were found not to have provided adequate accommodation were improvement notices – essentially polite letters to landlords asking them to

¹ Amounts given in councils' responses to the FOI requests

² Amounts taken from DCLG press release at <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/cash-for-councils-to-stop-rogue-landlords> unless otherwise stated

³ Amount given in response to FOI request. Amount in DCLG press release was slightly lower at £1,028,000

make improvements. However, it appears that the visits would have caused problems for many of the affected tenants.

First is the alarm and distress caused by the raids carried out by at least four of the councils.⁴ It is unclear why raids were necessary if the purpose of the visits was to investigate poor conditions caused by bad landlords, since it would be unusual for a landlord to spend much if any time at a property they let out, and therefore little point in trying to catch them using this tactic. Similarly, if the visits were genuinely to improve the situation of tenants, there would be no danger of them trying to cover up poor conditions, and no need for use raids as a tactic to prevent this.

Even where there is not evidence of raids being used, in 12 of the 20 local authorities that provided data,⁵ on at least some visits tenants would have had to answer to the police and/or UKBA. While it is difficult to tell from some of the information given, it seems that visits that were supposed to be cracking down on bad landlords and improving conditions for tenants in many cases actually lead to action against tenants, including investigation for drugs offences or council tax irregularities (Peterborough), detention by UKBA (Redbridge), ASBOs (Barnsley and Herefordshire) or arrest for unspecified reasons (Newham).

Then there is the question of what happened to tenants in cases where action was taken against the landlord, particularly where landlords were prohibited from operating or buildings (presumably outbuildings) demolished. For example, in Hounslow, 147 outbuildings were found to have people living them (including 23 with children), and 10 were demolished while a further 83 had facilities removed. Yet there is no information about any support being provided to tenants to be rehoused. Similarly, where overcrowding was found, there is no information about any support being provided to the tenants, some of whom would have had to move out in order to deal with this problem. Even with the best intentions, at a time of increasing cuts many councils lack the financial resources or social housing stock to provide people with decent housing in their local area. The problem is particularly acute in London, with the issue of gatekeeping by local authorities to prevent homeless people from accessing the help to which they are legally entitled well documented by groups such as [Housing Action Southwark and Lambeth](#).^{iv}

Even where landlords have been required to make improvements, in many cases it is likely that the tenants were evicted or subject to significant rent increases (which would in many cases would be likely to force the tenant to move out) in order to facilitate this, particularly where major works were required. While recent changes in the law are designed to protect tenants from retaliatory eviction when there are poor conditions in a property, they are yet to fully come into effect. In any case, it is likely that many tenants remain unaware of these new rights or how to enforce them, and would comply with any notice seeking possession that they received.

It is clear from the information provided by the local authorities about how properties were selected for visits that in most cases, working class communities were targeted for the projects, and so tenants in these areas were more likely than tenants in more affluent areas to find themselves being investigated by the authorities and/or left homeless as the result of scrutiny of or action against their landlord.⁶

Recommendations

With the government making a further £5m available to 65 councils to continue the war on 'rogue landlords',^v it is clear that the execution of these schemes needs to change radically. For them to succeed without making life harder for tenants, changes would need to include:

- Tenants being fully protected from eviction or rent hikes following action against landlords.
- Councils having the resources and will to rehouse any tenants who lose their accommodation or live in inadequate conditions.
- Tenants being protected from action or investigation by the authorities involved in investigating landlords. (This could happen in the same way that healthcare professionals maintain their patients' confidentiality, even if they may have been involved in illegal activity e.g. drugs, unless vulnerable individuals are at risk.)

⁴ Blackburn, Ealing, Newham and Nottingham

⁵ The 12 councils are Boston, Bournemouth, Brent, Ealing, Fenland, Herefordshire, Leeds, Lewisham, Newham, Nottingham, Redbridge and Rossendale. The councils that did not provide this information were Blackpool, Hillingdon, Medway, Oxford, Peterborough, Plymouth, Rochdale, Sheffield, Slough and Southwark.

⁶ One member of the South London radical urban reading group has written about similar concerns about the ways in which landlord licensing schemes are being implemented – see A Handbook for City Renters (2014) *Against Landlord Licensing*. Available: <https://handbookforcityrenters.wordpress.com/2014/11/19/against-landlord-licensing/> [16 January 2016]

2. Build to Rent

About the scheme

The Built to Rent fund was a £200m fund launched in 2012 by the Conservative-Liberal Democrat government, and increased to £1bn in 2013.^{vi} This money was made available to developers as subsidised finance (cheap loans or the government buying shares in their project) for up to 50 per cent of the cost of them building new private rented housing that would be let at market rents. The money would be paid back to the government by the developers refinancing the project or selling it on to other investors once it was built.^{vii}

The government claimed in April 2013 that the first £700m of the funding “has the potential to deliver between 8,000 and 10,000 new homes”. 43 companies with a total of 45 bids (a quarter of which were in London) were assessed for this first round, an average of £15.6m per project. These were:

- A2 Dominion Housing
- Blackswan Property
- Bouygues Development
- Bovis Homes
- Broomleigh Regeneration
- Carillion-Igloo
- Carpenter Investments
- CCURV LLP
- Chestnut Homes
- Clearstorm
- Climate Energy Homes
- Countryside x 2
- Crest Nicholson
- CS Capital Partners
- Derwentside Homes
- Evenbrook Capital
- Genesis Housing Association
- Geronimo
- Grainger
- Greenwich Peninsula
- Housing Solutions
- Hurst Street
- Inland Homes
- Keepmoat
- Kier Project Investment
- YH Residential
- Lendlease
- Lovell Partnerships
- LPC Living
- Mill Group
- Mount Anvil
- Muse Developments
- Network Housing Group
- Notting Hill Housing
- Orbit Homes 2020
- Persimmon Homes
- PlaceFirst x 2
- Plus Dane
- Quintain Estates
- Regeneration
- Relta
- South Yorkshire Housing Association
- Taylor Wimpey^{viii}

The government said that the purpose of the scheme was to encourage private investment in private rented housing “by reducing the up-front risk in a relatively untested market”. It argued that the fund would help to

create “a more balanced rental market, driven by quality instead of demand” and said that projects supported in the first round (with 70 per cent of the funding) “have the potential, subject to due diligence, to deliver between 8,000 and 10,000 homes”.^{ix}

This research

As part of the research for an [action by London private renters groups](#) in November 2013, I looked at which developments were being subsidised in London, and how much the scheme was costing the public purse.

a) Subsidised developments

A Freedom of Information request to the Greater London Authority (which was assessing the bids for Build to Rent funding in London; the remainder of the scheme was administered by the Homes and Communities Agency) revealed that 12 developers with 15 schemes had applied for Built to Rent funding for developments in London.^x

These were:

Developer	Project
Bouygues	Canning Town
CCURV	Taberner House
Clearstorm	Leamouth Peninsula South
Genesis Housing Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New Hendon Village (Colindale, Barnet) • Madeley Road (Ealing) • Springboard House (Upton Park, Newham)
Geronimo Brentford	Waterside Plot E
Greenwich Peninsula Regeneration	Greenwich Peninsula
Inland Homes	Drayton Garden Village
Mill Group	Sutton Wharf
Muse Developments	Brentford Lock West
Notting Hill Housing Trust	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wooddene • Great Eastern Quay
Quintain	Wembley Plot NW01
RELTA / TLRHC	Dylon - Bromley

b) Costs of the scheme

Working with an economics expert, we estimated the costs of providing the subsidised funding at around £90m (not including the costs of administering the scheme).⁷ At interest rates at the time, developers would pay 1.74 per cent interest on the Build to Rent loans,^{xi} yet the government was paying 2.66 per cent to borrow this money.^{xii} On this basis, we calculated that the minimum cost to the government of the loans (excluding operating costs for the scheme) is £92m (lending money at 0.92 per cent below the government’s cost of borrowing £1bn over the ten year period).

We estimated that the effective subsidy to the developers was around double this figure, as the developers were able to benefit from access to loans at a considerably lower rate via the Build to Rent scheme than they would be to access themselves directly on the market.

Criticisms of the scheme

The London Renters groups involved in the action against one of the Build to Rent beneficiaries had three main criticisms of the scheme:

- The UK doesn’t need more insecure and expensive private rented accommodation. For example, private rented flats at Genesis’ Stratford Halo development were being let at £1,700 in 2013.^{xiii} According to figures produced by Shelter, a family would need an income of £76,000 to be able to afford this rent.^{xiv} The average household income in Newham at this time was less than £27,000.^{xv}
- It’s a public subsidy to private developers. If the housing is going to be let at market rents, then it shouldn’t need to be subsidised.
- Public money could be used more effectively to provide good quality, secure and genuinely affordable social housing. We calculated that if the £1bn Built to Rent fund was used to build social housing on

⁷ This figure was based on funding provided through loans to developers with A-AAA credit ratings and normal collateralisation for a ten year period, with annual interest payments and the principle repaid at the end of the period.

publicly owned land, around 10,000 new homes could be built (at a cost of £100,000 per home excluding land costs)^{xvi}, with money recovered through the rents. This would also help to reduce the housing benefit bill, 40 per cent of which now goes to private landlords because one in four private tenants currently needs housing benefit in order to afford their rent.^{xvii}

APPENDIX A: Other government policy on the PRS since 2010

a. The coalition government (2010-15)

In addition to the Build to Rent scheme and funding for local authorities to tackle 'rogue landlords' and 'beds in sheds', the government also did largely useless things like producing "[How to rent: a checklist for renting in England](#)" and producing a standard [model tenancy agreement](#).

Ministers repeatedly stated that they were opposed to increasing regulation in the sector, but failed to find good reason to oppose amendments to legislation that would lead to limited improvements in a few areas:

- Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Act 2013 - letting agents now have to sign up to an ombudsman scheme, and the Office of Fair Trading will have the power to ban those who act improperly. However, it's still possible for anyone to set up a lettings agency, without any qualifications, need to conform to any code of conduct or provide safeguards.
- Consumer Rights Act 2015 – lettings agents have to public their fees, however they can still be as much as they want!
- Deregulation Act 2015 – landlords will not be able to use s21 (no fault) evictions against tenants for 6 months after they complain about conditions/repairs, as long as the council sends an improvement notice to the landlord. Landlords are still be able to use s21 in all other circumstances – and the act also made it easier for them to evict tenants in certain other situations such as repeated non-payment of rent.

In 2014 they consulted on minor improvements e.g. requiring landlords to fit smoke alarms which have been introduced since.

b. The Conservative government (2015-)

Since May 2015, the government has:

- Introduced a requirement for landlords to provide smoke alarms (and CO alarms where there are solid fuel appliances) under the Smoke and Carbon Monoxide Alarm (England) Regulations 2015.
- Consulted on extending HMO (houses of multiple occupation) licensing.^{xviii}
- Consulted on measures aimed at "tackling rogue landlords and improving the private rented sector", including creating a blacklist/database of 'rogue landlords' and letting agents, introducing a 'fit and proper person' test for landlords needing a licence, and extending the use of Rent Repayment Orders and introducing civil penalties (like parking notices) for housing offences. There was also proposal to make it easier for landlords to evict tenants if they 'abandon' their tenancy, which had support from less than half of respondents.^{xix} The majority of these policies (including on evictions in cases of 'abandonment') were included in the Housing and Planning Bill 2015-16 when it was published in October 2015.
- Continued to provide loan guarantees for developers building new private rented housing.^{xx}
- Provided a further £5m to 65 councils to tackle 'rogue landlords' and 'beds in sheds' – a thinly veiled means to using the housing budget to fund immigration raids (see section 4 below). It's argued that "the poor quality, overcrowded and dangerous accommodation rented by rogue landlords can result in a ripple effect of wider problems in the local community such as noise problems, council tax and benefit fraud, greater fire risk, anti-social behaviour such as street drinking" without any explanation as to the mechanism for this,^{xxi} apart from an implication that the tenants are part of the problem.

In general, the government argues that "the majority of tenants are happy with their home"^{xxii} and describes its approach as "creating a bigger, better private rented sector", seeking "to ensure there are sufficient measures in place to protect tenants, while at the same time avoiding needless red-tape"^{xxiii} which would "deter investment, increase rent and reduce choice for tenants".^{xxiv} It points to "other measures the government is taking to improve standards in the private rented sector and crack down on the unscrupulous landlords who exploit the most vulnerable...Forthcoming legislation [the dreaded Housing and Planning Bill 2015] will create a blacklist of persistent rogue landlords and letting agents, helping councils to focus their enforcement action on where it is most needed, and keeping track of those who have been convicted of housing offences."^{xxv}

APPENDIX B: Summary of findings of FOI requests to councils in receipt of 'rogue landlord' or 'beds in sheds' funding

Local authority	Main use of funding	Number of properties visited	How properties identified	Other agencies on visits	Outcomes
<i>London boroughs:</i>					
Brent	Staff, aerial photography	973	Aerial photography	Police "where necessary"	Action in 20 cases
Croydon	Staff	201	Complaints by public, referrals by other organisations	Fire service/corporate fraud/planning for 8 of 25 properties	1 prosecution, 19 improvement notices, 4 prohibition orders
Ealing	Staff	Over 10,000 outbuildings	Street surveys, GIS mapping, leaflets encouraging people to give information	Operational raids with the police and UKBA. Works with other partners inc fire service and HMRC "to further enforcement by intelligence sharing"	557 planning notices, 91 housing notices, 2 demolitions, 2 prosecutions. £11,654 confiscated for illegal use of outbuilding as rental property
Hillingdon	Staff (legal)	486			12 prosecutions
Hounslow	Staff, publicity	3856	6 wards with highest concentration of outbuildings identified from aerial photos	"213 properties were visited with partner agencies"	170 enforcements, 83 facilities removed, 14 prosecutions pending, 10 demolitions. Found 147 tenanted outbuildings (inc 23 with children).
Lambeth	Staff, publicity	207	Ward street surveys, complaints from occupants, referrals for other agencies, properties owned by suspect landlords, properties above takeaways	20 joint visits with crime reduction team, fire service, fraud services, housing, council tax, or planning/building control. Joint work (but not inspections) with UKBA in 3 cases and with crime reduction team in 2 cases ⁸	61 enforcement notices, 4 enforcement actions/prosecutions, 12 prohibitions, 2 demolitions ⁹
Lewisham	Staff	1305		61 inspections with police and other agencies including UKBA in some cases	147 notices served, 49 enforcements/prosecutions
Newham	Staff (mainly police)	4504 inc 341 raids		Funding "largely allocated to help fund the Section 92 Met Police Teams who are tasked by the Council to tackle rogue landlords and unauthorised premises and	1028 notices, 577 prosecutions, 101 demolitions/prohibitions, "nearly 400 arrests whilst on joint property licensing operations"

⁸ Although a large amount of data was provided, there were also a lot of gaps in it.

⁹ Although a large amount of data was provided, there were also a lot of gaps in it.

				structures. The Police provide additional intelligence, enable access to be gained into all premises and prevent breaches of the peace."	
Redbridge	Staff	Approximately 800	Various sources including council tax, police, fire service, planning and neighbours	"On a few occasions we have carried out multi-agency visits with UKBA and the police. These are usually where the alleged illegal structure is attached to a potential unlicensed HMO and possible overcrowding."	Served 62 statutory notices and 44 planning enforcement notices, 2 prosecutions for illegally occupied outhouses. 24 people detained by UKBA
Southwark	Staff, thermal imaging	<i>Not possible to separate funded from core work</i>			
<i>Rest of England:</i>					
Barnsley	Staff, publicity, training	597 (some external only)	Council data linked to previous complaints to council to identify target areas	Usually housing department only. Visit might lead to "additional aid from other council department as part of the referral process". Police specifically not involved.	12 hazard awareness/improvement notices, 1 nuisance notice, 32 ASBO notices
Blackpool	<i>No response provided</i>				
Bolton	Staff	151	Focus on 2 wards. Properties selected through external visits, referrals by police/community safety/health professionals/social services, and tenant complaints	"Information not held"	84 hazard awareness letters, 52 nuisance cases
Boston	Staff, Gangmasters Licensing Authority, legal costs	185	Streets identified as majority PRS, potentially containing HMOs and known to be poor quality (by age and location). Also reports via hotline, and checking all owner's properties when poor conditions found in one. GLA/police involved in identifying around 30 properties	Some visits with police and/or Gangmasters Licensing Authority	218 formal notices inc 75 requests for information, 111 powers of entry, 8 hazard notices, 8 improvement notices, 3 prohibition orders, 1 emergency remedial action notice. 1 prosecution and up to 4 more pending. May also be other action by GLA, police or fire services
Bournemouth	Staff	65		Police and fire services	6 prosecutions pending, 33

					management notices, 1 property closed, 13 properties where landlord removed
Derby	Staff	272	Two wards where worst properties known/owned by regular offenders. Additional streets identified from antisocial behaviour data, housing conditions and health service data.	Most visits by council environmental health officers only	81 formal notices/orders served
Fenland	Staff, training	490	"By following up on complaints from neighbours, elected members, intelligence in relation to organised crime groups"	"The visits were carried out in partnership including Fenland District Council, Cambridgeshire Police and Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue."	270 notices under housing and planning legislation
Hastings	Staff, reporting hotline	693	Reports to hotline and areas where high risk of rogue landlord behaviour (the council's Housing Renewal Area)	"Occasionally other agencies are involved, depending on the situation, for example referrals to CAB or BHT [advice services]"	318 enforcement actions
Herefordshire	Staff, training, equipment, legal costs	46	Information from police, fire, UKBA, GLA, local knowledge, complaints, other council teams, internet and walked streets	2 with UKBA, 4 with police, others with GLA, fire services, trading standards, housing solutions, CAB. Took place in afternoon/evening not early morning	3 prosecutions, 10 prosecutions pending, 5 ASB orders inc 1 to tenant, 8 protection from eviction actions. Some action taken in total of 37 cases.
Leeds	Staff	200	Flats above shops in 3 target areas	Joint project with fire service. Partners include police, other council services e.g. locality teams, environmental health, jobs & skills, Leeds Credit Union	148 legal notices to owners including 26 improvement notices and 8 emergency prohibition/prohibition orders. 119 hazards reduced. 141 referrals to partners such as benefits, Leeds Credit Union, jobs & skills, energy efficiency advice and crime prevention.
Medway	Staff	116	Prioritised properties where owner suspected rogue landlord, converted flats (conversions in last 4 years higher priority), shared houses, HMOs		68 improvement notices, 13 prohibition orders, 4 prosecutions

Nottingham	Staff, publicity, training, equipment	3	Raids where provision by magistrates court warrant/trading standards	Police and fire service	Prosecutions pending
Oxford		5000 (identified and require investigation)			
Pennine Lancashire ¹⁰	Staff	342	Blackburn with Darwen council responded to all complaints about HMOs and also dealt with known HMOs. Other departments of council, police and fire service involved in identifying HMOs	15 raids or multi agency visits	6 properties prohibited from use, 37 statutory notices served, 217 enforcement actions across Pennine Lancashire. In addition there were 23 prosecutions carried out by Blackburn with Darwen
Peterborough	Staff	8392	All properties in target areas (places with the most rented/old properties, overcrowding, large numbers of HMOs)		3 planning enforcement notices served, 3 prohibition orders. 144 referrals to other agencies for action such as council tax irregularities, planning enforcement, housing enforcement for high risk house conditions, police for drugs related issues
Plymouth	Training, publicity, support work	<i>Did not carry out visits as part of project</i>			
Rochdale	Staff, publicity, vehicles, equipment, training, property surveys				
Rossendale	Staff, publicity, legal fees, database, training	341	Environmental health, housing benefit and fraud departments, and evidence from Sure Start and CAB	21 joint investigations, including with police, HMRC, DWP, fire service, UKBA, social services, and HSE	491 follow-up actions including improvement notices, interviews under caution, 1 prosecution and 1 Interim Management Order
Sheffield	Staff, accommodation, equipment	415	Properties in council's selective licensing and voluntary registration areas		11 prosecutions, 20 prosecutions pending, 5 further investigations. 55 formal notices

¹⁰ Pennine Lancashire is a formal partnership of five local authorities: Blackburn with Darwen, Burnley, Hyndburn, Pendle and Rossendale. The FOI request was submitted to and answered by Blackburn with Darwen, hence there is more detailed information about this borough.

					requiring improvements, 48 informal notices of works required, 208 licence schedules, 1 prohibition order, 1 partial prohibition. 120 landlords received training.
Slough	Staff, aerial photography	7000 outhouses identified; 3220 inspected to date	Aerial photography		Informal action for 44 properties

Research by Christine Haigh, private tenant and housing activist in Lambeth. For more information email [yippee333@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:yippeee333@yahoo.co.uk).

ⁱ DCLG (2012) *£1.8 million to tackle scandal of 'beds in sheds'*. Available: <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/1-8-million-to-tackle-scandal-of-beds-in-sheds> [16 January 2016]

ⁱⁱ DCLG (2013) *Cash for councils to stop rogue landlords*. Available: <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/cash-for-councils-to-stop-rogue-landlords> [16 January 2016]

ⁱⁱⁱ DCLG (2012) *Major clampdown launched on 'beds in sheds'*. Available: <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/major-clampdown-launched-on-beds-in-sheds> [16 January 2016]

^{iv} See for example HASL (2015) *Unlawful and aggressive gatekeeping at Lambeth – justice for ML*. Available: <https://housingactionsouthwarkandlambeth.wordpress.com/2015/12/22/unlawful-and-aggressive-gatekeeping-at-lambeth-justice-for-ml/> [16 January 2016]

^v DCLG (2015) *New funding to crack down on rogue landlords and tackle 'beds in sheds'*. Available: <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/new-funding-to-crack-down-on-rogue-landlords-and-tackle-beds-in-sheds> [16 January 2016]

^{vi} DCLG (2013) *Up to 10,000 new homes will improve the rental market*. Available: <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/up-to-10-000-new-homes-will-improve-the-rental-market> [16 January 2016]

^{vii} RICS (2015) *Build to Rent*. Available: <http://www.rics.org/uk/knowledge/glossary/build-to-rent/> [16 January 2016]

^{viii} DCLG (2013) *Up to 10,000 new homes will improve the rental market*. Available: <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/up-to-10-000-new-homes-will-improve-the-rental-market> [16 January 2016]

^{ix} DCLG (2013) *Up to 10,000 new homes will improve the rental market*. Available: <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/up-to-10-000-new-homes-will-improve-the-rental-market> [16 January 2016]

^x GLA (2013) Response to freedom of information request, 17 October 2013

^{xi} Homes and Communities Agency, DCLG, Mayor of London (2013) *Built to Rent fund – round 2. Prospectus*. September 2013

^{xii} FT (2013) *Bond rates*. Available: <http://markets.ft.com/Research/Markets/Government-Bond-Spreads>

^{xiii} Genesis (2013) *Stratford Halo*. Available: <https://www.geneshahomes.org.uk/for-rent/stratford-halo-3/#enquire>

^{xiv} Shelter (2012) *London Private Rent Watch: Rent inflation and affordability in London's private rental market*. London: Shelter. Available: http://england.shelter.org.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0008/425708/London_Rent_Watch.pdf [16 January 2016]

^{xv} LSE (2012) *Lasting legacy or missed opportunity?* Available: <http://www.lse.ac.uk/newsAndMedia/news/archives/2012/07/Lasting-legacy-or-missed-opportunity-.aspx> [16 January 2016]

^{xvi} Seaford, C. (2010) *One million homes*. London: New Economics Foundation. Available: <http://www.neweconomics.org/publications/entry/one-million-homes> [16 January 2016]

^{xvii} Dyson, R. (2014) Landlords' £9bn housing benefit 'fuelling bubble'. *Telegraph*, 25 April 2014. Available: <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/finance/personalfinance/investing/buy-to-let/10787462/Landlords-9bn-housing-benefit-fuelling-bubble.html> [16 January 2016]

^{xviii} DCLG (2015) *Extending mandatory licensing of houses in multiple occupation and related reforms*. Available: <https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/extending-mandatory-licensing-of-houses-in-multiple-occupation-and-related-reforms> [16 January 2016]

^{xix} DCLG (2015) *Tackling rogue landlords and improving the private rental sector*. Available: <https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/tackling-rogue-landlords-and-improving-the-private-rental-sector> [16 January 2016]

^{xx} DCLG (2013) *Housing guarantee scheme rules: private rented sector*. Available: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/housing-guarantee-scheme-rules-private-rented-sector> [16 January 2016]

^{xxi} DCLG (2015) *New funding to crack down on rogue landlords and tackle 'beds in sheds'*. Available: <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/new-funding-to-crack-down-on-rogue-landlords-and-tackle-beds-in-sheds> [16 January 2016]

^{xxii} DCLG (2015) *New funding to crack down on rogue landlords and tackle 'beds in sheds'*. Available: <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/new-funding-to-crack-down-on-rogue-landlords-and-tackle-beds-in-sheds> [16 January 2016]

^{xxiii} DCLG (2015) *Brandon Lewis raises the alarm over tenant safety*. Available: <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/brandon-lewis-raises-the-alarm-over-tenant-safety> [16 January 2016]

^{xxiv} DCLG (2015) *New funding to crack down on rogue landlords and tackle 'beds in sheds'*. Available: <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/new-funding-to-crack-down-on-rogue-landlords-and-tackle-beds-in-sheds> [16 January 2016]

^{xxv} DCLG (2015) *Brandon Lewis raises the alarm over tenant safety*. Available: <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/brandon-lewis-raises-the-alarm-over-tenant-safety> [16 January 2016]