

**Research Briefing**

Number CBP-8497

By ,

Wendy Wilson

15 June 2023

# Freehold houses: estate charges

<b>1</b>	<b>The legal basis of estate charges</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Freeholders' concerns</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Government approved redress schemes</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Government proposals</b>	<b>5</b>
4.1	A right to challenge estate charges and a right to manage	5
4.2	The New Homes Ombudsman	7
4.3	Regulating property managers	8
<b>5</b>	<b>Housing, Communities and Local Government (HCLG) Select Committee inquiry 2017-19</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Parliamentary debate</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>Competition and Markets Authority (CMA) investigation 2023</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>Devolved administrations</b>	<b>15</b>

## 1 Summary

It is standard practice for long leaseholders in blocks of flats to pay a service charge to cover the cost of maintaining the building and any common areas. Long leaseholders have statutory rights in terms of information about service charges and an ability to challenge the reasonableness of the charges, and/or whether the service provided is of a reasonable standard, at a First-Tier Tribunal (Property Chamber) or the Leasehold Valuation Tribunal in Wales.

It has become increasingly common on new-build private estates for freeholders to be required to contribute to the maintenance of the estate's communal areas and facilities.

These owners do not have equivalent rights to leaseholders in terms of information about charges and a right to challenge the level of the charges. The practice has been referred to as 'fleecehold'.

This short paper provides background on this issue and sets out the Government's proposals for reform. Legislation will be introduced "[when Parliamentary time allows](#)".

The paper mainly covers England. Section 8 covers Wales.

# 1 The legal basis of estate charges

It is relatively common for private estates with freehold houses<sup>1</sup> to include a provision in the deed of transfer which places a duty on the owners to contribute to the maintenance of the estate's communal areas and facilities. The deed of transfer should state:

- What the freeholder is expected to contribute towards.
- The proportion of costs they should pay.
- Dates on which payment is due.

---

<sup>1</sup> The estates may form a mixture of freehold houses and leasehold flats.

Alternatively, liability might arise through an estate rent charge which forms part of the purchase contract.

The then-Housing Minister, Kit Malthouse, outlined how these arrangements might arise as part of a planning condition in a PQ response of 12 December 2018:

Developers of new estates may voluntarily provide open spaces for residents or be required, as a planning condition, to include public open spaces and make provision for its future upkeep. It is up to developers and local planning authorities to agree appropriate funding arrangements for those developments where public open space is a planning condition.<sup>2</sup>

The Government published a consultation paper in July 2017, [Tackling unfair practices in the leasehold market](#), which described the different ways in which arrangements for estate charges can be structured:

The developer can set up a Residents' Management Company that owns the communal areas and facilities. The Residents' Management Company may upkeep the communal areas and facilities itself or employ a managing agent to act on its behalf. Alternatively, the developer can retain the ownership of the communal areas and facilities, and the responsibility for their maintenance. As in the case of a Residents' Management Company, the developer can carry out the maintenance directly or through a managing agent, who is accountable to the developer under the terms of the management contract. However, other approaches may be used to provide for the long-term management of shared areas and facilities.<sup>3</sup>

## 2

## Freeholders' concerns

It is a bone of contention amongst freeholder owners that they have limited rights to challenge the level of charges and the standard of service provided. Rights which may be conferred in the deeds or in common law can be contrasted with the statutory rights leaseholders have to challenge the same charges and management standards. The Association of Residential Managing Agents (ARMA) published an advice note for freeholders in this position: [Freehold houses on private estates](#) (revised August 2022).

Helen Goodman MP summarised freeholders' complaints during a Westminster Hall debate on [Freehold Estate Fees](#) which took place on 22 January 2019:

---

<sup>2</sup> [PQ 198765 \[Service Charges\], 12 December 2018](#)

<sup>3</sup> Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG), [Tackling unfair practices in the leasehold market](#), July 2017, para 6.2

There needs to be more transparency and a system of redress, as my hon. Friend says. There also need to be some rules of the game about the standard to which the estates are built in the first instance. The management companies charge residents an inflated annual fee—in exchange, apparently, for tending to grassy areas, shrubs and other facilities on the estate. That is on top of their council tax.

This is a scandal. There has clearly been mis-selling. The public perception of freehold is deliberately exploited by the property companies in their sales materials. Many homebuyers are not made aware of the arrangements for the management of open spaces until the completion of the sale. One of my constituents reported that the first they had heard of their management company, which was Greenbelt, was a threatening late payment letter. They had not received a bill, let alone a welcome pack.

There is no room in the glossy brochure for an outline of the legal arrangements, but there always seems to be plenty of space for images of parks, playgrounds and woodland areas, backed up by verbal assurances from the sales rep that they are planned for the estate. Those promises are then broken and the land is passed or sold on to the maintenance company.

For example, at DurhamGate, a large housing development in Spennymoor in my constituency, the plans promised a “green spine” running through the centre of the site. Several years in, and with the site still under construction, residents are being hit with a full-price fee of £120 a year. Another of my constituents reported receiving a maintenance bill for a parking area that did not exist. The fees charged to residents for the maintenance of their estates are high, rising, uncapped and completely unregulated.

In Bishop Auckland, the annual fee for each household is somewhere between £100 and £200 a year, depending on the site. At first that does not sound too onerous, but when we consider that 278 neighbours on the estate are also paying the fee, it is obviously a grossly excessive £30,000 just for mowing some grass. In other parts of the country, in line with higher house prices, fees can be up to £400 or £600; I have even heard of fees of £800 a year. There is no limit to price increases and residents frequently report an annual leap in the fee. As my hon. Friends have said, there is no transparency and little accountability.<sup>4</sup>

There were several references during this debate to freeholders who are required to pay for services they believe should be covered by their Council Tax payments. Section 6 provides the Government position on this issue.

---

<sup>4</sup> [HC Deb 22 January 2019 c121WH](#)

## 3 Government approved redress schemes

Where the charge is collected by a property agent in England an affected freeholder may be able to raise a complaint through the relevant redress scheme. Managing and property agents in England have had to be a member of a Government approved redress scheme since 1 October 2014.<sup>5</sup>

The Regulations provide for complaints against members of the scheme to be investigated and determined by an independent person. Local authorities are empowered to enforce compliance by imposing a fine of up to £5,000 on a non-compliant agent, with a right of appeal to the First-Tier Tribunal. For additional information see: [Lettings agents and property managers: which government approved redress scheme do you belong to?](#)<sup>6</sup>

## 4 Government proposals

### 4.1 A right to challenge estate charges and a right to manage

[Tackling unfair practices in the leasehold market](#) (July 2017) asked for views on whether the Government should “promote solutions” which would provide freeholders with equivalent rights to leaseholders to challenge the level of charges and the standard of service provided.<sup>7</sup>

The consultation paper said: “the Government wants to promote appropriate rights for all freeholders living on private estates to challenge the reasonableness of service charges.”<sup>8</sup>

In [Tackling unfair practices in the leasehold market: government response](#) (December 2017) the Government said it would legislate:

...to ensure that freeholders who pay charges for the maintenance of communal areas and facilities on a private or mixed use estate can access

---

<sup>5</sup> [The Redress Scheme for Lettings Agency Work and Property Management Work \(Requirement to Belong to a Scheme etc\) \(England\) Order 2014](#) (SI 2014/2359)

<sup>6</sup> Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities, [Lettings agents and property managers: which government approved redress scheme do you belong to?](#), updated August 2018

<sup>7</sup> DCLG, [Tackling unfair practices in the leasehold market](#), July 2017, para 6.5

<sup>8</sup> As above, para 6.5

equivalent rights as leaseholders to challenge the reasonableness of service charges.<sup>9</sup>

In part 4 of a further consultation paper, [Implementing reforms to the leasehold system in England](#) (October 2018) the Government confirmed an intention to “replicate consultation requirements and obligations on the provider of services to provide information to the freeholder.”<sup>10</sup> The paper posed the following questions:

- How we give freeholders an equivalent right to leaseholders so they can challenge the reasonableness of service charges levied through a deed of covenant or an estate rent charge;
- Whether there are any justifiable reasons why freeholders should not have a mechanism to change the provider of the services covered by a deed of covenant or an estate rent charge. In particular whether a right to apply to the tribunal to appoint a new manager is appropriate; and
- What the impact of these changes would be on companies or bodies that provide the long term management of communal areas and facilities.<sup>11</sup>

The outcome of the consultation was published on 27 June 2019:

[Implementing reforms to the leasehold system in England: summary of consultation responses and government response](#). The Government committed to:

- **Equal rights for freeholders:** we will legislate to give freeholders on private and mixed tenure estates equivalent rights to leaseholders to challenge the reasonableness of estate rent charges (replicating relevant provisions in the Landlord and Tenant Act 1985) as well as a right to apply to the First-tier Tribunal to appoint a new manager to manage the provision of services covered by estate rent charges (replicating relevant provisions of the Landlord and Tenant Act 1987).
- **Right to Manage for freeholders:** we will consider introducing a Right to Manage for residential freeholders after the Law Commission has reported to the Government (on their review of Right to Manage for leaseholders) as part of creating greater parity between leaseholders and residential freeholders.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> DCLG, [Tackling unfair practices in the leasehold market: government response](#), December 2017, para 80

<sup>10</sup> Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG), [Implementing reforms to the leasehold system in England, 15 October 2018, para 4.4](#)

<sup>11</sup> MHCLG, [Implementing reforms to the leasehold system in England, 15 October 2018, section 4](#)

<sup>12</sup> MHCLG, [Implementing reforms to the leasehold system in England: summary of consultation responses and government response, 27 June 2019, p9](#)

The Law Commission's final report: [Leasehold home ownership: exercising the Right to Manage](#) was published on 21 July 2020.

On 15 December 2021, then-Housing Minister, Eddie Hughes, responded to a PQ on estate charges:

The Government also intends to give freeholders on private and mixed tenure estates equivalent rights to leaseholders to challenge the reasonableness of estate rentcharges, as well as a right to apply to the First-tier Tribunal to appoint a new manager to manage the provision of services. In addition, we will ensure that where a freeholder pays a rentcharge, the rentcharge owner is not able to take possession or grant a lease on the property where the rentcharge remains unpaid for a short period of time. We will translate these measures into law when parliamentary time allows.<sup>13</sup>

There is no timetable for the introduction of the promised legislation. The Housing Minister, Rachel Maclean, responded to a PQ on timing on 30 May 2023:

We want to make estate management companies more accountable to their freeholders for how their money is spent

When Parliamentary time allows, the Government intends to legislate to ensure that freehold homeowners who pay estate rentcharges have the right to challenge their reasonableness and to go to the tribunal to appoint a manager to manage the provision of services.

In addition, we will remove the statutory right for owners of rentcharges to take possession or grant a lease of the property in the event of non-payment by the homeowner.<sup>14</sup>

## 4.2 The New Homes Ombudsman

The Government included measures in the [Building Safety Act 2022](#) to require all developers of new-build homes to be members of an Ombudsman scheme.<sup>15</sup> [A factsheet](#) on the New Homes Ombudsman was published which contains background information.<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> [PQ 88845 \[Leasehold: Reform\], 15 December 2021](#)

<sup>14</sup> [PQ 186361 \[Freehold: Service Charges\], 30 May 2023](#)

<sup>15</sup> See [Building Safety Bill](#), Library briefing (CBP-9277), section 7

<sup>16</sup> Note the factsheet withdrawn on 25 July 2022 but still contains useful information.

## 4.3

## Regulating property managers

[Protecting consumers in the letting and managing agent market: call for evidence](#) (October 2017) sought views on whether an overhaul of regulation in the property agent market was needed. The call for evidence closed on 29 November 2017; the [Government response](#) was published in April 2018.<sup>17</sup>

The response included a commitment to regulate managing agents “to protect leaseholders and freeholders alike”.<sup>18</sup> A single, mandatory and legally enforceable Code of Practice covering letting and managing agents will be introduced to set minimum standards in certain key areas of activity.

Managing agents will be required to have a nationally recognised qualification to practice. An independent regulator will own the Code of Practice and will have enforcement powers. A Working Group led by Lord Best was established to develop the regulatory regime. The Group’s report was published in July 2019.<sup>19</sup> The key features of the proposed regime include:

- The regulatory framework should cover estate agents across the UK and letting and managing agents in England. All those carrying out property agency work should be regulated, including rent-to-rent firms, online agents and property guardians. Some exclusions would apply, including the short-let sector, but legislation would allow for the future extension of regulation.
- The Government should create a list of ‘reserved activities’ which can only be performed by a licensed property agent at a regulated firm.
- Property agents and qualifying agents should be required to hold and display a licence to practise from the new regulator. The regulator will check the agent has fulfilled their legal obligations and passed a fit-and-proper person test. The regulator should be able to vary licensing conditions and maintain records of licensed property agents.
- All property agents should be required to adhere to a code of practice which is described as “a single, high level set of principles applicable to all property agents which is set in statute”. Underneath would sit regulatory codes specific to various aspects of property agent practice.

---

<sup>17</sup> Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG), [Protecting consumers in the letting and managing agent market: Government response](#), April 2018

<sup>18</sup> As above.

<sup>19</sup> [Regulation of Property Agents: working group report - GOV.UK](#), July 2019

- All agents would have to ensure their staff are trained to the appropriate level. The Group recommend that licensed agents should be qualified to a minimum level 3 of Ofqual's Regulated Qualification Framework. Company directors and managing agents should be qualified to a minimum of level 4. The requirement for qualifications would apply only to licensed agents who carry out reserved activities. The regulator would set and review a modular syllabus. Continuing professional development should also be mandatory for licensed agents.
- The regulator would provide information on managing agent performance and would have a role in enforcing compliance with any new requirements in relation to leasehold/freehold charges which will apply to managing agents.
- The regulator should be a new public body which is accountable to the Secretary of State at MHCLG (now DLUHC). It should publish an annual report on progress in raising standards of property agents. Funding would come from regulated firms and individuals but initial 'seed corn' funding would be provided by the Government.
- The regulator should take over responsibility for approving property agent redress and client money protection schemes. The regulator would be able to consider complaints from all sources.
- The regulator would have a range of enforcement options from agreeing remedial actions to revocation of licences and prosecutions for unlicensed practice. Rights of appeal would apply to the First-Tier Tribunal.<sup>20</sup>

The Group recommended the new regulator should be given a statutory duty to ensure transparency of leaseholder and freeholder charges, and should work with the sector (property agents, developers, and consumers) to draw up the detail of the regulatory codes to underpin this aim as it applies to property agents.<sup>21</sup>

On 15 May 2023, the Housing Minister, Rachel Maclean, responded to a PQ on the regulation of property managing agents saying:

The Government is considering the recommendations in the final report on the regulation of property agents from Lord Best's working group. We will continue to work with industry on improving best practice. Announcements will be set out in the usual way.<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> As above, pp3-6

<sup>21</sup> As above, p4

<sup>22</sup> [PQ 183794 \[Property Management Companies: Regulation\] 15 May 2023](#)

## 5

# Housing, Communities and Local Government (HCLG) Select Committee inquiry 2017-19

The HCLG Select Committee launched [an inquiry into leasehold reform](#) on 24 July 2018. The [Committee's report](#) was published on 19 March 2019.<sup>23</sup> Although the inquiry focused on leasehold reform, the final report included recommendations on charges paid by freeholders.

The Committee commented on 'permission fees' in relation to new-build freehold dwellings:

The growing practice of imposing permission fees in the deeds of new-build freehold properties and enfranchised former-leasehold properties is an unjustified intrusion upon homeowners which many campaigners have rightly referred to as 'fleecehold'. The Government should require that permission fees are only ever included in the deeds of freehold properties where they are reasonable and absolutely necessary, although we cannot think of any circumstances in which they would be so.<sup>24</sup>

The [Government response \(PDF\)](#), published on 3 July 2019, agreed "in principle" on the subject of permission fees but could see some circumstances where these fees should be required for freehold properties:

The Regulation of Property Agents working group chaired by Lord Best will consider in what circumstances such fees are justified and whether they should be capped or banned. The Regulation of Property Agents working group is expected to report back to Ministers later this summer. The Government will consider recommendations made by the working group alongside those made by the Committee on leasehold and freehold fees and charges, and we will consult as necessary.<sup>25</sup>

The Committee also recommended clear agreement before a development starts between developers and local authorities on the question of areas to be adopted by local authorities and said: "These details must be provided to prospective purchasers at the start of the sales process."<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup> Housing, Communities and Local Government Select Committee, [Leasehold Reform](#), 19 March 2019, HC 1468 2017-19.

<sup>24</sup> As above, para 138

<sup>25</sup> [Government response to the Housing, Communities and Local Government Select Committee report on Leasehold Reform \(82OKB, PDF\)](#), CP 99, 3 July 2019, para 65

<sup>26</sup> Housing, Communities and Local Government Select Committee, [Leasehold Reform](#), 19 March 2019, HC 1468 2017-19, para 160

The [Government response \(PDF\)](#) pointed to the fact that local authorities can use conditions or section 106 planning obligations to secure commitments from developers on the maintenance of open and communal spaces on new developments. This means authorities do not have to adopt and maintain the land at their own expense and “it is up to developers and the local planning authority to agree appropriate funding arrangements as part of these commitments.”<sup>27</sup>

There was a commitment to update guidance on planning obligations and conditions “to reaffirm that there should be a clear agreement between developers and local authorities about public areas and utilities that are to be adopted.”<sup>28</sup> The Government agreed potential purchasers should be clear about arrangements in place for the upkeep of open spaces and roads.<sup>29</sup>

The HCLG Committee expressed support for legislation to extend the existing rights of leaseholders to challenge the fairness of fees to freeholders. The Committee supported the introduction of a standardised form “which clearly identifies the individual parts that make up the overall charge”.<sup>30</sup>

The Government response also referred to the work of Lord Best’s Regulation of Property Agents Working Group which recommended the introduction of a standardised form for service charges and permission fees.<sup>31</sup> The Government committed to considering the Committee’s recommendations alongside those of the Working Group and to consult as necessary.<sup>32</sup>

## 6 Parliamentary debate

Helen Goodman presented the [Freehold Properties \(Management Charges and Shared Facilities\) Bill 2017-19](#) on 14 November 2018 under the Ten Minute Rule procedure. The Bill’s purpose was the:

...regulation of fees charged by management companies to freeholders of residential properties; to make provision for self-management of shared

---

<sup>27</sup> [Government response to the Housing, Communities and Local Government Select Committee report on Leasehold Reform \(82OKB, PDF\)](#), CP 99, 3 July 2019, para 72

<sup>28</sup> As above, para 73

<sup>29</sup> As above.

<sup>30</sup> Housing, Communities and Local Government Select Committee, [Leasehold Reform](#), 19 March 2019, HC 1468 2017-19, para 163

<sup>31</sup> [Regulation of Property Agents: working group report - GOV.UK](#), July 2019

<sup>32</sup> [Government response to the Housing, Communities and Local Government Select Committee report on Leasehold Reform \(82OKB, PDF\)](#), CP 99, 3 July 2019, para 75

facilities by such freeholders; to require management companies to ensure shared facilities are of an adequate standard; and for connected purposes.<sup>33</sup>

When asked whether the Government would support the Bill, then-Minister, Heather Wheeler, referred to the existing commitment to legislate and said: “We will consider our position on the Ten Minute Rule Bill once the detail has been published.”<sup>34</sup>

During her Westminster Hall debate on 22 January 2019, Helen Goodman called for the Government to go further:

Legislation to improve access to dispute resolution is helpful, but it does not tackle the root problem. The Freehold Properties (Management Charges and Shared Facilities) Bill, which I introduced in November, recommended three changes for homeowners who are already caught in this trap. First, it would cap and regulate estate maintenance fees, to give homeowners financial stability and allow them to buy and sell their homes knowing that costs cannot increase indefinitely. Secondly, it would introduce measures to ensure that shared spaces are maintained to a proper standard, perhaps through something similar to the new homes ombudsman. Thirdly, it would contain provisions for residents if they chose to opt out of their management company and to self-manage, if that was what they wanted to do.

For estates yet to be built, the planning regulations need to be tightened, to require them to be built to an adoptable standard. Local authorities are currently often willing to adopt spaces in exchange for an agreed sum from the developer to cover upkeep for a fixed period. For example, Durham County Council asked for 15 years’ worth. That is a reasonable ask of an industry that can afford to pay its chief executive officer bonuses of £75 million.

Many of these estates were built with support from the Government’s Help to Buy scheme, financed by taxpayers. I would like the Minister to tell us this afternoon that the Government are going to stop providing support to any development using that model. Will the Minister also refer the mis-selling aspect of this to the Financial Conduct Authority to investigate, and to the Law Society, to strike off lawyers who have worked unethically in the interests of property dealers while taking fees and purporting to work for homebuyers?

A situation has arisen whereby the private estates model is rapidly becoming the norm for new developments, with those who have saved hard for their homes bearing an unfair burden and builders treating them as a cash cow. Homeowners do not want sympathy and understanding. They want action, and they would like to see action now. I hope the Minister will be able to make a clear, timetabled commitment this afternoon.<sup>35</sup>

---

<sup>33</sup> [HC Deb 14 November 2018 cc324-6](#)

<sup>34</sup> [PQ 191310 \[Freehold Properties \(Management Charges and Shared Facilities\) Bill\], 20 November 2018](#)

<sup>35</sup> [HC Deb 22 January 2019 c123WH](#)

Sarah Jones questioned the impact of giving freeholders the right to challenge charges at a tribunal in light of recorded difficulties long leaseholders face when seeking to challenge service charges using the same channel:

We know from the Government's own repeated consultations on fixing the leasehold sector that the system currently in place for leaseholders is not working. People are not going to trial because they fear the complexity and potential cost of the process. Property companies turning up with teams of lawyers make an imbalance and a mockery of the system.

[...]

Why are the Government presenting access to tribunals as the solution when that has abjectly failed to stop abuses in the leasehold sector?<sup>36</sup>

Responding to the debate, the Minister reiterated the intention to extend leaseholders' rights to challenge service charges to freeholders and said the Government was considering "whether freeholders should have a right to change the provider of maintenance services by applying to the tribunal for the appointment of a new manager".<sup>37</sup>

The Minister provided a detailed response to the question of whether the services freeholders are required to pay for should be met by Council Tax contributions:

It has been argued that local authorities should be compelled to adopt all communal facilities on a new estate. At this point it is worth pausing to consider planning arrangements and how they support new developments. When a new development is granted planning permission, local authorities can use conditions, or a section 106 planning obligation, to secure a commitment from developers to provide and maintain open and communal space. This means that the local authority does not have to adopt or maintain the land at its own expense.

It is up to developers and the local planning authority to agree appropriate funding arrangements as part of those commitments. Conditions and planning obligations cannot, however, currently be used to compel local authorities to do something. The local authority has powers to ensure that developers build and maintain communal facilities to the standards and quality set out in the planning permission. In terms of roads, local highways authorities are responsible for the maintenance of local public roads in England. A decision on whether to adopt a road is a matter for the local highway authority and the Government have no direct role in that process.

It has been suggested that freeholders who pay these charges should receive a rebate in their council tax. We think that argument is misplaced. The amount

---

<sup>36</sup> [HC Deb 22 January 2019 cc129-30WH](#)

<sup>37</sup> [HC Deb 22 January 2019 c131WH](#)

of council tax due from each of us is not adjusted to reflect the specific level of services we receive as residents of the area. Instead, the level of council tax helps the authority to deliver a broad range of services to the wider community in its area. It is open to local authorities to offer council tax discounts to individuals or groups of taxpayers. This is an entirely local decision.

In the end, all these matters have to be paid for. There is only so much money that can be extracted from a particular housing development. It is therefore at the discretion of local authorities to decide the balance of 106, the cost to them of adopting measures, and where and when maintenance should fall on residents rather than on the local authority.

It should always be clear to potential purchasers what the arrangements are for the upkeep of open space and the maintenance of roads. However, we do not think that requiring local authorities to adopt all communal facilities on new developments is the right approach. It removes local flexibility and, in our view, sends the wrong message to developers about their responsibilities.<sup>38</sup>

Helen Goodman said she would take the matter up with the Financial Conduct Authority.<sup>39</sup>

Richard Fuller led an [adjournment debate on freehold management service charges](#) on 20 April 2023 during which many of the same concerns were raised. The Housing Minister was pressed on the timing of legislation and said “this issue is top of the list of priorities for our Department”, she went on:

...We take it very seriously, and we fully intend to bring forward legislation to implement the changes as soon as parliamentary time allows. That is the plan, and we remain committed to it.<sup>40</sup>

She said there had been “no dilution” of the Government’s commitments on this issue.<sup>41</sup>

## 7

### Competition and Markets Authority (CMA) investigation 2023

The CMA opened an [investigation into the housebuilding market](#) in February 2023. The note on the scope of the investigation poses questions concerning freeholder estate charges:

---

<sup>38</sup> [HC Deb 22 January 2019 c132WH](#)

<sup>39</sup> [HC Deb 22 January 2019 c134WH](#)

<sup>40</sup> [HC Deb 20 April 2023 c479](#)

<sup>41</sup> As above.

As regards charges made to freehold owners on residential estates:

- a. How transparent are estate charges and covenants (including how they may change over time) to prospective house buyers on freehold estates at all stages up to the point of sale?
- b. What influence (if any) do homeowners have over the companies managing their estates?
- c. Post-sale, what safeguards exist to ensure the quality of the management service or that the estate charges applied are fair, reasonable, and transparent?
- d. Are freeholders' rights (including to redress) in relation to estate management services and charges, and how covenants are applied, adequate? If not, what are the key gaps?<sup>42</sup>

The Leasehold Knowledge Partnership is encouraging affected freeholders to submit evidence to the investigation.<sup>43</sup>

## 8 Devolved administrations

### Wales

Freehold estate charges were [debated in the Welsh Assembly](#) following a Member's Legislative Proposal on 14 March 2018. The proposal suggested bringing in similar reforms to those consulted on in England. The motion was agreed; the responding Minister said the Welsh Government would create a "task and finish group" to look at the matter.

The task and finish group published its report, [Residential Leasehold Reform: A Task and Finish Group Report](#), in July 2019. It suggested several options for reform which are set out on pages 8-9 of the report.

Julie James AM, then-Minister for Housing and Local Government, launched a [Call for Evidence](#) on estate charges on 6 February 2020.<sup>44</sup> She highlighted the issue of poor management of leasehold properties and said:

To address this I have commissioned work to develop a new accreditation scheme for those companies which are engaged in the management of leasehold properties as well as housing developments where estate charges

---

<sup>42</sup> CMA, [Statement of scope](#) (PDF) February 2023, p28

<sup>43</sup> [Property rip-off 'Whack-a-mole': Now it's your chance to tell CMA about freehold - Leasehold Knowledge Partnership](#), 13 March 2023 [accessed on 15 June 2023]

<sup>44</sup> [Estate charges on housing developments](#) [accessed on 18 December 2021]

are in use. The scheme will be voluntary in the first instance with a view to it becoming mandatory in the future.<sup>45</sup>

[A summary of responses to the Call for Evidence](#) (November 2020) described the next steps:

It is clear from the evidence provided that the practice of estate charges does not work effectively for everyone under the current arrangements. The Minister will therefore use the evidence that has been gathered to consider the areas where change is needed and the potential options which may be available to make those changes.

This is just the start of a change process and any changes proposed or considered will be developed in conjunction with the industry and would be subject to further formal consultation and stakeholder engagement affording a further opportunity for feedback.<sup>46</sup>

The [Welsh Government Programme for Government](#) contains a commitment to “Ensure that estate charges for public open spaces and facilities are paid for in a way that is fair.”<sup>47</sup> The Minister for Climate Change responded to a question about unfair freehold charges on 5 May 2022:

We are committed to addressing the issue of unfair estate charges as reflected in our Programme for Government (<https://gov.wales/programme-for-government-2021-to-2026>).

I have previously set out my intention to include estate management companies within our plans to introduce a mandatory registration and licensing scheme for residential property management. Doing so will provide for much greater oversight and accountability in relation to the activities of these companies.

I have also committed to working with the UK Government to introduce legislation on a Wales and England basis that will give freeholders equivalent rights to leaseholders in relation to such matters. This would include the right to apply to a tribunal to challenge the fairness of estate charges, and to appoint a new manager to manage the provision of services covered by estate rent charges. My expectation is that legislation introduced later in the current Westminster Parliament, in relation to the implementation of the Law Commission’s recommendations on leasehold and commonhold, will include these extra protections for freeholders.

The UK Government has also announced its intention to repeal Section 121 of the Law of Property Act 1925 to ensure homeowners are not subjected to unfair

---

<sup>45</sup> [Written Statement: Response to Report of the Task and Finish Group on Leasehold Reform](#), 6 February 2020

<sup>46</sup> [Estate charges on housing developments](#), November 2020, p3 [accessed on 18 December 2021]

<sup>47</sup> [The Welsh Government Programme for Government](#), June 2021 (updated December 2021), p12

possession orders as a consequence of unpaid estate charges. My intention is that that this reform should also be applied in Wales as well as in England.

Although it is usually my preference to make legislative change for Wales in the Senedd, I believe that pursuing these joint measures through a Bill introduced in the UK Parliament will be the most efficient route to change. Such a Bill would, of course, be subject to the legislative consent of the Senedd. If for any reason UK Parliamentary legislation is not forthcoming, or suitable for the needs of residents in Wales, I will consider alternative means to achieve a better outcome for those for those currently subject to estate management charges.<sup>48</sup>

## Scotland

Estate charges are also an issue in Scotland. Scottish factoring provisions can provide a remedy (the removal of the management company) in certain circumstances. For more information, see [Property factors - mygov.scot](https://mygov.scot).<sup>49</sup>

## Northern Ireland

The issue does not appear to have arisen in Northern Ireland.

---

<sup>48</sup> Written question from Rhys ab Owen (tabled 22 April 2022: [WQ85002](#))

<sup>49</sup> [accessed 15 June 2023].

### Disclaimer

The Commons Library does not intend the information in our research publications and briefings to address the specific circumstances of any particular individual. We have published it to support the work of MPs. You should not rely upon it as legal or professional advice, or as a substitute for it. We do not accept any liability whatsoever for any errors, omissions or misstatements contained herein. You should consult a suitably qualified professional if you require specific advice or information. Read our briefing '[Legal help: where to go and how to pay](#)' for further information about sources of legal advice and help. This information is provided subject to the conditions of the Open Parliament Licence.

### Feedback

Every effort is made to ensure that the information contained in these publicly available briefings is correct at the time of publication. Readers should be aware however that briefings are not necessarily updated to reflect subsequent changes.

If you have any comments on our briefings please email [papers@parliament.uk](mailto:papers@parliament.uk). Please note that authors are not always able to engage in discussions with members of the public who express opinions about the content of our research, although we will carefully consider and correct any factual errors.

You can read our feedback and complaints policy and our editorial policy at [commonslibrary.parliament.uk](https://commonslibrary.parliament.uk). If you have general questions about the work of the House of Commons email [hcenquiries@parliament.uk](mailto:hcenquiries@parliament.uk).

The House of Commons Library is a research and information service based in the UK Parliament. Our impartial analysis, statistical research and resources help MPs and their staff scrutinise legislation, develop policy, and support constituents.

Our published material is available to everyone on [commonslibrary.parliament.uk](https://commonslibrary.parliament.uk).

Get our latest research delivered straight to your inbox. Subscribe at [commonslibrary.parliament.uk/subscribe](https://commonslibrary.parliament.uk/subscribe) or scan the code below:



 [commonslibrary.parliament.uk](https://commonslibrary.parliament.uk)

 [@commonslibrary](https://twitter.com/commonslibrary)