

Ham Close Regeneration

Review of the Offer Document

'What Regeneration could mean for you'

Kevin Farrell
Tpas Associate
September 2017





Executive summary

When we began this study, we expected to be able to access data about London housing regeneration projects with ease. We also expected to gather a wide variety of offer documents produced by social landlords operating in the London Region for the benefit of the communities they serve. We were to be disappointed.

Ham Close's offer document *What regeneration could mean for you: A guide for RHP tenants & homeowners, (Autumn 2016)* is a rare example. Our extensive research was only able to identify a handful of similar documents which is surprising and also perturbing.

In this study we have examined the promises made by RHP to the homeowners and non-resident homeowners. We found that RHP has met four requirements and, exceeded what it is required to do in a further four.

We were also asked to analyse the number of Social/Affordable homes before and after regeneration on schemes across the London region, to see how Ham Close compared.

Of the 36 schemes we analysed covering the period 2014-16, only one has seen an increase in the number of homes for Social/Affordable rent.

Therefore the regeneration of Ham Close will buck the trend across London housing regeneration schemes by increasing the number of Social/Affordable Rent units. If it is compared to the 36 schemes in the G15 report, it is one of only two schemes to see an increase in that tenure category.

To date RHP has followed good practice and produced a clear and detailed offer document. All the promises meet or exceed what is expected. Eventually, the project will deliver more low-rent homes than before on the site.



1. Introduction

RHP asked Tpas to compare the offers made to the leaseholders of Ham Close in the offer document, *What regeneration could mean for you: A guide for RHP tenants & homeowners, (Autumn 2016)* with offers made by other housing associations in London.

We were also asked to check and re-state the:

- The offers made in Ham Close offer document
- The limits on RHP's powers set by statute
- What regulation governs each offer
- Legislation or regulation governing or constraining an offer

Finally, we were asked to find out the percentage of additional affordable homes created by housing regeneration schemes in London and compare the data with the Ham Close proposals. The results can be found in section 8 on page 13.

2. Methodology

Tpas contacted the Greater London Authority (GLA) Regeneration Team, DCLG and the National Housing Federation (NHF) to establish whether a register of London housing regeneration schemes exists.

Neither the GLA Regeneration team nor the NHF hold a register and DCLG retains a very limited interest in London housing regeneration. The NHF referred us to the report, *Meeting the challenge of urban renewal: the g15's contribution to regenerating London's estates* (October 2016). The G15 is a group of London's largest developing housing associations working across London.

We took as our starting point the 36 housing regeneration schemes identified in the report. Every member of G15 that had delivered, or was in the process of delivering, a scheme was contacted. We asked them if they had produced an offer, guarantee or leaseholder charter for their schemes.

An extensive web search was conducted to look for offer documents relating to the 35 schemes and any other offers that may have been published by housing associations in the London region.

A phone interview was carried out with relevant RHP staff member to understand the thinking behind the Ham Close offer document.

Each section of the existing offer document has been analysed in turn against the relevant regulations.



3. Key findings

Barring the offer documents produced by Circle Housing for Merton Priory and by London & Quadrant/Ealing Council for the South Acton estate, we didn't find any other substantial examples in the London area. Most of the G15 schemes had promotional web pages and in some cases dedicated websites, but we found only generic information about being a leaseholder.

Our survey of G15 members resulted in the following feedback:

- A2 Dominion's scheme at Stanwell is more than 10-years old and they were unable to retrieve a copy of the offer document from their archives. The Regeneration Director did provide a brief commentary, which has been included in the evidence folder for this report.
- A2 Dominion and London Borough of Ealing produced a freeholder and leaseholder booklet for the Green Man Lane estate
- Catalyst provided an information leaflet that was issued to resident leaseholders and freeholders of the Havelock Estate in March 2013
- Circle Housing, which is now part of the Clarion Housing Group, has produced offer documents for three schemes – Eastfields, High Path a.k.a Merton Priory and Ravensbury
- East Thames confirmed that there were no leaseholders on Phase 1 of the NewUnionWharf scheme but the intention is to produce an offer document for Phase 2
- Genesis has published a leaseholder booklet for the Graeme Park and Woodberry Down schemes but couldn't supply a copy
- Hyde Housing Association provided the Packington Square leaseholders document ten years ago, which covered the proposed transfer of Islington Council housing stock to the association, and which also set out the proposed offer to leaseholders in the event of the regeneration scheme going ahead
- London & Quadrant, Ealing Council and Countryside Properties has produced a guide for resident leaseholders and freeholders on the South Acton estate

None of the remaining G15 members replied to us within the timescale of this survey.

4. Validation of key promises for homeowners

In this section we examine the promises made to homeowners in the Ham Close offer document. Promise 1 affects every resident of the Close regardless of tenure and the remainder relate specifically to homeowners.

The rest of the promises are in the order they appear on page 7 of the offer document under the heading, 'Our offer for Homeowners'. We have taken the promises one by one and set out the relevant legislation, regulation and guidance. There then follows a Tpas determination on whether RHP has met or exceeded those rules together with the reasoning behind our assessment.



Promise 1 – The scheme is compliant with London housing design standards

Relevant legislation/regulation and guidance

The revised standards for new homes in London are set out in the 2016 London Plan and the Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) published in March 2016. Projects funded through the Homes for Londoners 2016-2021 programme are expected to meet the housing design and sustainability standards in the London Plan and relevant SPGs, in common with all other new development in London.

The Mayor of London promises to provide further guidance on policies in the London Plan that can't be addressed in sufficient detail in the Plan itself. Supplementary guidance can be useful where, as in the case of Ham Close, the level of detail is inappropriate for a development plan, for example development briefs, design guides and master plans.

Part 2.1.11 of the SPG states that, 'The 2016 Minor Alterations to the Plan adopted the nationally described space standard. The standard is set out by Government in the Technical housing standards – nationally described space standard document'. The standards set out the minimum level of quality and design that new homes should meet. The SPG goes on to say that 'Failure to meet one standard would not necessarily lead to an issue of compliance with the London Plan, but a combination of failures would raise concern - in most cases departures a clear and robust justification'.

Tpas finding: RHP has met the requirements

Richmond Housing Partnership has a duty to comply with the London Plan and the Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance. It has given a guarantee that 'New homes will be compliant with the design standards that apply to housing in London' in its offer document (page 2).

Promise 2 – Remain at Ham Close and the offer of new home

Relevant legislation/regulation

The law relating to compulsory purchase is complex. The rights to compensation and methods and procedures for assessing the correct amount are derived from what is commonly referred to as the "Compensation Code". This is made up of Acts of Parliament, case law and established practice. The principle Acts are the Land Compensation Acts of 1961 and 1973 and the Compulsory Purchase Act 1965.

Like other housing associations, RHP follows the guidance in the *Department of Communities and Local Government Booklet 4 - Compulsory Purchase and Compensation: Compensation to Residential Owners and Occupiers. April 2010* (referred to from here on as 'the guidance').

Paragraph 2.53 of the guidance states, "Subject to the comments on "Re-housing" at paragraph 2.71, there is no obligation on an acquiring authority to provide alternative premises. The guidance goes on to say that, most authorities will help to identify possibilities available on the market."



Section 2.71 states, “Where no suitable alternative accommodation is available on reasonable terms the local housing authority has a duty to re-house a resident whose dwelling has been compulsorily acquired regardless of which public authority was responsible for the acquisition.

Tpas finding: RHP has met and exceeded the requirements

By promising to offer homeowners a new home on Ham Close, RHP has met and exceeded Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG) guidance. On page 7 of the Ham Close offer document under the heading *I want to stay living at Ham Close* it states, “If you’re a homeowner you’ll be able to remain in Ham Close and will be offered a new home.”

Promise 3 – RHP will establish a market value for the homeowner’s existing property through a Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors (RICS) valuation

Relevant legislation/regulation

Section 2.7 of the guidance states, “When dealing with land for which there is a general market or demand compensation is based on the market value of the land.”

Section 2.11 states, “The value of the land is based upon what the land might be expected to realise if sold in the open market by a willing seller.”

Under Section 5 Fees, the guidance states that the acquiring authority will usually pay reasonable surveyors fees which homeowners incur for negotiating claims.

The guidance does not specify who should carry out the valuation and we note the use of the word “usually pay”. However, RICS is the recognised professional body for land and property valuation and it is listed in the Useful Contacts section of the guidance.

Tpas finding: RHP has met the requirements

On page 7 of the offer document under the heading, *How much will I get for my existing home?* It states, “To move forward with the redevelopment proposals, we’ll first need to establish market-value for your existing home. This is carried out as the construction site evolves and is done through a Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyor (RICS) valuation.” This statement implies that RHP will organise and pay for the valuation to be carried out.

Promise 4 - Pay the costs of a nominated surveyor to carry out a further valuation

Relevant legislation/regulation

Under Section 5 Fees, the guidance states that the acquiring authority will usually pay reasonable surveyors fees which homeowners incur for negotiating claims.



Tpas finding: RHP has met the requirements

On page 7 of the offer document under the heading, *What if I don't agree with your valuation?* It states, "If you don't agree with our valuation we'll pay the cost of your nominated surveyor to carry out a further valuation. The surveyor must be a member of RICS. They will agree the market value of your home".

Promise 5 - Compensation for home-loss

Relevant legislation/regulation

Section 2.64 of the guidance covers this point and states, "If you are actually living in the property you may be entitled to a home-loss payment in addition to any other compensation due. The home-loss payment is an additional sum to reflect and recognise the distress and discomfort of being compelled to move out of your home. A number of criteria need to be fulfilled to qualify for payment.

Section 2.65 states, "To qualify for a home-loss payment:

- you must have lived in the dwelling, or a substantial part of it, as your only or main residence, for a period of not less than one year ending with the day you have to move out; and
- your interest or right to occupy the property was freehold, leasehold, statutory tenancy or restricted contract under the Rent Act 1977, or a right to occupy under the terms of your employment or under a licence where secured tenancy or introductory tenancy provisions apply".

Section 2.67 continues, "If you are the owner of a freehold or a lease with at least three years unexpired you are entitled to 10 per cent of the market value of your interest, subject to a maximum payment of £58,000 and a minimum payment of £5,800 (from 1 October 2016). Any other claimant is entitled to a flat rate of £5,800."

Section 2.68 states, "Where two or more people are entitled to make a claim for a home-loss payment in respect of the same interest (such as a husband and wife who are joint owner-occupiers or joint tenants who share the same home) the payment is divided equally between claimants.

Tpas finding: RHP has exceeded the requirements by offering 10% of market value instead of 7.5% to non-resident leaseholders

On page 7 of the offer document under the heading, *Will I be entitled to compensation?* It states, "In addition to the market value, we'll also pay a home-loss payment. This payment is as follows:

- Owner occupiers will receive a payment equivalent to 10% of market value (with a minimum of £5,800 up to a maximum of £58,000 as of October 2016).



- To be entitled to a statutory home-loss payment, you must have lived in your home as your only or main residence for at least one year before the date of having to move.

We note that the RHP offer document does not mention the point at 2.67 about any other claimant, or the point at 2.68 about two or people entitled to make a claim. We would advise RHP to address these omissions in future correspondence with homeowners. Recommendation.

Promise 6 - Offer of a new lease

Relevant legislation/regulation

Tpas couldn't find any legislation, regulation or guidance covering this promise. LEASE commented, '125 years is the standard term for a Right to Buy or Right to Acquire lease. It may be less if derived from a headlease'.

Tpas finding:we conclude that RHP has made an offer it is not legally bound to make.

On page 7 of the offer document under the heading, *Will I get a new lease?* It states, "Yes. All new homes would have a 125 year lease at no additional cost."

Promise 7 - Help with the cost of moving

Relevant legislation/regulation

Section 2.52 states, "If you have to sell or move out of your property you are entitled to the costs and expenses reasonably incurred in vacating that property. The claim can include the costs of acquiring a replacement property (but not the cost of the property) and the costs of moving in to the property."

Section 2.54 states, "Examples of items which can be claimed are set out below:

- removal expenses;
- legal fees arising from the acquisition of a replacement property;
- stamp duty arising from the acquisition of a replacement property;
- surveyors fees arising from the acquisition of a replacement property;
- survey fee and costs in connection with the transfer of an existing mortgage or raising a new one;
- special adaptations of the replacement premises;
- altering soft furnishings and moveable fittings and fixtures to fit your new home;
- disconnection and reconnection of services telephone, electricity, etc;
- forwarding of post (for a reasonable period);
- incidental costs of acquiring replacement property;
- if a tenant is displaced from rented accommodation as a result of a compulsory purchase the acquiring authority may agree to pay the reasonable expenses incurred (other than the price of the property) of buying a reasonably comparable dwelling, provided it is bought within a year of the displacement.



Section 2.55 adds, “This is not an exhaustive list. Every loss should be considered on its merits and should be recoverable if a natural, direct and reasonable consequence of being disturbed. The onus is on the claimant to justify his or her claim. Therefore it is up to you to prove that you should be compensated rather than expect the acquiring authority to come up with anything. Accordingly, it is of the utmost importance that you keep a detailed record of losses sustained and costs incurred in connection with the acquisition of your property. You should keep all relevant documentary evidence such as receipts, invoices and fee quotes. You should also keep a record of the amount of time you have spent on matters relating to the compulsory purchase of your property.”

Tpas finding: RHP has met the requirement

On page 8 of the offer document under the heading, *Will I be entitled to help with the cost of moving?* It states, “As a Homeowner you’re also entitled to a disturbance payment, which pays for other reasonable costs when moving home. These include removals and other costs such as redirecting post, disconnecting and reconnecting appliances and new carpets and curtains. It can also include solicitors and surveyors fees and Stamp Duty Land Tax for a replacement home. An agreement will be reached between yourself and RHP on the amount of disturbance payment made. Payment will be made after receiving the relevant receipts”.

We note that Section 2.56 of the guidance also mentions an entitlement to compensation as the result of losses incurred as a result of having to transfer a mortgage and this point should be included in future consultations with homeowners. Recommendation.

Promise 8 - Shared equity scheme

In the offer document, RHP states, “As part of our commitment to offer everyone the opportunity to remain in their community we’ll offer a Shared Equity scheme for a new flat on a like-for-like basis i.e. the same number of bedrooms as your current home. The current market value of your home will be converted into a percentage of your new home.”

This section of the offer document then goes in to some detail about how the scheme works and the various options. We do not have any comment to make on the offer as this section of the report as RHP is not obliged to put a shared equity scheme in place, but the policy reflects good practice in trying to help communities stay together, and help home owners who have put down roots in Ham Close and want to stay.

Relevant legislation/regulation

None.

Tpas finding: there is no requirement for RHP to make this offer but is viewed as good practice. Therefore RHP is going beyond the legal and regulatory requirements in making this offer.

There is a broad acceptance in central government, local government, the social housing sector and the tenant movement that the dispersal of communities during clearance projects in the



1960s was a failure. RHP's offer is an attempt to keep the Ham Close community together and this approach is supported by bodies such as DCLG, the Homes and Communities Agency and the GLA.

5. Validation of key guarantees for non-resident homeowners

Promise 1 – Home-loss compensation

Home loss payment: 10 % of Open Market Value

Relevant legislation/regulation:

We could find no mention in Booklet 4 but we recognise that 7.5% is the sector norm.

Tpas finding: RHP has exceeded the sector norm by offering 10% of market value instead of 7.5%

On page 10 of the offer document it states, "If you're a non-resident landlord, you're entitled to a home-loss payment. Current regulations state this to be 7.5% of market value. RHP will increase this to 10%."

Promise 2 - Offer of a new home at full market value

This promise currently applies if a non-resident homeowner wants a bigger home.

Relevant legislation/regulation:

We could find no mention in Booklet 4 and LEASE couldn't offer any advice.

Tpas finding: Current regulations state that non-resident home owners can buy a new home at full market value. RHP has exceeded the regulations by offering a shared equity scheme on a like for like basis.

On page 10 of the offer document it states under the heading, *Will I be offered a new home?* It states, "Current regulations state that non-resident home owners can buy a new home at full market value. RHP have decided to also offer shared equity on a like for like basis."

**Table1. Summary of RHP's offers to homeowners**

1. The scheme is compliant with London housing design standards	Met
2. Remain at Ham Close and the offer of new home	Met and exceeded
3. RHP will establish a market value for the homeowner's existing property through a Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors (RICS) valuation	Met
4. Pay the costs of a nominated surveyor to carry out a further valuation	Met
5. Compensation for home-loss	Met and exceeded
6. Offer of a new lease	Exceeded – no requirement
7. Help with the cost of moving	Met
8. Shared equity scheme	Exceeded – no requirement

Table 2. Summary of RHP's offers to non-resident homeowners

Home-loss compensation	Met and exceeded
Offer of a new larger home at full market value	Met and exceeded
Shared equity scheme	Exceeded – no requirement

6. Survey of other housing association offers

Our survey of other housing associations revealed that there a very few homeowner documents and only one that was comparable to the Ham Close offer document (Circle Housing's Merton Priory scheme).

We carried out a web search on all 35 schemes mentioned in the G15 report and a general search for leaseholder offer documents. The results were disappointing.

Many of the schemes had web pages or dedicated websites, which provide general information about the scheme and are designed to promote the development partners and the achievements of the project. Only the South Acton Estate had published a booklet for homeowners.

Fourteen of the G15 members were contacted directly and asked whether they had produced a set of offers/guarantees/charter for homeowners affected by housing regeneration schemes.

Those that responded to our enquiry provided the following information:

- A2 Dominion's scheme at Stanwell is more than 10-years old and they were unable to retrieve a copy of the offer document from their archives. The Regeneration Director did provide a brief commentary, which has been included in the evidence folder for this report.



- A2 Dominion and London Borough of Ealing has produced a freeholder and leaseholder booklet for the Green Man Lane estate – we were unable to obtain a copy.
- Affinity Sutton has recently merged with Circle Housing to form the Clarion Housing Group. Affinity supplied the documents for the schemes at Lavender Point and Sherwood Close and pointed out that they are in the process of aligning their offer with Circle Housing.
- Catalyst provided an information leaflet that was issued to resident leaseholders and freeholders of the Havelock Estate in March 2013
- Circle Housing (now part of Clarion Housing Group) provided the Merton Priory offer document – see section further down this page – and documents for Eastfields and Ravensbury schemes.
- East Thames confirmed that there were no leaseholders on Phase 1 of the New Union Wharf scheme but the intention is to produce an offer document for Phase 2
- Genesis has published a leaseholder booklet for the Grahame Park and Woodberry Down schemes, but we were unable to obtain a copy
- Hyde Housing Association provided the Packington Square leaseholders document which covered the proposed transfer of Islington Council housing stock to the association, and which also set out the proposed offer to leaseholders in the event of the regeneration scheme going ahead
- London & Quadrant, Ealing Council and Countryside Properties has produced a guide for resident leaseholders and freeholders on the South Acton estate which is available on the estate website www.yoursouthacton.co.uk

None of the remaining G15 members replied to us within the timescale of the survey.

In conclusion it would seem that housing associations are not publishing homeowner offers on the web and very few have produced booklets. Our findings suggest that the majority of associations are making offers through individual correspondence with the homeowner and do not wish to make the information widely available.

Circle Housing's Residents Offer in Merton

During the course of our study, only Circle Housing's 'Residents Offer' in Merton was found to be comparable with the Ham Close offer document.

The Circle Housing offer is generous and exceeds the RHP offer. The stand-out offer from Circle is the like-for-like replacement of the homeowner's property with a new home at no extra cost. However, we understand that the tenure mix is 60% Sale and 40% Sociable/Affordable Rent, and that the scheme is cross subsidised by two the schemes. By packaging High Path with other developments, Clarion has been able to create a financial arrangement that it advantageous to existing homeowners. But it is highly unlikely that Clarion would be able to replicate the model



elsewhere. In a financial sense, High Path is an outlier and does not provide a realistic comparator with Ham Close.

The Clarion Housing Group offer appears to be an outlier and we did not come across any other offer documents that matched it.

7. Percentage of additional affordable created by housing regeneration schemes in London

As part of this study, RHP asked us to examine other housing regeneration schemes in London to establish the percentage of additional affordable housing created by each.

The Greater London Authority doesn't report on such data and was not prepared to carry out an in-depth collation exercise on our behalf.

DCLG retains an interest in London housing regeneration due to its Estate Regeneration Fund, but was unable to help.

We were made aware of the research being carried out by Professor Loretta Lees at University of Leicester. She replied to our enquiry and confirmed that she is collating data on all council estates affected by regeneration since 1997, but she was unable to provide the data we needed.

The Estates Gazette carries out in-depth bespoke research on the real estate market. We had an initial discussion with the Head of the research team and he was of the view that obtaining the data would be a lengthy and very detailed exercise.

The National Housing Federation was not aware of any data on the subject but the G15's report, *Meeting the challenge of urban renewal: the g15's contribution to regenerating London's estates* (October 2016) did contain data about the tenure mix before and after the 36 schemes had been completed (see Appendix 1).

8. Analysis: Percentage of additional affordable created by housing regeneration schemes in London

We analysed the data provided in the above NHF report to understand the tenure mix of the 36 regeneration schemes before and after (see Appendix 1).

The tenure mix before regeneration generally fell into two categories: 'Social' – traditional sub-market Secure or Assured rents – or 'Leaseholder'.

After regeneration the tenure mix became more diverse with the introduction of Affordable Rent (AR), Intermediate Rent (IMR), ORS (Outright Sale), Private Rented Sector (PRS) and Shared Ownership/ Shared Equity (SO/SE) categories.

In order to understand how the Ham Close regeneration compared to the G15 schemes in terms of delivering low-rent homes, we analysed whether there had been an increase or decrease in



'Social' and the percentage increase or decrease in the number of housing units (homes). We also noted the number of Affordable homes the scheme had produced.

In three cases the categories in the report's tables had been changed and we could not make a direct comparison. However, a clear picture emerged: of the 36 schemes, 31 had seen a decrease in the number of Social/AR from anywhere between 10% - 100%. One scheme had remained at the same number and only one had increased (by 10%).

By comparison the Ham Close currently has a total of 192 housing units with the following tenure mix:

143 - Social
49 - Leaseholders

After the regeneration is completed a total of 425 homes will have been built and the tenure mix will be:

169 - Social (London Affordable Rents or Lower)
49 - Replacement Leaseholder Properties
10 - London Living Rent
38 - Shared Ownership
159 - Sale

Therefore, Ham Close will buck the trend across London housing regeneration schemes by increasing the number of Social/AR by 26 units. If the RHP scheme was compared to the 36-scheme G15 cohort, it would be one of only two schemes to see an increase in that tenure category. In light of our findings this is a considerable achievement which demonstrates an ongoing commitment to provide sub-market-rent homes for people on low incomes.


Appendix 1: Table: G15 members' regeneration schemes – tenure mix before and after

G15 member	Scheme	Tenure mix before	Tenure mix after	+/- Social	No. homes before/ after	No. Social after % (+/-)
G15 member 1	Scheme 1	Social: 390 (85%) Leasehold: 66 (15%)	Social: 335 (44%) ORS: 305 (40%) SO/SE: 67 (8%) PRS: 63 (8%)	- 55 units	456/770 +69%	- 41%
G15 member 1	Scheme 2	Social: 96 (55%) PR: 78 (45%)	Social: 72 (26%) AR: 23 (8%) ORS: 166 (60%) SO/SE: 18 (6%)	- 24 units (inc+ 23 new Affordable units)	174/279 +60%	- 29%
G15 member 2	Scheme 3	Social: 160 (76%) Leasehold: 49 (24%)	Social: 109 (36%) ORS: 191 (63%) SO/SE: 5 (2%)	- 51 units	209/305 +46%	- 40%
G15 member 2	Scheme 4	Social: 431 (91%) Leasehold: 40 (9%)	Social: 191 (30%) AR: 146 (23%) ORS: 243 (38%) SO/SE: 65 (10%)	- 240 units (inc.+ 146 new Affordable units)	471/645 +37%	- 61%
G15 member 3	Scheme 5	Social: 1400 (93%) Leasehold: 100 (7%)	Social: 1269 (83%) Leaseholder: 100 (6%) SO/SE: 161 (11%)	- 131 units	1500/1530 +2%	- 10%
G15 member 3	Scheme 6	Social: 481 (57%) Leasehold: 64 (43%)	Social: 430 (40%) Leasehold: 156 (14%) ORS: 450 (42%) SO/SE: 42 (4%)	- 51 units	845/1078 +28%	- 17%



Table contd: G15 members’ regeneration schemes – tenure mix before and after

G15 member	Scheme	Tenure mix before	Tenure mix after	+/- Social	No. homes before/ after	No. Social after % (+/-)
G15 member 3	Scheme 7	Social: 100 (91%) Leasehold:10 (9%)	Social/ Leaseholders: 85 (53%) Leaseholders:1 (1%) ORS: 58 (36%) SO/SE: 15 (9%)	Unclear due categorisation change	110/159 +45%	Unclear due categorisation change
G15 member 3	Scheme 8	Social: 96 (80%) Leasehold: 24 (20%)	Social: 122 (59%) ORS: 86 (41%)	+ 26 units	120/208 +73%	- 21%
G15 member 3	Scheme 9	Social: 538 (100%)	Social: 538* (54%) ORS: 442 (44%) SO/SE: 20 (2%)	No change	538/1000 +86%	(- 54%) *No change in Social units
G15 member 4	Scheme 10	Social: 473 (92%) Leasehold: 39 (8%)	Social: 299 (58%) AR: 35 (7%) ORS: 150 (29%) SO/SE: 32 (6%)	- 174 units (inc.+ 35 new Affordable units)	512/516 +1%	- 34%
G15 member 5	Scheme 11	Social/AR: 357 (94%) Leasehold: 25 (6%)	Social/AR: 200 (48%) SO/SE: 221(52%)	- 157 units	382/481 +10%	- 46% (Social/AR)



Table cont'd: G15 members' regeneration schemes – tenure mix before and after

G15 member	Scheme	Tenure mix before	Tenure mix after	+/- Social	No. homes before/ after	No. Social after % (+/-)
G15 member 5	Scheme 12	Social: 189 (100%)	Social: 158 (40%) AR: 37 (9%) ORS: 157 (39%) SO/SE: 47 (12%)	- 31 units (inc. + 37 new Affordable units)	189/399 +111%	- 60%
G15 member 5	Scheme 13	Social: 82 (68%) Leasehold: 38 (32%)	Social: 92 (41%) ORS: 104 (46%) SO/SE: 29 (13%)	+ 10 units	120/225 +88%	- 27%
G15 member 6	Scheme 14	Social: 527 (84%) Leasehold: 111 (16%)	Social: 119 (17%) AR: 248 (21%) ORS: 616 (52%) SO/SE: 129 (11%)	- 408 units (inc. + 248 new Affordable units)	638/1192 +87%	- 67%
G15 member 6	Scheme 15	Social: 510 (84%) Leasehold: 93 (16%)	Social: 345 (34%) ORS: 498 (50%) SO/SE: 156 (16%)	- 165 units	603/999 +66%	- 50%
G15 member 7	Scheme 16	Social: 1365 (77%) Leasehold: 412 (33%)	Social: 745 (26%) AR: 38 (1%) ORS: 1572 (55%) PRS: 151 (5%) SO/SE: 345 (12%)	- 620 units (inc. + 38 new Affordable units)	1777/2851 +60%	- 51%



Table cont'd: G15 members' regeneration schemes – tenure mix before and after

G15 member	Scheme	Tenure mix before	Tenure mix after	+/- Social	No. homes before/ after	No. Social after % (+/-)
G15 member 7	Scheme 17	Social: 1320 (67%) Leasehold: 660(33%)	Social: 1115 (20%) ORS: 3342 (61%) SO/SE: 1043 (19%)	- 205 units	1980/5500 +178%	- 47%
G15 member 8	Scheme 18	Social: 499 (93%) Leasehold: 39 (7%)	Social: 452 (57%) ORS: 300 (38%) SO/SE: 39 (5%)	- 47 units	538/791 +47%	- 36%
G15 member 9	Scheme 19	Social/AR: 360 (82%) Leasehold: 76 (18%)	Social: 230 (37%) ORS: 366 (59%) SO/SE: 20 (3%)	- 130 units	436/616 + 41%	Unclear due categorisation change
G15 member 9	Scheme 20	Social/AR: 485 (100%)	Social/AR: 248 (32%) IMR: 44 (6%) ORS: 143 (19%) PRS: 209 (27%) SO/SE: 126 (16%)	- 237 units	485/770 +59%	- 68%
G15 member 9	Scheme 21	Social/AR: 1403 (79%) Leasehold: 375 (21%)	Social: 852 (30%) ORS: 1541 (54%) SO/SE: 460 (16%)	- 551 units	1778/2853 +60%	Unclear due categorisation change



Appendix 1 cont'd: G15 members' regeneration schemes – tenure mix before and after

G15 member	Scheme	Tenure mix before	Tenure mix after	+/- Social	No. homes before/ after	No. Social after % (+/-)
G15 member 10	Scheme 22	Social: 1444 (71%) Leasehold: 592 (29%)	Social: 2275 (53%) Leasehold: 2032 (47%)	+ 831 units	2036/4307 +112%	- 18%
G15 member 10	Scheme 23	Social: 537 (79%) Leasehold: 143 (21%)	Social: 262 (12%) Leasehold: 1645 (75%) SO/SE: 287 (13%)	- 275 units	680/2194 +223%	- 67%
G15 member 10	Scheme 24	Social: 167 (62%) Leasehold: 103 (38%)	Social: 325 (72%) Leasehold: 103 (23%) SO/SE: 21 (5%)	+ 158 units	270/449 +66%	+ 10%
G15 member 11	Scheme 25	Social: 256 (94%) Leasehold: 16 (6%)	Social: 103 (45%) Leasehold: 16 (7%) ORS: 110 (48%)	- 153 units	272/229 -16%	- 49%
G15 member 11	Scheme 26	Social: 861 (76%) Leasehold: 267 (34%)	Social: 728 (51%) AR: 84 (6%) Leasehold: 267(19%) ORS: 221 (15%) SO/SE: 139 (10%)	- 133 units (inc. + 84 Affordable units)	1128/1439 +28%	- 25%



Appendix 1 cont'd: G15 members' regeneration schemes – tenure mix before and after

G15 member	Scheme	Tenure mix before	Tenure mix after	+/- Social	No. homes before/ after	No. Social after % (+/-)
G15 member 12	Scheme 27	Social: 64 (97%) Leasehold: 2 (3%)	Social: 45 (51%) PRS: 44 (49%)	- 19 units	66/89 +35%	- 46%
G15 member 12	Scheme 28	Social: 529 (88%) Leasehold: 70 (12%)	Social: 349 (37%) IMR: 48 (5%) PRS: 426 (45%) SO/SE: 126 (13%)	- 138 units	599/949 +58%	-51%
G15 member 12	Scheme 29	Social: 185 (86%) Leasehold: 29 (14%)	Social: 122 (36%) PRS: 151 (45%) SO/SE: 65 (19%)	- 63 units	214/338 +58%	- 50%
G15 member 12	Scheme 30	Social: 1163 (100%)	AR: 1265(100%)	- 1163 units (inc. + 1265 new Affordable units)	1163/1265 +9%	- 100%
G15 member 12	Scheme 31	Social: 198 (92%) Leasehold: 17 (8%)	AR: 291 (84%) SO/SE: 54 (16%)	- 198 units	215/345 +60%	- 100%



Table cont'd: G15 members' regeneration schemes – tenure mix before and after

G15 member	Scheme	Tenure mix before	Tenure mix after	+/- Social	No. homes before/ after	No. Social after % (+/-)
G15 member 13	Scheme 32	Social: 11 (78%) Leasehold: 3 (12%)	Social: 45 (36%) ORS: 28 (25%) SO/SE: 39 (35%)	+ 34 units	14/112 +700%	- 42%
G15 member 13	Scheme 33	Social: 234 (66%) IMR: 117 (34%)	Social: 221 (42%) ORS: 249 (47%) SO/SE: 58 (11%)	- 13 units	351/528 +50%	- 24%
G15 member 14	Scheme 34	Social: 30 (100%)	Social: 63 (73%) ORS: 249 (47%)	+ 33 units	30/86 +187%	- 27%
G15 member 14	Scheme 35	Social: 199 (100%)	Social: 160 (69%) ORS: 72 (31%)	- 39 units	199/232 +17%	- 21%
G15 member 14	Scheme 36	Social: 260 (96%) Leasehold: 11 (4%)	Social: 268 (64%) Leaseholders: 3 (1%) ORS: 89 (21%) SO/SE: 61 (14%)	+ 8 units	271/421 +55%	- 32%
Key:						
AR: Affordable Rent						
IMR: Intermediate Rent						
ORS: Out Right Sale						
PRS: Private Rented Sector						
SO/SE: Shared Ownership / Shared Equity						



Appendix 2: List of G15 members contacted

A2 Dominion

Affinity Sutton (Clarion Group)

Catalyst

Circle Housing (Clarion Group)

East Thames

Family Mosaic (The Peabody Group)

Genesis

Hyde Housing Association

London & Quadrant

Metropolitan

Network Homes

Notting Hill Housing Trust

Peabody (The Peabody Group)

Southern Housing Group



Appendix 2: Reference documents and webpages

A2 Dominion

<http://www.rydon.co.uk/what-we-do/regeneration/case-studies/regeneration-case-studies/green-man-lane>

https://www.ealing.gov.uk/info/201104/housing_regeneration/373/green_man_lane/5

Affinity Sutton (Clarion Group)

A Guide for Sherwood Close's Resident Freeholders and Leaseholders (May 2106)

<http://sherwoodclose.co.uk/>

<http://www.rydon.co.uk/news/first-phase-of-sutton-regeneration-scheme-enjoys-sales-success>

Catalyst

<https://www.chg.org.uk/development-regeneration/regeneration/church-end-brent/>

<https://www.chg.org.uk/development-regeneration/regeneration/havelock/>

Information for resident leaseholders and freeholders (other than those living in Phase 1a) whose homes are required during the regeneration of the Havelock Road estate pamphlet (March 2013)

<https://www.chg.org.uk/development-regeneration/regeneration/mill-farm-harrow/>

<https://www.chg.org.uk/development-regeneration/regeneration/south-kilburn/>

<https://www.chg.org.uk/development-regeneration/regeneration/wornington-green-kensington/>

Circle Housing (Clarion Group)

https://www.circle.org.uk/your_home/orchard_village_information_hub/

The future of High Path: Housing options compensation support

http://www.mertonregen.org.uk/eastfields/eastfields_residents_offer/

http://www.mertonregen.org.uk/ravensbury/ravensbury_residents_offer/



Appendix 2: Reference documents and webpages (continued.)

East Thames

<http://www.east-thames.co.uk/weavers-quarter-barking-and-dagenham>

<http://www.weaversquarter.co.uk/>

<https://www.east-thames.co.uk/new-union-wharf-tower-hamlets>

<https://www.east-thames.co.uk/ocean-estate-tower-hamlets>

Family Mosaic

<http://www.rydon.co.uk/what-we-do/affordable-housing/case-studies/housing-case-studies/heathside-and-lethbridge>

<http://www.familymosaic.co.uk/resident-services/your-estate/stonegrove/>

Genesis

http://www.genesisha.org.uk/regeneration/homes_in_development/grahame_park.aspx

http://www.genesisha.org.uk/regeneration/homes_in_development/woodberry_down.aspx

Hyde Housing Association

Regenerating Packington: Packington Square leaseholders(2006)

<https://www.hyde-housing.co.uk/homeowners/major-works-and-section-20/>

<https://www.hyde-housing.co.uk/corporate/building-homes/estate-regeneration/packington-estate/>

London & Quadrant

South Acton Estate: a guide for resident leaseholders and freeholders

www.yoursouthacton.co.uk

Metropolitan

www.metropolitan.org.uk/about-us/our-developments/clapham-park/

www.metropolitan.org.uk/about-us/our-developments/west-hendon/



Appendix 2: Reference documents and webpages (continued.)

Network Homes

www.networkhomes.org.uk/about-us/our-development-offer/experts-in-regeneration/rectory-park-ealing/

www.networkhomes.org.uk/about-us/our-development-offer/experts-in-regeneration/south-kilburn-phase-2-brent/

www.networkhomes.org.uk/about-us/our-development-offer/experts-in-regeneration/stockwell-park-lambeth/

Notting Hill Housing Trust

www.nhhg.org.uk/building-homes/developments/aylesbury-estate-southwark/

www.nhhg.org.uk/building-homes/developments/barham-park-brent/

Peabody

<https://www.peabody.org.uk/homes-in-development/bexley>

www.peabody.org.uk/homes-in-development/kensington-chelsea/silchester-more-west

www.peabody.org.uk/homes-in-development/wandsworth/st-johns-hill

Southern Housing Group

<http://www.shgroup.org.uk/about-us/latest-news/latest-developments/lisgar-terrace/>

Centre for London

Another storey: The real potential for estate densification (Hanna, Oduwaiye, Redman)
(September 2016)

Department for Communities and Local Government

Compulsory Purchase and Compensation: Compensation to Residential Owners and Occupiers.
Department for Communities and Local Government. (2004). ISBN 978 1 4098 2885 3

Estate Regeneration National Strategy: Resident Engagement and protection
ISBN: 978-1-4098-4945-2



Appendix 2: Reference documents and webpages (continued.)

Hackney Council

Hackney Regeneration Estates: Leaseholder and freeholder options document

Mayor for London

Homes for Londoners: Draft good practice guide for estate regeneration (December 2016)

Tpas/LEASE

Leasehold Engagement Guide (2015)

Tpas would like to thank the following for their help with this report:

Adam Tucker (RHP), Tracey Elliott (RHP), Bob Beaumont (Clarion Housing Group), Tristan Carylton (NHF), Prof. Loretta Lees (University of Leicester), A2 Dominion, Catalyst, DCLG, Ealing Council, East Thames, Genesis, GLA, LEASE, London & Quadrant