



Edited by Susannah Bunce, Nicola Livingstone,  
Loren March, Susan Moore and Alan Walks

# Critical Dialogues of Urban Governance, Development and Activism

## London and Toronto



 **UCLPRESS**

# Critical Dialogues of Urban Governance, Development and Activism

# Critical Dialogues of Urban Governance, Development and Activism

*London & Toronto*

Edited by

Susannah Bunce, Nicola Livingstone, Loren March,  
Susan Moore and Alan Walks

 **UCL**PRESS

First published in 2020 by  
UCL Press  
University College London  
Gower Street  
London WC1E 6BT

Available to download free: [www.uclpress.co.uk](http://www.uclpress.co.uk)

Collection © Editors, 2020  
Text © Contributors, 2020  
Images © Contributors and copyright holders named in captions, 2020

The authors have asserted their rights under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 to be identified as the authors of this work.

A CIP catalogue record for this book is available from The British Library.

This book is published under a Creative Commons 4.0 International licence (CC BY 4.0). This licence allows you to share, copy, distribute and transmit the work; to adapt the work and to make commercial use of the work providing attribution is made to the authors (but not in any way that suggests that they endorse you or your use of the work). Attribution should include the following information:

Bunce, S., Livingstone, N., March, L., Moore, S. and Walks, A. 2020. *Critical Dialogues of Urban Governance, Development and Activism: London and Toronto*. London: UCL Press. <https://doi.org/10.14324/111.9781787356795>

Further details about Creative Commons licences are available at  
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

Any third-party material in this book is published under the book's Creative Commons licence unless indicated otherwise in the credit line to the material. If you would like to reuse any third-party material not covered by the book's Creative Commons licence, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

ISBN: 978-1-78735-681-8 (Hbk.)  
ISBN: 978-1-78735-680-1 (Pbk.)  
ISBN: 978-1-78735-679-5 (PDF)  
ISBN: 978-1-78735-682-5 (epub)  
ISBN: 978-1-78735-683-2 (mobi)  
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.14324/111.9781787356795>

# Contents

<i>List of figures</i>	viii
<i>List of tables</i>	x
<i>List of acronyms</i>	xi
<i>List of contributors</i>	xiii
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	xix
<b>Introduction:</b> Critical dialogues of urban governance, development and activism in London and Toronto <i>Susan Moore, Susannah Bunce, Nicola Livingstone, Loren March and Alan Walks</i>	1
<b>Part I:</b> Perspectives on governance	21
1. Capital flows in the capital: Contemporary governmental imaginations in London's urban development <i>Mike Raco and Nicola Livingstone</i>	23
2. The elusive, inclusive city: Toronto at a crossroads <i>Shauna Brail and Tara Vinodrai</i>	38
3. Regulating property conditions in the private rented sector: The complex geography of property licensing in London <i>Tatiana Moreira de Souza</i>	54
4. Metromobility and transit-led urbanisation in London and Toronto <i>Theresa Enright</i>	67
5. The governance of urban public spaces in London: In the public interest or in the interest of local stakeholders? <i>Claudio De Magalhães</i>	80
6. London, its infrastructure and the logics of growth <i>Daniel Durrant</i>	93
7. Governing urbanisation in the global city: A commentary <i>Alan Walks and Mike Raco</i>	106

<b>Part II: Real estate and housing</b>	<b>113</b>
8. Governing urban development on industrial land in global cities: Lessons from London <i>Jessica Ferm</i>	115
9. Global city, global housing bubble? Toronto's housing bubble and its discontents <i>Alan Walks</i>	130
10. Trends and issues in the (unaffordable) London housing market <i>Tommaso Gabrieli</i>	145
11. Housing crisis in a Canadian global city: Financialisation, buy-to-let investors and short-term rentals in Toronto's rental market <i>Emily Hawes and Sean Grisdale</i>	158
12. Planning for densification and housing in London: Urban design and real estate agendas in practice <i>Michael Short and Nicola Livingstone</i>	175
13. Addressing equity concerns in land value capture: The spatial distribution of community benefits in Toronto's urban redevelopment <i>Jeff Biggar and Matti Siemiatycki</i>	191
14. Real estate and housing: A commentary. Dynamics of a housing crisis – the politics and planning of housing in London and Toronto <i>Susannah Bunce and Nicola Livingstone</i>	208
<b>Part III: Community, activism and engagement</b>	<b>217</b>
15. DIY: Making space in Toronto's 'Creative City' <i>Loren March</i>	219
16. Pragmatic fix or a farewell to welfare? Making sense of and contesting the financialisation of public land and council housing in London <i>Joe Penny</i>	233
17. Community-based responses to exclusionary processes of neighbourhood change in Parkdale, Toronto <i>Elena Ostanel</i>	246

18. Time to be an activist: Recent successes in housing activism in London <i>Pablo Sendra and Daniel Fitzpatrick</i>	259
19. Engagement and activism in community land ownership: The emergence of community land trusts in London and Toronto <i>Susannah Bunce</i>	274
20. Community, activism and engagement: A commentary <i>Loren March and Susan Moore</i>	289
<b>Conclusion:</b> Critical dialogues on urban governance, development and activism in London and Toronto <i>Alan Walks, Susannah Bunce, Nicola Livingstone, Loren March and Susan Moore</i>	297
<i>Index</i>	306

## List of figures

2.1	Neighbourhood income change: City of Toronto, 2015 vs 1970 (Hulchanski 2017)	39
2.2	Economic performance of clusters in the Toronto CMA (authors' calculations based on Statistics Canada, Census of Population, 2006 and 2016, custom tabulations)	42
3.1	Map of all licensing schemes operating in London (based on data from London Datastore 2017)	61
5.1	The four cases (author)	85
5.2	Jubilee Gardens use regulations (author)	87
8.1	Architects' illustration of a mixed-use industrial and residential development, included in the <i>Industrial Intensification and Co-Location Study (We Made That 2018)</i> , commissioned by the Greater London Authority (© We Made That)	117
8.2	Map of London boroughs showing the management of the transfer of industrial land to other uses under the policies in the London Plan 2016 (GLA 2016)	122
8.3	Map of London boroughs showing the management of industrial land capacity under the policies proposed in the Draft London Plan 2017 (GLA 2017a)	123
9.1	House prices in the Toronto census metropolitan area compared with house prices in other large metropolitan areas in Canada. Created by the author, using data from the Teranet House Price Index dataset (Teranet 2020). The Canada 10-City Index was calculated using the Teranet indices and weights for the Montreal, Vancouver, Calgary, Edmonton, Ottawa, Winnipeg, Quebec City, Hamilton, Victoria and Halifax metropolitan areas (CMAs), that is, 10 of the 11 metros in the Teranet 11-City Index (i.e. without the Toronto CMA). Teranet only collects information on 11 CMAs. January 2008 = 100	132

10.1	Median housing affordability ratio (author, data from ONS 2018)	147
11.1	Average rents (CAD) in Toronto, 2008–16 (Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation 2018)	162
11.2	Proportion of owners and renters spending more than 30 per cent of income on shelter costs in Canada and the City of Toronto, 1981–2016 (custom tabulated by Sean Grisdale based on data from Canada Statistics n.d.)	165
13.1	Percentage of total Section 37 benefits, 1997–2014 (Biggar 2015; City of Toronto 2015)	196
13.2	Frequency of community benefits by form of payment and year (Biggar 2015; City of Toronto 2015)	197
13.3	Total cash value (millions) of community benefit agreement by ward (Biggar 2015; City of Toronto 2015)	198
15.1	Map of different place-based creative scenes in Toronto (map by L. March)	223
15.2	A DIY recording studio assembled in a musician’s living room in a rental apartment (photograph taken by research participant, 2018)	227
15.3	Boxes of supplies remain unpacked within this workspace, as the practitioner occupies the space with the presumption that she will soon have to move again (photograph taken by research participant, 2018)	228
17.1	The timeline of community activism in Parkdale (organisations’ websites and Barna 2007)	250
18.1	Location of case studies and examples mentioned in the chapter. Elaborated by the authors from Open Street Map cartography and boundary data (© OpenStreetMap contributors. Data are available under the Open Database Licence, and the cartography is licensed as CC BY-SA. <a href="https://www.openstreetmap.org/copyright">https://www.openstreetmap.org/copyright</a> )	261
18.2	London Plan Examination in Public, February 2019 (photograph by P. Sendra)	269
19.1	St Clement’s Site, Mile End, London (photograph by S. Bunce)	281
19.2	Kensington Market, Toronto (photograph by S. Bunce)	286

## List of tables

1.1	Firms signed up as TfL property development partners (TfL 2016)	33
1.2	Key planning objectives that proposals must meet in the London Plan (information synthesised from GLA 2018)	33
12.1	Sustainable residential quality (SRQ) density matrix (habitable rooms and dwellings per hectare) in the adopted London Plan (GLA 2016)	182
12.2	Summary of site and development characteristics (author)	185
13.1	Conceptual typology of developer provisions, showing differences between LVC instruments (Alterman and Kayden 1988)	193
13.2	Interview themes (author)	200

## List of acronyms

AONB	Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
AST	Assured Shorthold Tenancy (London)
BC	British Columbia
BID	Business Improvement District (London)
BOST	Bankside Open Spaces Trust (London)
CAPREIT	Canadian Apartment Properties REIT
CIL	Community Infrastructure Levy (London)
CLHL	Community-Led Housing London
CLSA	Conditional Land Sale Agreement (London)
CLT	Community Land Trust
CMA	Census metropolitan area (Toronto)
CMHC	Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation
CSCB	Coin Street Community Builders (London)
CTRL	Channel Tunnel Rail Link (London, see also HS1)
DCLG	Department for Communities and Local Government (London)
DEFRA	Department for the Environment, Farming and Rural Affairs
DfT	Department for Transport (London)
DIY	Do-it-yourself
ELCLT	East London Community Land Trust, now London CLT
EiP	Examination in Public (London)
GDP	Gross domestic product
GFC	Global Financial Crisis
GLA	Greater London Authority
GLC	Greater London Council
GTA	Greater Toronto Area
HCA	Homes and Communities Agency (London)
HDV	Haringey Development Vehicle (London)
HMO	Houses in Multiple Occupation (London)
HNWI	High net-worth individuals
HPI	House price index
HRA	Housing Revenue Account (London)
HS1 and HS2	High Speed One and High Speed Two (London)
ICT	Information and communications technology

IFC	International financial centre
ILEO	Inclusive Local Economic Opportunity
JSEP	Just Space Economy and Planning (London)
KMCLT	Kensington Market Community Land Trust
LP	London Plan
LPDM	London Plan density matrix (London)
LQ	location quotient
LTV	Loan-to-value ratio
LVC	Land value capture
NLT	Neighbourhood Land Trust
OMB	Ontario Municipal Board (Toronto)
PARC	Parkdale Activity Recreation Centre (Toronto)
PCED	Parkdale Community Economic Development, also Parkdale People's Economy Community Planning (Toronto)
PNLT	Parkdale Neighbourhood Land Trust (Toronto)
POPS	Privately owned public spaces
PRS	Private rented sector
PTAL	Public transport accessibility level (London)
REIT	Real estate investment trust
RTP	Regional Transport Plan (Toronto)
SE	Shared equity
SO	Shared ownership
SPD	Supplementary planning documents
SPV	Special purpose vehicle
SRQ	Sustainable residential quality (London)
TfL	Transport for London
TOD	Transit-oriented development
TSNS	Toronto Strong Neighbourhoods Strategy
TTC	Toronto Transit Commission
TTSSG	Thames Tideway Strategic Study Group
WECH	Walterton and Elgin Community Homes
WKGGCH	West Ken and Gibbs Green Community Housing (London)

# List of contributors

## Editors

**Susannah Bunce** is Associate Professor in the Department of Human Geography and City Studies Program at the University of Toronto Scarborough. Her research focuses on the relationships between spatial, social and environmental processes in urban neighbourhoods and urban community-based development. She has researched community land trusts, as a model for collective and de-commodified land ownership, in cities in the UK, US and Canada for the past 10 years. In addition to articles in international peer-reviewed journals, Bunce is the author of *Sustainability Policy, Planning, and Gentrification in Cities* (2018).

**Nicola Livingstone** is Associate Professor in Real Estate at the Bartlett School of Planning, UCL. Before joining UCL she worked as a lecturer at Heriot-Watt University, where she completed her PhD. Her background is in real estate and urban studies. She has published widely on these topics and has recently been working on projects examining real estate investment trends, the evolution of the retail market, the impacts of changes to the planning system on cities, the political economy of charity and food insecurity. Recent co-authored publications include *Understanding the Impacts of Deregulation in Planning* (2020) and *New Money in Rural Areas* (2019). She has completed funded research work for both the RICS and the British Academy/Leverhulme and is currently working on a collaborative ORA-ESRC-funded project on investment flows and residential development in London, Paris and Amsterdam named WHIG: What is Governed in Cities.

**Loren March** is a PhD candidate in Human Geography at the University of Toronto's Department of Geography and Planning. Their research centres around complex processes and experiences of change in altered urban environments and has critically examined gentrification, redevelopment and creative place-making practices. Their most recent work specifically examines questions of environmental gentrification and the more-than-human implications of capitalist urbanisation processes in Toronto.

**Susan Moore** is Associate Professor in Urban Development and Planning at the Bartlett School of Planning, UCL. Her research has focused on relational geographies of urban and suburban development, with a particular focus on

development cultures in context. She has written extensively on New Urbanism in Toronto and is currently co-authoring a book on the international reach and mainstreaming of New Urbanism with Dan Trudeau (Macalester College), to be published by University of Toronto Press as part of the Global Suburbanisms Book Series. Her other work has looked at urban development and governance models and the formation and circulation of so-called best practices. Most recently, she has collaborated with geography and media colleagues from Birkbeck, University of London in examining the use of social media platforms in relation to processes of local urban change in east London. She is also co-author of several papers and book chapters on the phenomenologies of Platform Urbanism and a co-researcher in a collaborative, international UNECE-supported project on Urban Data Cultures.

**Alan Walks** is Professor of Urban Planning and Geography at the University of Toronto. His work examines the causes and consequences of different forms of urban inequality, including those related to housing policies and housing markets, financial markets, gentrification, automobility, gated communities and neighbourhood segregation processes. In addition to publishing his research in numerous international peer-reviewed journals, he is the editor of the book *The Political Economy and Ecology of Automobility: Driving Cities, Driving Inequality, Driving Politics* (2015), and co-editor of the books *The Political Ecology of the Metropolis* (2013) and *Changing Neighbourhoods: Social and Spatial Polarization in Canadian Cities* (2020).

## Authors

**Jeff Biggar** is an urban planning professional and adjunct professor. His research focuses on planning and urban governance, with a focus on land use conflict in neighbourhood-level urban redevelopment. His current research assesses the implications of smart city schemes for innovation and governance in the public sector. He has taught courses in urban studies, geography and planning and he has extensive experience consulting on planning and policy projects. He holds a PhD in Planning from the University of Toronto.

**Shauna Brail** is Associate Professor in the Institute for Management and Innovation at the University of Toronto. As an urban planner and economic geographer, Brail's research focuses on the transformation of cities as a result of economic, social and cultural change.

**Daniel Durrant** is Lecturer in Infrastructure Planning at UCL's Bartlett School of Planning and currently a Humboldt Fellow at the Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin. His interests are in the issues surrounding large infrastructure projects and new infrastructures, how they are planned, how they function as socio-technical systems and the politics of infrastructure. He has a long-standing interest in the role of civil society in shaping the built environment and the provision of public goods.

Beyond this he is interested in the political economy of the built environment, which has also led him to conduct research into the development industry and housing.

**Theresa Enright** is Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of Toronto. Her research examines urban and regional politics with a focus on transport and mobility. She is the author of *The Making of Grand Paris: Metropolitan Urbanism in the Twenty-first Century* (2016) and editor (with Ugo Rossi) of *The Urban Political: Ambivalent Spaces of Late Neoliberalism* (2017). She is currently working on a book titled *Art in Transit: The Cultural Politics of Mobility*.

**Jessica Ferm** is Associate Professor at the Bartlett School of Planning, UCL. She is a practice-focused academic with research interests in spatial planning, economic development and social justice, with a particular interest in land use conflicts between industry and housing. She has published widely on these topics in the journals *Urban Studies*, *European Planning Studies*, *Planning Practice and Research* and *Journal of Corporate Real Estate*. She is co-editor of a book on planning practice in the UK and co-author of *Understanding the Impacts of Deregulation in Planning: Turning Offices into Homes* (2019). She has worked on research projects for the RICS Research Trust and is currently a Co-Investigator on the ESRC project WHIG: What is Governed in Cities, which compares residential investment landscapes and the governance and regulation of housing production in London, Amsterdam and Paris. She is active in planning practice and policy in London and is a member of Just Space Economy and Planning, the London Planning and Development Forum, the Economics Roundtable for London and the Commission for Economic Renewal. Prior to academia, she worked for 10 years as a planning consultant and in public practice for a north London planning authority.

**Daniel Fitzpatrick** is a Teaching Fellow at the Bartlett School of Planning, UCL, where he finished his PhD in Planning Studies in 2017, investigating mutual housing models in London and their governance. His current research is around community-led planning, housing and governance issues and he has co-authored the book *Community-led Regeneration* (2020) with Pablo Sendra.

**Tommaso Gabrieli** is Associate Professor in Real Estate at UCL's Bartlett School of Planning. His research focuses on the economic analysis of urban policy issues and his major area of contribution is currently in the interface between urban planning/design and real estate/urban economics. His expertise encompasses the economic modelling of real estate markets, the analysis of the financial viability of major urban projects, multidimensional value measurement and value capture, as well as urban policy issues related to segregation, poverty and deprivation. He employs interdisciplinary methods merging behavioural economics, game theory and real option analysis, as well as qualitative empirical methods, and he is one of very few economists in the UK actively collaborating with scholars in urban planning and urban design. He has authored research reports, book chapters and

journal articles across various fields, including *Urban Studies*, *Progress in Planning* and *Journal of Economic Asymmetries*. He is currently Co-Investigator in the UCL team for the 'Urban Maestro' Horizon 2020 project.

**Sean Gridale** is a PhD candidate in Human Geography at the University of Toronto. His research on the political economy of urban development focuses on how digital technologies and platforms are increasingly centred as solutions to problems of sustainability and affordable housing, particularly in post-industrial, global city contexts such as Toronto. His most recent projects have considered the politics of short-term rental platforms and the 'smart city' as expressions of the ongoing but shifting dynamics of urban planning and governance under capitalism.

**Emily Hawes** is a PhD candidate in Human Geography at the University of Toronto. Her research on urban and economic life is concerned with the interactions between large-scale processes and everyday lived experiences. Her most recent projects have considered financialisation, inequality, household debt, FinTech and rental housing.

**Claudio De Magalhães** is Professor in Urban Regeneration and Management at the Bartlett School of Planning, UCL, with a background in architecture and urban planning. His interests have been in planning and the governance of the built environment at various levels, looking at property development processes and urban regeneration policy, the management of urban quarters and the provision and governance of public space. He has conducted research for UK Research Councils, professional bodies such as the RICS, CABE, UK government departments and local authorities and published widely on property markets and globalisation; capacity-building for urban governance; the relationship between urban governance, the built environment and property markets; business improvement districts; and the provision and management of public spaces. His most recent research looks at the relationship between planning policies and perceptions of risk in the housebuilding industry. His most recent books include *Design Governance: The CABE Experiment* (2017) and *Planning, Risk and Property Development: Urban Regeneration in England, France and the Netherlands* (2013). He is currently working on a book comparing the governance and management regimes for public spaces in London and Hong Kong.

**Tatiana Moreira de Souza** is a Research Fellow in Urban Planning and Property Markets at Oxford Brookes University. Her research interests include urban regeneration and neighbourhood change, urban diversity and social mix, housing policy and the links between housing tenure, housing conditions and well-being. She was educated in Brazil and in the UK, with a first degree in Architecture and Urbanism from the University of São Paulo, Brazil, an MSc in Urban Regeneration and a PhD in Planning Studies from UCL's Bartlett School of Planning.

**Elena Ostanel** holds a PhD in Urban Planning. She is now running a Marie Skłodowska-Curie research project at Iuav University of Venice in partnership with University of Toronto and TU Delft. At Iuav she is based at the Department of

Architecture and Arts, where she collaborates with the UNESCO Chair on Social and Spatial Inclusion of International Migrants. She teaches courses in community planning and innovation in local governments. Among her recent publications is '(In)visibilising Vulnerable Community Members: Processes of Urban Inclusion and Exclusion in Parkdale, Toronto'.

**Joe Penny** is Lecturer in Economic Geography at Queen Mary University of London. He is interested in the local state, the governance of austerity and the financialisation of housing.

**Mike Raco** is Professor of Urban Governance and Development at the Bartlett School of Planning, UCL. He has published widely on the topics of urban governance and regeneration, urban sustainability, social diversity, and the politics of urban and regional economic development. He is currently leading a team at UCL that is working on a collaborative ORA-ESRC-funded project on investment flows and residential development in London, Paris and Amsterdam named WHIG: What is Governed in Cities. Recent works include *The Future of Sustainable Cities: Critical Reflections* (2011, with John Flint), *State-led Privatisation and the Demise of the Democratic State: Welfare Reform and Localism in an Era of Regulatory Capitalism* and *Regenerating London: Governance, Sustainability and Community in a Global City* (2013, with Rob Imrie and Loretta Lees).

**Pablo Sendra** is Lecturer in Planning and Urban Design at the Bartlett School of Planning, UCL. He combines his academic career with professional practice in urban design. He is co-founder of the urban design practice Lugadero, which has recently facilitated a co-design process for two public spaces in Wimbledon, London. He is also co-founder of Civicwise, a network that works on civic engagement and collaborative urbanism. He develops action research projects and radical teaching in collaboration with community groups and activists in London. At UCL, he is Acting Director of the MSc in Urban Design and City Planning programme, coordinator of the Civic Design CPD Course and Deputy Leader of the Urban Design Research Group. He is co-author of *Designing Disorder* (2020, with Richard Sennett) and *Community-Led Regeneration* (2020, with Daniel Fitzpatrick) and co-editor of *Civic Practices* (2017, with Maria J. Pita and Civicwise).

**Michael Short** is Principal Teaching Fellow in Planning and Urban Conservation, Bartlett School of Planning, UCL. He is an urbanist and conservator interested in issues of design quality in the historic environment. He undertakes practice-based projects, teaching and research in three main areas. The first area is how design issues are negotiated through the planning process and how they are implemented on site; the second is the conservation of buildings of the recent past and the challenges this presents for conservation and planning practice; and the third is debates about increased building height and density in environments where the historic environment and character of place are relevant. At the heart of all three areas of research is an interest in the negotiation of a higher-quality built environment.

**Matti Siemiatycki** is Canada Research Chair in Infrastructure Planning and Finance and the Interim Director of the School of Cities at the University of Toronto. His work focuses on delivering large-scale infrastructure projects, public–private partnerships and the effective integration of infrastructure into the fabric of cities. His recent studies explore the value for money of delivering infrastructure megaprojects through public–private partnerships, the causes of and cures for cost overruns on large infrastructure projects, the development of innovative mixed-use buildings and the diversity gap in the infrastructure industry workforce.

**Tara Vinodrai** is Associate Professor in the Institute for Management and Innovation at the University of Toronto. She holds a graduate appointment to the Department of Geography and Planning and is a Senior Associate at the Innovation Policy Lab at the Munk School of Global Affairs and Public Policy. Her research focuses on the dynamics of urban economies, including issues related to the cultural and creative economy of cities; local and regional economic development; clusters, innovation and technological change; and local labour market dynamics.

## Acknowledgements

We would like to first extend our gratitude to the Global Engagement Office at UCL and the Office of the Vice-President, International Partnerships at the University of Toronto (UofT), which have provided significant and important funding to foster urban research collaboration between the two universities. The offices provided administrative support and funding for workshops held in London (in June 2017) and Toronto (in April 2018) that were integral for building discussions between contributors to this book and in the development of the book themes. Funding by the Global Engagement Office at UCL also supported an additional editorial meeting for the book, held in Toronto in June 2019.

We also wish to thank Professor Mark Fox, Associate Director of Research at the School of Cities, University of Toronto, and Professor Mike Raco, Bartlett School of Planning, UCL, who brought together UofT and UCL urban researchers for the first joint collaborative workshop in London in June 2017. Without their foresight, this book would not have been possible. It was at this first workshop in London that a commitment to pursuing a book was decided upon and an editorial team was formed. We are also grateful for the assistance of Tatiana Moreira de Souza and Dimitris Panayotopoulos-Tsiros at the Bartlett School of Planning, UCL, who were instrumental in creating a literature review and for helping to compile a database of London-focused literature, respectively. On the Toronto side, we would like to extend our thanks to Ewa Modlinska, PhD candidate in Planning at the UofT, who provided assistance in compiling Toronto-based literature and was key to the successful organisation of the second workshop held in Toronto in April 2018. Two cities, London and Toronto, have made the contents of this book possible. They are cities that are dynamic, fascinating, complex and never lacking in excitement. London and Toronto are close to our hearts as cities in which we live and work on an everyday basis, and as places that are constantly transforming in multiple ways.

# Regulating property conditions in the private rented sector: The complex geography of property licensing in London

Tatiana Moreira de Souza

## Introduction

Since the turn of the millennium, the UK housing market has been shaped by a resurgence in private renting. During the 1980s and 1990s the proportion of households renting from a private landlord in England hovered around 9–10 per cent, but since 2013–14 this proportion has increased to approximately 19 per cent of all households in the country (MHCLG 2019a). Today, the private rented sector (PRS) is the second largest housing tenure in England, accounting for 4.5 million households (MHCLG 2019a). In London, the proportion of renters is even higher. The latest figures show that approximately 29 per cent of households rent from a private landlord and it is forecast that one in three households will be renting privately by 2025.

The recent growth of the PRS is not unique to London or England. Since the 2008–9 Global Financial Crisis (GFC), many global north countries have witnessed a rise in private renting, with this rise being more pronounced in Anglo-Saxon countries with liberal markets (Kemp 2015; Crook and Kemp 2014a). Explanations extend beyond current trends in household formation and the weakening of the economic position of working populations. They reflect a multitude of factors, such as reduced accessibility to mortgage finance, austerity politics in response to the GFC – which have also negatively impacted the production of subsidised housing – the financialisation of the residential sector, rent liberalisation and reduced tenant protections (Pawson et al. 2017; Hochstenbach 2017; August and Walks 2012).

In many countries, notably those in which the sector is loosely regulated, there is substantial variability in the quality of housing and management of privately rented properties, with substandard accommodation commonly being found at the lower end of the sector. The impacts of poor housing on health have been widely researched (Roys et al. 2010; Marsh et al. 1999) and studies have

shown how some landlords take advantage of reduced tenant protections and the precarious situation of some tenants – such as recipients of housing benefits, ethnic minority groups and undocumented immigrants – to reduce spending on repairs and property maintenance (Desmond et al. 2015; Grineski and Hernández 2010). Others have highlighted the lack of interest from landlords in investing in property maintenance in areas of high housing demand (Ambrose 2015), and recent studies in the United States, Canada and Germany have connected the growing financialisation of rental housing to reduced spending from investors on property maintenance as part of a wider strategy to reduce costs and increase tenant turnover in order to raise rents (August and Walks 2018; Fields and Uffer 2016).

Issues related to poor property conditions have generally been tackled through the provision of direct subsidies for housing improvement and through a regulatory approach. This is generally done through the prescription of minimum standards for privately rented housing and/or through the requirement that landlords register or license their rental properties. Examples range from national landlord registration schemes, such as in Scotland and Wales, to legislation introduced by city, state or regional governments, such as in the case of Toronto, where a by-law passed in 2017 introduced minimum property maintenance standards and the requirement for registration of certain types of purpose-built rental properties. In England, there is no minimum standard of housing condition in the PRS. Instead, property conditions are assessed by a system of risk assessment that identifies hazards to occupants. Local authorities are responsible for enforcing housing standards. They have a duty to license certain types of private rental accommodation and they also have discretionary powers to implement licensing schemes for other types of rental properties under certain conditions. This approach to licensing, however, due to its targeted focus, results in considerable variability in terms of regulation and of enforcement activity when local authorities are compared with one another.

This chapter explores the complex and fragmented regulatory landscape that is forming in London as a result of the various discretionary licensing schemes operating in Greater London's 32 boroughs. The study draws from the analysis of licensing schemes currently in place in each local authority, the analysis of two parliamentary inquiries into the sector and interviews conducted between September 2017 and February 2018 with eight enforcement officers and policy-makers in charge of private sector housing and enforcement in 11 of these local authorities. The chapter reveals that this fragmentation results from the combination of central government's aversion to regulation, austerity politics and differing local political willingness to implement licensing schemes. This results in substantial variation across London in the amount of intelligence held about the sector and in significant disparities in the terms and conditions of schemes as well as in enforcement, affecting both tenants and landlords, with wider impacts to the local community. Finally, it considers how this inconsistent regulatory landscape interacts with the current mayor's plans of introducing rent controls based on information gathered from a London-wide landlord register.

The chapter starts with an overview of the PRS in England and in London, followed by an overview of the regulatory framework that governs property conditions and landlord management and of how the PRS is problematised by different levels of government (central and local). It then gives an overview of the licensing schemes operating in London and discusses the wider implications of these different licensing approaches and capacities. It concludes with a discussion of the views expressed by local authority enforcement officers on the Mayor's proposal for a London-wide register, which highlighted the need to reduce regulatory complexity in order to increase compliance.

## A brief overview of the PRS in England and in London

The PRS in England has been growing since the late 1990s due to a combination of deregulatory policies introduced by the 1988 and 1994 Housing Acts which removed rent controls and introduced shorter tenancy agreements, and new financial products that have allowed homeowners to buy additional properties to let (Buy-to-Let mortgages). Much of the sector's growth has been due to tenure change rather than to new housing construction (Crook and Kemp 2014b), with estimates that over 500,000 privately rented dwellings were originally social housing properties sold under 'right to buy' (Rugg and Rhodes 2018). Decades of under-supply in housing markets, coupled with easy availability of credit, contributed to house prices rising, while the decline of the social housing stock has resulted in social housing being allocated to those most in need. Since the onset of the GFC, the PRS has rapidly changed from being a marginal tenure – housing mainly students, young professionals, recently arrived migrants and newly formed households (Rugg and Rhodes 2008) – to becoming 'the new normal' (Reynolds and de Santos 2013). This has led to the phenomenon of 'Generation Rent', as many more people are renting for longer in their lives and see no prospects of ever changing their housing tenure status (Hoolachan et al. 2017; McKee et al. 2017). In London, where the housing crisis is most acute (see Penny, Chapter 16), rents have been rising substantially faster than earnings, surpassing the average mortgage payment. Londoners already spend on average 42 per cent of their income on rent (MHCLG 2019b) – with 25 per cent of them paying more than half of their wages (GLA 2018) – and welfare reforms introduced by central government have significantly impacted the ability of low-income families to afford rents in the capital.

Differently from countries such as Canada, which has a long history of institutional and corporate investment in purpose-built privately rented housing, the PRS in England has a larger share of older properties and is dominated by small-scale landlordism. Ninety-four per cent of landlords are private individuals, with 45 per cent owning one property and only 17 per cent owning more than five (MHCLG 2019b, 5). Despite active support from central government for institutional investment in the sector – through subsidies for purpose-built developments

solely for private renting, called ‘build to rent’ – this segment of the PRS is still in its infancy. As of 2019, approximately 32,000 units had been built and another 111,000 are under construction or in planning across the UK (Savills 2019). This predominance of private individual landlords has been associated with great variability in the quality of PRS properties and standards in property management being endemically poor, due to a large proportion of landlords being unaware of their responsibilities (Rhodes and Rugg 2018; Faulkner and Saxena 2016).

Thus, compared with the owner-occupied and social rented sectors, the PRS in England has the highest proportion of housing in poor condition. The latest figures show that over a quarter of PRS homes fail to meet the Decent Homes Standard,<sup>1</sup> a proportion that is well above what is found in the owner-occupied and social rented sectors (19 per cent and 13 per cent respectively) (MHCLG 2019a). Although the proportion of non-decent housing has reduced over time – from almost 47.7 per cent in 2006 (MHCLG 2018) to 25 per cent in 2018 – in absolute terms this figure has increased from 1.29 million to 1.35 million (Rugg and Rhodes 2018, 139). In London, the proportion of non-decent homes in the sector also stands at 25 per cent. Between 2015 and 2016, almost 4,000 serious health and safety hazards in privately rented dwellings were identified by local authorities (Pidgeon 2016). A study by Rhodes and Rugg (2018) showed that almost all vulnerable households living in PRS accommodation in the capital experience problems of unaffordability or overcrowding (living without a sufficient number of bedrooms) due to living in a non-decent home.

The deregulatory measures introduced in the 1980s and 1990s are also partly to blame for property standards and management being poor, because they significantly weakened the position of tenants. The standard tenancy agreement in England usually lasts six months to one year, after which the landlord has the right to repossess the property at two months’ notice by serving a Section 21 eviction notice – which allows landlords to evict tenants without a reason once a fixed-term tenancy agreement expires. Over the years, cases of landlords evicting tenants who complain about housing conditions have been widely documented by housing charities and the media. In response, the Deregulation Act 2015 introduced protection for tenants by prohibiting landlords from serving such notices for a period of six months after receiving an improvement notice from a local authority.<sup>2</sup> Although this has been seen as an improvement, it reveals that tenants are highly dependent on the quality of enforcement provided by local authorities once they make a complaint.

## **The power imbalance between central and local government and its impacts on London**

The main tools available to local authorities for enforcing housing conditions in both the PRS and the owner-occupied sector were introduced by the New Labour government (1997–2010) in the Housing Act 2004. New Labour endorsed the

earlier deregulation of the sector initiated by the Conservative Party and created regulation targeting only the underperforming portion of the PRS (Lowe 2007), after it was acknowledged that the sector contained a disproportionate amount of housing in poor condition and a sizeable portion of landlords providing poor management and profiteering from tenants (DETR 2000). This new regulatory framework comprised a system for assessing housing conditions – the Housing Health and Safety Rating System, a risk-based assessment that identifies 29 categories of hazards attributable to property conditions and the degree to which they can affect the health and safety of any potential occupier and visitor – and a new licensing model comprising three forms of licensing. The first is *mandatory licensing* for large Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs),<sup>3</sup> which then applied to HMOs with three or more storeys (including cellars, basements and loft conversions) and occupied by five or more people forming at least two households.<sup>4</sup> The other two forms of licensing are *discretionary* and include (i) *additional licensing*, which applies to smaller HMOs, and (ii) *selective licensing*, which initially applied to all privately rented properties located in areas of low housing demand but currently includes areas with high rates of properties in poor conditions or that are experiencing a rapid increase in PRS properties, inward migration or high levels of deprivation or crime.

However, it is widely known that decision-making and the systems in place for funding public services and local government in England are highly centralised. It has been argued that this high level of centralisation impacts on local democracy, as local authorities are generally seen by ministers as ‘agencies for the provision of services in accordance with national policies rather than as local government meeting the needs and aspirations of local communities and citizens’ (Stewart 2014, 846). Despite central government’s signalling to devolve more powers to local government through the Localism Act (2011) and through legislation that will allow local authorities to retain business rates and council tax, in reality, the latter often have to abide by rigid terms and conditions which limit their ability to take initiatives and innovate. Their situation is exacerbated by the fact that since 2010 they have been severely impacted by austerity measures implemented by central government which have resulted in cuts of nearly 50 per cent to local authorities’ budgets without any reduction in their statutory obligations to provide services (NAO 2018). The enforcement of housing standards is funded by local authorities’ environmental health budgets and these have been reduced by an average of 30 per cent despite the rapid growth of the PRS (LGA 2018). Consequently, many local authority enforcement teams have been reduced to a handful of officers and have just enough resources to provide basic statutory service, thus lacking capacity to take complex cases to court, particularly given the often protracted nature of the enforcement process.

The discretionary powers given to local authorities were not free from rigid conditions. On the contrary, they can only implement discretionary licensing schemes if they provide evidence that licensing is the most appropriate response

to problems in the PRS and conduct extensive public consultation. Once implemented, discretionary schemes can only run for a maximum period of five years during which their need must be occasionally reviewed. In 2010, the need for additional and selective licensing schemes to be reviewed by the Secretary of State was abolished. However, in 2015, in a move that resembles Stoker's (1991, 150) description of the Thatcher government 'setting for local authorities arbitrary and non-negotiated goals and targets', central government reintroduced this requirement for selective licensing designations covering more than 20 per cent of a local authority geographical area or more than 20 per cent of its privately rented housing stock. This change was in response to four London boroughs and Liverpool City Council rolling out district-wide selective licensing schemes. Despite much criticism for interfering in local democracy, central government defended its position, stating that:

as its name implies, selective licensing should be targeted to deal with specific local problems. Blanket licensing of all landlords may impose unnecessary costs on responsible landlords, which would be passed on to tenants in the form of higher rents. (MHCLG 2018b, para. 72)

This change in legislation has particularly affected London as some boroughs have attempted to either implement or continue with large or borough-wide selective licensing schemes to deal with a rapid increase in private renting in their areas. Soon after the legislation was passed, Redbridge Council was barred from introducing a borough-wide selective licensing scheme despite it arguing that licensing would allow it to respond more effectively to significant and persistent problems with anti-social behaviour in the PRS, crime and inward migration (Phillipson and Baker 2016). In 2017, the London Borough of Newham's application to continue with its borough-wide selective licensing scheme was approved with modifications by the Secretary of State.<sup>5</sup> Despite the outcome being considered a success because Newham's new selective licensing designation still covers 97 per cent of the borough, the decision-making process was severely criticised by the borough mayor, who stated that 'local people showed their overwhelming support for a borough-wide scheme and these decisions should be taken on the ground by local authorities who know their local area rather than ministers sitting in Whitehall' (Hopps 2017).<sup>6</sup>


The examples discussed above highlight the importance of examining the effects on Greater London of the different approaches to property licensing taken by London boroughs as these create spatial disparities in terms of housing quality, enforcement response and landlord obligations. Despite the mayor having little power over housing and no statutory powers over the PRS,<sup>7</sup> the housing crisis is London-wide, as evidenced by the fact that housing increasingly plays a central part in mayoral elections. London-wide measures to improve housing conditions in the PRS have been proposed since the 2012 elections, when it was acknowledged

that private renting had risen by 75 per cent between the 2001 and 2011 censuses. Although these initially relied on voluntary action by landlords – such as Labour Party mayoral candidate Ken Livingstone’s proposal to set up a not-for-profit London Lettings Agency (Mulholland 2011), and former mayor Boris Johnson (Conservative Party) creating the ‘London Rental Standard’, a voluntary set of rental standards which was severely criticised for accrediting only 1,800 landlords in the capital – in the 2016 mayoral election, some candidates (particularly from the Labour and Green parties) pledged to take a more interventionist approach towards the sector. The winner and current mayor, Sadiq Khan, has so far fulfilled his pledge to create a London-wide database of criminal landlords,<sup>8</sup> has been playing a coordinating role with London boroughs to share best practice in terms of enforcement of housing standards and, most importantly, has been lobbying central government for more powers to introduce rent controls and increase tenant security. These were unveiled in his blueprint for reform of the PRS (GLA 2018) which calls for devolution on the basis that ‘London’s housing market self-evidently presents particular challenges’, and in other global cities such as ‘Paris, Berlin, and New York, it is common for these powers to be devolved to a city, state or regional level to allow for appropriate local decision-making’ (33).

Mayor Sadiq Khan’s strategy revolves around the introduction of rent controls informed by a light-touch universal register of landlords intended to collect accurate data about PRS properties and rent prices. The register is supposed to work in tandem with licensing, as explained by the Mayor’s Housing Strategy: ‘landlord registration helps to ensure landlords are fulfilling their legal duties, while property licensing ensures the homes themselves meet relevant legal requirements’ (GLA 2019, para. 6.25). By doing this, it is clear that the mayor wants to tip the power balance towards the metropolitan level without interfering with local authority autonomy over licensing schemes. It is to these schemes that the chapter will now turn.

## The complex geography of licensing in London

There are multiple property licensing schemes operating across London and when these are seen together, a complex and fragmented regulatory landscape emerges. Overall, three situations are found across the capital: (i) local authorities that do not run any discretionary licensing scheme, (ii) local authorities that run either additional HMO or selective licensing schemes and (iii) local authorities that run both additional HMO and selective licensing schemes (see Figure 3.1). This fragmentation is also materialised by differing prices and the way fees are calculated,<sup>9</sup> terms and conditions, types of HMOs that qualify for additional licensing, dates that licences start and cease to operate and, most importantly, their spatial coverage. While some licensing schemes cover entire boroughs, others cover wards, portions of wards or a certain number of streets. For example, Islington Council’s



**Figure 3.1** Map of all licensing schemes operating in London (based on data from London Datastore 2017)

additional licensing scheme covers only two main roads in the borough while the London Borough of Tower Hamlets’ additional and selective licensing designations cover three wards. The complexity of this regulatory geography is evidenced by the large amount of online forum discussion and advice on the topic, as well as the existence of a website,<sup>10</sup> ‘London Property Licensing’, solely created for those looking into, as its slogan puts it, ‘making sense of property licensing in London’.

The interviews revealed that this fragmented licensing landscape reflects substantial disparities in the amount of intelligence held about the sector across London. Currently, licensing is the only instrument that allows local authorities to directly gather detailed information about the location of private rented properties and those in charge of managing them (landlords or managing agents). Without it, local authorities have to rely on stock condition surveys produced from aggregated data obtained from council tax returns, housing benefits and other sources to estimate the size of the sector and location of properties. At the time of the interviews, some of these surveys – which are commissioned to external consultancies – were

over three years old and did not capture recent fluctuations in the sector. These disparities were also reflected in the human, financial and technical capacities of private sector housing teams as the local authorities that operated schemes – especially of the selective type – were able to hire staff to work on matters related to licence registration and data analysis with the income generated from licensing, which is ring-fenced to its function only.

Regarding enforcement, the findings bear a resemblance to the results of a survey conducted by London Assembly member Caroline Pidgeon (Pidgeon 2016) which showed significant variation in enforcement activity across London, with much more vigorous work taking place in local authorities that ran borough-wide selective licensing schemes, such as the London Borough of Newham, responsible for more than two-thirds of all prosecutions in London. The interviews with officers working for local authorities that did not run discretionary schemes revealed that their teams were generally only able to carry out their statutory duty of responding to complaints: ‘they’ve been a very reactionary team. They are just about keeping their heads above water.’ Conversely, those working for local authorities that ran licensing schemes, particularly selective licensing, were able to conduct enforcement in a proactive manner as they were able to more easily identify non-compliant landlords, as noted by one officer: ‘everyone that didn’t license became conspicuous by their absence’.

Thus it can be argued that this fragmented licensing landscape is also creating a ‘postcode lottery’ in London in terms of tenant protection, landlord obligations and the overall quality of neighbourhoods. Landlords, particularly those who have more than one property, might have to license their property and adhere to certain conditions in one borough, or in one area within a borough, but not in another, and they might be fined or face prosecution if they fail to license a property in an area that requires a licence. Besides improved housing standards, tenants living in areas subject to licensing will be better protected against unfair use of a Section 21 eviction notice as these are invalidated if the landlord does not have a licence in such areas. Lastly, since licensing allows local authorities to impose certain conditions related to property standards, management, use and occupation,<sup>11</sup> officers spoke of a noticeable improvement to certain neighbourhoods due to a reduction in overcrowding, criminal activity in the PRS and fly-tipping as a result of more active enforcement in areas where licensing schemes, particularly selective licensing, are in operation.

What would the future of licensing be if the mayor’s plans come to fruition? In the interviews, local politics played a significant role in local authorities’ responses to the increase in private renting in their areas. In certain local authorities, officers reported that some councillors believed in ‘not burdening landlords’ with any type of discretionary licensing despite being aware of problems related to poor housing conditions and management in their areas. Conversely, interviews with officers working in two local authorities that had borough-wide licensing schemes revealed that there was ‘a push from the top’, referring to local

councillors reaching a consensus over the need to improve conditions in the PRS and setting aside a considerable amount of funding to initiate the licensing process despite cuts to their budgets. For this reason, there was strong support from officers for a system of compulsory registration of landlords with a universal set of terms and conditions, which most officers believed should be nationwide rather than London-wide.<sup>12</sup> In the absence of a national system, many supported the idea of a London-wide approach, with the responsibility of registration falling to the Greater London Authority and enforcement being conducted by local authorities. The removal of regulatory complexity – rather than the introduction of regulation – was seen as crucial to increase compliance and produce more effective enforcement. The view was that a system of landlord registration would render licensing redundant, exactly because of the fragmentation of rights and obligations that it currently produces as a result of central government legislation and the different terms and conditions imposed by local authorities. However, since the proposal for a register is not accompanied by a minimum standard for property conditions and management, some of the improvements to PRS properties found in licensing designation areas – which also have spillover effects to the wider community – could be potentially lost.

## Conclusion

This chapter has given an overview of the regulations governing property standards in the PRS in England and its impacts on London, where the housing crisis is most acute and where one in three households are renting privately. It argues that central government's targeted approach to regulation – focused on regulating accommodation either at the bottom end of the sector or in problematic areas – is producing a patchy licensing landscape in London. This is producing a complex geography of rights and obligations and creating disparities in the intelligence held by local authorities on the sector and their enforcement activities, with wider implications for the mayor's ability to implement his rent control policy.

The interviews also highlighted that local politics as well as austerity play an important role in local authorities' decisions to use their discretionary powers over licensing schemes – whether or not to roll them out, as well as their type and reach. If the system continues as it is, with time, the already noted disparities in terms of data and enforcement activities might become even more accentuated, as local authorities that run licensing schemes can build more capacity since the income from both licensing registration and civil penalties are ring-fenced to their respective departments.

Although one could argue that this loose and disjointed licensing landscape can be found elsewhere in England, the challenges imposed by the London housing market and the rapid increase in private renting in the capital undoubtedly call for a more London-focused response. If this response comes in the form of more powers to the mayor to introduce rent control and increase security of tenure, it

is important that property and management standards and their enforcement are also consistent across the capital in order to reduce possibilities of disinvestment in maintenance.

## Notes

1. The Decent Homes Standard was introduced in 2000 to provide a minimum standard of housing conditions in the social rented sector. In 2006, it was updated to include the Housing Health and Safety Rating System, introduced by the Housing Act 2004. The Standard only applies to the social rented sector but is used to compare property conditions in all tenures.
2. Central government recently carried out consultation on abolishing Section 21 eviction notices after it was announced that the end of a tenancy through Section 21 notices is one of the biggest causes of homelessness.
3. HMOs are residential properties where facilities such as toilets, kitchens and bathrooms are shared by more than one household. These generally fall under the category of bedsits, shared flats or houses and households with lodgers (Lowe 2007).
4. In 2018 the three-storey condition was scrapped, and requirements were added for minimum room sizes for sleeping accommodation and for the provision of refuse disposal.
5. Newham was the first council in England to implement such a scheme and it has been highly successful in disrupting criminal operation, reducing overcrowding and anti-social behaviour, and increasing tax collections from landlords' rental income (Collinson 2017).
6. Whitehall is a street in London where many government departments are located and thus is a metonym for the UK government.
7. The mayor's role is mostly confined to setting the overall amount, type and location of new housing across London in their Housing Strategy, to distributing some funding for affordable homes and to calling in planning applications that are of potential strategic importance to London – generally those with 150 residential units or more.
8. The Rogue Landlord and Agent Checker (<https://www.london.gov.uk/rogue-landlord-checker>) was launched in December 2017 and shows information from all London councils about private landlords and letting agents who have been prosecuted or fined.
9. This calculation is based on the costs of operating licensing schemes, which vary according to borough. For example, while the London Borough of Enfield charges a flat fee of £650 for mandatory licences, Bromley charges £185 per unit of accommodation at the time an application is submitted, followed by £75 per unit of accommodation once a licence is granted. This means that a mandatory licence for a five-bedroom HMO in the borough would cost £1300 ((185 x 5) + (75 x 5)).
10. See <http://www.londonpropertylicensing.co.uk>.
11. Examples include the imposition of limits on the number of occupants in a dwelling, and the requirement for the licence holder to provide details of the arrangements in place to prevent or reduce anti-social behaviour and for repairs and property management.
12. Many officers drew parallels to drivers being required to have a driving licence or business owners needing to register their businesses.

## References

- Ambrose, Aimee R. 2015. 'Improving Energy Efficiency in Private Rented Housing: Why Don't Landlords Act?'. *Indoor and Built Environment* 24(7):913–24. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1420326X15598821>.
- August, Martine and Walks, Alan. 2012. 'From Social Mix to Political Marginalization? The Redevelopment of Toronto's Public Housing and the Dilution of Tenant Organisational Power'. In *Mixed Communities: Gentrification by Stealth?*, edited by Gary Bridge, Tim Butler and Loretta Lees, 273–98. Bristol: Policy Press.
- August, Martine and Walks, Alan. 2018. 'Gentrification, Suburban Decline, and the Financialization of Multi-Family Rental Housing: The Case of Toronto'. *Geoforum* 89:124–36. Accessed 9 September 2019. <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0016718517300982>.
- Crook, Tony and Kemp, Peter A. (eds). 2014a. *Private Rental Housing: Comparative Perspectives*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

- Crook, Tony and Kemp, Peter A. 2014b. 'England'. In *Private Rental Housing: Comparative Perspectives*, edited by Tony Crook and Peter A. Kemp, 224–46. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Desmond, Matthew, Gershenson, Carl and Kiviat, Barbara. 2015. 'Forced Relocation and Residential Instability among Urban Renters'. *Social Service Review* 89(2):227–62. <https://doi.org/10.1086/681091>.
- DETR (Department of Environment, Transport and the Regions). 2000. *Quality and Choice: A Decent Home for All*. Housing Green Paper. London: HMSO.
- Faulkner, Kate and Saxena, Akansha. 2016. *The Impact of Accidental Landlords on the Private Rented Sector*. Hemel Hempstead: TDS Charitable Foundation.
- Fields, Desiree and Uffer, Sabina. 2016. 'The Financialisation of Rental Housing: A Comparative Analysis of New York City and Berlin'. *Urban Studies* 53(7):1486–502. Accessed 29 June 2017. <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0042098014543704>.
- GLA (Greater London Authority). 2018. *London Housing Strategy*. London. Accessed 17 June 2018. [https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/2018\\_lhs\\_london\\_housing\\_strategy.pdf](https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/2018_lhs_london_housing_strategy.pdf).
- GLA (Greater London Authority). 2019. *Reforming Private Renting: The Mayor of London's Blueprint. A Proposal for Reforming Tenure and Rents*. London: GLA.
- Grineski, Sara E. and Hernández, Alma Angelica. 2010. 'Landlords, Fear, and Children's Respiratory Health: An Untold Story of Environmental Injustice in the Central City'. *Local Environment* 15(3):199–216. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13549830903575562>.
- Hochstenbach, Cody. 2017. 'State-led Gentrification and the Changing Geography of Market-oriented Housing Policies'. *Housing, Theory and Society* 34(4):399–419. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14036096.2016.1271825>.
- Hoolachan, Jennifer, McKee, Kim, Moore, Tom and Soaita, Adriana Mihaela. 2017. "'Generation Rent" and the Ability to "Settle Down": Economic and Geographical Variation in Young People's Housing Transitions'. *Journal of Youth Studies* 20(1):63–78. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13676261.2016.1184241>.
- Hopps, Kat. 2017. 'Newham Council Property Licensing Scheme Renewed except for East Village, Stratford'. *Newham Recorder* 17 December. Accessed 12 October 2020. <https://www.newhamrecorder.co.uk/news/newham-council-property-licensing-scheme-renewed-except-for-east-village-stratford-1-5303494>.
- Kemp, Peter A. 2015. 'Private Renting After the Global Financial Crisis'. *Housing Studies* 30(4):601–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02673037.2015.1027671>.
- LGA (Local Government Association). 2018. *Local Government Association Briefing Debate on the Housing, Communities and Local Government Report: Private Rented Sector*. Accessed 19 January 2019. <https://www.local.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/LGA%20briefing%20-%20debate%20on%20private%20rented%20sector%20report%20-%20HC%20291118.pdf>.
- London Datastore. 2017. 'Statistical GIS Boundary Files for London'. Contains National Statistics data © Crown copyright and database right [2015] and Contains Ordnance Survey data © Crown copyright and database right [2015]. Accessed 12 August 2017. <https://data.london.gov.uk/dataset/statistical-gis-boundary-files-london>.
- Lowe, Stuart. 2007. 'The New Private Rented Sector – Regulation in a Deregulated Market'. In *The Private Rented Housing Market: Regulation or Deregulation?*, edited by David Hughes and Stuart Lowe, 1–14. Aldershot and Burlington, VT: Ashgate.
- McKee, Kim, Muir, Jenny and Moore, Tom. 2017. 'Housing Policy in the UK: The Importance of Spatial Nuance'. *Housing Studies* 32(1):60–72. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02673037.2016.1181722>.
- Marsh, Alex, Gordon, David, Pantazis, Christina and Heslop, Pauline (eds). 1999. *Home Sweet Home? The Impact of Poor Housing on Health*. Bristol: Policy Press, University of Bristol.
- MHCLG (Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government). 2018. *English Housing Survey. Headline Report, 2016–17*. London: MHCLG. Accessed 9 October 2018. [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/705821/2016-17\\_EHS\\_Headline\\_Report.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/705821/2016-17_EHS_Headline_Report.pdf).
- MHCLG (Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government). 2019a. *English Housing Survey. Headline Report, 2017–18*. London: MHCLG.
- MHCLG (Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government). 2019b. *English Housing Survey. Private Rented Sector, 2017–18*. London: MHCLG. Accessed 20 August 2019. [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/817630/EHS\\_2017-18\\_PRS\\_Report.pdf?\\_ga=2.234517399.847729822.1566579768-982615184.1561459799](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/817630/EHS_2017-18_PRS_Report.pdf?_ga=2.234517399.847729822.1566579768-982615184.1561459799).
- Mulholland, Hélène. 2011. 'Ken Livingstone Promises to Tackle Soaring London Rents If Elected'. *The Guardian*, 13 December. Accessed 8 May 2019. <https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2011/dec/13/ken-livingstone-tackle-london-rent>.
- NAO (National Audit Office). 2018. *Financial Sustainability of Local Authorities 2018*. N.p.: National Audit Office.
- Pawson, Hal, Hulse, Kath and Morris, Alan. 2017. 'Interpreting the Rise of Long-term Private Renting in a Liberal Welfare Regime Context'. *Housing Studies* 32(8):1062–84. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02673037.2017.1301400>.
- Phillipson, John and Baker, Edward. 2016. *Redbridge Selective Licensing, Evidence Base*. London: Borough of Redbridge. Accessed 22 July 2020. <https://www.redbridge.gov.uk/media/3396/redbridge-property-licensing-proposal-supporting-evidence-base-1.pdf>.

- Pidgeon, Caroline. 2016. *A Survey of Local Authority Enforcement in the Private Rented Sector*. London: Greater London Assembly. Accessed 12 September 2017. [https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/rogue\\_landlords\\_in\\_london\\_-\\_a\\_survey\\_of\\_local\\_authority\\_enforcement\\_in\\_the\\_private\\_rented\\_sector.pdf](https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/rogue_landlords_in_london_-_a_survey_of_local_authority_enforcement_in_the_private_rented_sector.pdf).
- Reynolds, Liam and de Santos, Robbie. 2013. *The Rent Trap and the Fading Dream of Owning a Home*. London: Shelter England. Accessed 22 July 2020. [https://england.shelter.org.uk/\\_\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0007/624391/Rent\\_trap\\_v4.pdf](https://england.shelter.org.uk/__data/assets/pdf_file/0007/624391/Rent_trap_v4.pdf).
- Rhodes, David and Rugg, Julie. 2018. *Vulnerability amongst Low-income Households in the Private Rented Sector in England*. York: Centre for Housing Policy, University of York.
- Roys, Mike, Davidson, Maggie, Nicol, Simon, Ormandy, David and Ambrose, Peter. 2010. *The Real Cost of Poor Housing*. Bracknell: IHS BRE Press.
- Rugg, Julie and Rhodes, David. 2008. *The Private Rented Sector: Its Contribution and Potential*. York: Centre for Housing Policy, University of York.
- Rugg, Julie and Rhodes, David. 2018. *The Evolving Private Rented Sector: Its Contribution and Potential*. York: Centre for Housing Policy, University of York.
- Savills. 2019. *Build to Rent Market Update Q2 2019*. Accessed 9 September 2019. [https://www.savills.co.uk/research\\_articles/229130/286997-0/uk-build-to-rent-market-update---q2-2019](https://www.savills.co.uk/research_articles/229130/286997-0/uk-build-to-rent-market-update---q2-2019).
- Stewart, John. 2014. 'An Era of Continuing Change: Reflections on Local Government in England 1974–2014'. *Local Government Studies* 40(6):835–50. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03003930.2014.959842>.
- Stoker, Gerry. 1991. *The Politics of Local Government*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.