



Home Office

Evaluation of the Right to Rent scheme

Full evaluation report of phase one

Research Report 83

Claire Brickell, Tom Bucke, Jonathan Burchell, Miriam Davidson, Ewan Kennedy, Rebecca Linley, Andrew Zurawan
(Migration and Border Analysis, Home Office Science)

October 2015

Contents

Executive Summary	4
1. Introduction	8
2. Methodology	10
3. Implementation of the scheme	12
3.1 Explanation of the scheme.....	12
3.2 Conducting the checks.....	13
3.3 Landlords Checking Service (LCS) and helpline	13
3.4 Permission to rent	15
3.5 Civil penalties.....	15
4. Awareness of the scheme and communications	16
4.1 Communications activity.....	16
4.2 Levels of awareness	16
4.3 Communication methods	17
5. Immigration enforcement outcomes	19
5.1 Intelligence and enforcement activity.....	19
5.2 Immigration outcomes.....	19
5.3 Deterrent effects	20
5.4 Joint working.....	20
6. Impacts on tenants	22
6.1 Discrimination.....	22
6.2 Documentation.....	25
6.3 Other concerns	26
7. Impacts on the housing sector	28
7.1 Perceptions of impact on the housing market.....	28
7.2 Impacts on landlords, letting agents and housing associations.....	28
7.3 Concerns raised by landlords and letting agents.....	30
7.4 Other impacts of the scheme	30
8. Impacts on local authorities and VCS organisations	32
8.1 Impacts on local authorities.....	32
8.2 Impact on VCS organisations	34
Annex A – Research questions	35
Annex B – Methodology	37
Annex C – External data exploration	42
Annex D – Online survey data tables	52

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank the Consultative Panel members and all those who assisted in both the design of the research and the recruitment of research participants. Particular thanks to all those who participated in the research through interviews, focus groups and completing surveys. Thanks to the research contractors BDRC with ESA retail and IRIS consulting.

Thanks to Home Office colleagues within the Right to Rent Implementation team, Landlords Checking Service, West Midlands Immigration Compliance and Enforcement team, Tracker team, Civil Penalties Compliance team, Strategic Communications and Immigration Intelligence for their help with the research and provision of information and data.

Thanks to colleagues within Home Office Science: Migration and Border Analysis for their work on the evaluation, in particular, Katharine Beaney, Laura Broomfield, Andrea Grabham, Bwalya Kankulu, Susie Macpherson and Jon Simmons.

This evaluation was carried out by the Home Office Science directorate, drawing on research conducted by Home Office Science, BDRC Continental/ESA Retail and IRIS Consulting.

Disclaimer: 'The views expressed in this report are those of the authors, not necessarily those of the Home Office (nor do they represent Government policy).'

Executive Summary

The Right to Rent scheme was introduced as part of the Immigration Act 2014. It requires landlords of privately rented accommodation to conduct checks on new tenants to establish if they have a legal right to be in the UK and therefore have the right to rent. The scheme was implemented in the five local authority areas of Birmingham, Dudley, Sandwell, Walsall and Wolverhampton from 1 December 2014. The evaluation of the first six months (up until 31 May 2015) of the scheme's operation was undertaken by the Home Office.

The evaluation reports primarily on the impact of the scheme (on illegal migrants' access to housing, actions against landlords who rent to illegal migrants, the impact on landlords and agents, impacts on the rental market and any unintended consequences) and includes content on the process of implementation.

Multiple research methods were used. These included online surveys, interviews and focus groups with staff from local authorities, letting agents, landlords, tenants, housing associations, voluntary and community sector organisations (VCS) and Home Office teams. These research activities were carried out by Home Office Science and IRIS Consulting. A mystery shopping exercise was undertaken by BDRC Continental in order to understand any potential discrimination in housing access linked to the scheme.

Implementation of the scheme

- Overall, the evaluation found that landlords, letting agents and housing associations intended to and were carrying out Right to Rent checks.
- The Landlords Checking Service (LCS) was set up successfully.
 - The web-based Right to Rent tool had received 11,670¹ hits. The majority (21 out of 27) of letting agent and housing association respondents and landlords (15 out of 17) who had used the online tool had found it helpful.
 - The helpline had received 879 calls.
 - The checking service for complex cases had made 109 decisions on potential tenants' right to rent, resulting in 94 'yes' and 15 'no' decisions, all within its target of two working days.
- The civil penalties regime for landlords has been established. There were 13 referral notices served and 5 civil penalty notices have been issued.

Awareness of the scheme and communications

- Broadly speaking, people felt informed about the Right to Rent scheme, although this varied by the type of survey respondent.
 - Local authority respondents – 21 out of 24 felt informed.
 - VCS, including housing association respondents – 20 out of 34 felt informed.

¹ The data in this section covered the period from 3 September 2014 to 29 May 2015 and was provided by the Landlords Checking Service. This and other management information used in this report is drawn from live administrative data systems and is therefore subject to change.

- Letting agents – 36 out of 44 felt informed.
- Landlords – 70 out of 114 felt informed.
- Tenants – 22 out of 68 felt informed.
- The lower awareness levels found among tenants could be expected given that the focus of the scheme is on landlords' responsibility to carry out checks. Additionally, many of the tenants surveyed had not moved or looked for accommodation since the scheme's introduction on 1 December 2014, so would not have had direct experience of Right to Rent checks.
- In the case of landlord awareness, nearly half (46%, 52 out of 114) of landlords surveyed had not had any new tenancies since the scheme's introduction. In addition, of those respondent landlords with new tenancies, 27 out of 62 always used letting agents. These factors are therefore likely to have affected landlords' awareness.
- To learn about the scheme, a variety of information sources were used.
 - Stakeholder events were a key source of information, especially for local authority staff.
 - For letting agents and landlords (35 out of 42, 53 out of 96 respectively), member organisations were a key sources of information.
 - The gov.uk website was also cited as informative across most respondent groups (local authorities: 9 out of 10; letting agents: 41 out of 53; VCS and housing associations: 12 out of 16).
 - Of responding tenants who were aware of the scheme, 22 out of 39 had received their information from their university accommodation service.

Immigration enforcement outcomes

- There were 37 enforcement visits that resulted directly from a Right to Rent referral (for example from the Landlords Checking Service). This does not include Right to Rent activity undertaken as part of other Home Office enforcement work.
- In total 109 individuals who were in the UK illegally were identified, of whom 63 were previously unknown to the Home Office.
- Joint working with local authorities and other government departments has taken place as a result of the scheme.
 - All (7 out of 7) local authority staff and just under half of Home Office enforcement staff (6 out of 13) surveyed had been involved in joint working.
 - A multi-agency enforcement forum has been set up to facilitate joint working across the phase one local authorities and with Her Majesty's Revenue and Customs (HMRC).

Impacts on tenants

Discrimination

- The mystery shopping research found that there were no major differences in tenants' access to accommodation between phase one and the comparator area.
 - However, a higher proportion of Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) shoppers were asked to provide more information during rental enquiries in the phase one area.
 - Despite these differences during rental enquiries, BME shoppers in the phase one area were more likely to be offered properties, compared with White British shoppers.
 - Together this suggests there was no evidence of any difference regarding the final outcome from rental search.
- However, comments from a small number of landlords reported during the mystery shopping exercise and focus groups did indicate a potential for discrimination.

Documentation

- There was evidence of an increase in the number of landlords and letting agents requesting documentation from potential tenants as a result of the scheme.
 - Before the scheme, 53 out of 64 letting agents always required photo ID, which rose to 60 out of 64 after the scheme began.
 - Before the scheme, 18 out of 35 landlords always requested photo ID, which increased to 26 out of 32 after the scheme began.
- A small number of stakeholders being interviewed raised a concern that a potential unintended consequence of the scheme may be that the documentation requirements could present difficulties for some British citizens with limited documentation, for example if not having a passport or driving licence. One housing association respondent in an interview reported experiences of where this issue had occurred.

Impacts on the housing sector

- Letting agents felt that, overall, the scheme had no obvious impact on the housing market, with 45 out of 56 reporting no impact on rental prices, 44 out of 56 reporting no change in turnover and 42 out of 56 reporting no change in availability of rented accommodation.
- Landlords largely said that there had been no housing market impact or they did not know if there had been an impact. For example, 46 per cent (53 out of 114) said rents had not changed and a further 45 per cent (51 out of 114) did not know the impact on rental prices. Similar results were found on turnover and availability of properties.
- Overall landlords, letting agents and housing association respondents found Right to Rent checks to be relatively undemanding, although a small number of respondents did find that the checks took longer than expected.
 - Twenty-six out of 40 letting agents and housing associations found the checks easy, with a further 9 out of 40 finding them neither easy nor difficult.
 - Twelve out of 26 landlords thought checks were easy, with a further 10 out of 26 finding them neither easy nor difficult.
- Landlords, letting agents and housing association staff reported a range of views on the impacts associated with the scheme.
 - A higher proportion of landlords (27 out of 35) said that the scheme had increased their workload, compared with 26 out of 56 letting agents and 4 out of 13 housing associations. This may reflect that, generally, individual landlords would typically be doing fewer checks than letting agents and housing associations.

Impacts on local authorities and the voluntary and community sector

- Local authority respondents interviewed provided a mixed picture on the scheme's impact.
 - Five out of nine local authority respondents felt the scheme had increased their workload while four stated that there had been no effect.
 - In interviews, a key factor appeared to be the team in which the respondent worked. The numbers were small, but staff in private rental sector teams reported minimal workload impacts compared with social services staff, whose perception was that there had been a small increase in their workloads.
- A similarly mixed picture was seen for VCS organisations.

- Sixteen out of 30 VCS respondents felt the scheme had negatively affected their workload while 14 stated there had been no effect.
- From the small number of interviews with VCS staff, there was no evidence provided to suggest that the scheme had resulted in additional work for their organisations.

1. Introduction

The Right to Rent scheme was introduced as part of the Immigration Act 2014. The scheme requires landlords of privately rented accommodation to conduct checks on all new tenants to establish if they have a legal right to be in the UK and therefore have the right to rent. Landlords, or their agents, who rent to an illegal migrant without having conducted these checks will be liable to civil penalty action. A more detailed explanation of the scheme is provided in section 3.1.

The Government gave a public commitment to a phased implementation of the scheme, with phase one starting on 1 December 2014. The phase one location comprises the local authorities of Birmingham, Dudley, Sandwell, Walsall and Wolverhampton. To inform further roll-out of the scheme, an evaluation of the scheme was commissioned to examine the first six months of implementation.

The Right to Rent scheme aims to:

- make it more difficult for illegally resident individuals to gain access to privately rented accommodation, and so deter those who are illegally resident from remaining in the UK;
- deter those who seek to exploit illegal residents by providing illegal and unsafe accommodation, and increase actions against them;
- deter individuals from attempting to enter the UK illegally, and undermine the market for those who seek to facilitate illegal migration or traffic migrant workers;
- tackle rogue landlords by increasing joint working between the Home Office, local authorities and other government departments.

The scheme's implementation is being supported in a number of ways.

- A helpline for landlords, agents and prospective tenants seeking further information about the scheme.
- An online aid² which landlords, agents and prospective tenants can use to check whether the property is in the phase one area, and establish whether the prospective tenant has a right to rent in the UK.
- A case-checking service for status verification where the prospective tenant has an outstanding immigration application with the Home Office (or the Home Office is in possession of their documents). This service aims to provide a clear yes/no response within two working days.
- A code of practice on illegal immigrants and private rented accommodation. This includes lists of documentation, which provide a permanent or time-limited right to rent.
- A code of practice for landlords: avoiding unlawful discrimination when conducting Right to Rent checks in the private rented residential sector.³

² See *Right to Rent* at <https://eforms.homeoffice.gov.uk/outreach/lcs-application.ofml>.

³ Codes of practice can be found at www.gov.uk/government/publications/right-to-rent-landlords-code-of-practice.

The evaluation has been designed around two interconnected sets of process and impact questions (detailed at Annex A). The evaluation assesses the impact of the Right to Rent scheme in the phase one area, in terms of: immigration enforcement outcomes; the compliance burden on landlords and agents; potential discrimination linked to the scheme; effects on vulnerable groups and impact on the housing market. The impact evaluation provides the main focus of this report. The process evaluation was conducted specifically to inform further roll-out of the scheme as it focuses on the delivery and operations. Some process evaluation content, where it has relevance to the impact and delivery of the scheme beyond the Home Office, has been provided in this report.

In order to evaluate the scheme a number of research strands were conducted (explained in section 2 and Annex B on research methods). This included two externally commissioned pieces of research to collect data to inform the evaluation of the Right to Rent scheme:

- Research with landlords, letting agents and tenants (part of the Right to Rent evaluation) – conducted by IRIS Consulting.
- Mystery shopping to test the potential for discrimination within the private rental sector (part of the Right to Rent evaluation) – conducted by BDRC Continental in a consortium with ESA Retail.

This report draws on these two pieces of research along with the other research strands conducted by Home Office researchers, to provide a comprehensive evaluation of phase one of the scheme.

Section 3 of the report explores the implementation of the scheme and addresses the process evaluation questions. Section 4 then explores the levels of awareness of the scheme among key stakeholder groups. Section 5 reports on the enforcement and immigration outcomes related to the scheme. The subsequent sections then explore, in turn, the impacts on tenants, the housing sector, local authorities and the voluntary and community sector (VCS).

2. Methodology

In order for the impact and process evaluation questions to be explored a range of both quantitative and qualitative methods were used. The research was organised into five distinct strands, which provide the evidence drawn upon in this report. This report draws on the following.

- *Pulse check surveys* – These were short online surveys conducted at three points during the evaluation to assess the emerging experience of key stakeholders. They were sent to Home Office enforcement staff, local authorities, letting agents, housing associations and VCS. These surveys took place in December, March and May, with between 110 to 124 respondents to each of the 3 waves. The first pulse check focused on awareness and communication of the scheme with the latter two around the experience and impact from the scheme. The data presented in the report is from the final pulse check survey unless otherwise stated.
- *Mystery shopping* – This research was conducted by BDRC Continental in a consortium with ESA Retail. The strand focused on discrimination, primarily on the grounds of race, which could be linked to the Right to Rent scheme. In total, 332 encounters took place across the phase one location and comparator locations (Coventry and Stoke-on-Trent). Three scenarios were used for the mystery shopping, based on a student, an older UK citizen with limited documentation and a single mother on a low income.
- *Landlords, agents and tenants* – This research was conducted by IRIS Consulting. The strand consisted of online surveys with 114 landlords, and with 68 tenants (predominantly students). Alongside this, ten focus groups with landlords, letting agents and tenants (including students) took place.
- *Local authorities, VCS and Home Office staff interviews* – Semi-structured interviews were conducted by Home Office Science staff across these stakeholder groups. In total, there were 20 interviews with external stakeholders which broke down to 11 local authority, 5 housing association and 4 VCS organisation staff. Sixteen interviews and two focus groups were conducted with Home Office staff.
- *Management information* – This strand draws on both internal management information and external data sources to provide both contextual information and volumes of work as a result of the scheme. Unless otherwise stated, the management information is reported from the start of the scheme (1 December 2014⁴) up to 31 May 2015. Management information is taken from live administrative data systems and therefore precise numbers may change. A number of external data sources were also explored as potential sources of information, as summarised in Annex C.

Table 1 lists the different elements of research activity and numbers of respondents in each. Further detail regarding the methodology is provided in Annex B.

⁴ For the landlords helpline, data is from 3 September from when the service began and the checking service would have been able to conduct checks from 3 November.

Table 1: Summary of research activity

Research strand	Number of respondents
Pulse check surveys	
Wave 1 (Local authorities, letting agents, housing associations, VCS, Home Office Enforcement staff)	Total 124 respondents
Wave 2 (respondents as above)	Total 123 respondents
Wave 3 (respondents as above)	Total 110 respondents
Mystery shopping	
Mystery shopping encounters	332 contacts, providing 166 comparable pairs
Focus groups and online surveys with landlords, agents and tenants	
One-off surveys (landlords and tenants)	114 landlord and 68 tenant respondents
Focus groups (landlords, letting agents and tenants)	10 focus groups in total
Interviews with local authorities, VCS organisations and Home Office staff	
External stakeholder interview (local authorities, housing associations, VCS)	Total 20 interviews
Internal stakeholder interview (Home Office staff)	Total 16 interviews and 2 focus groups

Within the evaluation a variety of quantitative and qualitative research methods were used. Quantitative research provides an understanding of how many times an experience occurs or a view is held. Within this report please be aware that, in some areas, sample sizes are low which means the findings should be seen as indicative, rather than definitive. Qualitative research provides more detailed evidence and aims to explore the range of views and experiences of respondents. As such, this report does not provide precise information on how frequently particular views or experiences were expressed within qualitative interviews and focus groups.

3. Implementation of the scheme

This section reports on the implementation of key parts of the Right to Rent scheme which was launched on 1 December 2014.

3.1 Explanation of the scheme

The Right to Rent scheme is based on landlords in the private rental sector,⁵ or their nominated agents, checking the right to rent of new tenants. The scheme applies to all new tenancies starting on or after 1 December 2014. Prospective tenants can provide landlords with a number of documents to demonstrate either a permanent or time-limited right to rent (List A and List B documents respectively⁶). The landlord retains a copy of this documentation, which provides a statutory excuse, appropriate to the tenant's leave to remain at that time, against a civil penalty for renting to an illegal migrant.

The scheme is based on landlords being able to undertake most of the checks themselves, as is the case with the checks employers carry out on new employees. As mentioned in the introduction, landlords are supported by the online aid, guidance, codes of practice and helpline.

For more complex cases (typically, where the prospective tenant has a live application with the Home Office), the landlord can send the prospective tenant's details to the Landlords Checking Service (LCS) operated by the Home Office. The LCS will carry out the checks using Home Office case data, and will respond to the landlord within two working days, with a decision on the prospective tenant's right to rent. The LCS response will indicate whether the prospective tenant has a right to rent by issuing a simple yes/no response. 'Yes' responses will be valid for 12 months, allowing the landlord to rent to the individual and diarise a repeat check after a year has passed.

As well as supporting landlords in checking documentation, the scheme also has an enforcement dimension, as reflected in the aims set out in section 1. Consistent with the approach taken with employers who employ illegal workers, landlords who are found to have rented to an illegal migrant and cannot prove they completed a Right to Rent check may be subject to a civil penalty. Additionally, immigration enforcement action may be taken against any illegal migrants who are encountered as a result of the scheme.

Intelligence referrals are a key means of achieving these enforcement outcomes. One source of referrals is negative LCS decisions. Referrals may also come from a number of other sources including other internal Home Office teams, external organisations (like local authorities and

⁵ The private rental sector includes housing association tenancies which do not come through a nomination or referral by a local authority. Additionally, lodgers of social housing tenants are also covered by the scheme.

⁶ List A and List B documentation are listed in the *Code of Practice on illegal immigrants and private rented accommodation: Civil penalty scheme for landlords and their agents*, at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/368622/draft_code_of_practice_on_illegal_immigrants_and_private_rented_accommodation.pdf. List A documents establish a 'continuous statutory excuse' against a civil penalty and List B documents establish a 'time-limited statutory excuse.' Within List A, group 1 consists of acceptable single documents, whereas, for List B, any two documents are acceptable when produced in any combination.

other government departments) and public allegations. These referrals may then result in enforcement activities.

This current section explores the implementation of the different stages of this process. Intelligence referrals and immigration enforcement activity are explored in Section 5.

3.2 Conducting the checks

This section covers evidence of agents', landlords' and housing associations' intent to carry out checks on new tenants. At the first pulse check, 20 out of 41 letting agent respondents said they planned to carry out the Right to Rent checks in house and 16 out of 41 said they would use a tenant referencing service, while 5 out of 41 did not know how they would conduct the checks.

At the first pulse check, 33 out of 57 letting agent and housing association respondents had read the code of practice on illegal immigrants and private rented accommodation and 29 out of 57 had read the code of practice on avoiding unlawful discrimination. Of those who had read the codes, 31 out of 40 had found them helpful and 7 stated they had no opinion regarding the helpfulness of the codes.⁷

In the landlords survey, 42 per cent (48 out of 114 respondents) said they had read the code of practice on illegal immigrants and private rented accommodation, although more (53%, 60 out of 114) had not read it. Of those who had read this code, most (73%, 35 out of 48) had found it helpful. A lower proportion (29%, 33 out of 114) of landlords had read the discrimination code. Of those who had read it, 25 (out of 32 responses) found the information helpful.

At the time of the landlords survey in May, many respondents had not had any new tenancies starting since 1 December while other landlords always used letting agents to check new tenants. Twenty-six landlords (out of 35 respondents with new tenancies starting since 1 December) said that they had conducted checks on their prospective tenants. In addition, of those respondent landlords with new tenancies, 27 out of 62 always used letting agents. These factors are therefore likely to have affected landlords' awareness of the scheme more generally.

3.3 Landlords Checking Service (LCS) and helpline

In order to implement the scheme successfully the LCS was established to provide: a helpline function which gives information on the scheme; a web tool to take people through the checking process; and a checking service for use in certain circumstances, where a decision is provided on potential tenants' right to rent. The helpline cannot verify immigration documents or give advice on spotting forgeries. This helpline went live in September 2014 prior to the launch of the scheme, and the LCS started to be able to conduct checks from 3 November 2014, 28 days before the scheme went live.

Since the service began, there have been 35,775 hits to the webpage and 11,670⁸ hits to the LCS web tool. In the pulse check survey, 27 out of 66 letting agent and housing association respondents had used the online tool, of whom 21 (out of 27) found it helpful. However, within qualitative research, some housing association respondents described the tool as unhelpful because the information provided on next steps they should take was unclear. Despite this, some landlords in focus groups found the tool useful to check what they had done was correct

⁷ Here, and elsewhere in this report, responses of 'helpful' and 'very helpful' have been summed, as have responses of 'unhelpful' and 'very unhelpful.'

⁸ The data in this section covered the period from 3 September 2014 until 29 May 2015 and was provided by the LCS.

and eligibility of documents. The Right to Rent guidance and online tool are currently being revised with the Government Digital Service, with the wording and format being standardised with other content on gov.uk.

The landlords helpline has received 879 calls of which 865 (98%) were answered.⁹ The LCS completes wrap-up questions after each phone call. Based on responses up to 31 May, the largest proportions of calls were from:

- landlords outside the phase one area (26%, 213 out of 825);
- letting agents within the phase one area (20%, 161 out of 825);
- letting agents outside the phase one area (19%, 156 out of 825);
- landlords within the phase one area (15%, 124 out of 825).¹⁰

The main reasons for the calls included:

- asking about the types of acceptable documents (25%, 204 out of 825);
- asking if they needed to complete the check (22%, 185 out of 825);
- asking how to complete the check (18%, 152 out of 825).

In the pulse check survey, 7 out of 66 letting agent and housing association respondents had called the landlords helpline, 4 of whom had found it helpful and 3 found it unhelpful. Reasons for calls included querying the identification of genuine documents (3 out of 7 cases) and asking about the types of acceptable documents (2 out of 7 cases). Overall, 96 per cent of landlords surveyed (109 of 114) had not used the helpline. Of the five respondents who had used the helpline their reasons for so doing were:

- to see if they needed to carry out a check (3 respondents);
- to ask about identifying genuine documents (2);
- to ask when to use the Landlords Checking Service (1);
- to ask how to do a check (1); and
- to ask about types of acceptable documentation (1).

In total, since the service began up until 31 May, 109 checks were undertaken by the LCS, resulting in 94 'yes' and 15 'no' decisions. All of these had been completed within the service level agreement of two working days. Of letting agents and housing associations, 14 out of 41 had used the LCS. All but one respondent had found the online checking form easy to use.

Very few landlords responding to the survey had needed to use the LCS to check a prospective tenant's right to rent with 23 out of 26 saying they had not done so. The two respondents who had used the LCS¹¹ said it was easy to complete the online checking form. In the two focus groups with agents only one participant mentioned having used the LCS. The agent did not offer the applicants a tenancy, because the LCS decision was that the two individuals did not have a right to rent.

Home Office staff reported that the vast majority of activity has been online with 'thousands of hits on the website,' and (relatively) very few calls, minimising costs. Overall, the LCS was viewed as a success by Home Office staff, who attributed this to the testing of systems before

⁹ The remaining two per cent not being answered was due to a short-term technical issue, which has now been resolved.

¹⁰ This data has been provided by the LCS. The base response to the survey is slightly lower than the total number of calls received by the helpline, due to a small number of callers not completing the survey.

¹¹ The remaining one respondent did not know if they had used the Landlords Checking Service.

the launch date and regular meetings to share any lessons learned.

3.4 Permission to rent

There are circumstances where someone who does not have right to rent may be given permission to rent by the Home Office. These circumstances might include families with minor children who are complying with conditions placed on them by the Home Office, or those released to a private rental address on immigration bail. For phase one, the Tracker Team within the Home Office have provided a service where local authorities can check if a migrant has permission to rent. Within the first six months of the scheme, 126 status checks had been received by the Tracker Team, with 82 receiving a “yes” decision and 37 receiving a “no” decision. For the remaining seven cases, no trace of the individual being checked could be found by the Tracker Team. In total, 87 per cent (109 out of 126) of these status checks were delivered within the service level agreement of five working days.¹²

3.5 Civil penalties

If an illegal migrant is found living at a property, Home Office enforcement staff will issue the landlord with a referral notice informing them that their liability for a civil penalty is being considered. The Home Office Civil Penalties Compliance Team (CPCT) had received 13 referral notices¹³ from enforcement staff by the end of the six-month evaluation period. As a result of these five civil penalty notices had been issued. The total value of these penalties was £3,480. Eight cases have been given a ‘no action’ notice.

Some Home Office respondents raised concerns that there were too many documents that could be used to support right to rent, some of which are difficult to verify, do not prove identity or are not directly related to immigration status. These respondents recommended revisiting the documentation lists before wider roll-out. Documentation requirements are now being reconsidered.

Enforcement staff reported that they did not have the power to search for documents, so evidence could only be based on those the landlord or tenant provided and any oral evidence given in response to questioning on enforcement visits. There are now proposals within the new Immigration Bill to expand the search and seizure powers of Immigration Officers, which will increase their ability to find evidence of breaches of the scheme.

¹² Since March 2015, all status checks have been delivered within the service level agreement.

¹³ Data within this section was provided by the CPCT.

4. Awareness of the scheme and communications

The evaluation looked at key stakeholder groups' awareness of the scheme, how they accessed information and how informative these communication methods were.

4.1 Communications activity

In order to raise awareness of the scheme the Home Office used a number of different media channels to provide information on the scheme. By January 2015 there had been several national media stories with an estimated combined reach of almost 1.5 million people and regional media reports with a reach of around 2.4 million people.¹⁴ In the early part of the year, the communications evaluation rated a 96 per cent neutral or positive endorsement from regional journalists. Alongside this there had been 27,171 visits to the online guidance on gov.uk, engagement with industry websites and direct messaging to key stakeholders.¹⁵

4.2 Levels of awareness

Broadly, respondents felt informed about the Right to Rent scheme. The main exception was tenants, with 22 out of the 68 respondents (who were predominantly students) feeling informed¹⁶ about the scheme. These survey findings on awareness were reinforced by comments provided in focus groups, where very few tenants had heard about Right to Rent, although a small number of student tenants had heard of the scheme. As it is landlords' or letting agents' responsibility to undertake Right to Rent checks, there is arguably less need for tenants to be aware of the scheme. However, there are benefits in tenants being made aware of the scheme, including understanding why the checks are being conducted (covered in the discussion of tenant impacts, below) and, from the Home Office perspective, increasing the understanding of the scheme's aims. This could be considered as part of the planning for further roll-out.

The VCS (including housing association respondents) were another group with lower levels of awareness, with 20 out of 34 feeling informed about the scheme at the first pulse check. Local authority respondents reported the highest level of feeling informed (21 out of 24, at the first pulse check). The interviews with local authority staff found a different picture with a small number of staff who had little or no knowledge of the scheme. These respondents commented that they felt the scheme had little to do with their specific job roles, which included social services, neighbourhood work and homelessness.

Letting agents also reported high levels of being informed (36 out of 44, at the first pulse check), while landlords had lower awareness levels, with nearly two-thirds feeling informed (61%, 70 out of 114). As noted above, many of the landlords surveyed either rely on agents to check prospective tenants or have had no new tenancies over the period of the evaluation, so some

¹⁴ Estimated number of different people exposed to at least once to the articles.

¹⁵ This data was provided by the strategic communication team evaluation on the communication activity.

¹⁶ Here, and elsewhere in this report, responses of 'very informed' and 'informed' have been summed.

level of lack of awareness might be expected. Unsurprisingly, smaller-scale landlords were more likely to report lower levels of being informed about the scheme, with 22 (out of 37) landlords with only one property feeling poorly or not informed about the scheme. The proportion of landlords who rented out only one property was much lower (at 32%, 37 out of 114) than in the 2010 Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG) private landlords survey, where it was estimated at 78 per cent.¹⁷ Reaching these large numbers of smaller-scale landlords may require additional effort in communication for the full roll-out of the scheme.

The qualitative research with landlords tended to support the evidence from the survey, with more professional landlords having heard about the scheme, but with many smaller-scale landlords being unaware of it. This was also raised as an issue by other respondent groups in terms of reaching 'hidden landlords' to make them aware of the scheme. This group includes landlords with smaller property portfolios, people with lodgers, landlords who are not members of a landlord association, non-compliant landlords or landlords outside of the pilot area or living overseas. Strategies for reaching these groups might be considered as part of wider roll-out. The mystery shopping research found that informal landlords had some awareness that a scheme had been introduced, but were not always aware of its details.

Qualitative research with participants from all groups reported that some stakeholders felt that the Home Office's communications could have been more effective if it had taken place earlier, allowing them more time to understand the implications of the scheme. Another finding from qualitative interviews was that there were differing views on what being informed about the scheme meant. While some had heard of the scheme before it began, staff from the VCS and housing associations felt that they should have had more direct communications from the Home Office at the outset. This could be considered for wider roll-out.

4.3 Communication methods

A variety of information sources had been used across the different stakeholder groups. The majority of the local authority respondents (16 out of 23, first pulse check survey) had obtained information on the scheme from local stakeholder events. A number commented within interviews that it was individual contact and presentations from Home Office officials which had provided the best source of information. Other stakeholder groups also shared this view. These findings were supported at the third pulse check survey, with meetings with Home Office staff being cited as the most informative method of communication for local authorities (10 out of 10) and the VCS including housing associations (13 out of 16). However, only 6 out of 23 letting agents found these Home Office events an informative method of communication.

For letting agents, the most common method of receiving information was from member organisations (35 out of 42, third pulse check survey). Similarly, the most frequently cited source of information for landlords (53 out of 96) was through their membership of a landlords' or letting agents' professional body. The gov.uk website was also cited as a source of information in the first pulse check survey and, in the third, was often cited as an informative source of information (local authorities: 9 out of 10; letting agents: 41 out of 53; VCS and housing associations: 12 out of 16). However, qualitative interviews found some participants stated that the site was not user friendly, difficult to access and that 'simpler language should have been adopted' (interviews and focus groups with letting agents and local authorities).

¹⁷ *Private Landlords Survey 2010*, at https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/7249/2010380.pdf.

Of tenants who were aware of the scheme, 22 out of 39 had received their information from their university accommodation service. In interviews, VCS and housing association staff felt that their clients did not seem to be aware of the scheme. Consideration is also being given to developing information on the scheme which can be to reach tenants via their landlord, letting agent or housing association.

5. Immigration enforcement outcomes

The evaluation explored enforcement activity and immigration outcomes associated with the Right to Rent scheme.

5.1 Intelligence and enforcement activity

The Home Office Immigration Intelligence unit analysed internal data to provide information on intelligence received and enforcement activity taken as a result of the scheme. Data was examined for the six month evaluation period (1 December 2014 to 31 May 2015). As the scheme only applied to new tenancies, the scale of referrals and enforcement activity linked to the scheme increased over the course of the six month period from a small initial pool of tenancies in scope.

In total 26 referrals specifically related to the scheme were formally recorded on the Home Office's intelligence database within the first six months of the scheme. More intelligence referrals had been received but were not recorded in this database as they were sent directly to enforcement teams. The sources of referrals included immigration casework, the LCS, local authorities, reporting centres, other government departments, the police, as well as allegations from members of the public.

All referrals received in relation to the Right to Rent scheme were considered within standard Home Office tasking procedures, with those referrals assessed as appropriate for further action then being tasked to local enforcement staff. Right to rent intelligence was not prioritised within this tasking process and was therefore actioned on a 'business as usual' basis, meaning that these results were achieved without the use of additional resources. This was done to ensure that outcomes for the scheme achieved during phase one were achieved on the same resource as would be available if the scheme was rolled out.

During the first six months of the scheme 37 enforcement visits linked to the Right to Rent scheme were conducted. This includes those where referrals were recorded within the intelligence database, where referrals were received directly to enforcement teams and where Right to Rent questions were asked as part of other visits conducted.

In total 109 individuals who were in the UK illegally were identified, of whom 63 were previously unknown to the Home Office. Therefore, the Right to Rent Scheme led to the detection of these illegal migrants and who otherwise would have remained undetected. The remaining 46 were illegal migrants previously known to the Home Office, who were out of contact with the Home Office at the time of being identified.

5.2 Immigration outcomes

This section presents the immigration outcomes resulting from enforcement activity as a direct result of the Right to Rent scheme between 1 December 2014 and 31 May 2015. Over a longer time period (and therefore more tenancies turning over) and with rollout to a wider area, we would anticipate that these numbers will continue to increase.

Once an illegal migrant is detected the Home Office will examine their case and take appropriate action. The complexity of the case will affect the length of time taken to reach a conclusion. The paragraphs below describe the outcomes for illegal migrants identified within the first six months of the scheme (1 December to 31 May 2015). Outcomes are reported as of 14 September 2015, therefore these should not be seen as final outcomes as cases will progress further over time.

As stated in the previous section, in the first six months of the scheme 109 illegal migrants were identified. For six individuals no enforcement action could be taken due to limited details provided within the referral. The remaining 103 cases have been progressed by the Home Office. These individuals' immigration status were as below as of 14 September 2015.

- Nine had been removed from the UK.
- Five were pending removal, for example in a detention centre or within the assisted voluntary returns process.
- Twenty-five individuals had barriers for removal: broken down as 19 without valid travel documents, 4 with an outstanding judicial review, 1 not removable due to their nationality, and 1 with further representations. Their cases are being progressed.
- Two were involved in criminal cases including one in prison.
- Fifteen individuals were being progressed as family cases.
- Twenty-eight had outstanding cases such as asylum applications.
- Nine were granted leave to stay in the UK.
- Nine had been ordered to report to Immigration Enforcement but had failed to do so.
- One is deceased.

5.3 Deterrent effects

A key aim of the scheme is to make it more difficult for illegally resident individuals to gain access to privately rented accommodation, and so deter those who are illegally resident from remaining in the UK. Within research with letting agents and landlords there was some indication that access to the private rental sector was being restricted.

In one focus group letting agents cited three examples of non-EEA migrants (or people they believed to be non-EEA migrants) who they had turned away as they could not produce passports or other acceptable identification. It cannot be known whether these prospective tenants had the right to rent, but were unable to provide the requested documentation, or if they did not have the right to rent.

Also in focus groups, some agents and landlords reported that a small number of prospective tenants would put down the phone rather than completing their enquiry when asked about providing documentation relating to their immigration status. This could be seen as a sign of the scheme restricting migrants' access to accommodation, but, as in the previous example, it is not known if these potential tenants were illegal migrants.

5.4 Joint working

Joint working with local authorities and other government departments is an aspiration of the scheme. Home Office Immigration Enforcement staff were asked in the pulse check survey if they had been involved in joint working relating to Right to Rent, with 6 out of 13 responding that they had. This could be because of differences in enforcement staff's job roles. The most common organisations or departments which enforcement staff worked with were:

- housing teams within local authorities (5 out of 6);
- social services departments within local authorities (2 out of 6); and
- the police (2 out of 6).

Joint-working activities involved liaising with the organisations, tasking of enforcement action and joint enforcement visits (each selected in 4 out of 6 cases).

Local authority respondents were asked the same questions in the pulse check, with all respondents (7 out of 7) having been involved in joint working. This had been with neighbouring local authorities, VCS organisations and other government departments (5 out of 7 selected each of these options).

Joint working activity involved:

- sharing of intelligence (6 out of 7);
- joint inspections of properties (5 out of 7);
- sharing best practice (4 out of 7); and
- developing information about the scheme (4 out of 7).

Qualitative evidence was again broadly positive in relation to increased joint working. Workshops held by the Home Office with external stakeholders at the beginning of the scheme were considered by local authority staff to have been fruitful in both raising awareness and also establishing working relationships with these different organisations.

A regular multi-agency enforcement forum has been set up in the West Midlands to facilitate joint working and data exchange under the auspices of the scheme, and is chaired monthly by the Home Office and attended by the five affected local authorities and HMRC. This was seen by Home Office staff as a positive aspect of the scheme which has led to good intelligence and a number of arrests. Home Office staff said that the Right to Rent scheme had been connected to other interventions, such as internal referrals for illegal working.

Enforcement staff also suggested that, while some joint working has been beneficial, there was further potential to improve the quality of referrals by working with other government departments such as the Department for Work and Pensions and the police, as well as local authorities.

There were mixed reports from different local authorities about the amount of joint working that had taken place, with some saying that there were positive working relationships with enforcement staff. Some local authorities stated that the scheme had provided an opportunity to check properties which they had not previously been able to visit, allowing them to follow up on issues, such as overcrowding or health and safety concerns. Some local authority staff raised concerns about not knowing if appropriate risk assessments had taken place before visits. Some local authority staff shared the perception that Home Office staff were not following up on referrals provided and that they were not receiving all relevant referrals from the Home Office.

6. Impacts on tenants

The evaluation looked at the impact of the scheme on tenants, in particular the potential for discrimination, primarily on the grounds of race, related to the scheme and the implications of the documentation requirements the scheme introduced.

6.1 Discrimination

Mystery shopping research aimed to compare the experience of multiple pairs of shoppers, across the phase one area and comparator locations (Coventry and Stoke-on-Trent) where the scheme had not yet been introduced in order to establish whether there was any evidence of differential treatment in the phase one area. Within each pair, one shopper had a White British ethnic background and the other had a Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) background. They enacted one of three scenarios in each encounter with a landlord or letting agent to cover a range of shopper types in the real world.

At an overall level there did not appear to be major differences for White British and BME shoppers in accessing accommodation between the phase one location and the comparator area. There was evidence of differences at particular stages of the process of renting a property, although these were not necessarily indicative of discrimination against BME shoppers.

Three stages in the rental process were outlined for the purposes of the research: initial contact; registering and finding properties; and follow-up contact.

At the initial contact stage mystery shoppers initiated contact with the agent or landlord through a specified channel (email, telephone or face to face). Shoppers were asked to tick adjectives that described the manner of the letting agent or landlord representative who they communicated with.¹⁸ In total, 81 per cent (270 out of 332) of these adjectives were positive from BME shoppers compared to 70 per cent (206 out of 294) from White British shoppers. Although these samples are small, BME shoppers were slightly more positive about their initial encounter with the letting agent than White British shoppers in terms of the manner of the member of staff and the outcome of the initial encounter. An exception at this stage was around receiving a prompt reply from email enquiries, where the White British shoppers in the phase one area were more positive (60%, 18 out of 30) when compared to the BME shoppers (40%, 12 out of 30).¹⁹ This difference was not observed in the comparator location (White British shopper 43%, 13 out of 30; BME shopper 47%, 14 out of 30) which could imply a difference linked to the scheme. However, this may not be due to ethnicity as shoppers contacted the agents at different times over the fieldwork period, so it may instead reflect a change in the available stock.

¹⁸ The range of adjectives in the questionnaire were: encouraging, helpful, friendly, attentive, obstructive, dismissive, unfriendly, vague and other.

¹⁹ Shopper's name indicated that they were likely to come from a BME background.

Within both locations BME shoppers were more likely to be asked if they wanted to register compared with White British shoppers. Of those who wanted to register, rental fees were not mentioned to White British shoppers in the phase one location, but were raised with 67 per cent (10 out of 15) of BME shoppers. This difference was not seen in comparator areas (White British shopper 50%, 3 out of 6; BME shopper 60%, 9 out of 15).

The stage of registering and finding properties involved interaction between the shopper and the agent or landlord about the specification of the property they were looking for. At an overall level, it was generally the case that a higher volume of information was requested from BME shoppers across both locations. However, there were some differences which only occurred in the phase one area.

- Requests for references – White British shoppers (7%, 5 out of 70) were asked less often to provide references when compared to BME shoppers (20%, 14 out of 70). In the comparator location the proportions being asked to provide references were broadly the same (White British shopper 20%, 13 out of 64; BME shopper 19%, 14 out of 72).
- Length of residency in the local area – BME shoppers (11%, 8 out of 70) were more likely to have been asked how long they had lived in the local area, compared with White British shoppers (1%, 1 out of 70). In contrast, the proportions were similar in the comparator area (White British shopper 6%, 4 out of 64; BME shopper 7%, 5 out of 72).
- Being informed about fees – a higher proportion of BME shoppers (31%, 22 out of 70) than White British shoppers (19%, 13 out of 70) were informed of additional fees in the phase one location than in the comparator location (White British shopper 27%, 17 out of 64; BME shopper 24%, 17 out of 72).
- Mention of the Right to Rent scheme – the scheme was only mentioned to BME shoppers in the phase one location (9%, 6 out of 70), specifically only those who were enacting the scenario of an older UK citizen with limited documentation. It was not mentioned to any BME shoppers in the comparator location, nor to White British shoppers in either location. Due to the specific shopper types to whom the scheme was mentioned, the most likely reason is because of their personal circumstances (that is being older and/or not having certain documentation required), with letting agents and landlords pointing to the scheme to justify any requests for fuller documentation.

Despite these differences in dialogue between shoppers and the letting agent or landlord, this did not appear to affect whether they were told about relevant properties. Thirty-three per cent (23 out of 70) of White British shoppers were told that relevant properties were available, with a higher proportion (53%, 37 out of 70) of BME shoppers being informed of relevant properties. This difference was not observed in the comparator location (White British shopper 47%, 30 out of 64; BME shopper 51%, 37 out of 72). Therefore, within the limited sample of cases in the mystery shopping research, while additional questions were asked of BME shoppers, they were still more likely to be offered properties compared to White British shoppers in the phase one area.

While this data provides no evidence of difference in final outcome, verbatim comments collected during the mystery shopping process suggest that there were a small number of instances of potentially discriminatory behaviour or attitudes.

The two quotes below illustrate the individual experiences of two BME shoppers in the phase one area.

The landlord said that if I was under that scheme he was not going to bother because he had a local person who wanted the property and it was much easier to rent to them. (Phase 1, Asian shopper, landlord – card advert, telephone)

I was told they needed to look at what they had that was suitable for me and they needed to check with the landlords on whether the landlord wanted to do the Right to Rent check because it cost extra. (Phase 1, Asian shopper, independent agent)

These quotes collected by the mystery shoppers illustrate that there were a few individual instances where agents and landlords appeared to imply an element of discrimination. The quantitative data, however, suggests that on the whole these instances were not impacting on BME shoppers' access to rental accommodation.

The vast majority of verbatim comments do not allude to any discrimination. There are also comments illustrating that landlords and agents are aware of the scheme and their obligations, as below.

The agent said that since 2014 they had to check if a person had a right to be in the country under new government rules. (Phase 1, Asian shopper, independent agent, telephone)

He said that he had to follow the Right to Rent rules because otherwise he could get into trouble. (Phase 1, Asian shopper, landlord – card advert, telephone)

The mystery shopping exercise also recorded if the agent or landlord initiated follow-up contact with the shopper. The majority of shoppers did not receive follow-up contact and this was similar across shoppers and locations (phase one: White British shopper 83%, 58 out of 70; BME shopper 80%, 56 out of 70; comparator location: White British shopper 85%, 54 out of 64; BME shopper 69%, 50 out of 72). Further findings of the mystery shopping research and data tables can be found in the report 'Mystery shopping to test the potential for discrimination within the private rental sector (part of the Right to Rent evaluation)'.

The other strand of contracted research with landlords, agents and tenants also identified some areas where there might be a risk of potentially discriminatory behaviour by landlords in a very small number of cases. These risks, predominantly reported in focus group discussions, were around:

- attitudes towards potential tenants with time-limited leave, with one apparent instance of a tenancy being refused for this reason;
- a preference for tenants whose right to rent was seen as easy to check (for example, international students);
- a preference for 'lower risk' tenants (for example, people with local accents) for whom landlords felt they did not need to carry out a Right to Rent check.

Such instances of potentially discriminatory behaviour were not identified by tenants themselves in the focus group or survey. However, both the tenants survey and focus groups were dominated by students, a group whose right to rent tended to be seen as relatively easy to check.

Similar to the findings with tenants, other qualitative research showed that respondents had not been aware, first hand, of discrimination linked to the scheme, but did raise concerns that it could be a potential unintended consequence. Discrimination was also covered within a broader survey and interview question about complaints and concerns about the scheme. Responses to

this are covered below. A concern was raised by local authority respondents around the two-day turnaround resulting in potential tenants possibly missing out on accommodation if landlords and agents were concerned about using the checking service. However, they did not cite any examples of where this had occurred. Similarly, VCS organisations provided no examples of discrimination, but added that it may not be visible, as potential tenants may not be aware if it was the Right to Rent checks which had led to refusal and landlords would not state if this was the case.

6.2 Documentation

The nature of the documentation required to secure accommodation appears to have changed as a result of the Right to Rent scheme. At the third pulse check, letting agents and housing association respondents were asked what their documentation requirements were before and after the scheme was introduced. Before the scheme, 53 out of 64 always required photo ID, which rose to 60 out of 64 after the scheme. For landlords, 18 out of 35 always requested photo ID and 11 out of 35 never requested this before the scheme. Since the scheme has been introduced, this increased to 26 out of 32 always requesting photo ID; there was a corresponding decrease to just 2 never requesting this.²⁰ This apparent change was confirmed by some tenant focus group participants, who specifically said this had changed around the time of the introduction of the scheme.

This appears to show a change in practice for those letting agents, housing associations and landlords responding to the surveys, indicating take-up of Right to Rent checks. However, an unintended consequence, suggested by respondents in the research interviews and focus groups, is that British citizens who have limited documentation, such as not having a passport, driving licence or birth certificate, could find it harder to access rented accommodation. It was felt this was more likely to affect groups including older people, students with documentation kept in their home town,²¹ those on a lower income (who were less likely to have passports and driving licences and may have difficulties buying replacement birth certificates), homeless people and victims of domestic violence. This potential risk was mentioned by a number of respondent groups and by one housing association respondent who reported experience of potential tenants not being able to provide documentation. In the landlords survey and focus groups, documentation was mentioned as having the potential to cause issues such as delays and complaints from British citizens about the need for checks. However, in the landlords survey and focus groups with landlords and agents, there were no direct examples provided of British citizens being unable to access the private rental market because they were unable to provide documentation.

In focus groups, the tenants interviewed during this research reported very few issues in providing documentation. A large number of participants in the tenant focus groups were students, who were able to provide passports and visas easily. Some other focus group participants rented in the informal market and had not been asked for documentation. Only eight (out of 23) tenants responding to the survey said that they had their right to rent checked; however, two (out of 8) mentioned that they found it difficult to provide the requested documentation. Although the number of responses is small, this does suggest there will be some prospective tenants who may struggle to find acceptable documentation easily, although that does not imply they will not eventually be able to do so.

²⁰ A large number of landlords did not answer this question, so findings should be treated with caution. This reflects that many survey respondents either used a letting agent or had not had any new tenancies starting since 1 December.

²¹ Just one specific instance of this was raised in the online survey of tenants, but it also appeared to be a concern for students within the focus groups with tenants.

6.3 Other concerns

Within the tenants survey, 55 out of 68 respondents said that they had no concerns²² about the scheme. Of the 13 who did express concerns, these related to concerns about:

- being treated unfairly (10 out of 12²³);
- not being able to get accommodation due to not having the correct documentation (6 out of 13);
- checks delaying the tenancy start date (5 out of 12); and
- increased costs to cover the checks (4 out of 12).

Overall, 83 per cent of landlords (95 of 114 responses) said they were not aware of any concerns by tenants about the Right to Rent scheme. Of the 19 landlords who indicated that there might be some concerns for tenants they specified these as:

- that the checks might delay the start of tenancies (10 out of 18²⁴);
- that people might be treated unfairly (9 out of 18); and
- that vulnerable groups might be disadvantaged because of not having the required documentation (9 out of 18).

In the focus groups and survey comments, some landlords expressed general concerns about how the scheme might adversely affect tenants through having to provide personal information which could potentially leave them open to identity fraud and exploitation in the housing market. However, many landlords and especially agents were already requesting personal documentation as part of their existing checks.

Other concerns were raised by VCS organisations about the potential impacts. At the second pulse check,²⁵ 14 out of 33 VCS respondents stated that, from their experience, the people their organisations work with or represent had been impacted by the scheme. These impacts included:

- those who do not have a right to rent being exploited by rogue landlords (8 out of 13²⁶);
- people who have the right to rent, but not the right documentation, struggling to find accommodation (7 out of 13);
- individuals being discriminated against on the basis of their nationality (7 out of 13);
- people becoming homeless (6 out of 13).

It may be relevant to note that, in research interviews, some VCS respondents also expressed general concerns about the scheme (in areas including discrimination, access to accommodation and exploitation by rogue landlords), but were not able to identify instances where these had materialised.

²² With all online surveys, respondents were asked about concerns about the scheme. These are concerns that they raised within the survey and therefore may not be actualised problems.

²³ One respondent did not answer this question reducing the base number to 12.

²⁴ One respondent did not answer this question reducing the base number to 18.

²⁵ For the VCS respondent group the second pulse check survey data is presented here due to the small sample size at the third wave.

²⁶ One respondent did not answer this question reducing the base number to 13.

At the second pulse check, 10 out of 29 VCS respondents were aware of complaints from people they worked with. These complaints were about:

- discrimination (8 out of 10);
- charges being applied for completing checks (7 out of 10);
- exploitation by rogue landlords (6 out of 10);
- discrimination based on not wanting to check particular documents (4 out of 10).

Of those who had not received any complaints, 4 out of 18 felt this was because people were not being impacted by the scheme. Eleven of these eighteen respondents felt they had not received complaints because people were not aware of the scheme.

7. Impacts on the housing sector

This section explores findings on the potential impact on the housing sector, in particular landlords, letting agents and housing associations.

7.1 Perceptions of impact on the housing market

At the first pulse check, letting agents were asked about their perception of the scheme's anticipated effects on the housing market. Overall, respondents felt there would be no effect on the cost of rental accommodation (28 out of 39), turnover of accommodation (27 out of 39) or its availability (28 out of 39). At the third pulse check survey, respondents felt that, overall, the scheme had had minimal impact on the housing market, with 45 out of 56 reporting no impact on rental prices, 44 out of 56 reporting no change in turnover and 42 out of 56 reporting no change in availability of rented accommodation.

Findings on housing market impact were less clear-cut in the landlords survey, with larger proportions stating that they did not know what the impact would be. For example, when asked about the scheme's impact on rental prices, 45 per cent (51 out of 114) said they did not know, while 46 per cent (53 out of 114) said rents had not changed. Similar results were found on turnover and availability of properties. Within focus groups, a number of letting agents and landlords commented that it was too early to tell what impact the scheme would have on the housing market.

7.2 Impacts on landlords, letting agents and housing associations

Among landlords, 12 out of 26 thought checks were easy,²⁷ with a further 10 (out of 26) finding them neither easy nor difficult, with 4 finding them difficult to complete. Across letting agents and housing associations, in the pulse check survey, 26 out of 40 respondents found the checks easy, with a further 9 out of 40 finding them neither easy nor difficult.

Within the focus groups with agents, there were diverse views on impacts. Some agents suggested that conducting Right to Rent checks represented a disproportionate effect on them as small businesses. Other agents commented that the checks were easily assimilated with existing checks on new tenants. Eight (out of 57) letting agent respondents in the pulse check survey reported that they were now charging a fee for conducting the check, which ranged from £10 to £120. This was a free text question and it is possible that letting agents may have interpreted the question in different ways, for example citing costs for all tenant referencing rather than specific Right to Rent checks.

In terms of extra time required to do the checks, a majority of landlords (16 out of 26) who responded to this survey question said that it took them less than 20 minutes to do a Right to Rent check. Five (out of 26) felt it took them between 20 minutes and an hour. Four (out

²⁷ Here, and elsewhere in this report, responses of 'very easy' and 'easy' have been summed, as have responses of 'difficult' and 'very difficult'.

of 26) said that it took over an hour. Only two (out of 26) landlords said the checks took no extra time. These different responses on time taken could be due to landlords' level of familiarity with the scheme at the time of doing a check, for example they may include time taken to read the codes of practice as part of the time taken.

Overall, 39 (out of 59) letting agent and housing association respondents reported that conducting the checks took extra time, while 13 out of 59 reported it took no additional time. Over a quarter of the letting agents and housing association representatives (17 out of 59) felt that checks took no longer than ten minutes longer to complete.

Of the 35 landlords who responded to the survey questions, 25 said that there had been some increase in their workload as a result of the introduction of the scheme, with a further 2 saying it had increased a lot. Six (out of 35) landlords said that their workload had not increased at all and two (out of 35) said they did not know if there had been any increase. In focus groups with landlords, some commented that Right to Rent checks were not onerous because they were already careful about who they let their properties to, so the introduction of the Right to Rent scheme had created little extra work.

Within the pulse check survey, 30 out of 56 letting agents reported that the scheme had not affected their workload. Of the 26 respondents who felt the scheme had affected their workload, the following reasons were cited:

- explaining the scheme to tenants (22 out of 26);
- the additional work to do the checks (21 out of 26);
- having to monitor when follow-up checks were due (19 out of 26);
- explaining the scheme to landlords (16 out of 26);
- having to check documents which they may not be familiar with (14 out of 26).

There were some specific practical aspects of the checking regime which had implications for landlords and agents. One issue raised in focus groups with landlords and agents was around re-checks for tenants with time-limited leave to remain. Scheduling and, in the longer term, conducting re-checks was therefore seen as an additional administrative task for landlords and agents.

In the focus groups and survey, some small-scale and informal landlords raised some practical issues, including the potential difficulties in capturing high-quality copies of documentation and keeping these copies and tenants' personal information securely. This could be addressed in future communications with landlords and agents as part of further roll-out.

For housing association respondents, 9 out of 13 reported that there had been no impact on their workload. Some workload implications were mentioned in qualitative interviews with housing association staff. These included developing and delivering training, changing office systems to ensure that re-checks were flagged to happen when due, and explaining changed documentation requirements to tenants and tenant management organisations.

In the interviews with housing association staff it appeared that pre-existing approaches to documentation affected how much the scheme had changed their workload. For example, one housing association had faced particular challenges from prospective tenants because documentation which had previously been accepted (like NHS cards or bank statements) was not on the Right to Rent document lists. In such cases, they would therefore be required to change their procedures to meet the requirements of the new scheme. In contrast, another housing association's existing documentation requirements were much closer to those of the scheme.

Looking collectively at the effects on landlords, letting agents and housing associations, it appears that landlords (who do their own checks, rather than using agents or referencing services) perceived greater impacts than letting agents and housing associations. Compared with letting agents and housing associations, many landlords will only have done a small number of checks in the six-month evaluation period. It may be the case that checks will become quicker as landlords become more familiar with the scheme, whereas agents who routinely carry out checks on tenants as part of their usual business will find the scheme relatively straightforward to administer.

7.3 Concerns raised by landlords and letting agents

The pulse check survey found that 14 out of 55 letting agents had received complaints from landlords or potential tenants about the scheme. The most frequently mentioned complaints were about discrimination and checks delaying tenancies from starting (both 9 out of 14). Other complaints mentioned were around people not understanding the immigration system (8 out of 14) and additional work for landlords (5 out of 14). Of those letting agents who had not received complaints about the scheme, 22 out of 41 indicated that this was because they believed that people had not been impacted by the scheme.

In total, 52 per cent (59 of 114) of respondents to the landlords survey said they had concerns about the scheme. These concerns included:

- the additional work for them (45 out of 59);
- checks delaying tenancy start dates (30 out of 59);
- not understanding the immigration system (29 out of 59);
- vulnerable groups being disadvantaged because they did not have the required information (25 out of 59);
- properties being left empty (22 out of 59).

In the landlords survey, in particular, there was a view, expressed by many respondents in write-in comments, that they felt the scheme meant that they were carrying out a role that should be done by Immigration Officers.

7.4 Other impacts of the scheme

Turning to the benefits of Right to Rent, 84 per cent of landlords (96 out of 114) and letting agents (46 out of 55) said they had not noticed any benefits from the scheme. Nine (out of 55) letting agents had seen positive impacts. These included tackling illegal immigration, standardising landlords' practice and agent checks, and professionalising the housing sector (all were 6 out of 9). For the minority of landlords (18 out of 114, 16%) who identified positive impacts, these related to tackling illegal immigration (16 out of 18), tackling rogue landlords (9 out of 18), standardising checks by landlords and agents (8 out of 18) and reputational benefits for landlords and agents (6 out of 18).

Similar benefits were referred to by some landlords and agents in focus group discussions. Some housing association staff made similar points in interviews, in terms of professionalising the housing market and also ensuring that the 'scarce resource' of housing was only allocated to those with the right to remain in the UK.

At the same time, some landlords and agents considered that the Right to Rent scheme was only being observed by the 'responsible' players in the private rental sector, and that 'rogue' elements might be getting away with non-compliance. Some participants in the landlord and agent focus groups felt that the more exploitative end of the sector could increase as a result of

the Right to Rent scheme, as immigrants unable to provide the required documents might be channelled into this part of the private rental sector.

8. Impacts on local authorities and VCS organisations

This final section reviews the impact of the scheme on local authorities and the voluntary and community sector.

8.1 Impacts on local authorities

In the third pulse check, five out of nine local authority respondents felt that the scheme had increased their workload. This was to do with:

- having to explain the scheme to landlords (4 out of 5);
- responding to enforcement activity (3 out of 5);
- responding to more enquiries (3 out of 5).

There was also a mixed picture from the interviews as to whether the scheme had increased the workload of local authority staff, with some noting an increase whereas others indicated very little change at all. A key factor affecting these different views appeared to be the team in which the respondent worked. Those with roles linked to the private rental sector reported minimal impacts, although there were some areas of increased workload around raising awareness of the scheme and conducting multi-agency visits. The latter were seen as a positive step, in that, while workload may have increased, it was felt that this was offset by the positive opportunities provided by joint working.

Respondents working in social services, homelessness or children's services tended to comment on larger increases in workloads. For example, a small number of local authority respondents felt their no recourse to public funds (NRPF) caseload had increased as some families were now presenting themselves to social services departments as they were not able to access private rental sector accommodation.

A small number of social services staff said that having to do permission to rent checks with the Home Office had resulted in a very small number of migrants having to stay in emergency accommodation for longer than they would previously have done which could add to pressures on local authority support. These staff referred to a very small number of cases where the turnaround time of up to five days for the Home Office to complete a check had resulted in the migrant being unable to move to private rental accommodation, as the landlord had not been willing to wait for the permission to rent decision. However, a permission to rent check has the same turnaround time as a status check (that is, the check done to establish whether a migrant has no recourse to public funds) and is conducted as part of this check, so it should not add additional time into the process of a migrant's move from short-term accommodation to the private rental sector.

While these views were expressed, the local authority staff did not quantify the scale of any additional workload, NRPF caseload or additional costs for emergency accommodation. Additionally, identifying a positive benefit of the scheme, these same local authority staff also commented that the implications of checking permission to rent had helped bring home the

Evaluation of the Right to Rent scheme

reality of some individuals' immigration status. They commented that, for a small number of individuals, this had led to them progressing their immigration cases, either directly with the Home Office or through their legal representative. These local authority respondents felt that in the longer term, this might lead to individuals either successfully regularising their immigration status or returning to their home country. It was recognised therefore that there was a possibility that, in the longer term, some migrants might leave the NRPF caseload quicker than would otherwise be the case, thereby reducing the cost to the local authority. However, due to the fact that the scheme has only been running six months it was felt too early to tell which of these potential effects might be realised.

In an attempt to assess if the scheme could be linked to an increase in homelessness²⁸ (and a resulting additional burden on local authorities) evidence was obtained from the Department for Communities and Local Government (see Annex C) for the phase one local authorities and a comparator location (West Yorkshire²⁹). The comparator location was used to understand whether any increase could be linked to the Right to Rent scheme, or if it might be part of a wider trend. The data was explored to understand if there had been an increase in the number of applications and acceptances of homelessness, for both UK and foreign nationals, since the introduction of the scheme.

This data suggests that the scheme has not led to a major change in the number of homelessness decisions, with patterns of acceptances being broadly similar in the two locations. There was, however, a slight increase in the number of homelessness acceptances for non-EEA nationals³⁰ in the West Midlands in 2015³¹ compared to 2014 and 2013 (Table C2). This slight increase was not seen in West Yorkshire in 2015, where acceptances were similar to 2014 (but lower than 2013). However, a similar increase was also observed for homelessness acceptances for EEA nationals in the West Midlands (Table C4). As there were similar trends for both EEA and non-EEA nationals this suggests that the changes are likely to be due to factors other than the Right to Rent scheme.

In the pulse check, only one local authority respondent (out of 9) was aware of any complaints about the scheme (in fact, just one landlord having difficulties completing Right to Rent checks). Of those who had not received complaints (8 out of 9), they felt this was because people:

- were not being impacted by the scheme (8 out of 8);
- were unaware that they could seek advice from the local authority (4 out of 8); or
- did not realise their problem was related to the scheme (3 out of 8).

A third of local authority respondents (3 out of 9) had noticed positive impacts of the scheme. The most commonly cited positive impacts were:

- tackling illegal migration (3 out of 3);
- opportunities for joint working (3 out of 3);
- tackling rogue landlords (2 out of 3);
- identifying houses of multiple occupation (2 out of 3);

²⁸ Homelessness relates to statutorily homeless i.e. those households which meet specific criteria of priority need set out in legislation, and to whom a homelessness duty has been accepted by a local authority (<https://www.gov.uk/homelessness-data-notes-and-definitions>).

²⁹ This comparator location was chosen on a number of criteria, including having a similarly sized population, and private rental sector, to the phase one area.

³⁰ The figure for non-European Economic Area nationals will account for legal migrants and may also include illegal migrants if they are eligible for support.

³¹ Data for 2015 is only available for Q1. To allow comparisons to be made with previous years' annual data, the Q1 figure has been crudely extrapolated to produce an estimated number for 2015. However, this does not account for any seasonal variation over the year.

- landlords checking tenants' immigration status (2 out of 3).

Local authority staff, especially those working in private rental sector teams, also referred to these positive impacts in interviews. Examples included Right to Rent referrals (from either members of the public or local Home Office staff) presenting opportunities to identify overcrowded, unsafe or exploitative housing situations. It was therefore suggested that the scheme has the ability to protect tenants against exploitation of various kinds and help address the problem of rogue landlords.

8.2 Impact on VCS organisations

At the second pulse check, 16 out of 30 VCS respondents felt that the scheme had negatively affected their workload. The most commonly cited reasons were:

- having to explain the scheme to tenants (10 out of 16);
- additional work needed to support people to access accommodation (7 out of 16);
- raising awareness of Right to Rent (7 out of 16).

Within the interviews respondents from VCS organisations stated that they had not received any additional work. However, some respondents highlighted difficulties of linking an issue specifically to the Right to Rent scheme. For example, a small number of respondents highlighted that an advice organisation may be contacted by an individual who is finding it difficult to find accommodation, but it may not be clear if this problem was linked to the scheme, especially if the individual involved did not present their concerns as being around their right to rent.

At the second pulse check, respondents were also asked about any positive impacts of the scheme. From this, 5 out of 28 VCS organisation respondents noticed some positive impacts which included tackling illegal immigration and ensuring the right people had access to housing (both 3 out of 5). Section 7 above gives more information on the impact on housing associations.

Annex A – Research questions

Impact evaluation

1. To assess if illegal migrants' access to privately rented accommodation is being restricted, with reference to the indicators below.
 - a. *Compliance* – as measured by landlords' compliance with the scheme.
 - b. *Enforcement outcomes* – has the Right to Rent scheme resulted in detection of, and enforcement action against, illegal migrants?
 - c. The linked question of whether there has been the unintended effect of *displacement* of illegal migrants to surrounding areas, outside the phase one location?
2. To assess the compliance burden on landlords and agents, and how they can be supported in checking immigration status? Specifically, are landlords and agents (or potential tenants) experiencing problems with the checking regime and what time demands does it create? (This also links to the process evaluation questions, discussed in the next section.)
3. Has the Right to Rent scheme led to discrimination or had particular impacts on vulnerable groups? There are a number of potential indicators of this.
 - a. Are landlords/letting agents discriminating against potential tenants on the basis of perceived nationality or race as a consequence of the checking duty?
 - b. Is there an increased demand for emergency accommodation or other support (and, if so, how does this impact on the local authority and housing association sectors)?
 - c. Are the checks affecting vulnerable people, for example those in crisis situations or people with learning disabilities, who might find it hard to understand the requirements of the scheme?
 - d. Are there any other 'unintended consequences' (e.g. British citizens having difficulties proving their status or effects on community cohesion)?
4. What is the impact on the rental market?
 - a. What is the evidence for potential effects on the cost, turnover and availability of rented accommodation (including student accommodation)?
 - b. Is there any evidence that checks are giving rise to a growth in the illegal housing market (such as 'beds in sheds')?
 - c. Have checks helped identify illegal/unsafe housing and tackle rogue landlords?

Process evaluation

1. Is the Right to Rent scheme being delivered to plan?
2. Is the Right to Rent scheme working smoothly? Specifically:
 - a. How useful do landlords and letting agents find the online guidance which helps them

- identify who is affected by the scheme and, if they are, what they need to do about it?
- b. How frequently do prospective tenants have difficulty in providing landlords and letting agents with the required evidence of their Right to Rent in the UK (that is, using the documents in List A and List B³²)?
 - c. For cases where there is a referral to the checking service, what proportion of these enquiries are being completed within the two-day limit?
3. What is the quality of the information given by the landlord helpline?
 4. What is the quality of the yes/no responses issued by the checking service?
 5. What is the quality and quantity of decisions to issue civil penalty referral notices? This could be assessed by the scale and nature of appeals and objections and the 'conversion rate' from initial notices to penalties.
 6. How extensive is the reach of the Right to Rent scheme? For example, how aware are landlords of the scheme, and are prospective tenants in the more informal end of the market (e.g. lodgers in private homes) being checked?
 7. How well has the training equipped Home Office staff to fulfil their role?
 8. How well has the familiarisation equipped landlords to understand and comply with the scheme?

³² For information on these documents see section 5.2 at: www.gov.uk/government/publications/right-to-rent-landlords-code-of-practice.

Annex B – Methodology

This annex provides a detailed overview of the methodology used for the different research strands in the evaluation. Table B1 provides details on the number of respondents for each strand and when the research was conducted.

Table B1 – Detailed research method overview

Activity	Date	Number of respondents
Pulse check surveys		
Wave 1 online survey	December to January	Total 124 respondents <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Home Office enforcement staff – 22 • Local authorities – 24 • Letting agents – 44 • Housing associations – 14 • VCS – 20
Wave 2 online survey	February to March	Total 123 respondents <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Home Office enforcement staff – 15 • Local authorities – 8 • Letting agents – 54 • Housing associations – 10 • VCS – 36
Wave 3 online survey	May	Total 110 respondents <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Home Office enforcement staff – 14 • LAs – 10 • Letting agents – 64 • Housing associations – 15 • VCS – 7
Mystery shopping		
Mystery shopping encounters	March and May	332 contacts, therefore 166 pairs achieved <p>Visits were divided by person approached:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Letting agents – 102 • Landlords – 64 <p>Visits were divided by method approached:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Face to face – 26 • Telephone – 80 • Emails - 60 <p>Visits were divided equally across the phase one and comparator location</p>

Activity	Date	Number of respondents
Research with landlords, letting agents and tenants		
One-off surveys with landlords and tenants	May	114 landlords 68 tenants <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 88% were students
Focus groups with landlords, letting agents and tenants	March, May and early June	10 focus groups, with 70 respondents in total: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 with letting agents 3 landlords 4 student tenants 1 tenants/lodgers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participants were from, or let properties in, across the phase one area.
Interviews with local authorities, VCS organisations and Home Office staff		
External stakeholder interviews (local authorities, housing associations, VCS)	February, March, May and early June	Total 20 interviews <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 11 local authority staff (coverage across all 5) 5 housing associations 4 VCS organisations
Internal stakeholder interviews (Home Office staff)	April and May	Total 16 interviews and 2 focus groups <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Covered 10 Home Office teams 14 participants in focus groups

Pulse Checks

Method – The research strand was conducted by Home Office Science. Short online surveys conducted at three points during the evaluation period. These surveys were posted on SmartSurvey and consisted of a mixture of closed and open questions. Survey questions are available on request from Home Office Science.

Sampling – The sampling approach varied dependent on respondent group:

- Home Office enforcement staff** – West Midlands Immigration Compliance and Enforcement (ICE) team staff working in enforcement roles relevant to the Right to Rent scheme were nominated by senior operational colleagues. This initially included 27 staff. However, due to staff changes and leave arrangements this changed at each wave. ICE team staff were given unique IDs in order to help us to remind participants to take part in the research. The response rates at each wave were:
 - Wave 1 – 88 per cent (22 out of 25)
 - Wave 2 – 65 per cent (15 out of 23)
 - Wave 3 – 58 per cent (14 out of 24).
- Local authorities** – Local authority leads on the consultative panel were approached in the first instance to establish who would be the best staff to assist with pulse checks. A contact sheet was devised by the evaluation team to understand the structure of each local authority and which staff had roles that were relevant to the scheme. This included staff working in private rental sector teams, homelessness and social

services. Local authority leads then gathered this information on our behalf and between four and six staff were identified in each local authority. This initially included 30 staff. However, due to staff changes and leave arrangements this changed at each wave. Local authority staff were given unique IDs in order to help us to remind participants to take part in the research. The response rates at each wave were:

- Wave 1 – 86 per cent (24 out of 28)
- Wave 2 – 29 per cent (8 out of 28)
- Wave 3 – 37 per cent (10 out of 27).
- **Letting agents** – A list of letting agents was compiled through desk-based research. This mainly involved searching Right Move and Zoopla along with more targeted research to identify specialist agents, notably those operating in the student market. The initial total of letting agents was 329. After cleaning the list and eliminating those that dealt with commercial lettings, were not in the phase one location or had closed or did not have any contact details, the number reduced to 273. After sending out the first pulse check survey a number of email addresses were found to be incorrect, which reduced the sample further to just over 250 email addresses. Additional to this list, the survey was promoted by industry bodies such as NALS (the National Approved Letting Scheme) and property-based websites. Therefore the nature of the distribution means that it is not possible to calculate a response rate.
- **Housing associations** – Housing associations with units in the phase one area were identified from the National Housing Federation (NHF) website. Contact details were then identified from desk research on the listed housing associations. Unfortunately, most of the emails identified were quite generic. This resulted in a list of over 50 email addresses. Additional to this list, the survey was promoted by the five local Councils of Voluntary Service (CVSs). Therefore the nature of the distribution means that it is not possible to calculate a response rate.
- **Voluntary community sector** – As it was not possible to collate a list of VCS organisations the pulse checks survey was distributed via the mailing lists of members of the local CVSs, the West Midlands Strategic Migration Partnership and Citizens Advice Bureaux in Sandwell and Walsall. Therefore the nature of the distribution means that it is not possible to calculate a response rate.

Analysis – The pulse check data was downloaded from SmartSurvey and imported into SPSS in order to produce frequencies and cross-tabulations. The analysis has focused on the most relevant wave of the surveys for the given topic, for example at wave 1 the focus was on awareness and at wave 3 the focus on experience and impact of the scheme. The response rate for the VCS at wave three was below ten, so this data has only been presented when grouped with other respondents such as housing associations. When looking specifically at the VCS, wave two data was reported.

Mystery Shopping

This strand of the evaluation was conducted by BDRC Continental in a consortium with ESA Retail.

Method – Paired mystery shopping encounters were divided across the phase one area and comparator locations. The comparator locations selected were Coventry and Stoke-on-Trent. Within each pair, one shopper had a White British ethnic background and the other had a Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) background, in which three scenarios were represented. Shoppers used different methods of communication with the letting agent or landlord which included email, telephone and face to face. A shopper feedback questionnaire was designed to gather information from the shoppers which contained proximately closed questions with a few supplementary open questions to enable the shopper to provide description and additional

information.

Sampling – A sample frame of letting agents across the different locations was devised through desk research. Private landlords were identified through informal advertising such as local press and cards in shop windows.

Analysis – The survey data was collated and analysed to provide frequencies and cross-tabs of responses to the feedback questionnaire. This allowed for comparisons to be made between the two shoppers in each location and then for that difference to be compared between the two locations. Statistical significance testing was not conducted on the data due to the relatively modest number of individual mystery shops completed at a sub-group level. Verbatim comments were reviewed thematically.

Detailed information about the methodology can be found in the research report ‘Mystery shopping to test the potential for discrimination within the private rental sector (part of the Right to Rent evaluation)’.

Research with landlords, letting agents and tenants

This strand of the evaluation was conducted by IRIS Consulting.

Method – This research comprised two online surveys with landlords and tenants, using SmartSurvey. The surveys comprised closed and open questions. A series of focus groups were also conducted with formal (2) and informal landlords (1), letting agents (2) and tenants (5, of which 4 were with students). Tenant respondents were provided with a £20 incentive to attend the group. Survey questions and topic guides are available on request from Home Office Science.

Sampling – Invitations to complete surveys and attend focus groups were sent out via property industry bodies, local authorities and education and student bodies. These contacts were identified through local engagement (especially with the student/university sector) and contacts provided by the research team (for example with local authority private rental sector teams and industry bodies).

There were 114 responses to the landlords survey and 68 responses to the tenants survey, of which 60 were from students. These numbers exclude responses that were screened out on the basis that the respondents did not live (tenants) or own properties (landlords) in the phase one area.

Analysis – Frequencies and limited cross-tabulations of survey responses have been reported. A thematic analysis of focus groups notes and write-in survey comments was conducted.

Detailed information about the methodology can be found in the research report ‘Research with landlords, letting agents and tenants (part of the Right to Rent evaluation) – conducted by IRIS Consulting’.

Interviews with local authorities, VCS organisations and Home Office staff

Method – The research strand was conducted by Home Office Science. Semi-structured interviews were conducted via telephone with external respondents which included staff from local authorities, housing associations and VCS organisations. The topics included in the interviews were awareness and communication of the scheme, experience of the scheme and outcomes and impacts of the scheme. Respondents provided written consent and were recorded when consent for this was given. Topic guides are available on request from Home Office Science.

Semi-structured interviews with Home Office staff whose work linked to the scheme also took place. A number of these took place on the phone. However, for those who had greater involvement in the scheme face-to-face interviews were used. Where there were multiple members of staff with similar roles relating to the scheme focus groups were conducted. Interviews were recorded with interviewees' consent and with a note taker present during focus groups.

Sampling – External stakeholder interviewees were identified through the pulse check distribution list, those who provided contact details at the first pulse check and through other stakeholder engagement that took place at the start of the evaluation. Home Office Science developed this list of appropriate Home Office staff.

Analysis – A thematic framework approach was used to analyse the stakeholder interviews. Thematic analysis was undertaken on transcripts of interviews with Home Office staff.

Annex C – External data exploration

As part of the evaluation, a number of external data sources were explored. This was to assess the impact of the scheme on private rental prices and homelessness levels in the West Midlands. Much of the data that was explored, however, was unusable. The first reason was that the data for the evaluation period was not available in some instances as the statistics were yet to be collected or had not been released. The second reason was that the data was often not available at the local authority level and therefore the impact in the West Midlands could not be assessed. Table C1 provides an overview of the data that was explored.

Table C1: Summary of external data for rental prices, homelessness and citizens advice bureau enquiries

Source	Statistics	Issues	Time Period Available	Next Release
Valuation Office Agency	Annual regional statistics on the mean and median price of privately rented accommodation in England	Statistics not available at the local authority level. Statistics are also a sample of rents which means figures cannot be compared over time.	03/2015	12/2015 – statistics up until 09/2015
Office for National Statistics	Index of private housing rental prices in England and its regions	Data currently not available at the local authority level.	03/2015	07/2015 – statistics up until 06/2015
Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG)	Annual snapshot of the number of people sleeping rough in all local authorities	The statistics are a count/estimate of rough sleepers on a single day each autumn. Difficult to attribute change to the scheme. Time lag in the availability of the data.	Autumn 2014	02/2016 – statistics for autumn 2015

Source	Statistics	Issues	Time Period Available	Next Release
DCLG	Local authority decisions and acceptances for applications (both UK and foreign nationals) for homelessness assistance ³³	Some data is annual as opposed to quarterly making it difficult to compare. Difficult to attribute change directly to the scheme. Time lag in the availability of the data.	Q1/2015	09/2015 – statistics for Q2/2015
DCLG	English Housing Survey – Information on overcrowding of residential properties	Only provides national estimates. Time lag in the availability of the data.	2013/14	2017 – data for 2015/16

From the above data sources, the only usable statistics were the number of homelessness decisions and acceptances by local authority in the West Midlands and West Yorkshire. This data was explored to understand if there had been an increase in the number of applications and acceptances of homelessness, for both UK and foreign nationals, following the introduction of the scheme. The same statistics were collected for West Yorkshire to allow the West Midlands data to be compared to a location without the scheme. This data is presented in Tables C2–C7.

³³ Data was provided for the local authority level upon request. Due to the small numbers, data was only available for Birmingham alone, the five West Midlands authorities aggregated together and the five West Yorkshire authorities aggregated together.

Table C2: Homelessness decisions for non-EEA nationals in the West Midlands (2010–2015)

Non-EEA nationals	Acceptances	Eligible, homeless and in priority need, but intentionally so	Eligible, homeless but not in priority need	Eligible, but not homeless	Ineligible	Total applicants
	Birmingham					
2010 Total	529	9	257	139	49	983
2011 Total	661	22	169	153	47	1,052
2012 Total	422	14	83	82	26	627
2013 Total	398	20	67	99	65	649
2014 Total	423	30	68	100	59	680
2015 Q1	125	6	13	19	10	173
	Total of Birmingham, Dudley, Sandwell, Walsall, Wolverhampton					
2010 Total	641	13	290	237	56	1,237
2011 Total	745	25	190	234	58	1,252
2012 Total	508	16	112	160	44	840
2013 Total	472	28	92	143	82	817
2014 Total	543	40	119	125	77	904
2015 Q1	148	9	29	25	16	227

Table C3: Homelessness decisions for non-EEA nationals in West Yorkshire (2010–2015)

Non-EEA nationals	Acceptances	Eligible, homeless and in priority need, but intentionally so	Eligible, homeless but not in priority need	Eligible, but not homeless	Ineligible	Total applicants
Total of Bradford, Calderdale, Kirklees, Leeds and Wakefield						
2010 Total	144	-	337	214	-	756
2011 Total	153	5	235	232	32	657
2012 Total	163	-	196	133	-	567
2013 Total	82	-	147	70	-	354
2014 Total	66	-	90	25	-	198
2015 Q1	17	-	36	11	-	71

Table C4: Homelessness acceptances of foreign nationals in the West Midlands (2010–2015)

Homelessness acceptances of foreign nationals		EEA national	Non-EEA national	EEA national	Non-EEA national	EEA national	Non-EEA national	EEA national	Non-EEA national	EEA national	Non-EEA national
		q1		q2		q3		q4		Total	
Birmingham	20	19	87	30	77	43	179	42	186	134	529
Total of 5 authorities ¹	10	21	112	37	99	45	217	43	213	146	641
		q1		q2		q3		q4		Total	
Birmingham	20	39	200	38	161	43	164	46	136	166	661
Total of 5 authorities ¹	11	44	220	41	184	44	190	47	151	176	745
		q1		q2		q3		q4		Total	
Birmingham	20	38	102	48	97	62	121	50	102	198	422
Total of 5 authorities ¹	12	44	108	52	111	68	156	62	133	226	508
		q1		q2		q3		q4		Total	
Birmingham	20	55	125	50	126	37	63	59	84	201	398
Total of 5 authorities ¹	13	64	145	67	141	49	84	78	102	258	472
		q1		q2		q3		q4		Total	
Birmingham	20	35	100	44	109	59	104	51	110	189	423
Total of 5 authorities ¹	14	50	131	57	138	69	128	63	146	239	543
		q1									
Birmingham	20	58	125								
Total of 5 authorities ¹	15	65	148								

1. Total of Birmingham, Dudley, Sandwell, Walsall, Wolverhampton

Table C5: Homelessness acceptances of foreign nationals in West Yorkshire (2010–2015)

Homelessness acceptances of foreign nationals		q1		q2		q3		q4		Total	
		EEA national	Non-EEA national	EEA national	Non-EEA national	EEA national	Non-EEA national	EEA national	Non-EEA national	EEA national	Non-EEA national
Total of 5 authorities ¹	2010	-	34	-	46	6	44	7	20	15	144
		q1		q2		q3		q4		Total	
Total of 5 authorities ¹	2011	11	34	11	48	5	42	11	29	38	153
		q1		q2		q3		q4		Total	
Total of 5 authorities ¹	2012	11	43	16	41	11	36	20	43	58	163
		q1		q2		q3		q4		Total	
Total of 5 authorities ¹	2013	9	12	9	19	11	29	6	22	35	82
		q1		q2		q3		q4		Total	
Total of 5 authorities ¹	2014	5	18	8	17	-	14	-	17	18	66
		q1									
Total of 5 authorities ¹	2015	9	17								

1. Total of Bradford, Calderdale, Kirklees, Leeds and Wakefield

Table C6: Homelessness acceptances of UK nationals in the West Midlands (2010–2015)

		Acceptances	Eligible, homeless and in priority need, but intentionally so	Not in priority need	Not homeless	Ineligible	Total decisions
2010	Birmingham	3,950	261	1,542	1,812	164	7,729
	Dudley	184	39	111	1,192	17	1,543
	Sandwell	331	33	-	63	-	489
	Walsall	122	-	-	45	-	181
	Wolverhampton	315	-	138	251	-	717
	Total	4,902	349	1,848	3,363	197	10,659
2011	Birmingham	4,177	377	1,359	1,624	141	7,678
	Dudley	153	-	-	1,575	19	1,903
	Sandwell	489	74	177	108	6	854
	Walsall	108	-	-	49	13	178
	Wolverhampton	343	14	129	244	5	735
	Total	5,270	507	1,787	3,600	184	11,348
2012	Birmingham	3,909	325	958	1,305	142	6,639
	Dudley	170	35	163	1,601	26	1,995
	Sandwell	521	66	111	56	15	769
	Walsall	200	-	10	45	-	269
	Wolverhampton	385	-	147	304	-	850
	Total	5,185	443	1,389	3,311	194	10,522
2013	Birmingham	3,368	346	727	1,330	199	5,970
	Dudley	173	38	348	1,314	25	1,898
	Sandwell	550	81	95	77	8	811
	Walsall	377	9	21	90	6	503
	Wolverhampton	328	24	120	254	6	732
	Total	4,796	498	1,311	3,065	244	9,914

		Acceptances	Eligible, homeless and in priority need, but intentionally so	Not in priority need	Not homeless	Ineligible	Total decisions
2014	Birmingham	3,084	322	473	1,208	205	5,292
	Dudley	98	34	460	1,318	51	1,961
	Sandwell	544	81	-	69	-	770
	Walsall	182	8	-	32	-	231
	Wolverhampton	350	33	168	159	22	732
	Total	4,258	478	1,174	2,786	290	8,986
2015 Q1	<i>Birmingham</i>	750	72	103	233	43	1,201
	<i>Dudley</i>	21	17	106	258	5	407
	<i>Sandwell</i>	147	22	-	30	-	239
	<i>Walsall</i>	31	-	-	-	-	40
	<i>Wolverhampton</i>	76	-	45	-	-	161
	<i>Total</i>	1,025	124	285	551	63	2,048

Table C7: Homelessness acceptances of UK nationals in West Yorkshire (2010–2015)

		Acceptances	Eligible, homeless and in priority need, but intentionally so	Not in priority need	Not homeless	Ineligible	Total decisions
2010	Bradford	134	-	-	236	-	419
	Calderdale	58	-	-	21	-	102
	Kirklees	359	69	74	107	27	636
	Leeds	453	46	1,054	1,798	131	3,482
	Wakefield	142	26	127	56	6	357
	Total	1,146	171	1,294	2,218	167	4,996
2011	Bradford	192	16	77	239	10	534
	Calderdale	50	-	-	24	-	93
	Kirklees	322	-	-	102	-	535
	Leeds	673	39	1,172	2,845	163	4,892
	Wakefield	169	34	138	157	18	516
	Total	1,406	151	1,448	3,367	198	6,570
2012	Bradford	322	28	127	336	20	833
	Calderdale	57	-	14	58	-	143
	Kirklees	373	-	116	79	-	628
	Leeds	784	35	1,255	2,425	191	4,690
	Wakefield	202	26	165	244	18	655
	Total	1,738	154	1,677	3,142	238	6,949
2013	Bradford	338	49	109	512	30	1,038
	Calderdale	60	-	-	44	-	132
	Kirklees	344	-	-	101	-	553
	Leeds	461	31	1,054	1,415	147	3,108
	Wakefield	191	28	138	236	10	603
	Total	1,394	168	1,371	2,308	193	5,434

		Acceptances	Eligible, homeless and in priority need, but intentionally so	Not in priority need	Not homeless	Ineligible	Total decisions
2014	Bradford	288	24	94	348	25	779
	Calderdale	72	7	5	45	5	134
	Kirklees	272	27	32	57	8	396
	Leeds	328	32	883	177	31	1,451
	Wakefield	175	44	166	203	22	610
	Total	1,135	134	1,180	830	91	3,370
2015 Q1	<i>Bradford</i>	93	10	34	100	12	249
	<i>Calderdale</i>	18	-	-	9	-	32
	<i>Kirklees</i>	81	7	-	15	-	108
	<i>Leeds</i>	111	13	295	27	5	451
	<i>Wakefield</i>	45	-	51	41	-	151
	<i>Total</i>	348	40	387	192	24	991

Annex D – Online survey data tables

This annex contains data tables for the survey responses within the report. Pulse checks were fully administered by Home Office Science and the raw data and analysis has been quality assured. Landlords and tenants surveys were administered by IRIS Consulting and have been subject to their own quality assurance process. Some tables do not total 100 per cent as respondents could respond to more than one category.

2. Method

Table D1: Number of responses to each survey wave by respondent (All waves)

	Survey Wave			Total
	Wave 1	Wave 2	Wave 3	
HO ICE	22	15	14	51
Housing association	14	10	15	39
Letting agent	44	54	64	162
Local authority	24	8	10	42
VCS	20	36	7	63
Total	124	123	110	357

3. Implementation of the scheme

Table D2: Letting agents – How does your office or company plan to carry out the Right to Rent checks? (Wave 1)

	Response total	Response %
In-house	20	49
Tenant referencing service	16	39
Don't know	5	12
Total	41	100

Table D3: Letting agents and housing associations – Have you read the code of practice on illegal immigrants and private rented accommodation? (Wave 1)

	Response total	Response %
Yes	33	58
No	19	33
Don't know	5	9
Total	57	100

Table D4: Letting agents and housing associations – Have you read the code of practice for landlords: avoiding unlawful discrimination when conducting the Right to Rent check in the private residential sector? (Wave 1)

	Response total	Response %
Yes	29	51
No	20	35
Don't know	8	14
Total	57	100

Table D5: Letting agents and housing associations – Would you say that the information you received from the code(s) was... (Wave 1)

	Response total	Response %
Very helpful	13	33
Helpful	18	45
No opinion	7	18
Unhelpful	1	3
Very unhelpful	1	3
Total	40	100

Table D6: Landlords – Have you read the code of practice on Gov.uk on illegal immigrants and private rented accommodation? (IRIS Survey)

	Response total	Response %
Yes	48	42
No	60	53
Don't know	6	5
Total	114	100

Table D7: Landlords – Overall, would you say that the information you received from the code of practice was ...? (IRIS Survey)

	Response total	Response %
Very helpful	12	25
Helpful	23	48
No opinion	12	25
Unhelpful	0	0
Very unhelpful	1	2
Total	48	100

Table D8: Landlords – Have you read the code of practice on Gov.uk for landlords: avoiding unlawful discrimination when conducting 'Right to Rent' checks in the private residential sector? (IRIS Survey)

	Response total	Response %
Yes	33	29
No	72	63
Don't know	9	8
Total	114	100

Table D9: Landlords – Overall, would you say that the information you received from the code of practice was: (select all that apply)? (IRIS Survey)

	Response total	Response %
Very helpful	4	13
Helpful	21	66
No opinion	5	16
Unhelpful	2	6
Very unhelpful	0	0
Total	32	100

Table D10: Landlords – Have any Right to Rent checks been conducted on your prospective tenants? (IRIS Survey)

	Response total	Response %
Yes	26	74
No	7	20
Don't know	2	6
Total	35	100

Table D11: Landlords – when you let your property do you use a letting agent? (IRIS Survey)

	Response total	Response %
Yes, always	27	44
Sometimes	15	24
No	20	32
Total	62	100

Table D12: Letting agents and housing associations – Have you used the online Right to Rent tool, available from Gov.uk? (Wave 3)

	Response total	Response %
Yes	27	41
No	33	50
Don't know	6	9
Total	66	100

Table D13: Letting agents and housing associations – Overall, would you say that the information you have received using the online tool was...? (Wave 3)

	Response total	Response %
Very helpful	7	26
Helpful	14	52
No opinion	1	4
Unhelpful	4	15
Very unhelpful	1	4
Total	27	100

Table D14: Letting agents and housing associations – Have you called the landlords helpline? (Wave 3)

	Response total	Response %
Yes	7	11
No	58	88
Don't know	1	2
Total	66	100

Table D15: Letting agents and housing associations – Overall, would you say that the information and advice you have received via the landlords helpline was...? (Wave 3)

	Response total	Response %
Very helpful	2	29
Helpful	2	29
Unhelpful	2	29
Very unhelpful	1	14
Total	7	100

Table D16: Letting agents and housing associations – Reasons for calling helpline (select all that apply) (Wave 3)

	Response total	Response %
To ask about identifying genuine documents	3	43
To ask about types of acceptable documentation	2	29
To ask when to use the Landlords Checking Service	1	14
To see if I need to carry out a check	1	14
Other	1	14
Total	7	

Table D17: Landlords – Have you used the Right to Rent helpline? (IRIS Survey)

	Response total	Response %
Yes	5	4
No	109	96
Don't know	0	0
Total	114	100

Table D18: Landlords - What was the reason you called the Right to Rent helpline? (select all that apply) (IRIS Survey)

	Response total	Response %
To see if I needed to carry out a check	3	60
To ask about identifying genuine documents	2	40
How to do a check	1	20
To ask about types of acceptable documentation	1	20
To ask when to use the Landlords Checking Service	1	20
To do a landlords check	1	20
Other (please specify):	0	0
Total	5	

Table D19: Letting agents and housing associations – Have you used the Landlords Checking Service? (Wave 3)

	Response total	Response %
Yes	14	34
No	26	63
Don't know	1	2
Total	41	100

Table D20: Letting agents and housing associations – How easy was it to complete the checking service form? (Wave 3)

	Response total	Response %
Very easy	6	43
Easy	7	50
Neither easy nor difficult	1	7
Total	14	100

Table D21: Landlords – Have you ever used the Home Office’s landlords checking service to check a prospective tenant’s Right to Rent?

	Response total	Response %
Yes	2	8
No	23	88
Don't know	1	4
Total	26	100

4. Awareness of the scheme and communications

Table D22: Tenants – How informed do you feel you are about the Right to Rent scheme? (IRIS Survey)

	Response total	Response %
Well informed	4	6
Informed	18	26
Poorly informed	17	25
Not informed – not heard of the scheme until now	29	43
Total	68	100

Table D23: All – How informed the different respondent groups were about the Right to Rent scheme (Wave 1)

	How informed?				Total
	Well informed	Informed	Poorly informed	Not informed	
HO ICE	3	13	6	0	22
VCS and Housing Association	10	10	8	6	34
Letting Agent	13	23	8	0	44
Local Authority	13	8	1	2	24
Total	39	54	23	8	124

Table D24: Landlords – How informed do you feel you are about the Right to Rent scheme? (IRIS Survey)

	Response total	Response %
Well informed	32	28
Informed	38	33
Poorly informed	26	23
Not informed – not heard of scheme until now	18	16
Total	114	100

Table D25: Landlords – Landlords’ awareness by size of property portfolio (IRIS Survey)

	Number of properties						Total
	One	2-5	6-10	11-20	21-50	More than 50	
Well informed	9	5	10	4	2	2	32
Informed	6	18	8	0	2	40	38
Poorly informed	11	6	0	50	1	33	26
Not heard of scheme	11	5	0	1	0	0	18
Total	37	34	19	10	5	9	114

Table D26: Local authority – Sources of information for understanding the scheme (select all that apply) (Wave 1)

	Response total	Response %
Local stakeholder events	16	70
Home Office materials	14	61
Gov.uk on Right to Rent	13	57
Newspapers/Articles	9	39
Other online content	5	22
Other	5	22
None	3	13
Right to Rent helpline	1	4
Total	23	

Table D27: All – Were meetings with Home Office staff informative? (Wave 3)

	Yes	No	Total
Local authorities	10	0	10
Letting agents	6	17	23
VCS inc housing associations	13	3	16
Total	29	20	49

Table D28: Letting agents – Was information from member organisations (e.g. NALS and ARLA) informative? (Wave 3)

	Yes	No	Total
Total	35	7	42

Table D29: Landlords – Where did you get your information about the Right to Rent scheme? (select all that apply) (IRIS Survey)

	Response total	Response %
Information provided by membership organisations (such as National Landlords Association, Residential Landlords Association or letting agents' organisations)	53	55
Information provided by local authorities	29	30
Midland Landlord Accreditation scheme	28	29
Gov.uk on Right to Rent	20	21
Local or national events	16	17
Colleagues/my organisation	14	15
Other (please specify):	15	16
Total respondents	96	

Table D30: All – Was information from the Government website informative? (Wave 3)

	Yes	No	Total
Local authorities	9	1	10
Letting agents	41	12	53
VCS inc housing associations	12	4	16
Total	62	17	79

Table D31: Tenants – Where did you get your information on the Right to Rent scheme from? (select all that apply) (IRIS Survey)

	Response total	Response %
Your university, college or student union	22	56
Estate agent/ landlord	12	31
Word of mouth	11	28
Gov.uk	4	10
News (articles or programmes)	4	10
Leaflets	2	5
Other websites	1	3
Other (please specify):	0	0
Total respondents	39	

5. Immigration enforcement outcomes

Table D32: Home Office – Has your team been involved in joint working related to the Right to Rent scheme? (Wave 3)

	Response total	Response %
Yes	6	46
No	7	54
Total	13	100

Table D33: Home Office – Who have you undertaken joint working with related to the Right to Rent scheme? (select all that apply) (Wave 3)

	Response total	Response %
Local authority – housing/homelessness/environmental health	5	83
Local authority – social services (including No Recourse to Public Funds Team)	2	33
Police	2	33
Local authority – other	1	17
HMRC	1	17
Total	6	

Table D34: Home Office – Ways of joint working (select all that apply) (Wave 3)

	Response total	Response %
Liaising with different organisations	4	67
Joint enforcement visits	4	67
Tasking enforcement action	4	67
Monitoring and sharing intelligence	2	33
Total	6	

Table D35: Local authority – Have you been involved in joint working related to the Right to Rent scheme? (Wave 3)

	Response total	Response %
Total	7	100

Table D36: Local authorities – Who have you undertaken joint working with related to the Right to Rent scheme? (select all that apply) (Wave 3)

	Response total	Response %
Neighbouring local authorities	5	71
Voluntary and community sector organisations	5	71
Government departments	5	71
Other team in my local authority	4	57
Police	2	29
Total	7	

Table D37: Local Authority - Ways of joint working (select all that apply) (Wave 3)

	Response total	Response %
Sharing of intelligence	6	86
Joint inspections of properties	5	71
Sharing of best practice	4	57
Development on information regarding the scheme	4	57
Total	7	

6. Impacts on tenants

Table D38: Letting agents and housing associations – Documents required before the scheme: Photo ID (Wave 3)

	Response total	Response %
Always	53	83
Sometimes	9	14
Never	1	2
Don't know	1	2
Total	64	100

Table D39: Letting agents and housing associations – Documents required after the scheme: Photo ID (Wave 3)

	Response total	Response %
Always	60	94
Sometimes	3	5
Don't know	1	2
Total	64	100

Table D40: Landlords – Before the introduction of the Right to Rent scheme did you ask your tenants for the any of the following types of documentation or information? (IRIS Survey)

	Always	Sometimes	Never	Don't know	Total
Photo identification (for example passport, National Identity Card, driving licence, UK Biometric Residence Permit, Asylum Registration Card)	18	6	11	0	35
Proof of current address (for example, bank statement, utility bill)	17	10	7	0	34
Proof of income (for example evidence of benefits payments, payslips)	19	7	8	0	34
Other (for example birth certificate, written reference, National Insurance number/card)	16	8	10	0	34
Total respondents					35

Table D41: Landlords – Following the introduction of the Right to Rent scheme do you now ask tenants for any of the following types of documentation or information? (IRIS Survey)

	Always	Sometimes	Never	Don't know	Total
Photo identification (for example passport, National Identity Card, driving licence, UK Biometric Residence Permit, Asylum Registration Card)	26	4	2	0	32
Proof of current address (for example, bank statement, utility bill)	19	7	4	0	30
Proof of income (for example evidence of benefits payments, payslips)	18	8	4	0	30
Other (for example birth certificate, written reference, National Insurance number/card)	18	8	5	0	31
Total respondents					32

Table D42: Tenants - Was your Right to Rent checked by the landlord or agent before you were offered the tenancy? (IRIS Survey)

	Response total	Response %
Yes	8	35
No	3	13
Don't know	12	52
Total	23	100

Table D43: Tenants - How easy have you found it to provide the required documentation to complete the Right to Rent checks? (IRIS Survey)

	Response total	Response %
Very easy	1	13
Easy	2	25
Neither difficult nor easy	2	25
Difficult	2	25
Very difficult	0	0
Don't know	1	13
Total	8	100

Table D44: Tenants – Do you have any other concerns about the Right to Rent scheme? (IRIS Survey)

	Response total	Response %
Yes	13	19
No	55	81
Total	68	100

Table D45: Tenants – What do these concerns relate to? (select all that apply) (IRIS Survey)

	Response total	Response %
Being treated unfairly	10	83
Not being able to get a tenancy because I don't have the documentation needed	6	50
Checks delaying tenancy start date	5	42
Increased costs for checks	4	33
Other (please specify):	2	17
Total respondents	12	

Table D46: Landlords – Are you aware of any concerns about the Right to Rent scheme from tenants or prospective tenants? (IRIS Survey)

	Response total	Response %
Yes	19	17
No	95	83
Total	114	100

Table D47: Landlords – What do these concerns relate to? (select all that apply) (IRIS Survey)

	Response total	Response %
Checks delaying tenancy starts	10	56
People being treated unfairly	9	50
Vulnerable groups being disadvantaged because they do not have required documentation	9	50
Other (please specify):	5	28
Total	18	

Table D48: Voluntary and community sector – From your experience, have the people that your organisation works with or represents reported that they have been impacted by the scheme? (Wave 2)

	Response total	Response %
Yes	14	42
No	19	58
Total	33	100

Table D49: Voluntary and community sector – Impacts of the Right to Rent scheme (select all that apply) (Wave 2)

	Response total	Response %
Those who do not have a right to rent have been exploited by rogue landlords	8	62
People with the right to rent who do not have the right documents have struggled to find accommodation	7	54
Landlords or agents have discriminated against individuals on the basis of nationality	7	54
People have become homeless	6	46
People are having to access emergency accommodation	3	23
Professionalising the housing market	3	23
Other	2	15
Total	13	

Table D50: Voluntary and Community Sector – Are you aware of any complaints from members of the public about the Right to Rent scheme? (Wave 2)

	Response total	Response %
Yes	10	35
No	19	66
Total	29	

Table D51: Voluntary and community sector – Reasons for complaints about the Right to Rent scheme (select all that apply) (Wave 2)

	Response total	Response %
Discrimination	8	80
Charges by agents for completing the checks	7	70
Exploitation by rogue landlords	6	60
Discrimination based on not wanting to check particular documents	4	40
Other	1	10
Total	10	

Table D52: Voluntary and community sector – Reasons for no complaints about the Right to Rent scheme (select all that apply) (Wave 2)

	Response total	Response %
People are not aware of the scheme	11	61
People do not realise that they can seek advice from our organisation	7	39
People do not realise that their problems are as a result of the Right to Rent scheme	5	28
People are not being impacted by the scheme	4	22
Other	2	11
Total	18	

7. Impact on the housing sector

Table D53: Letting agents – Do you anticipate that the Right to Rent scheme will affect the cost of rented accommodation? (Wave 1)

	Response total	Response %
Yes, rents will decrease	1	3
No, rents will not change	28	72
Don't know	10	26
Total	39	100

Table D54: Letting agents – Do you anticipate that the Right to Rent scheme will affect the turnover of rented accommodation? (Wave 1)

	Response total	Response %
Yes, turnover will increase	1	3
Yes, turnover will decrease	3	8
No, turnover will not change	27	69
Don't know	8	21
Total	39	100

Table D55: Letting agents – Do you anticipate that the Right to Rent scheme will affect the availability of rented accommodation? (Wave 1)

	Response total	Response %
Yes, will increase	2	5
Yes, will decrease	1	3
No, will not change	28	72
Don't know	8	21
Total	39	100

Table D56: Letting agents – What effect do you think the Right to Rent scheme has had on the cost of rented accommodation? (Wave 3)

	Response total	Response %
Rent has increased	3	5
Rent has not changed	45	80
Don't know	8	14
Total	56	100

Table D57: Letting agents – What effect do you think the Right to Rent scheme has had on the turnover of rented accommodation? (Wave 3)

	Response total	Response %
Turnover has increased	1	2
Turnover has not changed	44	79
Turnover has decreased	4	7
Don't know	7	13
Total	56	100

Table D58: Letting agents – What effect do you think the Right to Rent scheme has had on the availability of rented accommodation? (Wave 3)

	Response total	Response %
Availability has increased	1	2
Availability has not changed	42	75
Availability has decreased	4	7
Don't know	9	16
Total	56	100

Table D59: Landlords – What effect do you think the Right to Rent scheme has had on the cost of rented accommodation in the affected areas? (IRIS Survey)

	Response total	Response %
Rent has increased	9	8
Rent has not changed/not impacted by Right to Rent	53	46
Rent has decreased	1	1
Don't know	51	45
Total	114	100

Table D60: Landlords – What effect do you think the Right to Rent scheme has had on the turnover of rented accommodation in the affected areas? (IRIS Survey)

	Response total	Response %
Turnover has increased	2	2
Turnover has not changed/not impacted by Right to Rent	48	42
Turnover has decreased	10	9
Don't know	54	47
Total	114	100

Table D61: Landlords – What effect do you think the Right to Rent scheme has had on the availability of rented accommodation in the affected areas? (IRIS Survey)

	Response total	Response %
Availability has increased	3	3
Availability has not changed not impacted by Right to Rent	41	36
Availability has decreased	12	11
Don't know	58	51
Total	114	100

Table D62: Landlords – How easy have you found it to complete the Right to Rent checks? (IRIS Survey)

	Response total	Response %
Very easy	5	19
Easy	7	27
Neither easy nor difficult	10	38
Difficult	2	8
Very difficult	2	8
I have not done a check	0	0
Total	26	100

Table D63: Letting agents and housing associations – How easy have you found it to complete the Right to Rent checks? (Wave 3)

	Response total	Response %
Very easy	9	23
Easy	17	43
Neither easy nor difficult	9	23
Difficult	3	8
Very difficult	2	5
Total	40	100

Table D64: Letting Agents - Is there an additional cost for the tenant to complete the "Right to Rent" check? (Wave 3)

	Response total	Response %
Yes	8	14
No	47	82
Don't know	2	4
Total	57	

Table D65: Landlords – Time taken by landlords to do Right to Rent checks (IRIS Survey)

	Response total	Response %
No extra time	2	8
Less than 10 minutes	5	19
More than 10 less than 20 minutes	9	35
More than 20 but less than 30 minutes	4	15
More than 30 but less than 1 hour	1	4
More than 1 hour	4	15
Don't know	1	4
Total	26	100

Table D66: Letting agents and housing associations – How much extra time, on average, does it take to check a prospective tenant's Right to Rent? (Wave 3)

	Response total	Response %
No extra time	13	22
Less than 10 minutes	17	29
10 to 20 minutes	12	20
20 to 30 minutes	3	5
30 to 60 minutes	4	7
More than 1 hour	3	5
Don't know	7	12
Total	59	100

Table D67: Landlords – To what extent has the scheme increased your workload? (IRIS Survey)

	Response total	Response %
A lot	2	6
Some	25	71
Not at all	6	17
Don't know	2	6
Total	35	100

Table D68: Letting agents – Has the scheme negatively affected your workload? (Wave 3)

	Response total	Response %
Yes, a lot	9	16
Yes, somewhat	17	30
No, not at all	30	54
Total	56	100

Table D69: Letting agents – Reasons for increased workload (select all that apply) (Wave 3)

	Response total	Response %
Explaining the scheme to tenants	22	85
Additional work needed to do initial check	21	81
Having to note and monitor when a follow-up check is due	19	73
Explaining the scheme to landlords	16	62
Having to check documents which I may not be familiar with	14	54
Other	5	19
Total	26	

Table D70: Housing associations – Has the scheme negatively affected your workload? (Wave 3)

	Response total	Response %
Yes, a lot	1	8
Yes, somewhat	3	23
No, not at all	9	69
Total	13	100

Table D71: Letting agents – Are you aware of any complaints from landlords and/or prospective tenants about the Right to Rent scheme? (Wave 3)

	Response total	Response %
Yes	14	25
No	41	75
Total	55	100

Table D72: Letting agents – If yes, what did these complaints relate to? (select all that apply) (Wave 3)

	Response total	Response %
Discrimination	9	64
Checks delaying tenancy start dates	9	64
Not understanding the immigration system	8	57
Additional work for landlords	5	36
Abandonment of properties	2	14
Increases destitution/homelessness	2	14
Other	2	14
Displacing illegal migrants to outside the phase one area	1	7
Total	14	

Table D73: Letting agents – If no, what do you think are the reasons for not having any complaints? (select all that apply) (Wave 3)

	Response total	Response %
People are not being impacted by the scheme	22	54
People are not aware of the scheme	13	32
People do not realise their problems are a result of the Right to Rent scheme	8	20
Other	6	15
Total	41	

Table D74: Landlords – Do you as a landlord have any concerns about the Right to Rent scheme? (IRIS Survey)

	Response total	Response %
Yes	59	52
No	55	48
Total	114	100

Table D75: Landlords – What do these concerns relate to? (select all that apply) (IRIS Survey)

	Response total	Response %
Additional work for landlords	45	76
Checks delaying tenancy start dates	30	51
Not understanding immigration system	29	49
Vulnerable groups being disadvantaged because they do not have the required information	25	42
Properties being left empty	22	37
Other (please specify):	24	41
Total respondents	59	

Table D76: Landlords – Are you aware of any positive impacts of the Right to Rent scheme? (IRIS Survey)

	Response total	Response %
Yes	18	16
No	96	84
Total	114	100

Table D77: Letting agents – Have you noticed any positive impacts of the Right to Rent scheme? (Wave 3)

	Response total	Response %
Yes	9	16
No	46	84
Total	55	100

Table D78: Letting agents – If yes, what do these positive impacts relate to? (select all that apply) (Wave 3)

	Response total	Response %
Tackling illegal immigration	6	23
Scheme will help standardise checks by landlords and agents	6	23
Professionalising the housing sector	6	23
Scheme will have reputational benefits for landlords and agents	5	19
Tackling rogue landlords	3	12
Total	9	

Table D79: Landlords – Do these positive impacts relate to ...? (select all that apply) (IRIS Survey)

	Response total	Response %
Tackling illegal immigrants	16	89
Tackling rogue landlords	9	50
Standardising checks by landlords and agents	8	44
Reputational benefits for landlords and agents	6	33
Other (please specify):	3	17
Total respondents	18	

8 Impacts on local authorities and VCS organisations

Table D80: Local authority – Has the scheme negatively affected your workload? (Wave 3)

	Response total	Response %
Yes, somewhat	5	56
No, not at all	4	44
Total	9	100

Table D81: Local authority – Reasons for increased workload (select all that apply) (Wave 3)

	Response total	Response %
Explaining the scheme to landlords	4	80
Responding to enforcement activity	3	60
More enquiries that need responding to	3	60
Other	2	40
Total	5	

Table D82: Local authority – Are you aware of any complaints from members of the public about the Right to Rent scheme?

	Response total	Response %
Yes	1	11
No	8	89
Total	9	100

Table D83: Local authority – If yes, what did these complaints relate to? (select all that apply) (Wave 3)

	Response total	Response %
Difficulties in completing the checks for landlords	1	100
Other	1	100
Total	1	

Table D84: Local authority – If no, what do you think are the reasons for not having any complaints? (select all that apply) (Wave 3)

	Response total	Response %
People are not being impacted of the scheme	8	100
People do not realise their problems are a result of the Right to Rent scheme	4	50
People do not realise that they can seek advice from our organisation	3	38
Other	3	38
People are not aware of the scheme	2	25
Total	8	

Table D85: Local authority – Have you noticed any positive impacts of the Right to Rent scheme? (Wave 3)

	Response total	Response %
Yes	3	33
No	6	67
Total	9	100

Table D86: Local authority – If yes, what do these positive impacts relate to? (select all that apply) (Wave 3)

	Response total	Response %
Tackling illegal immigration	3	100
Opportunities for joint working	3	100
Tackling rogue landlords	2	67
Identify houses in multiple occupation (HMOs)	2	67
Landlords responsibility to check immigration status	2	67
Helping identify unsafe or overcrowded housing	1	33
Other	1	33
Total	3	

Table D87: Voluntary and community sector – Has the scheme negatively affected your workload? (select all that apply) (Wave 2)

	Response total	Response %
Yes, a lot	6	20
Yes, somewhat	10	33
No, not at all	14	47
Total	30	100

Table D88: Voluntary and community sector – Reasons for increased workload (select all that apply) (Wave 2)

	Response total	Response %
Explaining the scheme to tenants	10	67
Additional support given to help people access rented accommodation	7	47
Time spent raising awareness of the scheme	7	47
Other	3	20
Total	15	

Table D89: Voluntary and community sector – Have you noticed any positive impacts of the Right to Rent scheme? (Wave 2)

	Response total	Response %
Yes	5	18
No	23	82
Total	28	100

Table D90: Voluntary and community sector – If yes, what do these positive impacts relate to? (select all that apply) (Wave 2)

	Response total	Response %
Tackling illegal immigration	3	60
Ensuring the right people get access to housing	3	60
Total	5	

ISBN: 978-1-78246-908-7

ISSN: 1756-3666



© Crown copyright 2015

This publication is licensed under the terms of the Open Government Licence v3.0 except where otherwise stated. To view this licence, visit nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3 or write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or email: psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk.

Where we have identified any third party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.