



**BRIEFING PAPER**

Number 2121, 2 September 2019

# Tenancy deposit schemes

By Wendy Wilson  
Cassie Barton

**Contents:**

1. Statutory Tenancy Deposit Protection Schemes (TDP)
2. Case law and responses since 2010
3. Attempts to amend the *Housing and Planning Bill 2015-16*
4. Caps on deposits payable
5. Deposit protection in Scotland and Northern Ireland
6. Ongoing issues
7. Statistics



# TENANCY AGREEMENT

# Contents

<b>Summary</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1. Statutory Tenancy Deposit Protection Schemes (TDP)</b>	<b>4</b>
1.1 Background (England and Wales)	4
1.2 The statutory TDP scheme: April 2007 onwards	4
The insurance-based scheme	5
The custodial scheme	6
1.3 Alternative dispute resolution (ADR) vs the courts	7
1.4 Implications of failing to protect a deposit	8
1.5 Accountability & financial stability of TDP scheme operators	8
<b>2. Case law and responses since 2010</b>	<b>10</b>
2.1 Court of Appeal ruling November 2010	10
Late compliance with deposit protection and prescribed information	10
2.2 <i>Superstrike Ltd v Rodrigues 2013</i>	13
Tenancies beginning before 6 April 2007 and renewals after this date	13
2.3 <i>Charalambous &amp; Anor v Maureen Rosairie Ng &amp; Anor [2014]</i>	15
Tenancies and renewals beginning before 6 April 2007	15
<b>3. Attempts to amend the Housing and Planning Bill 2015-16</b>	<b>17</b>
Notification of 'relevant persons'	17
Electronic communication of prescribed information	17
Absent tenants/landlords	17
Government review of TDP	18
Access to tenancy deposit information for local authorities (England)	19
<b>4. Caps on deposits payable</b>	<b>20</b>
4.1 England	20
4.2 Scotland	20
4.3 Wales	20
4.4 Northern Ireland	21
<b>5. Deposit protection in Scotland and Northern Ireland</b>	<b>21</b>
5.1 Scotland	21
5.2 Northern Ireland	21
<b>6. Ongoing issues</b>	<b>23</b>
Non-compliance and lack of enforcement	23
Insurance-based TDP: loopholes and abuses	24
Affordability and transferability of deposits	25
Landlord concerns	26
Tenancy deposit reform: a call for evidence (June 2019)	27
<b>7. Statistics</b>	<b>28</b>
7.1 Number and value of deposits protected	28
7.2 Disputes	29

Contributing Authors: Alexander Bellis

## Summary

In June 1998 the National Association of Citizens Advice Bureaux (NACAB) published a report based on CAB clients' experience of the payment of deposits. In the light of evidence highlighting the difficulties faced by tenants trying to reclaim their deposits from private landlords, NACAB concluded that the case for reform was "overwhelming" and that the failure to regulate deposits damaged the image and reputation of the private rented sector.

Provisions were added to the *Housing Act 2004* to place a duty on 'the appropriate national authority' to establish at least one statutory tenancy deposit scheme. Tenancy deposit protection schemes (TDP) became operational from 6 April 2007 in respect of assured shorthold tenancies (AST) created in England and Wales after that date. Landlords/agents are required to protect tenants' deposits, failure to do this can result in the imposition of financial penalties. A guide to dealing with disputes about deposits has been published by operators of the TDP schemes: [Guide to deposits, disputes and damages](#) (revised June 2017).

There were around 3.7 million deposits protected in England and Wales at the end of March 2018, with a total value of around £4.16 billion, according to [statistics published by the Tenancy Deposit Scheme](#).

Scotland and Northern Ireland have also legislated to make protecting deposits mandatory. The end result is similar in all constituent parts of the UK.

The legislation governing mandatory TDP in England and Wales has been modified several times. The *Localism Act 2011* amended (with effect from 6 April 2012) sections 213 and 214 of the *Housing Act 2004* to resolve issues arising from several court cases. The amendments ensured that landlords who had failed to protect a deposit could continue to serve a section 21 notice to terminate an AST if they did, eventually, protect the deposit. The changes also made it clearer that late protection of a deposit would be subject to a financial penalty determined by the courts.

*The Deregulation Act 2015* tackled further issues arising from case law. The Act clarified that, for those tenancies starting before 6 April 2007 but renewed or rolling into a statutory periodic tenancy after that date, any initial deposits received would need to be protected by a TDP. This Act also provided that a section 21 notice could not be served if a deposit was not protected, even if the tenancy (AST or statutory periodic) started before 6 April 2007.

Further attempts to amend the TDP were made as the *Housing and Planning Act 2016* progressed through Parliament. None of the proposed amendments were made. Most recently, the *Tenant Fees Act 2019* has placed a cap on the amount that tenants can be required to pay in the form of a security deposit in England.

Critics of the TDP point to the number of non-compliant landlords; the length of time it can take to resolve disputes; as well as persistent loopholes and abuses of the schemes. In June 2019 the Government launched a [call for evidence](#) with the aim of understanding the barriers tenants face providing a second deposit when moving from one tenancy to another. Submissions are accepted up to 5 September 2019.

This briefing paper explains the duty on landlords to protect tenants' deposits and summarises how the schemes operate.

# 1. Statutory Tenancy Deposit Protection Schemes (TDP)

## 1.1 Background (England and Wales)

The *draft Housing Bill 2002-03*, which was subject to pre-legislative scrutiny by the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) Housing, Planning, Local Government and the Regions Select Committee,<sup>1</sup> did not contain provisions to introduce a mandatory TDP scheme but the Committee concluded that there was a case for such a scheme.<sup>2</sup> The Government's response to the Committee's report was published on 10 November 2003.<sup>3</sup> The Government, at that time, did not agree that a statutory tenancy deposit scheme should be included in the forthcoming *Housing Bill* on the grounds that more time was needed to work up proposals.<sup>4</sup>

The *Housing Bill 2003-04* was presented on 8 December 2003. The original Bill did not contain measures to introduce a statutory TDP. During the Commons Committee Stage an amendment was moved that would have placed a duty on the 'appropriate national authority' to introduce a mandatory tenancy deposit scheme within 12 months of the Act coming into force.<sup>5</sup> The then Minister for Housing, Keith Hill, reiterated the Government's commitment to consider the case for legislation alongside the Law Commission's proposals.<sup>6</sup>

However, on 19 May 2004 the then Minister announced that amendments *would* be added to the *Housing Bill* in respect of tenancy deposits.<sup>7</sup> Thus provisions to enable the establishment of mandatory tenancy deposit schemes were added to the *Housing Bill*: these provisions can be found in Chapter 4 and Schedule 10 to the *Housing Act 2004*.

## 1.2 The statutory TDP scheme: April 2007 onwards

Since 6 April 2007 tenancy deposit protection has applied to all newly created assured shorthold tenancies in England and Wales where a deposit is taken.<sup>8</sup> There are two main aims:

---

<sup>1</sup> Cm 5793

<sup>2</sup> [HC 751-1](#), ODPM: Housing, Planning, Local Government and the Regions Committee, *The Draft Housing Bill*, Tenth Report of Session 2002-03, pp 64-65, para 196

<sup>3</sup> Cm 6000

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, para 64

<sup>5</sup> The full debate on this amendment (which was ultimately withdrawn) can be accessed online (scroll down to column 690) SC(E) 24 February 2004 cc690-713

<sup>6</sup> SC(E) 24 February 2004 c705

<sup>7</sup> HC Deb 19 May 2004 cc51-2WS

<sup>8</sup> Assured shorthold tenancies are the standard type of private sector tenancy in England and Wales – there were around 1.7 million such tenancies in existence in 2006. These tenancies are governed by Part 1 of the *1988 Housing Act*.

- To ensure good practise in deposit handling, so that when a tenant pays a deposit, and is entitled to get it back, they can be assured that this will happen.
- To assist with the resolution of disputes by having an alternative dispute resolution (ADR) service. It should also encourage tenants and landlords to have in place, from the outset, clear agreement on the condition of the property though appropriate use of inventories.

Landlords are required to join a statutory TDP scheme if they take deposits off assured shorthold tenants. Failure to comply can result in a penalty charge.<sup>9</sup> Tenants can get all or part of their deposit back if they have kept the property in good condition and meet the requirements for the return of the deposit. The scheme offers alternative ways of resolving disputes which aim to be faster and cheaper than taking court action.

Landlords are able to choose between two types of scheme:

- A **custodial scheme**, in which the deposit is held by the scheme. This is free to join and is funded by the interest generated by deposits.
- An **insurance-based scheme**, in which the landlord keeps the deposit and pays a fee to the scheme.

In each scheme the deposit must be returned within 10 days of the end of the tenancy, provided the landlord and tenant have agreed the amount to be returned.

A guide to dealing with disputes over deposits has been published by the three operators of the TDP schemes: [Guide to deposits, disputes and damages](#).<sup>10</sup>

## The insurance-based scheme

- The tenant pays the deposit to the landlord.
- The landlord retains the deposit and pays a premium to the insurer.
- Within 30 days<sup>11</sup> of receiving a deposit, the landlord must give the tenant information about the scheme being used.<sup>12</sup>
- At the end of the tenancy, if the landlord and tenant agree how the deposit should be divided, the landlord returns all or some of the deposit. In England and Wales, this should happen within 10 working days; in Scotland and Northern Ireland it is 5 working days.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> See section 4.1 of this note concerning a Court of Appeal ruling on the penalty payable and amendments introduced by the *Localism Act 2011* from 6 April 2012.

<sup>10</sup> Revised in June 2017.

<sup>11</sup> Originally 14 days but this was extended with effect from 6 April 2012 - see section 2.6 of this note.

<sup>12</sup> [The Housing \(Tenancy Deposits\) \(Prescribed Information\) Order 2007](#) (SI 2007/797) sets out the information that a landlord must give to a tenant who has paid a deposit.

<sup>13</sup> See section 5 of this paper for information on deposits in Scotland and Northern Ireland.

## 6 Tenancy deposit schemes

- If there is a dispute, the landlord must hand over the disputed amount for safekeeping until the dispute is resolved.
- If for any reason the landlord fails to comply, the insurance arrangements will ensure the return of the deposit to the tenant if they are entitled to it.

**Example:** a tenant pays a deposit of £1000. At the end of the tenancy, the landlord says he wishes to keep £200 to pay for replacing damaged furniture. The remaining £800 will be returned to the tenant. The tenant disagrees, claiming the furniture was damaged when they moved in. Both agree to go to ADR, so the disputed £200 will be transferred to the scheme administrator until the dispute is settled.<sup>14</sup>

Insurance-based providers include [MyDeposits](#), the [Tenancy Deposit Scheme](#) and the [Deposit Protection Service](#).

Fees vary between providers. The Residential Landlords Association offers a discounted rate with the Tenancy Deposit Scheme called [Deposit Guard](#).

### The custodial scheme

- The tenant pays the deposit to the landlord.
- The landlord pays the deposit into the scheme, unlike the insurance-based schemes. This scheme is free for landlords. The interest accrued by deposits is used to pay for the scheme, as permitted in the [Housing Act 2004, Schedule 10, Section 3\(4\)](#). Providers are entitled to keep all the interest accrued on deposits they hold. Providers can, however, choose to deduct their fees and return the remainder to a tenant or landlord as per their contract.
- Within 30 days<sup>15</sup> of receiving a deposit the landlord must give the tenant information about the scheme being used.<sup>16</sup>
- At the end of the tenancy, if the landlord and tenant agree how the deposit should be divided, they tell the scheme which returns the deposit, divided in the way agreed by both parties. In England and Wales, this should happen within 10 working days; in Scotland and Northern Ireland it is 5 working days.<sup>17</sup>
- If there is a dispute, the scheme holds the amount until the dispute resolution service or courts decide what is fair.

---

<sup>14</sup> [Residential Landlords Association website](#) (accessed on 20 August 2019)

<sup>15</sup> Originally 14 days but this was extended with effect from 6 April 2012 - see section 4.1 of this note.

<sup>16</sup> [The Housing \(Tenancy Deposits\) \(Prescribed Information\) Order 2007](#) (SI 2007/797) sets out the information that a landlord must give to a tenant who has paid a deposit.

<sup>17</sup> See section 5 of this paper for information on deposits in Scotland and Northern Ireland.



### Box 1: Interest rates in custodial schemes

In 2007, the [Housing \(Tenancy Deposits\) \(Specified Interest Rate\) Order 2007](#) (SI 2007/798) specified that where interest is payable on money deposited in a TDP in accordance with paragraph 3(5) of Schedule 10 to the 2004 Act, the rate of interest applied will be equivalent to the Bank of England base rate less 2.32 per cent.

This was subsequently revoked in England by [The Housing \(Tenancy Deposits\) \(Specified Interest Rate\) \(Revocation\) \(England\) Order 2015](#). As Bank of England rates had remained below 2.32 per cent for a number of years, this had no impact at the time.<sup>18</sup>

The [Deposit Protection Service](#) (DPS) and the [Tenancy Deposit Scheme](#) (TDS) run a custodial deposit scheme.

## 1.3 Alternative dispute resolution (ADR) vs the courts

All the schemes offer alternative dispute resolution (which is funded by the scheme providers as part of their overall running costs<sup>19</sup>) but landlords/tenants may opt to use the courts to resolve deposit disputes. The Tenancy Deposit Scheme (TDS) provides the following advice in its leaflet, [The dispute process](#):

Either party may go to court if they prefer. We can only deal with their dispute if both tenant and landlord agree they want us to. However, if the landlord refuses to make a decision, we will deal with the dispute anyway. Most people prefer to come to us because they feel it will be quicker, cheaper and less stressful. Like the courts, we are independent and authoritative. We can deal with proposed deductions from a deposit, but we cannot award compensation.

TDS can only deal with claims against the deposit. We cannot deal with counterclaim issues in our adjudication. If a tenant feels that they are important to their case, they may wish their dispute to be resolved in the county court.<sup>20</sup>

Decisions under ADR are binding:

Because participation in this ADR process requires consent by both parties, the final decision of the adjudicator is binding on both the landlord and tenant. It cannot be challenged except through a Court of Law – although the parties should seek their own independent legal advice first. The Schemes are NOT permitted to re-open cases unless it can be shown that the Scheme did not follow the processes laid down in its own rules, or did not take into account all the evidence submitted by the parties. In extreme circumstances adjudicators may ask for further evidence or clarification on a particular matter from either party. In some cases, the adjudicator may decide that the case would be better dealt with through a formal court process. However, in the majority of cases the adjudicator will make a decision based on the evidence he has in front of him.<sup>21</sup>

<sup>18</sup> [English Tenancy Deposits Are Less Interest-ing](#), Nearly Legal, 13 January 2015

<sup>19</sup> HC Deb 16 December 2010 c 938W

<sup>20</sup> TDS: [The dispute process](#) 2013 [Accessed on 20 August 2019]

<sup>21</sup> TDS; MyDeposits; Deposit Protection Service: [Guide to deposits, disputes and damages](#) [Accessed on 20 August 2019]

In principle, tenants should be able get all or part of their deposit back if they have kept the property in good condition and meet the requirements for the return of the deposit. Charges for 'wear and tear' should not be deducted from the deposit although the meaning of this phrase is debateable. The website of the relevant TDP scheme should provide further information: for example, the jointly produced publication, [Guide to deposits, disputes and damages](#) outlines what evidence is collected and provides a definition of damage and 'wear and tear'.

### 1.4 Implications of failing to protect a deposit

If a landlord does not protect a deposit the tenant can pursue the matter through the local county court. Failure to protect a deposit can result in a penalty charge of up to three times the value of the deposit, payable to the tenant. Courts have discretion over how much the penalty charge will be according to the circumstances of the case (section 214(4) of the *Housing Act 2004*).

A landlord in this situation will also find that they lose certain rights, including the right to serve a section 21 Notice of Possession on an assured shorthold tenant. This is the means by which a landlord can end an assured shorthold tenancy on or after the expiry of the initial fixed term.

### 1.5 Accountability & financial stability of TDP scheme operators

Landlords and tenants who are unhappy with the outcome of a dispute dealt with by the alternative dispute resolution service offered under the TDP schemes have questioned whether the operators of the schemes are accountable to the Government. The providers operate under a Service Concession Agreement with the Government:

**Nicholas Brown:** To ask the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, what recent assessment he has made of the effectiveness of the Deposit Protection Service; and what plans he has to strengthen protections for tenants' damage deposits.

**Brandon Lewis:** The Department has a governance role in ensuring that all Tenancy Deposit Protection schemes perform to high standards.

The Deposit Protection Service is required to submit monthly key performance indicators and provide annual updates of their management and financial plans to the Department, in accordance with the Service Concession Agreement we have with them. In addition, the Department holds quarterly monitoring meetings with the scheme operators at which any performance issues can be discussed. Since the schemes began in 2007, the Deposit Protection Service's performance against the benchmarks



set by our key performance indicators has been consistently high.<sup>22</sup>

The scheme providers each have a complaints procedure that landlords/tenants can use if they feel that their cases have been badly handled – details can be found on the providers' websites.

Questions have also been asked about the financial stability and integrity of TDP scheme providers:

**Nigel Adams:** To ask the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government pursuant to the answer to the hon. Member for Dudley North of 14 December 2009, *Official Report*, column 919W, on tenancy deposit schemes, (1) what (a) guarantees, (b) underwriting, (c) liabilities and (d) obligations were agreed in relation to support for the three tenancy deposit protection schemes under the previous Administration; [

(2) what assessment he has made of the financial stability and integrity of each of the three tenancy deposit protection schemes, including the effect of low interest rates on their integrity, since May 2010;

(3) what steps he has taken since May 2010 to ensure that tenancy deposit schemes can meet their financial liabilities.

**Grant Shapps:** The three tenancy deposit protection schemes are operated by private companies under service concession agreements with my Department. All three schemes are designed to be self-financing.

The service concession agreement that was agreed by the previous Administration with the custodial tenancy deposit protection scheme contained a guarantee that the Government would meet any shortfall arising if approved fees were not covered by the interest on deposits held. That guarantee was removed as part of a revised agreement negotiated in August 2010 which also incorporated a four year extension of the original agreement.

Neither of the two insurance based tenancy deposit protection schemes' agreements have ever included any similar government guarantees, underwriting, liabilities or obligations.<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup> [PO 10482, 15 October 2015](#)

<sup>23</sup> HC Deb 5 April 2011 cc855-6W

## 2. Case law and responses since 2010

The legislation governing tenancy deposits has been amended following several court cases.

### 2.1 Court of Appeal ruling November 2010

#### Late compliance with deposit protection and prescribed information

The Court of Appeal handed down its judgment in the two conjoined cases of *Universal Estates v Tiensia* and *Honeysuckle Properties v Fletcher* in November 2010.<sup>24</sup> These cases concerned situations where landlords had not complied with the requirement in section 213(1) of the *Housing Act 2004* to arrange for the protection of a deposit paid on an assured shorthold tenancy in an authorised scheme.

At the time the cases were taken, landlords had 14 days to comply with any initial requirements imposed by the terms of the TDP chosen after taking payment of a deposit.<sup>25</sup> In addition, sub-sections 213(5)-(6) require landlords to provide tenants with certain prescribed information regarding the TDP scheme used. Failure to comply with these requirements gave the tenant the right to apply to the county court (section 214) for an order that the deposit be repaid or put in a custodial scheme. If the court made either order prior to 6 April 2012 it also had to order the landlord to pay the tenant a sum equal to three times the amount of the deposit (s.214(4)).<sup>26</sup> However, The Act did not specify whether the court was to assess the question of compliance at the date of the hearing, the date when proceedings were issued, or at some other date.

In *Draycott v Hannells Lettings Ltd*<sup>27</sup> the High Court held that, so long as the deposit was protected and the prescribed information provided prior to the tenant issuing proceedings, the court could not grant the tenant any remedy under section 214 of the 2004 Act.

In *Tiensia*, the respondent landlord issued proceedings for possession and a money judgment for rent arrears against the tenant. The tenant counter-claimed for, *inter alia*, an order under section 214 of the 2004 Act and applied for summary judgment on the counterclaim. It was common ground that, when the claim was issued, the landlord had not complied with the initial requirements of an authorised TDP nor provided the prescribed information. These defects were remedied prior to the hearing of the summary judgment application. The District Judge granted summary judgment and held that the failure of the landlord to

---

<sup>24</sup> [2010] EWCA Civ 1224

<sup>25</sup> The following section explains the extension of the period from 14 to 30 days by the *Localism Act 2011*.

<sup>26</sup> The following section provides information on amendments to the penalty payable by landlords by the *Localism Act 2011*.

<sup>27</sup> [2010] EWHC 217 (QB); [2010] HLR 27

comply with the initial requirements of the scheme or provide the prescribed information within 14 days of receiving the deposit, was not capable of remedy. An appeal to the Circuit Judge was allowed and Ms Tiensia applied to the Court of Appeal.

In *Honeysuckle Properties*, the appellant landlord issued proceedings for a money judgment in respect of unpaid rent. The tenants counterclaimed for an order under section 214 of the 2004 Act. As in *Tiensia*, it was common ground that the initial requirements of a scheme had not been complied with, nor had the prescribed information been provided when the proceedings were issued, although both obligations were complied with by the time of the trial. The District Judge allowed the counterclaim. Permission to appeal was granted by the Circuit Judge who transferred the appeal to the Court of Appeal.

By a majority, the Court of Appeal dismissed the appeal in *Tiensia* and allowed the appeal in *Honeysuckle Properties*. It was held that court was only empowered to make an order under section 214 if – at the date of the hearing – there had been a failure by the landlord to comply with the initial requirements or provide the prescribed information. If the landlord was late in complying with these obligations, but did so before the hearing, s/he had a complete defence to the claim.

There was a widely held view that the decision of the Court of Appeal in these cases undermined the protection offered by the mandatory tenancy deposit schemes. Subsequent amendments to the 2004 Act are explained below.

## The Localism Act 2011

During the Commons Committee Stages of the *Localism Bill* Stephen Gilbert sought to improve the existing mandatory tenancy deposit scheme to “clarify the circumstances in which landlords must protect deposits and give judges greater discretion over the size of the penalty for landlords’ non-compliance to ensure that it is appropriate.”<sup>28</sup>

The then Minister, Andrew Stunell, said he was sympathetic to the main thrust of the proposed new clause but argued that it would make changes that did not flow from the Court of Appeal decision and would miss one of the key issues that *did* arise in the Court of Appeal.<sup>29</sup> He set out the Government’s position in some detail:

The key finding of the Court of Appeal concerned the application of a financial penalty for non-compliance with the requirements of tenancy deposit protection legislation in a situation when the tenancy is still in place and the landlord has protected the deposit after the deadline of 14 days. While the new clause tackles that issue, one of the reasons behind the Court’s view concerned the ability of a landlord to use section 21 of the Housing Act 1988 to evict a tenant when they were found to be in breach of tenancy deposit protection legislation. Under the legislation as it stands, a landlord who fails to comply with the deposit protection legislation cannot use section 21 to evict a tenant. That is important, because section 21 is one of the key characteristics of

---

<sup>28</sup> PBC 10 March 2011 cc948-53

<sup>29</sup> PBC 10 March 2011 c951

## 12 Tenancy deposit schemes

assured shorthold tenancies to which the tenancy deposit scheme relates. It allows a landlord to evict a tenant, having given reasonable notice, on a non-discretionary basis and without having to give a reason. The ability to gain possession of their property is key to a landlord's confidence in letting out that property in the first place, and in the current economic climate, we would not want to undermine that confidence.

As the Court of Appeal pointed out, under the tenancy deposit protection legislation as currently drafted, it could be argued that once a landlord has failed to protect a deposit, they would be unable to use section 21 in connection with that tenancy, even when they had subsequently protected the deposit and, where appropriate, paid the fine imposed by the court. That outcome is not the intention of the legislation, and we are therefore clear that any amendments aimed at tightening up the requirement to protect tenants within 14 days must also address that point.

The Government's view is that to address fully the concerns underlying the Court of Appeal's decision, it is important to allow the courts greater discretion than currently available when setting the financial penalty. My hon. Friend the Member for St Austell and Newquay relayed the current regime to the Committee. However, subsection (11) of the new clause does not offer sufficient flexibility, because as well as allowing flexibility up to a maximum tariff, it still leaves the minimum of one times the deposit. We think that there should be no lower limit. If the objective of such legislation is to encourage landlords to comply and to protect the deposits they take, it cannot be right to levy a substantial penalty when a well-intentioned landlord had made a mistake that, for instance, could result in the deadline for protection being missed by only one day. It is essential that the courts have the discretion to do justice in those de minimis cases, but that would not be possible if the minimum sanction were to be the payment of a penalty equal to the full amount of the deposit.<sup>30</sup>

The Minister said he would "reflect further on how the matter might best be addressed."<sup>31</sup>

On 20 July 2011 a new Government clause was added to the *Localism Bill* to amend the tenancy deposit sections of the *Housing Act 2004*.<sup>32</sup> The changes, which came into effect on 6 April 2012, gave landlords 30 days, rather than the original 14, to protect the deposit. Once that period has expired the tenant can immediately raise a claim against the landlord. The landlord cannot protect the deposit late without penalty. However, the penalty for late protection is now variable ranging from one, to three times, the sum of the deposit, so if the landlord has, in fact, protected the deposit before the hearing the court can take this into account and reduce the penalty payable accordingly. The amendments also cleared up some small loopholes so that the landlord cannot pay back the deposit and claim that the tenant is not entitled to a penalty. The restriction on serving a section 21 notice where the deposit has not been protected was tidied up so that the landlord can

---

<sup>30</sup> Ibid., c952

<sup>31</sup> Ibid., c953

<sup>32</sup> HL Deb 20 July 2011 c1489-90

simply return the deposit or resolve court proceedings with the tenant and then serve the notice.

The [\*Localism Act 2011 \(Commencement No. 4 and Transitional, Transitory and Saving Provisions\) Order 2012\*](#) brought the new TDP provisions into force on 6 April 2012.

The Residential Landlords Association has some helpful [Frequently asked questions](#) on deposit protection for landlords on its website.

## 2.2 *Superstrike Ltd v Rodrigues 2013*<sup>33</sup>

### Tenancies beginning before 6 April 2007 and renewals after this date

The Court of Appeal handed down judgement in respect of this case on 14 June 2013.

Mr Rodrigues was the assured shorthold tenant of Superstrike Ltd. His tenancy began in January 2007 (i.e. *before* the mandatory deposit scheme came into force for newly created assured shorthold tenancies on or after 6 April 2007) and was for a fixed period of one year less one day. He paid a deposit of £606.66. At the expiry of the fixed term of the tenancy in January 2008, he became a statutory periodic tenant. Where a fixed-term assured tenancy comes to an end by effluxion of time (and no new agreement is reached) a statutory periodic tenancy arises (section 5, *Housing Act 1988*).

In June 2011, Superstrike gave notice under section 21 of the *Housing Act 1988* requiring possession. A section 21 notice is the means by which a landlord can end an assured shorthold tenancy on or after the expiry of the initial fixed-term without having to prove fault on the part of the tenant. Mr Rodrigues defended the claim contending, *inter alia*, that the statutory periodic tenancy was a *new tenancy* and the previously paid deposit should be treated as having been paid in respect of that new tenancy and, as the deposit had not been protected within an authorised scheme, the section 21 notice should have no effect. Effectively, he argued that the trigger for the requirement to protect the deposit occurred in January 2008 on the creation of the statutory periodic tenancy. A Deputy District Judge found for Mr Rodrigues, but the Circuit Judge allowed an appeal.

The Court of Appeal held that the statutory periodic tenancy *was* a new tenancy: the deposit was held to guarantee obligations under it and was therefore to be treated as having been paid under it. It therefore followed that the provisions of the 2004 Act applied and the section 21 notice was deemed to be invalid.

Then Housing Minister, Mark Prisk, indicated in a letter to the Residential Landlords Association that a legislative response to the *Superstrike* case would be forthcoming.<sup>34</sup>

---

<sup>33</sup> [\[2013\] EWCA Civ 699](#)

<sup>34</sup> [Government may change the law over tenancy deposits](#), September 2013

## Legislative response to Superstrike

Section 32 of the [Deregulation Act 2015](#) inserted three new sections into Chapter 4 of Part 6 of the *Housing Act 2004*.

Section 215A confirmed the decision in *Superstrike* that a deposit previously held for an AST before 6th April 2007 must be put into a tenancy deposit scheme after this date if the AST becomes a statutory periodic tenancy. Failure to do this means that a landlord cannot serve a section 21 notice of intention to seek possession unless the deposit has already been returned to the tenant in full or with agreed deductions.

The Act provided an amnesty period of 90 days (23 June 2015) to comply with these provisions:

Subsection (3) [of section 215A] provides that instead of the landlord being required to comply with the tenancy deposit requirements at the start of the statutory periodic tenancy, a date which will have long passed in such cases, there is an extended period within which to comply. This is any time prior to the date which is 90 days after commencement of the new provisions or, if earlier, at any time prior to the date on which a court determines an application for penalties under section 214 of the 2004 Act or determines whether to make a possession order under section 21 of the Housing Act 1988 (or decides an appeal against either type of determination).<sup>35</sup>

These provisions are 'treated as having had effect since 6th April 2007'.<sup>36</sup>

Section 215B dealt with another potential issue arising from *Superstrike*; namely, whether deposit protection must be re-issued when an AST contract is renewed or rolls into a statutory periodic tenancy.

*The Deregulation Act 2015* clarified that renewal is not necessary:

New section 215B is intended to deal with the issue mentioned at paragraph 168 above. It covers cases where a landlord "receives" a deposit on or after 6 April 2007 (which could be at the start of a brand new tenancy or at the start of a renewed tenancy – see subsection (3)) and subsequently protects that deposit and sends the required information to the tenant. If the tenancy is subsequently renewed or rolls over into a statutory periodic tenancy, then so long as the deposit remains protected in accordance with the same authorised tenancy deposit scheme from one tenancy to the next, subsection (2) makes clear that there is no requirement for the landlord to re-send the same information to the tenant each time the tenancy is renewed or rolls over: the landlord will be treated as having complied with the tenancy deposit protection requirements afresh at the start of each new tenancy. Subsection (1)(d) and (e) make clear that subsection (2) applies not just to the first "renewal" of the tenancy but also to cases where there are multiple tenancy renewals, which could include a mixture of fixed term tenancies and periodic tenancies.<sup>37</sup>

---

<sup>35</sup> [Explanatory notes to the Deregulation Act 2015](#), para 172

<sup>36</sup> [Deregulation Act 2015 Section 32](#) (215C) and accompanying [Explanatory note](#)

<sup>37</sup> [Deregulation Act 2015 Section 32 Explanatory notes](#)



## 2.3 *Charalambous & Anor v Maureen Rosairie Ng & Anor [2014]*

### Tenancies and renewals beginning before 6 April 2007

[\*Charalambous & Anor v Maureen Rosairie Ng & Anor \[2014\]\*](#) was another case which tested the impact of tenancy deposit legislation on section 21 of the *Housing Act 1988* (service of notice of intention to seek possession).

This case parallels the case of *Superstrike Ltd v Rodrigues 2013* (see section 2.2). In *Superstrike*, the AST in question had started before the deposit scheme legislation had come into force on 6 April 2007 but had rolled over into a statutory periodic tenancy after this date. In *Charalambous*, **both** the original tenancy and the statutory periodic tenancy began before 6 April 2007.

In the case of *Charalambous*, the landlord was not obliged to protect the deposit because both the AST and statutory periodic tenancy had begun before 6 April 2007. However, in October 2012, the landlord served a section 21 notice. The tenants appealed, arguing that a section 21 notice could not be served because their deposit was not held in a TDP scheme. The case hinged on the interpretation of [section 215 of the Housing Act 2004](#):

#### **215 Sanctions for non-compliance**

(1) Subject to subsection (2A), if a tenancy deposit has been paid in connection with a shorthold tenancy, no section 21 notice may be given in relation to the tenancy at a time when—

- (a) the deposit is not being held in accordance with an authorised scheme, or
- (b) section 213 (3) has not been complied with in relation to the deposit.

(2) Subject to subsection (2A), if section 213 (6) is not complied with in relation to a deposit given in connection with a shorthold tenancy, no section 21 notice may be given in relation to the tenancy until such time as section 213 (6) (a) is complied with.

(2A) Subsections (1) and (2) do not apply in a case where—

- (a) the deposit has been returned to the tenant in full or with such deductions as are agreed between the landlord and tenant, or
- (b) an application to the county court has been made under section 214 (1) and has been determined by the court, withdrawn or settled by agreement between the parties.

The Court held that the section 21 notice was unlawful but the landlord was not liable for the financial penalties provided in the 2004 Act. This was because the deposit had not been received by the landlord at a time when the legislation applied. However, the Court felt that since “the deposit is not being held in accordance with an authorised scheme” (as per section 215(1)(a)), the landlord could not proceed with

a section 21 notice unless the deposit was protected in a scheme or returned to the tenant as per section 215(2A)(a).<sup>38</sup>

### Legislative response to *Charalambous*

The [Deregulation Act 2015 section 31](#) amended Chapter 4 of Part 6 of the *Housing Act 2004* to support the Court's judgment that a section 21 notice could not be served in cases such as *Charalambous*. The amendments also made it clear that in such scenarios, a landlord could not be subject to a financial penalty under section 214. The explanatory notes to the Act provide more detail:

Although it was never the government's intention – either in 2007 or following amendments made to the tenancy deposit legislation in 2012 by the Localism Act 2011 – that the tenancy deposit legislation should apply to such deposits, the amendments enshrine the Court of Appeal's decision in the legislation. However, they also make it absolutely clear that, since the tenancy deposit requirements in section 213 of the 2004 Act have never applied to such deposits, the other sanctions and penalties provided for in sections 214 and 215 do not apply in such cases. *Subsection (2)* amends section 214(1) to make it clear that section 214 does not apply in relation to such deposits. Section 214 (proceedings relating to tenancy deposits) enables tenants to apply to the court for a mandatory financial penalty where a landlord has failed to comply with the tenancy deposit requirements in section 213.

*Subsection (3)* replaces the current subsection (1) in section 215 (sanctions for non-compliance) with two new subsections. The new subsection (1) gives legislative effect to the Court of Appeal's judgment by making it clear that no matter when a tenancy deposit was last "paid" the landlord will need to protect that deposit if he or she wishes to serve a valid notice under section 21 of the Housing Act 1988 on the tenant (unless the deposit has already been returned to the tenant in full or with agreed deductions).<sup>39</sup>

---

<sup>38</sup> [Of Penalties and Possession](#), Nearly Legal, 17 December 2014

<sup>39</sup> [Deregulation Act 2015, Explanatory notes](#), accessed 30/05/2017

### 3. Attempts to amend the *Housing and Planning Bill 2015-16*

Proposed [amendments 24 to 31](#) to *the Housing and Planning Bill 2015-6* attempted to change some of the provisions governing tenancy deposits. Debate on these amendments took place mainly on 1 March 2016 during the Bill's Committee Stage in the House of Lords (day two).

#### Notification of 'relevant persons'

Amendment 24 attempted to remove the landlord's obligation to notify a 'relevant person' that a deposit was being held in a TDP. A relevant person is someone who has paid the deposit on behalf of the tenant. The Minister, Baroness Williams of Trafford, outlined what this usually entails and the reasons why the Government rejected the amendment:

[The 'relevant person'] can be a family member but in most cases it is a charity such as Crisis or Shelter, which offers deposit loan schemes to vulnerable people with a history of homelessness, or a local authority, which pays the deposit through housing benefit in cases where tenants are out of work or on a low income.

I welcome proposals which reduce burdens for business and I understand the spirit in which this amendment has been tabled. However, the proposals set out in Amendment 24 have the potential to adversely affect the willingness of a charity or a local authority to pay a deposit on behalf of a tenant. This could lead to vulnerable people or those on low incomes being unable to access the private rented sector, which is something we would want to avoid.<sup>40</sup>

Amendment 24 was withdrawn.

#### Electronic communication of prescribed information

Amendment 25 sought to clarify the tenancy deposit information could be supplied via email, rather than in hard copy. The Minister said that there was no need for this amendment:

**Baroness Williams of Trafford:** The Government welcome proposals that seek to reduce burdens on business but in this case primary legislation is not required. The aim of this amendment can be achieved through secondary legislation, using powers in the Electronic Communications Act 2000. I will be happy to look further into the proposals outside this Chamber and consider introducing secondary legislation at a later date.<sup>41</sup>

Amendment 25 was not moved.

#### Absent tenants/landlords

The [Housing \(Tenancy Deposit Schemes\) Order 2007](#) added articles 4A, 4B and 4C to Schedule 10 of the *Housing Act 2004*. These articles

More information about the process for claiming all or part of a deposit in the absence of a tenant or landlord (a 'single claim process') can be provided by a tenancy deposit scheme provider. For instance, both the [TDS](#) and [DPS](#) suppliers provide guides.

<sup>40</sup> [HL Deb 1 March 2016, cc702-711](#)

<sup>41</sup> [HL Deb 1 March 2016, c708](#)

established a procedure for **custodial** deposit schemes where either a tenant or landlord cannot be contacted. If, after 14 days, no agreement has been reached over the deposit and no ADR or court action taken due to an absent party, the other party can claim what they believe they are due from the deposit. A landlord must justify their claim. Either party, if they proceed with the claim, must make a statutory declaration, i.e. a declaration usually in the presence of a solicitor.

Amendments 26 and 31 aimed to remove the need for a statutory declaration:

**Earl Cathcart:** Interestingly, legislation in Scotland and Northern Ireland approaches this problem in a different way, and my amendment to Schedule 10 to the Housing Act 2004 proposes that we should adopt that process here. In Scotland and Northern Ireland, where a tenant fails to respond to requests from the landlord regarding the deposit repayment, the portion of the deposit requested is paid by the custodial scheme to the landlord once the custodial tenancy deposit scheme is itself satisfied that the tenant has failed to respond. A similar process applies where the tenant says that the landlord is not responding. This means that the deposit is repaid more quickly, without recourse to solicitors and statutory declarations, while ensuring that if the tenant or indeed landlord later reappears, they can seek to recover any disputed deposit through the courts. I am further advised that the proposed process has been working very successfully in both Scotland and Northern Ireland for the last three to four years.<sup>42</sup>

Baroness Williams explained why the Government disagreed with the proposed amendment:

I accept that there is a minor cost to a landlord or tenant in arranging for a solicitor or magistrate to witness a statutory declaration, but this process is necessary for the landlord or tenant to prove beyond any doubt that they have attempted to contact the other party and that they have not been able to reach an agreement on the amount claimed from the deposit before it is repaid. The example that the noble Lord, Lord Beecham, gave just before he sat down underlines this. Removing the requirement could leave the process open to abuse, with no independent verification that the other party had been contacted to give their consent.<sup>43</sup>

These amendments were not moved.

### Government review of TDP

Amendment 28 sought to secure a Government review of tenancy deposit protection schemes. This was chiefly due to a concern that those who are not happy with ADR, and who would like to pursue their claims via the courts, may find this option financially unviable:

**Lord Beecham:** Very often, one reads that allegations are made that the tenant has damaged the property and so forth. Given that usually not large sums are at stake, it seems to be the case that some tenants give up the ghost rather than pursue the matter. There is a scheme for dispute resolution, which is operated by the relevant agency without charge. However, it is

---

<sup>42</sup> [HL Deb. 1 March 2016. c704](#)

<sup>43</sup> [HL Deb. 1 March 2016. c708](#)

not binding on both parties to accept the scheme's involvement, so if a landlord, or it could arguably be a tenant, is at the wrong end of a claim, the other party would have to seek redress through the courts. We have already had a reference to the small claims limit this afternoon, and it is probable that most deposits would be within the range of up to £5,000. No legal aid is available and no costs are recoverable on a successful claim. This is going to make it less likely than ever that tenants will exercise their right to recover a deposit which is being wrongfully withheld.<sup>44</sup>

In response, Baroness Williams argued that the Department for Communities and Local Government already performed a "governance role" through the Service Concession Agreement<sup>45</sup> and highlighted that:

From the overall feedback received, we are satisfied that the alternative dispute resolution system generally works well. Of the 11.5 million deposits which have been protected since the launch of the scheme, less than 2% have gone to adjudication. On average, following adjudication, 27% are awarded to tenants, 17% to landlords or agents, and just over half are split between the two sides.<sup>46</sup>

For more information about the Service Concession Agreement, see section 3 of this paper.

Lord Beecham reiterated that the ADR might not work for all, and some may simply accept its adjudication because a small claims case would be too expensive. He contended that the figures cited "do not necessarily reflect the situation in the marketplace." Lord Beecham explained that he wanted the review to consider the role of deposits in the industry, beyond the smaller governance role played by the Government.<sup>47</sup>

The amendment was not moved in Committee, however the issue arose again as amendment 35 on the [first day of Report](#). The House divided on the amendment. Amendment 35 was disagreed to by 157 votes to 50.

## Access to tenancy deposit information for local authorities (England)

The *Housing and Planning Act 2016* made amendments to the *Housing Act 2004* to enable the sharing of certain data held by the three TDP schemes in England. The three scheme providers hold information relating to nearly 3 million private rented properties and address data for around 2 million landlords.<sup>48</sup>

Since 6 April 2017 authorities have been able to request and obtain certain information held by the TDP schemes – the aim is to help them identify private rented housing and landlords in their areas with a view

---

<sup>44</sup> [HL Deb, 1 March 2016, c706](#)

<sup>45</sup> [HL Deb, 1 March 2016, c708](#)

<sup>46</sup> [HL Deb, 1 March 2016, c708](#)

<sup>47</sup> [HL Deb, 1 March 2016, c710](#)

<sup>48</sup> DCLG, [Obtaining and using tenancy deposit information: explanatory booklet for local housing authorities](#), April 2017

to cracking down on rogue landlords through targeted enforcement and prevention work.<sup>49</sup>

## 4. Caps on deposits payable

### 4.1 England

In addition to preventing residential letting agents and private landlords from charging most upfront fees to prospective tenants in England, the *Tenant Fees Act 2019* has placed a cap on the amount of security deposit that a tenant can be required to pay in respect of new tenancies created after 1 June 2019, including renewals of existing tenancies.

A **maximum** tenancy deposit of no more than five weeks' rent (refundable) is payable where the annual rent is less than £50,000, or six weeks' rent where the annual rent exceeds £50,000.

Where a tenancy is renewed after 1 June 2019, landlords and letting agents are required to repay the amount of the deposit held which is over the five (or, where appropriate, six) week cap.

The Government has published separate guidance for [landlords/agents](#) and [tenants](#) on the *Tenant Fees Act 2019*. Pages 10-11 of [the guidance for tenants](#) provide advice on the steps to take if a prohibited payment has been charged.<sup>50</sup>

Background on the 2019 Act and its progress through Parliament can be found in this Library paper: [Tenant Fees Bill 2017-19: update on progress in Parliament](#).

### 4.2 Scotland

Section 90 of the *Rent (Scotland) Act 1984* provides that a deposit cannot exceed 2 months' rent payable. Charging any more than 2 months' rent for a deposit constitutes an illegal premium under the 1984 Act, which is a criminal offence.

### 4.3 Wales

The *Renting Homes (Fees etc.) (Wales) Act 2019* contains a power to cap deposits through regulations.<sup>51</sup> The Explanatory Memorandum on the Bill referred to unclear evidence on the need to cap deposits in Wales:

Evidence for capping security deposits in Wales is unclear and did not feature in responses to the consultation. However there is a risk that such deposits could rise and therefore become unaffordable. Powers for the Welsh Ministers to set a lower cap have therefore been included within the Bill as a necessary safeguard.<sup>52</sup>

---

<sup>49</sup> Ibid.

<sup>50</sup> [Tenant Fees Act 2019: Guidance](#) (accessed on 21 August 2019)

<sup>51</sup> Paragraph 2(4) of schedule 1 to the Act. National Assembly for Wales Research Paper, [Renting Homes \(Fees etc.\) \(Wales\) Bill: Bill Summary](#), November 2018, p

<sup>52</sup> [Explanatory Memorandum, Renting Homes \(Fees etc.\) \(Wales\) Bill](#), June 2018, para 3.28



## 4.4 Northern Ireland

There is no limit on the amount of deposit a landlord/agent can ask for in Northern Ireland.

# 5. Deposit protection in Scotland and Northern Ireland

Housing is a devolved matter in Scotland, Northern Ireland and Wales. **The relevant provisions of the *Housing Act 2004* apply in Wales** as they do in England. Both Scotland and Northern Ireland have legislated to make tenancy deposit protection obligatory for all assured shorthold tenancies.

## 5.1 Scotland

The [Housing \(Scotland\) Act 2006 Part 4 section 121](#) allows the Scottish Government to define and prescribe Tenancy Deposit Schemes for a rental contract involving a deposit. [The Tenancy Deposit Schemes \(Scotland\) Regulations 2011](#) brought this legislation into force on 7 March 2011, although deposit schemes did not become available until 2 July 2012.<sup>53</sup> [Article 1\(3\)](#) requires landlords to put deposits into an approved scheme within 30 days of receipt and provide the tenant with details of the chosen scheme.

Scottish Tenancy Deposit Schemes must provide an Alternative Dispute Resolution service ([Article 6](#)). The SI provides that the deposit must be “paid by the landlord to the scheme administrator”: it therefore **only provides for custodial schemes**, not insurance-based schemes ([Article 3, Section 11](#)).

At the time of writing, there are three Scottish deposit schemes available: [Letting Protection Service Scotland](#), [SafeDeposits Scotland](#), and [My Deposits Scotland](#).

More information can be found on [MyGov.Scot](#).

The Scottish Government published a [Review of Tenancy Deposit Schemes in Scotland](#) on 21 December 2018.

## 5.2 Northern Ireland

Articles 5A and 5B of the [Private Tenancies \(Northern Ireland\) Order 2006](#) were inserted by the [Housing \(Amendment\) Act \(Northern Ireland\) 2011](#). Article 5B stipulates that all deposits for a private tenancy must be protected by a deposit scheme. Once received, a deposit must be protected within 14 days and the landlord must give the tenant details of the chosen TDP scheme.

---

<sup>53</sup> [The Tenancy Deposit Schemes \(Scotland\) Regulations 2011: Your questions answered](#), Stewart and Watson, undated

## 22 Tenancy deposit schemes

Article 5A allows the Northern Ireland Government to define approved deposit schemes: the [Tenancy Deposit Schemes Regulations \(Northern Ireland\) 2012](#) brought this legislation into effect. It allows for both insurance and custodial schemes ([Part 3](#)) and outlines the ADR they must provide ([Part 6](#)). These approved schemes became operational on 1 April 2013. Since that date, a TDP has been a legal requirement for all private tenancy deposits.<sup>54</sup>

There are currently three scheme operators available: [Tenancy Deposit Scheme Northern Ireland \(TDS\)](#), [My Deposits Northern Ireland](#), and [Letting Protection Service NI \(LPSNI\)](#).

[NI Direct](#) has more information on Tenancy Deposit Protection Schemes in Northern Ireland.

---

<sup>54</sup> For more information, see [A Guide to the Tenancy Deposit Scheme Regulations](#), TDS Northern Ireland, 2015

## 6. Ongoing issues

The TDP has been praised by letting agents as an “effective barrier” to exploitation.<sup>55</sup> The Chief Executive of [TDS](#), writing for the Residential Landlords Association (RLA) in 2017, argued that not only do the schemes avoid costly and time-consuming court appearances, but they have also led to increasingly professional contracts and inventory check-ins.<sup>56</sup>

[Generation Rent](#), a private rented sector campaign group, published a consultation in May 2014 in which they said that the TDP had “vastly improved the ability of renters to retrieve their deposit at the end of a contract”.<sup>57</sup>

However, several perceived problems have been identified with the schemes and support for TDP within the sector is not comprehensive. The RLA commissioned Michael Ball, Professor of Urban and Property Economics at the University of Reading’s Henley Business School, to conduct research into the private rented sector. His report, *The impact of regulation on the private rented sector*, was published in 2014 and concluded:

Tenancy deposit schemes are poor value for money- costing the sector more than £275m a year in fees and administration, when only £7m is returned to tenants annually in deposits judged to have been unreasonably withheld.<sup>58</sup>

### Non-compliance and lack of enforcement

Despite the mandatory nature of tenancy deposit protection schemes for all ASTs, there is some evidence to suggest that a significant minority of landlords refuse to cooperate. According to a 2016 survey carried out by the Centre for Economics Business Research commissioned by Money.co.uk, as many as one-in-six landlords had not protected deposits at that time.<sup>59</sup> The results of the survey, which were widely reported, suggested that a lack of enforcement and reliance on tenants taking their landlords to court for failing to use a TDP, allowed some landlords to ignore the law with impunity.<sup>60</sup>

Hillarys, an interiors company, surveyed 2,588 people whom had left a rented home in 2016-17 and found “widespread scepticism” about the TDP. 81% of those responding said landlords/agents had “searched”

---

<sup>55</sup> [Investigation: How are the tenancy deposit schemes performing?](#) Negotiator, 27 January 2017

<sup>56</sup> Residential Landlords Association, [Tenancy deposit schemes 10 years on](#), 21 May 2017

<sup>57</sup> [The Renters’ Manifesto: a consultation document](#), Generation Rent, 19 May 2014. Also reported in [Generation Rent hits out at tenancy deposit 'rip-off'](#). *Inside Housing*, 22 July 2014

<sup>58</sup> [RLA Press Release](#), 29 April 2014

<sup>59</sup> [284,000 landlords risk being fined over tenancy deposits](#), 2016

<sup>60</sup> Landlords hold £½bn deposits illegally, *Times*, 28 January 2016

for a reason not to return the deposit.<sup>61</sup> 68% thought the landlord had not provided a good reason for withholding the deposit.<sup>62</sup>

Heather Wheeler, then Minister at MHCLG, responded to a PQ on delays in returning tenancy deposits on 30 October 2018:

To ask the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government, with reference to the news release entitled Nationwide highlights lottery of experiences on private tenancy deposits - and calls for more pragmatic approach, published by Nationwide Building Society on 20 October, what plans his Department has to ensure that deposits are returned in an efficient and timely manner as a result of that organisation's finding that 18 per cent of tenants wait more than three months for deposit returns.

**Heather Wheeler:** Under the Housing Act 2004, all deposits taken with assured shorthold tenancies since 6 April 2007 must be protected in a Government-approved tenancy deposit scheme within 30 days. In the vast majority of cases the deposit can be returned promptly as the landlord and tenant are able to agree deductions from the deposit. Deposits should be returned within 10 days of the tenant requesting it if held in the insured scheme, and within 10 days of the landlord and tenant agreeing deductions in the custodial scheme. It can take longer if they cannot agree and need to use the free dispute resolutions services provided by the deposit schemes. Only 1.5 per cent of cases go to formal dispute. The YouGov survey referenced in the news release asked about the worst experience tenants had ever had and so is not representative of the normal experience for tenants.

The current system works well but we are reviewing whether improvements can be made to the deposit protection model through the Tenancy Deposit Protection Working Group. Nationwide is a member of the Working Group which will look at the process at the end of tenancy and dispute resolution, as well as exploring whether deposit passporting can improve affordability by helping tenants who have to pay a deposit to their new landlord before they receive their current deposit back.<sup>63</sup>

### Insurance-based TDP: loopholes and abuses

Press reports have highlighted a problem that can arise where a landlord/letting agency is expelled from an insurance-based TDP. For example, in 2014 *Guardian Money* reported on a case involving the London based agency, Unida Place.<sup>64</sup> The agency reportedly registered its tenants' deposits with MyDeposits. Unida Place was, allegedly, expelled by MyDeposits for failing to provide certain information, including proof that tenants' deposits were kept in a separate client account. Once expelled, the tenants of Unida Place could not use the scheme to recover their deposits – the expulsion meant that their deposits were no longer protected.

---

<sup>61</sup> [Research reveals exactly why tenants lose all or part of their deposits](#). Letting Agent Today, 5 June 2017

<sup>62</sup> Ibid.

<sup>63</sup> [Written question – 183961](#), 30 October 2019

<sup>64</sup> *Guardian Money*, "[Rogue landlords exploit deposit protection loophole](#)", 19 June 2014

A landlord/agency in this situation is required to re-protect the deposits paid but if they fail to do so the only avenue open to affected tenants is legal action. For this reason, Generation Rent has suggested that insurance-based schemes should be banned or reformed to ensure that deposits are protected the life of the tenancy rather than the landlord's membership of the scheme.<sup>65</sup>

There have also been reports of landlords refusing to pay back insurance-protected deposits. A BBC investigation in February 2017 found over £1 million in deposits had been taken illegally by letting agents. 14 agents were convicted for this reason in 2016.<sup>66</sup>

### **Affordability and transferability of deposits**

There are concerns about the difficulties prospective tenants face in raising a deposit and that money can be held for a considerable period without attracting interest. The cap on deposits which was introduced in England from 1 June 2019 is aimed at tackling the affordability of security deposits.

Tenancy deposit protection schemes can act as a barrier to those who rely on the return of the money to pay a deposit on a new tenancy. Generation Rent argues that the Alternative Dispute Service can be slow and that renters are not receiving their deposits in time to use for their next property. As a result, some tenants may opt not use Alternative Dispute Resolution to avoid repayment delays.<sup>67</sup> This issue was raised by Lord Kennedy during the Lords Report Stage of the *Housing and Planning Bill 2015-16*. Lord Kennedy sought to amend the *Housing Act 2004* to force the Government to review the role of deposits in the market.<sup>68</sup>

The Residential Landlords Association has suggested that deposits should be held in trusts which can be easily transferred from one tenancy to another. This would be similar to a custodial scheme, but such a trust would also behave like a bank account that can be topped up. This would enable tenants to save up larger deposits for a more expensive tenancy or a mortgage deposit.<sup>69</sup>

In March 2018, Generation Rent published [Rethinking Tenancy Deposits](#) which proposed a new approach to making better use of tenants' assets tied up in deposits:

This paper proposes a different future for deposits: a modified version of the existing custodial deposit system where funds are held on the tenants' behalf, and actively managed by an accredited third party, with any net returns from those funds paid back to tenants at the conclusion of the tenancy, on top of the security deposit. This system would treat tenants' deposits as tenants' assets and give them a return, while reducing the administrative burden on letting agents and landlords that comes with holding and managing these funds. At the end of the

---

<sup>65</sup> [The Renters' Manifesto: a consultation document](#), Generation Rent, 19 May 2014.

<sup>66</sup> [£1m raided from tenants' deposits by letting agents](#), BBC News, 13 February 2017

<sup>67</sup> [It's not their money: Reforming tenancy deposit protection](#), Generation rent, 21 July 2014

<sup>68</sup> [HL Deb, 11 April 2016 c105](#)

<sup>69</sup> [The RLA's Manifesto: Cutting up front costs](#), RLA, 7 June 2017

tenancy the landlord would maintain the opportunity to make a claim for damage or unpaid rent and the tenant would have the chance to challenge such a claim.

A crucial element of the modified system would be to allow a portion of the deposit to be released by the landlord upon payment of the final month's rent, to allow the tenant to transfer it to a new tenancy.<sup>70</sup>

**Other commentators have proposed alternatives to the current tenancy deposit protection schemes.** These have included:

- Abandoning monetary deposits altogether. One major landlord announced in May 2017 that it would return all its deposits, subject to tenant referencing checks or guarantors.<sup>71</sup>

The Association of Residential Letting Agents (ARLA), in response to the Government's 2017 consultation on banning letting agent fees, also suggested alternative financing for deposits, including:

- Local authorities being given a statutory duty to provide interest free loans to those unable to afford deposit.
- Mandatory duties being placed on employers and public bodies to provide loans.
- The Government acting as a universal guarantor for all tenancies. ARLA argues that this would be cost-neutral for the Government "as the costs of recovery against such tenants could be included in any Money Order secured"<sup>72</sup>

The Housing, Communities and Local Government Select Committee, during its pre-legislative scrutiny of the *Tenant Fees Bill 2017-19*, recommended that the Government should encourage innovation in the deposit free renting sector by assessing the merits of alternatives to traditional security deposits and reporting their findings to the Committee.<sup>73</sup> In response, the Government said it would "explore the merits of deposit alternatives and reply to the Committee within six months."<sup>74</sup>

### Landlord concerns

If a tenant cannot be contacted at the end of a tenancy, or abandons the property, there are procedures for claiming all or part of a deposit held in a scheme.

Even if a landlord successfully makes a claim in this way, a tenant may still return to dispute the claim. There are two reasons for this: first, either party can always go to court to claim all or part of a deposit, rather than use an ADR. Second, scheme providers do not provide ADR indefinitely, the Tenancy Deposit Scheme promises to hold deposits for

---

<sup>70</sup> Wilson Craw D; Seiferling M: Generation Rent, [Rethinking Tenancy Deposits](#), March 2018

<sup>71</sup> [Tenancy Deposits Abolished By Major UK Landlord](#), Residential Landlord, 26 May 2017

<sup>72</sup> [Response to the Department for Communities and Local Government \(DCLG\) Consultation on the Banning of Letting Agent Fees paid by Tenants](#), ARLA Propertymark, May 2017

<sup>73</sup> [HC 583](#), 29 March 2018

<sup>74</sup> [Cm 9610](#), May 2018, para 39



three months after the end of the tenancy, with the possibility of extension in some circumstances.<sup>75</sup> The Tenancy Deposit Scheme points out that a tenant could return years later to claim a deposit through the courts. A time limit of 6 years normally applies to a tenant's ability to reclaim a deposit.<sup>76</sup>

Some landlords have expressed frustration at the timescales involved in this process.<sup>77</sup> This led to attempts to amend the law for custodial schemes during the *Housing and Planning Bill's* progress through Parliament (see section 3).

## Tenancy deposit reform: a call for evidence (June 2019)

The Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government launched a [call for evidence on Tenancy Deposit Reform](#) in June 2019 through which it is seeking to understand the barriers tenants face when moving between tenancies:

It looks at what can be done to speed up the return of deposits to tenants at the end of the tenancy.

It considers whether existing initiatives to address deposit affordability are meeting tenants' needs and whether the market can offer improved products. It also explores innovative approaches that could be taken to help tenants move more easily, including allowing tenants to passport their deposit between tenancies.

The call for evidence builds on the work of the Tenancy Deposit Protection Working Group, which has been looking at whether improvements can be made to deposit protection to the benefit of tenants and landlords.<sup>78</sup>

Submissions are accepted up to 5 September 2019.

---

<sup>75</sup> [What should the deposit holder do if they can't contact one of the parties at the end of the tenancy?](#) TDS, March 2013

<sup>76</sup> Ibid.

<sup>77</sup> For instance, see [Tenancy Deposits: What to do if Your Tenant Abandons Your Property](#), *Landlord News*, 1 August 2016.

<sup>78</sup> [Tenancy Deposit Reform: Call for Evidence](#), June 2019


## 7. Statistics

### 7.1 Number and value of deposits protected

Statistics published by the Tenancy Deposit Scheme (TDS)<sup>79</sup> look at trends in the number and value of deposits protected by the three operators since the mandatory scheme was introduced. As the chart below shows, the number of deposits protected in England and Wales rose from 0.9 million at the end of March 2008 to 3.7 million at the end of March 2018. During the same period, the total value of deposits protected rose from £0.89bn to £4.16bn.

#### Number of deposits in protection schemes

Millions, at end of March, England & Wales



Source: Tenancy Deposit Scheme, [Statistical digest 2017-18](#), October 2018

A [2013 survey](#) of 4,000 private tenants in England conducted by Shelter found that “one in five don’t know if their deposit has been protected. Almost one in ten (nine per cent) know that their deposit is definitely not protected.”<sup>80</sup> It is worth noting that deposit protection legislation only covers assured shorthold tenancies, although most private tenants in residential buildings will be subject to such an agreement.

The average value of a protected deposit has fluctuated somewhat. It was £958 at the end of March 2008 before sinking to a low point of £880 in 2010.<sup>81</sup> At the end of March 2018, the average was £1,110 in England & Wales.<sup>82</sup>

Tenancy Deposit Schemes were introduced in Scotland in 2012 and in Northern Ireland in 2013 (see section 6 above).

In Scotland, the number of deposits protected rose from around 116,800 in March 2013 to around 212,000 in March 2018. The value of deposits protected in March 2016 was around £143m.<sup>83</sup>

In Northern Ireland, the number of deposits protected rose from around 17,500 in March 2014 to around 53,500 in March 2018 (worth around £31m).<sup>84</sup>

<sup>79</sup> Tenancy Deposit Scheme, [Statistical digest 2017-18](#), October 2018

<sup>80</sup> Shelter, [Almost a third of renters unaware of their deposit rights](#), May 2013

<sup>81</sup> Tenancy Deposit Scheme, [Statistical digest 2016-2017](#), December 2017


<sup>82</sup> Tenancy Deposit Scheme, [Statistical digest 2017-18](#), October 2018

<sup>83</sup> Tenancy Deposit Scheme, [UK tenancy deposit statistics 2017-18](#), January 2019

<sup>84</sup> Tenancy Deposit Scheme Northern Ireland, [Statistical briefing 2017-18](#), October 2018

## 7.2 Disputes

There were 31,865 disputes leading to adjudication in England and Wales in 2017-18, according to figures published by the TDS.<sup>85</sup> The number of disputes increased sharply in the years following the introduction of the legislation, as shown in the chart below.



Source: Tenancy Deposit Scheme, [Statistical digest 2017-18](#), October 2018

The report from TDS notes that the number of disputes represents a small proportion of all deposits protected (0.85% in 2017-18).<sup>86</sup>

According to TDS, the main causes of disputes in their own scheme in 2017-18 were cleaning (cited in 54% of disputes), damage (49%), decoration (31%), rent arrears (20%) and gardening (16%).<sup>87</sup>

<sup>85</sup> Tenancy Deposit Scheme, [Statistical digest 2017-18](#), October 2018

<sup>86</sup> Ibid.

<sup>87</sup> Ibid.

### About the Library

The House of Commons Library research service provides MPs and their staff with the impartial briefing and evidence base they need to do their work in scrutinising Government, proposing legislation, and supporting constituents.

As well as providing MPs with a confidential service we publish open briefing papers, which are available on the Parliament website.

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

If you have any comments on our briefings please email [papers@parliament.uk](mailto:papers@parliament.uk). Authors are available to discuss the content of this briefing only with Members and their staff.

If you have any general questions about the work of the House of Commons you can email [hcenquiries@parliament.uk](mailto:hcenquiries@parliament.uk).

### Disclaimer

This information is provided to Members of Parliament in support of their parliamentary duties. It is a general briefing only and should not be relied on as a substitute for specific advice. The House of Commons or the author(s) shall not be liable for any errors or omissions, or for any loss or damage of any kind arising from its use, and may remove, vary or amend any information at any time without prior notice.

The House of Commons accepts no responsibility for any references or links to, or the content of, information maintained by third parties. This information is provided subject to the [conditions of the Open Parliament Licence](#).