



## The historical context of rent control in the private rented sector

Standard Note: SN/SP/6747  
Last updated: 22 October 2013  
Author: Sarah Heath  
Section: Social Policy Section

---

The recent rise in private sector rent levels and the focus on reducing Housing Benefit expenditure has led several commentators to call for the reintroduction of some form of private sector rent control. This note provides historical background to the introduction and impact of rent control, its continued use until January 1989 and its use in other European countries.

The *Increase of Rent and Mortgage Interest (War Restrictions) Act 1915* introduced rent control whereby rents were restricted to their August 1914 level. The Act was designed to prevent landlords from profiteering during the war years when demand for housing exceeded supply. Though originally intended as a temporary measure rent control continued to be applied to some rental agreements until January 1989.

The private rented sector which had made up nine-tenths of the housing stock in 1915 declined to one-tenth by 1991. Rent control has been widely identified as a factor in this decline because of its effect of reducing possible rent returns: thus reducing investment. Several other causes of this decline have been identified including, the increasing availability of alternative forms of investment other than rental property; and factors making it easier for people to own their own property such as rising real-terms incomes, Right to Buy and the increased availability of mortgages.

Efforts were made to stimulate the private rented sector by restricting rent control through the *1967 Rent Act*, which allowed previously controlled rents to be based instead on gross property values; the *1965 Rent Act*, which introduced regulated tenancies; and later the *1988 Housing Act*, which deregulated rents on new lettings after 15 January 1989. These acts were intended to encourage investment in the private rented sector by increasing potential rental income. At 2000/01 regulated tenancies made up 6 per cent of the private rented sector in England.

For information on recent discussion around the pros and cons of reintroducing rent controls see Library note: [Rent control in the private rented sector](#) (SN/SP/6760).

This information is provided to Members of Parliament in support of their parliamentary duties and is not intended to address the specific circumstances of any particular individual. It should not be relied upon as being up to date; the law or policies may have changed since it was last updated; and it should not be relied upon as legal or professional advice or as a substitute for it. A suitably qualified professional should be consulted if specific advice or information is required.

This information is provided subject to [our general terms and conditions](#) which are available online or may be provided on request in hard copy. Authors are available to discuss the content of this briefing with Members and their staff, but not with the general public.

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Background to the introduction of rent control</b>	<b>2</b>
1.1	Why was rent control introduced?	2
1.2	Changes to rent control legislation	3
	1918 Hunter Committee	3
	1920 Salisbury Committee	3
<b>2</b>	<b>The decline of the private rented sector</b>	<b>4</b>
	Decline in Investment in the private rented sector	4
	Post-WWI	4
	Alternatives to private rented accommodation	4
	Reintroduction of rent control	5
	Post-WWII decline	5
	Rent regulation	6
<b>3</b>	<b>Rent control in other countries</b>	<b>7</b>
3.1	The international context	7
	Regulation versus rent control	8
3.2	Finland	8
3.3	Netherlands	9
3.4	Germany	10
<b>4</b>	<b>Other sources of information</b>	<b>10</b>

## 1 Background to the introduction of rent control

### 1.1 Why was rent control introduced?

Demand for housing exceeded supply during 1914 to 1918 when only some new homes were built in a few munition production areas where accommodation was most in demand. The profiteering of some landlords and the resultant bad feeling from tenants led to rent strikes and unrest which threatened to undermine the war effort.<sup>1</sup>

The *Increase of Rent and Mortgage Interest (War Restrictions) Act 1915* was introduced in response to this unrest to protect both tenants and landlords by restricting rent on smaller, unfurnished, 'working class' dwellings and landlords' mortgage interest rates to August 1914 levels. Rent control was originally conceived as a temporary measure - due to expire 6 months after the cessation of the war. In the event, rent control was extended in duration

---

<sup>1</sup> Kemp P, *Private Renting in Transition*, 2004, p21

and widened in scope in both 1919 and 1920 as the housing shortage worsened over the course of the war.<sup>2</sup>

## 1.2 Changes to rent control legislation

Minor amendments to the 1915 Act were made by the *Courts (Emergency Restrictions) Act 1917* and the *Increase of Rent and Mortgage Interest etc (Amendments) Act 1918*, which restricted landlords' ability to obtain possession for their own occupation. This measure was needed to prevent those wishing to become owner occupiers from buying a tenanted property and immediately evicting the tenant in order to use it for their own occupation.<sup>3</sup>

### **1918 Hunter Committee**

A committee of inquiry set up in April 1918 under Lord Hunter examined the 1915 Act. A majority of tenants *and* landlords argued in favour of an extension of the Act after the war.<sup>4</sup> Landlords benefited from interest rates on mortgages in relation to controlled dwellings being held below market levels, thus the Act protected both landlords and tenants. The Committee recommended that landlords and mortgagees be allowed certain increases in rents and interest rates and that the restrictions should not apply to new dwellings. The recommendations were accepted and incorporated into the *Increase of Rent and Mortgage Interest (Restrictions) Act 1919*, which prolonged the operation of the 1915 Act until 1921. As the war continued the problems previously addressed by the 1915 Act had extended to larger properties also affected by lack of supply. The 1919 Act therefore also extended the 1915 Act to cover larger properties by doubling the rent limits specified within.

### **1920 Salisbury Committee**

The housing shortage due to the war resulted in significant house price inflation. Middle class tenants whose homes were not covered by rent control faced the options of 'purchase or quit' as their leases came to an end or were forced to pay greatly increased rent levels. Pressure built up for an extension of rent control. In 1920 the Salisbury Committee, examined the working of the Acts and recommended the continuation of rent control for the time being.

The *Increase of Rent and Mortgage Interest (Restrictions) Act 1920* gave effect to the Committee's recommendations extending the duration of rent control and raising rateable value limits such that almost all dwellings came within its scope. The Act also raised mortgage interest rates and the level of rent allowable to 40 per cent of August 1914 rates.

A further committee, headed by Lord Onslow in 1922, recommended phasing out rent control in three stages by 1925. The Conservative Government was keen to implement these recommendations but, in the face of public objections, decided to introduce changes to rent control more gradually.<sup>5</sup> The *Rent and Mortgage Interest Restrictions Act 1923* postponed decontrol by class of house until 1925 but allowed for decontrol on vacant possession. This transferred the basis for rent control from the property to the tenant.<sup>6</sup> The 1923 Act, followed by several Expiring Law Continuance Acts, extended rent control until December 1933.

---

<sup>2</sup> Kemp P, *Private Renting in Transition*, 2004, p22

<sup>3</sup> Kemp P, *Private Renting in Transition*, 2004, p24

<sup>4</sup> Kemp P, *Private Renting in Transition*, 2004, p21

<sup>5</sup> Kemp P, *Private Renting in Transition*, 2004, p25

<sup>6</sup> Kemp P, *Private Renting in Transition*, 2004, p25

## 2 The decline of the private rented sector

### ***Decline in Investment in the private rented sector***

Evidence suggests that the private rented sector began to lose its allure for investors during the 1920s<sup>7</sup> with the National Federation of Property Owners and Ratepayers (NFPOR) attributing this to the high cost of construction set against high unemployment and the difficulty of getting a mortgage.<sup>8</sup> The reputation of the sector reportedly discouraged individuals from becoming private landlords, as they were frequently depicted as “bloodsuckers, profiteers and despots.”<sup>9</sup>

### ***Post-WWI***

Although the construction of new homes for private rent did not revive in the 1920s<sup>10</sup> following the end of WWI, it is suggested that the role played by rent control, while important, should not be overstated.<sup>11</sup> During the inter-war years rent control did not apply to new dwellings and the possibility of its extension was, reportedly, fairly remote.<sup>12</sup> While rent control may have dampened the rent levels on new housing, more importantly, interest rates and building costs stood at significantly higher than pre-war levels and wages did not keep pace.<sup>13</sup> It is argued that the average working class tenant may not have been able to afford an economic rent on a new dwelling so demand was limited.<sup>14</sup> Peter Kemp, in *Private Renting in Transition*,<sup>15</sup> says “the building industry was forced to move upmarket in order to sell its products. Those who could afford the cost of new private housing tended to become owner-occupiers.”

It is suggested, however, that rent control did have the effect of devaluing tenanted properties in comparison to vacant ones by making it more profitable for landlords to sell repossessed or vacated rent controlled properties for owner occupation.<sup>16</sup>

### ***Alternatives to private rented accommodation***

Alternative forms of tenure in the form of local authority housing and owner occupation began to take-off after 1923 with Housing Acts in 1923 and 1924 reintroducing recently lapsed subsidies for the private housing and local authority housing sectors respectively. Subsidised local authority accommodation in particular competed from this time with the private rented sector.<sup>17</sup>

The demand for better quality housing increased following the end of WWI and in 1930 the Labour Government created an obligation for local authorities to undertake slum clearance, providing specified annual subsidies for those rehoused.<sup>18</sup> The subsidised local authority

---

<sup>7</sup> Kemp P, *Private Renting in Transition*, 2004, p25,27

<sup>8</sup> Kemp P, *Private Renting in Transition*, 2004, p25,27

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid* p27

<sup>10</sup> New housing construction for the private rented sector began to increase from the early 1930s. Kemp P, *Private Renting in Transition*, 2004, p 21

<sup>11</sup> Kemp P, *Private Renting in Transition*, 2004, p26

<sup>12</sup> Holmans A. E, *Housing policy in Britain*, 1987 and Kemp, P, *Private Renting in Transition*, 2004, p26

<sup>13</sup> Kemp P, *Private Renting in Transition*, 2004, p27, 36

<sup>14</sup> Kemp P, *Private Renting in Transition*, 2004, p27

<sup>15</sup> Kemp P, *Private Renting in Transition*, 2004

<sup>16</sup> Kemp P, *Private Renting in Transition*, 2004, p36

<sup>17</sup> Kemp P, *Private Renting in Transition*, 2004, p28

<sup>18</sup> Smith M, *Guide to Housing*, 1989, p8-9

accommodation sector continued to grow, rising to 18 per cent of housing in 1951 from 7 per cent in 1931.<sup>19</sup>

Owner occupation increased rapidly with first time buyers entering the market in numbers as the result of the availability of mortgage finance, raising real terms wages, job security and low interest rates.<sup>20</sup> Social attitudes also significantly shifted during the inter-war period in favour of owner occupation;<sup>21</sup> by 1951 owner occupation had increased to 30 per cent from 19 per cent in 1931.<sup>22</sup> Many people were choosing to own the home they previously rented. Peter Kemp in, *Private Renting in Transition*, said that:

It has been estimated that, over the period 1914 to 1975, about one in four transfers of privately rented dwellings to owner occupation involved purchases by sitting tenants (House of Commons Environment Committee, 1982).<sup>23</sup>

The private rented sector remained, however, the largest housing tenure (accounting for nearly three out of every five dwellings at the end of the 1930s).<sup>24</sup> Between 1933 and 1939 the conditions that encouraged owner occupation also assisted a modest revival in the private rented sector. In 1934, 21.4 per cent of new private dwellings were built for letting. This figure increased to 34.6% in 1939.<sup>25</sup> Rent control was gradually relaxed during the 1920s and 1930s – this was also the case in Europe where it had been introduced during WWI – See section 3 for more on the use of rent control in other countries.

### **Reintroduction of rent control**

The Second World War resulted in a significant shortage of housing and the *Rent Act 1939* reintroduced full rent control. Like the 1915 Act, the measure was intended to last for only six months after the end of the war. However, the legislation remained in place until 1968.

### **Post-WWII decline**

WWII marked a significant turning point in the private rented sector. From 1945 it declined rapidly in both relative and absolute size.<sup>26</sup> The existing stock was reduced by i) sales to the owner occupied sector, including sales to sitting tenants; ii) demolition through slum clearance schemes; and iii) acquisition by local authorities. The reduction of the existing stock was accompanied by very limited new construction for private renting. Britain can be contrasted with other advanced industrial nations in this regard where new building for private rent in the post-war era was not uncommon. Some European countries provided subsidies and tax incentives to private landlords but this was not the case in Britain.

Under the Conservative Government of 1951 the housing shortage made the continuance of rent control a political imperative. As private rents were frozen at their 1939 level they fell in real terms while house prices, earnings and retail prices all increased following the war. Rent yields were hit hard and landlords took opportunities to sell up and invest elsewhere.

The decline of the sector after 1945 has been attributed to a 'complex set of factors' of which rent control is one. In the post-war period blanket rent controls were continued. The 1939

---

<sup>19</sup> Smith M, *Guide to Housing*, 1989, p10, 15

<sup>20</sup> Kemp P, *Private Renting in Transition*, 2004, p30

<sup>21</sup> Kemp P, *Private Renting in Transition*, 2004, p30

<sup>22</sup> Smith M, *Guide to Housing*, 1989, p14

<sup>23</sup> Kemp P, *Private Renting in Transition*, 2004, p34

<sup>24</sup> Kemp P, *Private Renting in Transition*, 2004, p31

<sup>25</sup> Kemp P, *Private Renting in Transition*, 2004, p30

<sup>26</sup> Rhodes D, *The Modern Private Rented Sector*, 2006, p8

*Rent and Mortgage Interest Restriction Act* had extended rent control to virtually all rented housing, freezing rents at the September 1939 level.<sup>27</sup> The Ridley Committee reported in 1945 and recommended, in view of the housing shortage, that rent control should be continued for a considerable period. Two further suggestions, that rent tribunals should determine 'fair rents' on unfurnished private rented dwellings and that newly built dwellings should be exempt from controls (as occurred between 1919 and 1939) were rejected by the Labour Government. It is argued that this "made it almost inevitable that little new construction for private rental would be undertaken in the post-war years."<sup>28</sup>

The sector saw increased focus on conditions in the 1950s. The 1953 White Paper, *Housing – the next steps*, described rent structures as "hopelessly illogical" – it was recognised that many rent levels were insufficient to enable landlords to maintain their properties. The housing shortage meant that rents could not be totally decontrolled. The *House Repairs and Rents Act 1954* permitted limited increases in rents which had been let before September 1939 and which had been maintained in a good state of repair. Rent control was lifted from newly built and converted dwellings. Kemp notes, however, that there is "little evidence that this led to a resurgence of building for private rental."<sup>29</sup>

In 1956 the Labour Party Conference resolved that "...private landlordism had failed" – its response was to focus on the municipalisation of the existing private rented housing stock. For the Conservatives the sector's problems were identified with rent controls which had inhibited the ability of landlords to maintain their stock and attract new investment.<sup>30</sup>

The *1957 Rent Act* decontrolled all the more valuable houses as well as all new tenancies after a landlord had secured vacant possession. The Act also transformed the method of fixing the maximum rent payable by introducing a formula based upon rateable value. Disinvestment by private landlords continued, however, as sales into the owner occupied sector, including to sitting tenants, continued apace.<sup>31</sup> Between April 1951 and December 1961 the sector fell from 45 per cent of the housing stock to 25 per cent.<sup>32</sup> With controlled rents well below market rents decontrol on vacant possession gave landlords an incentive to remove sitting tenants by whatever means in order to charge higher rents or sell the property – this process became known as Rachmanism after a famously unscrupulous landlord.<sup>33</sup>

### **Rent regulation**

The Labour Government's *1965 Rent Act* introduced regulated tenancies (with long-term security of tenure) and fair rents assessed by independent rent officers. The expectation of rent regulation as opposed to rent control was that rents would be set by the market and where landlords and tenants disagreed either or both could refer the rent to the rent officer service. The *1974 Rent Act* brought furnished rentals within the regulated rent system and excluded tenancies with a resident landlord. Existing provisions relating to private sector tenants' rents and security of tenure were consolidated into the *1977 Rent Act*. Section 64 of the *1980 Housing Act* converted the remaining 400,000 controlled tenancies into regulated tenancies. Regulated tenancies with fair rents are now 'dying on the vine.' At 2000/01

---

<sup>27</sup> Kemp P, *Private Renting in Transition*, 2004, p38, 39

<sup>28</sup> Kemp P, *Private Renting in Transition*, 2004, p38

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid* p40

<sup>30</sup> Kemp P, *Private Renting in Transition*, 2004, p41, See also *Directions in Housing Policy: Towards Sustainable Housing Policies for the UK*, Ed. Williams P, 1997, p72

<sup>31</sup> Smith M, *Guide to Housing*, 1989, p16

<sup>32</sup> Kemp P, *Private Renting in Transition*, 2004, p42

<sup>33</sup> Smith M, *Guide to Housing*, 1989, p17

regulated tenancies made up only 6 per cent of the private rented sector in England. For more information on the fair rent system see Library note SN/SP/683, *Fair Rents*. This system of rent regulation remained in place until it was abolished for new private rented tenancies created after 15 January 1989 (the date on which Part 1 of the *Housing Act 1988* came into force). Tenants with regulated tenancies on 15 January 1989 who remain in situ are still subject to rent regulation through the fair rent regime; although, as noted above, their numbers are reducing year on year.

The *1988 Housing Act* provided that all new private sector tenancies entered into on or after 15 January 1989 would be either assured or assured shorthold tenancies– the rents on these tenancies are not regulated. The Department for Communities and Local Government has produced a guide which contains more information on setting and increasing rents on these tenancies. See [CLG guide](#).<sup>34</sup>

### **3 Rent control in other countries**

#### **3.1 The international context**

Britain was not the only country that introduced rent controls in response to wartime housing shortages, indeed, so did every other country involved in WWI.<sup>35</sup>

After 1989, private sector rents in Britain were deregulated. In much of Europe, in contrast, rents are still controlled by governments in some way. There has, however, been a general trend towards deregulation since the 1980s. Many countries have deregulated only the rents on new buildings, not new leases, so the majority of tenancies are still subject to rent control. This is the case for example in the Netherlands and Denmark. In the Netherlands about 75 per cent of the private rented stock still has controlled rents. In many countries the initial rent setting is free but subsequent rent rises are controlled. This is the case in France, Spain and Norway, for example.

While there are many similarities between the housing sectors in the rest of the developed world and that in the Britain, it is important to note that none are directly comparable. For example, a greater proportion of the populations of France, Germany and Switzerland are renters than is the case in Britain.<sup>36</sup> In Switzerland in particular private renting is common. This has partly been the result of the fact that, though there are strong rent-control measures in place, a landlord can increase rent at any time if their costs increase. The Swiss tax system is also important for the prevalence of the rental sector as it disincentivises homeownership by taxing the imputed rental income of homeowners. Importantly, institutions are required by law to invest in real estate, and residential properties form an important part of their holdings.<sup>37</sup>

The London School of Economics (LSE) study, *Contrasting Varieties of Private Renting: England and Germany*, set out the broad differences between the US, European and British models of private renting:

Since the 1960s, the British market in private rented housing has been dominated by individual landlords with small property portfolios providing short-term lettings. This is

---

<sup>34</sup> DCLG, *Assured and Assured Shorthold Tenancies: A Guide for Tenants*, 2007

<sup>35</sup> Kemp P, *Private Renting in Transition*, 2004, p21

<sup>36</sup> Scanlon K and Kochan B (eds), *Towards a Sustainable Private Rented Sector: The Lessons from Other Countries*, LSE London, 2011

<sup>37</sup> Scanlon K and Kochan B (eds), *Towards a Sustainable Private Rented Sector: The Lessons from Other Countries*, LSE London, 2011

in contrast to the USA, for example, where institutional investors (dedicated property companies, pension funds, etc.) own enormous portfolios, often dominated by purpose-built single-tenure rental developments. The US experience is often cited as a model, but European models of private renting can also offer lessons. In France, Germany, Sweden and Austria, private renting is often a normal long-term tenure choice even for middle-income households and the landlords tend to be private individuals owning a few properties. In all these countries the sector is larger than in the UK, but only in Switzerland is it dominated by institutional investors.<sup>38</sup>

### **Regulation versus rent control**

Professor Christine Whitehead highlights the difference between much of the 'rent regulation' that is in place to varying degrees in many developed countries and the kind of 'rent control' that was introduced in Britain in 1915:

It is important to make it clear that what is commonly thought of as rent control – nominal caps on rent levels – is hardly found today. Those countries that do combine strong rent regulation with sizable private rented sectors usually have systems that permit rents to adjust to near-market levels even though they are formally 'controlled'.<sup>39</sup>

The LSE study found that, in countries where strong rent control does not apply the affordability of rental housing is an issue (USA, Belgium, Hong Kong, Norway, France and Australia). In France there have been proposals to reintroduce regulation of rents on new tenancies. In contrast, in countries where rent is controlled, policy discussions centred more on the specifics of rent regulation (Sweden, Switzerland and Denmark). In Switzerland there had been discussions about whether rent rises should reflect increases in the mortgage interest rate or the cost of living. In Denmark, where despite the decontrol of rent for buildings built after 1991, there has been no surge in new supply, rent control was being discussed.<sup>40</sup>

### **3.2 Finland**

Finland has had a history of state control and regulation over the private rented sector, with government control extending to rent setting, increases, and security of tenure. Landlords' ability to regain control over their properties was limited, and tenant eviction was allowed under very limited conditions. Regulations were relaxed in 1987 to enable landlords to generate a reasonable profit from their rental properties.

In 1970 the private rented sector in Finland stood at about one third of the stock. The sector fell to about 13 per cent during the 1980s but has, since 1990, recovered slightly to about 16 per cent.

#### **Deregulation after 1990**

The deregulation of the sector took place in two stages between 1993, when new contracts were deregulated, and 1995, when deregulation was extended to cover all private rental properties. Initial rents and rent increases are no longer regulated, except in the case of those fixed-term contracts with predetermined rents which do not include clauses allowing rent increases. Notice periods apply to all private rented tenancies, and are linked to the duration of the tenancy. A research team for Cambridge Centre for Housing and Planning

---

<sup>38</sup> Kemp P, and Kofner S, *Contrasting Varieties of Private Renting: England and Germany*, February 2010

<sup>39</sup> Professor Whitehead C et al, *The Private Rented Sector in the New Century: A Comparative Approach*, September 2012, p13

<sup>40</sup> Scanlon K and Kochan B (eds), *Towards a Sustainable Private Rented Sector: The Lessons from Other Countries*, LSE London, 2011



Research (CCHPR), led by Christine Whitehead, Professor in Housing in the Department of Economics at LSE observed that as the landlord's rights to regain the property are only restricted for fixed-term tenancies, most landlords opt for indefinite tenancies - though very short fixed-term tenancies are allowed.

### **The current private rented sector**

Rents in Finland have risen steeply since deregulation, especially in the Helsinki region. Equally, since deregulation the size of the sector has increased in absolute and to a limited degree in relative terms. This growth is seen as related to conditions in other tenures as much as in private renting.

## **3.3 Netherlands**

### **Historical rent control**

Throughout the post-war period, the private rented sector in the Netherlands has been one of the most highly regulated in Europe and remains so today. Rent regulation, including a freeze on rents beginning during WWII lasted until 1951 followed by a series of differentiated increases. In 1950 a general rent increase was introduced and from 1955 rent levels were related to the difference between costs and 'bricks and mortar' subsidies rather than pre-war rent levels. From 1967 rents were increased annually and decontrol began in areas with a housing surplus of 1.5 per cent or more. From 1971 a points index for calculating maximum rent based on housing quality was introduced.

### **The current private rented sector**

The Netherlands still has a strong regulatory regime, though even there rents on more expensive properties are now deregulated. The rent regulation system in the Netherlands covers both social and private renting, unrelated to ownership of the dwelling. Below a certain threshold rent regulations apply and around 72 per cent of private rented dwellings have a regulated rent which is increased annually based on a points system which assesses the quality of each property.<sup>41</sup> Professor Whitehead has said that "regulation in the Netherlands is intended to produce rents below market levels. However, the general view is that actual rents may only be substantially below (notional) market rents in the larger cities."<sup>42</sup>

The private rented sector in the Netherlands declined from 17 per cent in 1980 to 8 percent in 2010. Professor Whitehead said that:

Strong regulation, particularly rent control, is often seen as one reason for the decline in private renting. But as importantly both owner occupation and the social rented sector have benefited from subsidies and tax incentives while private landlords have been disadvantaged; especially from the 1980s on.

Compared with other European countries, the social rented sector has dominated the housing market throughout the post-war period. Almost a third of households rent a social dwelling. Regulation is generally perceived as beneficial, which may be why successive governments have found it difficult to introduce deregulation despite concern that regulation has contributed to the private rented sector's decline.<sup>43</sup>

---

<sup>41</sup> Haffner M, *Towards a Sustainable Private Rented Sector: The Lessons from Other Countries*, Scanlon K and Kochan B (eds), LSE London, 2011

<sup>42</sup> Professor Whitehead C et al, *The Private Rented Sector in the New Century: A Comparative Approach*, September 2012, p146

<sup>43</sup> Professor Whitehead C et al, *The Private Rented Sector in the New Century: A Comparative Approach*, September 2012, p146

### 3.4 Germany

The historical level of private renting in Germany is difficult to establish due to reunification and the close relationship between social and private renting but it is thought that the sector has remained relatively stable.<sup>44</sup> Peter Westerheide, in an LSE study, commented that:

The private rented sector in Germany has some unique characteristics compared to other countries. In particular, renting is not seen as an inferior housing option but as a fully accepted alternative to owner occupation. This is particularly the case in cities where the majority of private households live long periods of their life or even their whole lives in a rented apartment or house. German households' propensity to rent can be partly explained by a strong regulatory framework, which gives tenants a high degree of security but also by a long tradition of renting as 'the standard option' amongst all groups in the population.<sup>45</sup>

Since 1971 initial rents have not been strictly regulated thought they must not exceed the rents for comparable dwellings in the same area by more than 20 per cent. Rents can be increased during a tenancy — within a maximum of two years and not by more than 20 per cent within a three-year period — if they are demonstrably below the local rent levels for comparable dwellings.<sup>46</sup>

In Germany, Professor Whitehead concluded that “regulation in the [private rented sector]] is generally perceived as beneficial to tenants without being harmful to landlords. Fiscal incentives have been widely used to encourage investment in the [sector] and privately rented property is a common form of pension provision. The effects of cuts to depreciation allowances in 2006, together with more recent reorganisation of the subsidy system and pension structure, may however lead to some reduction in the” private rented sector.<sup>47</sup>

## 4 Other sources of information

### The history of rent control

Kemp P, *Private Renting in Transition*, Chartered Institute of Housing, 2004

Rhodes D, *The Modern Private Rented Sector*, Joseph Rowntree Foundation, 2006

Smith M, *Guide to Housing*, Third Edition, The Housing Centre Trust, 1989

### Rent control in other countries

Kath Scanlon of the LSE published [Towards a sustainable private rented sector – learning the lessons from other countries](#) in 2011. This book considers the PRS in Germany and the USA as well as the Netherlands, Denmark and France.

Turner, M. (1990) Impacts of Rent Control on the D.C. Housing Market: An Empirical Case Study in Mark Alan Hughes & Therese J. McGuire (eds.), *Research in Urban Economics*, 8

Shelter published a briefing, [Generation rent: learning from different rental markets](#) in October 2011.

---

<sup>44</sup> Professor Whitehead C et al, *The Private Rented Sector in the New Century: A Comparative Approach*, September 2012, p134

<sup>45</sup> Westerheide P, et al, *Towards a Sustainable Private Rented Sector: The Lessons from Other Countries*, Scanlon K and Kochan B (eds), LSE London, 2011, p45

<sup>46</sup> Professor Whitehead C et al, *The Private Rented Sector in the New Century: A Comparative Approach*, September 2012, p13

<sup>47</sup> Professor Whitehead C et al, *The Private Rented Sector in the New Century: A Comparative Approach*, September 2012, p134

Professor Whitehead C, et al, *The Private Rented Sector in the New Century: A Comparative Approach*, September 2012, contains case studies on Denmark, England, Finland, France Germany, Netherlands, Norway, Republic of Ireland, Spain Sweden and Switzerland.