



CIH Scotland commentary on recent bedroom tax tribunal rulings

Second revised edition – February 2014

February 2014

CIH Scotland commentary on recent bedroom tax tribunal rulings

Cases covered in this briefing

This briefing provides information on the following cases, with approximate dates on which the cases were reported:

1. Fife (5 cases) – September 2013
2. Westminster – September 2013
3. Redcar and Cleveland – October 2013
4. Glasgow – October 2013
5. Islington – November 2013
6. Inverness – November 2013
7. Liverpool – December 2013
8. Edinburgh – December 2013
9. Liverpool – January 2014
10. Rochdale – January 2014
11. Middlesbrough – January 2014
12. Aberystwyth – January 2014
13. Monmouthshire – February 2014

Note In the preparation of this briefing, CIH Scotland readily acknowledges the excellent information and balanced legal analysis provided by the website www.nearlylegal.co.uk

Main message

Recent bedroom tax rulings in Scotland and England have thrown up a number of issues of interest, but CIH Scotland believes that caution should be exercised in reading too much into the implications at this stage. All the rulings have been at First Tier Tribunal stage and, as such, do not influence any other judgements. Our understanding is that some cases are being appealed. The outcome of any appeals to Upper Tier Tribunals would be binding within Great Britain.

Previous cases from 2012

As things stand, the only wider implications of any previous ruling relate to the Gorry case, heard in the Court of Appeal in May 2012. This means that local authorities should allow an extra bedroom for children who are unable to share because of their severe disabilities. Regulations¹ to confirm this, along with accompanying guidance², appeared in November 2013, operative from 4 December 2013. As always, a council's decision in any particular case will depend on the specific circumstances in question.

¹ The Housing Benefit and Universal Credit (Size Criteria) (Miscellaneous Amendments) Regulations 2013 <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukxi/2013/2828/regulation/2/made>

² https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/260580/A21-2013_2013-11-21.pdf

In late January 2014, the Appeal Court considered the cases of ten households who are seeking judicial review of the bedroom tax on the grounds of disability discrimination. The original cases were heard and rejected by the High Court in July 2013. The Appeal Court's verdict is awaited.

Recent cases

Fife (reported September 2013)

Case 1³ – The claimant argued that a room was too small at 64 square feet, and that the Housing (Scotland) Act 1987 Act 'states a room of 50-70 square feet should only be sufficient for a child aged under 10'. The QC said it was 'relevant to have regard to statutory space standards' and therefore allowed the appeal on this ground.

But the QC rejected the additional argument that the room was needed to store medical equipment as he deemed that there was space elsewhere to do this.

Observations

- It is worth noting that according to the housing association in this case, the room measurements were not checked by the local authority nor by the tribunal; the association says the room is not straightforward to measure but that it is bigger than claimed.
- In guidance issued after the Fife rulings⁴, the DWP maintained that it was not appropriate to use space standards in the overcrowding legislation for the purposes of the under occupation charge. Indications are that the DWP may appeal this case, Case 2 below and potentially further Fife cases). CIH believes that an Upper Tier Tribunal is more likely to suggest that whilst room size may be a relevant factor it should not be a sole, determining factor.
- In the meantime, the DWP says one factor is whether a room can fit a single bed. One observation here is that it would seem reasonable for this to be considered case by case, and that it is for landlords (when they let property and set the rent) and local authorities to come to sensible judgements on whether small rooms can be used as a bedroom. For example, in some cases, it may be reasonable to argue that if a single bed was all that a room could fit, this may not be adequate for use as a bedroom in daily use, as it would need to have space for more than just a bed.
- CIH believes that relevant factors, in addition to bedroom size, might include indications in original plans of the property (where accessible), and evidence of the landlord's intentions when making the let and setting the rent.

Case 2⁵ – As in Case 1 above, the QC agreed with the tenant's claim that a bedroom, at 66 square feet, was too small.

³ See details at <http://nearlylegal.co.uk/blog/2013/09/of-bedrooms-that-arent/>

⁴ DWP Circular U6/2013
https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/244604/u6-2013.pdf

⁵ See details of Fife cases 2-5 at <http://nearlylegal.co.uk/blog/2013/09/changing-rooms/>

But the QC rejected arguments about the room being needed for the storage of disability equipment, saying he was satisfied that the equipment could be stored elsewhere in the property.

Case 3 – This related to a blind woman living in a three-bedroom Kingdom HA property, receiving support from KHA under a contract awarded by Fife Council. It was argued by the tenant that the accommodation was ‘exempt accommodation’ and therefore not subject to HB rules. The Council argued that because the support was not tied to the tenancy agreement, it was not exempt accommodation.

The QC ruled that it *was* exempt accommodation, because the 2006 Regulations⁶ say exempt accommodation includes ‘accommodation provided by a housing association where the association (or a body contracted by the association) also provides the claimant with care, support or supervision.

Observation

- On the face of it, it seems hard to question the ruling, as the case appears to fit the definition in the regulations. What is arguably odd about the regulations is that they are worded in such a way as to include not only specialist supported accommodation (i.e. accommodation you wouldn’t be living in if you didn’t need the support) but also visiting/floating support *where that is coincidentally provided by the same body as provides the accommodation*. The regulations have the effect, therefore, that if – for example in this case – the housing association were to subsequently lose the support contract to another body, the house would no longer be exempt accommodation. [It is worth bearing in mind that historically, housing association accommodation was not affected by the regulations as it was rarely, if ever, referred (to the Rent Officer) for consideration under the regulations – it was generally only private sector accommodation which was referred.]

Case 4 – 1660s property; the housing association landlord said it had three bedrooms, but the claimant successfully argued only one was a bedroom. The QC said one room had been used as a sitting room since 1996 and there was no evidence to suggest it had ever been used as a bedroom. He said another room was being used as a dining room and a third room was an ‘irregular L-shape’ and had a floor area of only 67 square feet and with no evidence of use as a bedroom.

Observations

- The ruling in this case appears to suggest that actual use of a room is a relevant factor – something with which the DWP does not agree.
- This seems to be a bizarre decision, for example based mainly on use of a room as a sitting room when a dining room already exists, and the landlord in question says that the current living room was always meant to be entirely usable as a bedroom.
- CIH Scotland believes that any appeal of this decision could decide that actual current use of a room is less important than an assessment of (a)

⁶ Sub-paragraph 4.10 (b), Schedule 3 of the Housing Benefit and Council Tax Benefit (Consequential Provisions) 2006 <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukxi/2006/217/schedule/3/made>

whether a room could reasonably be used as a bedroom and (b) the landlord's original indications in letting the property and setting the rent.

Case 5 – The tenant argued that a spare room was used to store gardening equipment and had always been used for this purpose. The QC did not accept that the room had always been used for this.

Observation

- Although the rejection of the tenant's claim appears to be understandable, there is again a somewhat bizarre aspect to the ruling: the implication from the QC was that had he been convinced that the room had indeed always been used for this purpose, he would have upheld the claimant's appeal.

Westminster (reported September 2013)⁷

A disabled tenant's appeal was upheld because the judge accepted that a room was being used to store medical equipment.

Observation

- It might be supposed that the local authority did not believe it had any locus to accept that a room needed to be used for disability equipment because the regulations do not appear to allow for this. This ruling therefore appears to be less a judgement on the local authority's competence in coming to the view it came to, and more a judgement on the reasonableness of the under occupation charge itself.

Redcar and Cleveland (reported October 2013)⁸

This appeal was upheld as the court agreed that a disabled woman needed a separate bedroom from her husband. As a result, the tenant was deemed to be under occupying only by one bedroom rather than two.

Observation

- As with the Westminster case, it might be supposed that the Council authority did not believe it had any locus to accept that a separate bedroom was needed as a result of the disability as the regulations do not allow for this. Again this ruling appears to be a judgement on the reasonableness of the under occupation charge itself rather than on whether the regulations were properly observed.

Glasgow (reported October 2013)⁹

The appeal was from a disabled woman who uses an adapted bed and keeps medical equipment in her room. She argued that her husband needed to sleep in a

⁷ See details at <http://nearlylegal.co.uk/blog/2013/09/westminster-clear-up/>

⁸ See ruling at <http://nearlylegal.co.uk/blog/wp-content/uploads/2013/10/m1a.pdf>

⁹ See details at <http://nearlylegal.co.uk/blog/2013/10/yell-tak-the-high-road/>

separate room. The appeal was upheld as the court agreed that a separate bedroom was needed for each of the disabled woman and her husband. The court said that the house was therefore fully occupied, and that the under occupation penalty was incompatible with the appellant's human rights ('the applicant's flat is not larger than she needs. She does not have a spare or extra bedroom.').

Our understanding is that the DWP intends to appeal this ruling.

Observation

- Again, however reasonable the ruling may seem in human terms, it is not at all clear that the regulations allow for a separate bedroom for disabled adults. In coming to their original decision, it would seem that the landlord and local authority came to the only judgement they thought was possible under the regulations. So again, this ruling could be said to be more of a judgement on the reasonableness of the under occupation charge itself than on whether the regulations were properly observed.

Islington (reported November 2013)¹⁰

In this case, a 60 year old tenant whose severely disabled son stays in her home two or three nights a week won her appeal against the imposition of a 25% penalty for under occupying by two bedrooms. The judge ruled that one bedroom was occupied by her son, who lives in full time care when he is not at his mother's, and that the box room, which measured less than 50 square feet, should not be considered a bedroom as it was used to store equipment.

Initial indications seem to suggest that Islington Council does not plan to appeal to the Upper Tier Tribunal, but it is not known at this stage whether the DWP may seek to appeal.

Observations

- This is an interesting case as it partly centres on the occupation of a bedroom for part of a week. Again, in human terms the ruling would seem reasonable and understandable, but it seems that the regulations do not allow for these circumstances, potentially making a DWP appeal quite likely
- As with other First Tier Tribunal rulings, this case is not binding and has no clear implications for other 'shared care' disability cases nor for other situations in which someone – such as a child who stays with a separated parent – occupies a bedroom for part of the week (see Inverness case below).

Inverness (reported November 2013)

A tenant unsuccessfully argued that he should not be penalised as his second bedroom was used for his three children to stay with him at weekends under access arrangements. The tribunal judge was sympathetic but said that according to the regulations, the under occupation penalty could be avoided only if the children were occupying the property as their main home, which was not the case.

¹⁰ See details at <http://nearlylegal.co.uk/blog/2013/11/not-home-alone/>

Observation

- This seems to be an example of circumstances where, whilst there is broad sympathy for parents (most often fathers) with arrangements for children to stay with them, the regulations do not allow for the bedroom tax to be avoided. Only one parent can say that their home is the main home of their children.

Liverpool (reported December 2013)¹¹

The tenant's adult daughter, who has autism, receives care twice a week from her sister, who stayed in a third bedroom. Bedroom tax was imposed by the local authority because the regulations did not allow for a non-dependant receiving care to be exempt from the bedroom tax. The tribunal ruled that the regulations were discriminating on the grounds of disability by treating a non-dependant differently from a tenant or partner of a tenant. So again, the council appears to have followed the regulations but the tribunal's ruling is a judgement on the regulations rather than the council's reading of them.

Whilst the appeal was therefore successful, the tribunal rejected a secondary argument that a room of 54 square feet (excluding an alcove of 15 square feet) was not a bedroom, not least as it had previously been used as a permanent bedroom and was still used twice a week by the daughter caring for her sister.

Edinburgh (reported December 2013)¹²

A couple claimed they were unable to share a bedroom due to the health condition of husband. The property had five bedrooms, with a dependant son and adult daughter living with them. The local authority was assessed as needing three bedrooms, but the appeal was that a four bed was needed, thereby reducing the bedroom tax liability from 25% to 14%. The tribunal accepted that the local authority's decision discriminated on basis of disability and so reduced the liability to 14%.

Observation

- This ruling is similar to that in the Redcar and Cleveland case above, in other words the local authority's decision appeared to follow the regulations but the ruling effectively judged the regulations to be discriminatory.

Liverpool (reported January 2014)¹³

The appeal was based on a claim that two rooms were too small to be considered as bedrooms. The tribunal accepted that the local authority should have had regard to

¹¹ Further information at <http://nearlylegal.co.uk/blog/wp-content/uploads/2013/10/SC068-13-10123-LIVERPOOL.pdf>

¹² Further information at <http://nearlylegal.co.uk/blog/wp-content/uploads/2013/10/EdinburgFTT.pdf>

¹³ Further information at <http://nearlylegal.co.uk/blog/wp-content/uploads/2013/10/Lpool-Bedroom-tax-decision.pdf>

Housing Act 1985 provisions on overcrowding, as 'under-occupancy can be seen as the flip side of over-crowding'. The tribunal cited Reg B13(5) of the 2006 Housing Benefit Regulations that to be classified as a bedroom a room should be large enough to be appropriate for use as a bedroom by one adult or by two children. The available information on this case does not include the room sizes but the tribunal accepted the claim that they were too small for appropriate use as a bedroom.

Rochdale (reported January 2014)¹⁴

This case concerned a single adult living in a property which the landlord and local authority considered to have two bedrooms. Indeed the claimant's Housing Benefit application described his home as have two bedrooms. But the claimant argued that the living room, which contained the kitchenette, was not large enough for a dining table and so one of the rooms had always been used as a dining room. The tribunal accepted this argument.

Observation

- In CIH Scotland's view, any ruling based purely on the historic use made of a room could well be overturned if it were to be appealed.

Middlesbrough (reported January 2014)

This was a three bedroom property. Both of the tenant's sons were in the army, living in barracks and not on operations. The tribunal agreed that the barracks could not be classified as the sons' main home.

Aberystwyth (reported January 2014)¹⁵

This case involved a couple living in what the local authority had classed as a three bedroom property. The tribunal accepted the argument that the husband's disabilities were such that the couple could not share a bedroom (i.e. as was also accepted in the Redcar and Edinburgh cases above). The tribunal further accepted an argument that a third room, at around 63 square feet, was too small for an adult to occupy.

Monmouthshire (reported February 2014)¹⁶

A couple and their adult son living in what was described (in the tenancy agreement) as a four bedroom house appealed against the imposition of a 25% deduction for under occupying by two rooms. The tribunal accepted the argument that two rooms, each measuring less than 70 square feet, were used as box rooms. The tribunal stated that neither room could realistically be let out to a lodger and could be used only by a child under 10, hence the penalty was inappropriate.

¹⁴ Further information at <http://nearlylegal.co.uk/blog/wp-content/uploads/2014/01/BT-appeal-result1.pdf>

¹⁵ Further information at <http://nearlylegal.co.uk/blog/2014/01/bedrooms-in-wales/>

¹⁶ Further information at <http://nearlylegal.co.uk/blog/2014/02/on-folding-beds-and-sleeping-bags/>

Observation

- Again, then, this First Tier Tribunal ruling has focused on the significance of room size (and, to a lesser degree, actual use of the room). This issue will be tested when the Upper Tier Tribunal considers the DWP's appeal against a room size ruling in one of the Fife cases covered earlier in this briefing.

Further general observations

- CIH Scotland is aware of some landlords raising the issue of whether the number of bedrooms or apartments is a contractual issue. The number is not normally specified in tenancy agreements but presumably is in the offer letter, so the legal position on this may not be clear.
- Approaches differ on whether a reclassification of the property size should lead to a rent reduction. Arguably, the organisation's rent policy is key here: where this is based on number of *apartments*, it could be argued that a reduction in the number of *bedrooms* does not change the number of apartments and that no rent reduction is therefore required.

For more information on the contents of this paper, please contact the Policy and Practice Team on 0131 225 4544 or david.bookbinder@cih.org