Meeting the challenge of urban renewal

The g15’s contribution to regenerating London’s estates

October 2016
The g15’s manifesto sets out the ambition to deliver 72,000 homes for London over the next five years and another 80,000 over the following five. There is the potential for at least one-sixth of these to be on existing estates.

Our ambition is to create places where people want to live and in so doing to unlock hidden social value. We see regeneration as a catalyst for alleviating deprivation and improving living conditions and socio-economic prospects for the people already in-situ. We also regard it as a means to transform a locality by attracting a broad mix of inhabitants. The replacement of existing ageing stock with new homes is not, therefore, the limit of our ambition. It is the means to a bigger end: the revitalisation of communities.

The g15 is a group of London’s largest housing associations working across all London’s boroughs and beyond. We believe that continuing to provide homes for a diverse population on a range of incomes is vital to London’s ongoing prosperity and growth. We have a long-term commitment to the city’s residents, investing all our profits in housing and supporting low income, vulnerable households by building a range of high quality homes for ownership and rent.
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The problem is most acute in London where there is an urgent need for more high quality homes at an affordable level. If that need is to be met it will require a new approach from central and local government and a closer and more strategic partnership with developers and housing associations.

Integral to the creation of new homes will be the regeneration of existing estates which is the subject of this report from the g15, a group of London’s largest housing associations. We have a common social mission to house and support low income, vulnerable households and deliver a range of products for ownership and rent, targeted at all those households unable to access the market. Together we own and manage 550,000 homes and house one in ten Londoners. We have ambitious plans to deliver more homes in the capital including through a number of urban renewal schemes.

The evidence from these 35 schemes that are presented here serves as an important corrective to some of the myths and negative perceptions that surround estate regeneration. While the case studies we cite underline the difficulty and complexity inherent in the regeneration process, they reveal how these problems are being tackled and the overwhelmingly positive benefits that flow from urban renewal.

They also highlight the critical and constructive role that housing associations play in delivering successful estate regeneration. We have the capacity and commitment to fund schemes and engage with communities, along with the neutrality to work within different political environments to bring about mutually beneficial results for Londoners.

But to continue to do so – in ways that can deliver new high quality homes on the scale required by the current housing crisis – we need closer partnerships and increased support from local and central government. To that end this report identifies a series of challenges which must be met if future progress is to be made.

David Montague CBE
Chair, g15 and Chief Executive, L&Q
Executive summary

Through regeneration the g15 will deliver at least an additional 14,000 new homes for Londoners...

Everyone is agreed on the need to build more houses. In London, especially, demand far outstrips supply. But in an area where land is scarce, the regeneration of existing estates is critical to the provision of new high quality homes.

However, regeneration is a difficult, expensive and time consuming process. That is why housing associations such as those that comprise the g15 play such a critical role. Few, if any, other organisations would be willing to make the long-term commitment and financial investment that these projects require.

Few other organisations share the same social philosophy that is vital to regeneration. Rooted in the charitable sector, housing associations are driven by people and not by profit. Our first concern is to provide affordable homes for households on low incomes.

Between now and 2040, the g15 will deliver at least an additional 14,000 new homes for Londoners through 35 estate regeneration schemes. These are in addition to new homes built to rehouse existing residents and leaseholders, many of whom are often living in poor quality accommodation, and further to the g15 members’ individual new build programmes.

A concern for community is at the heart of our approach. Regeneration is inherently disruptive, but the evidence here shows that the vast majority of secure and assured tenants in the g15 schemes are offered the option to stay and have been rehoused within the new schemes or alternative homes close to relatives and friends.

Successful regeneration depends on effective resident engagement and in this housing associations bring special value and experience. The g15 members involve residents in helping to shape the design of schemes and at all stages of the planning process. We are experts in leading community consultation.

We have ambitious plans for major regeneration in London as part of a wider scheme that will deliver more high quality homes in diverse communities. The g15 have committed to deliver 93,000 homes in London and the South over the decade to 2025, but have identified they have the capacity to build much more than this if they can work with their partners to create the right conditions for housing delivery. There is potential for a substantial amount of this to be on existing estates.
Recent housing completions split between new, replacement and additional regeneration units

g15 housing completions during 2014 – 16

17,456 units

- Replacement regeneration units
- Additional regeneration units
- All g15 completions (excluding regeneration units)
An existing housing estate is not just a collection of buildings but a community in which people live, work and play.

The provision of adequate housing is one of the most critical social issues of our time and among the key tests of any political administration. Everyone accepts there is a need to build more homes. Nowhere is that truer than in London, which is in the midst of a housing crisis. London’s population is expanding rapidly, predicted to surpass 9.5 million by 2025, while housing supply remains stubbornly around half of the 49,000 homes required each year to meet this demand.

But this is not simply a question of metrics. Housing is about much more than the number of units that can be created from bricks and mortar. It touches deep into the heart of issues concerning the economic prosperity and social cohesion of the nation. The goal is clear. We need more high quality homes that are accessible to people on a wide range of incomes, planned and delivered in ways that are sensitive to the needs of residents and local communities.

So delivering new housing on this scale and in this manner is not a straightforward task. In a period when finance and space are in short supply, the construction of new homes requires imagination and collaboration. In an urban environment, it requires the regeneration of existing stock and the spaces that surround it.

Estate regeneration presents a series of significant challenges and it is surmounting all of these to deliver a successful project, and support a community, that is perhaps the most significant task of all. That social dimension is central to any programme of regeneration and at the heart of the g15 philosophy.
Realising our regeneration aspirations requires partnership and support. In this report we identify five key challenges that need to be met in order to deliver urban renewal on the scale which is needed.

1. The first challenge relates to housing policy. Recent policies such as on the Voluntary Right to Buy for housing associations and Starter Homes have had a significant impact on the business plans of housing associations. We need flexibility on Starter Home requirements and greater capacity to deal with leaseholders if we are to deliver projects in the future. More generally, we need a stable policy environment in which government provides clear guidance.

2. The second challenge concerns rents. Recent reductions have seriously impacted our business plans. Going forward we need more flexibility to secure viable rental income.

3. The third challenge is investment. Regeneration costs money and the vast bulk of the funding for the schemes being undertaken by the g15 members comes from their own resources. The total value of government grants for 29 schemes that received subsidy was £462m, which constituted only 10% of the predicted total scheme costs of £4.8bn.

4. That level of financial commitment is unsustainable. We need more public subsidy and greater flexibility over how funding may be used.

5. The fourth challenge is targeted action. Successful regeneration depends on the identification of which estate(s) will benefit from investment, either to halt a cycle of decline or at an early preventative stage. In so doing, care is needed not to stigmatise struggling estates.

6. The fifth challenge is leadership and partnership. In the context of London, local authorities and the Greater London Authority (GLA) have a vital role to play in smoothing the path to regeneration through quick and effective planning systems. At the local level, vision, leadership and support during the regeneration process are of utmost importance in unlocking and delivering successful schemes.
1.1 The g15 philosophy

We apply a set of core principles and pledges that govern our approach.

As several recent reports have highlighted, regeneration is no simple option². Housing associations in particular face a number of difficulties in delivering new projects:

- Estate regeneration is typically a long, complex balancing of competing demands: reconciling those of existing residents with local authorities’ future vision for their borough.
- Vacant sites are extremely rare, requiring collaboration with existing occupants. In addition new schemes often have to resolve the legacies of historical design failures.
- Viability is increasingly stretched given reduced public investment in regeneration and affordable housing.
- Housing and planning reforms, such as extending the Right to Buy to housing association residents and Starter Homes, challenge the future deliverability and vision for existing schemes on site and planned projects.
- The recent rent reduction has removed considerable capacity from our business plans.

A central aspect of the g15’s work is the regeneration of existing stock; a task to which we apply a set of core principles and pledges that govern our approach:

- A regeneration philosophy that is focused on the resident. Fostering community involvement in the process and incorporating resident views into the design of new homes and their neighbourhood.
- Working to ensure new housing is affordable to existing residents while providing new low cost homes for rent and ownership to help young Londoners get on the housing ladder.
- A promise to deliver high quality, safe, warm, new homes abiding by best practice standards of design.
- Acknowledging our long-term obligation to communities. We will commit to all existing management obligations to support communities over the lifetime of the neighbourhood.
- Resulting in the delivery of refreshed and modernised neighbourhoods with improved facilities and a chance to meet new neighbours from all walks of life.

1.2 Support and partnership

Despite these difficulties our determination to deliver high quality homes is undimmed. We bring specialist knowledge and experience that can augment the skills and resources that developers and local and central government possess. By working together we can successfully revitalise communities. But it requires partnership and support.

To that end we set out our ‘asks’ in each of the previously described five areas of challenge, where a new approach with central and local government could help to unlock the potential for wider urban renewal.

1 A stable policy environment

The current political and market environment brought on by new policies under the Housing and Planning Act and Brexit pose real challenges to the delivery of projects. Our long-term ask of central government, particularly important when delivering long and complex regeneration schemes, is for a stable policy environment and certainty over rents in particular.

The introduction of policies such as Starter Homes have the potential to alter existing business plans and the vision for areas undergoing regeneration, including the ability to deliver truly mixed communities. The introduction of Voluntary Right to Buy (VRTB) will lead to increased numbers of leaseholders on estates, which is a positive step for those aspiring to homeownership, but poses challenges to the delivery of schemes planned for estate regeneration.

- Delivering Starter Homes requires a robust standardised procedure for assessing viability. We will help as many people as possible into homeownership (viability allowing), but regeneration sites are an example where the Starter Homes requirement should be adjusted to local need.

- Where estates have a large number of leaseholders or residents exercising Right to Buy, this must be dealt with sensitively and in line with housing associations’ individual VRTB exemption policies. There should be clear recognition of how compensation or incentives for residents will impact on the viability of the project. As an alternative to strengthening Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) powers (which are slow and only used as a last resort) additional funding or mechanisms are required to incentivise leaseholders to cooperate in relocation.

On a practical level, we ask for policies and government endorsed guidance, such as for stock transfer, which are conducive to the delivery of regeneration. We will work with the HCA, GLA and government to identify areas where comprehensive guidance is needed.

2 Rents

Importantly, we ask central government for flexibility to set rents at a level which ensures both viability to deliver schemes and affordability for our customers and certainty that once set, rents will not be altered (directly or indirectly). Certainty and control over rents is vital for our business models and to ensure lender confidence. Fewer rent restrictions would increase the opportunity to scale up regeneration output.
Investment

The g15 collectively have committed to deliver 93,000 new homes in London and the south east in the decade to 2025. However, we have identified the capacity to increase this to 152,000 if the right environment for home building can be created. These homes, including on regenerated estates, will be funded primarily through private finance, internal sources and new revenue streams. Although there will be minimal public subsidy, many more homes, especially affordable, can be delivered with the support of our partners – whether this is through additional investment, bond guarantees, land or other contributions that help us deliver more homes together.

We ask central government for greater flexibility for housing associations (and local authorities) on the apportionment of funding to ease different pressure points and phases in regeneration schemes e.g. to fund the costly initial stages of regeneration.

We also ask for flexibility to deploy overall funding to deliver a mix of tenures that meet local housing needs and affordability rather than meeting tenure targets that are detached from local markets and needs.

Targeting improvement areas

The g15 are practiced at identifying which estate(s) will benefit from investment, either to halt a cycle of decline or at an early preventative stage. Care is needed not to stigmatise struggling estates or belittle the activities of existing communities and residents. Regeneration has the potential to improve and revitalise communities socially and economically, if delivered at the right time, with the right levels of investment in consultation with residents.

Leadership and partnership

Regeneration requires strong local leaders to coordinate a wide range of stakeholders to deliver a vision. This includes working together with local authorities to take an area-level strategic programme approach to improving whole neighbourhoods, not just estates and the buildings they consist of. This requires collaborating to devise inventive use of surrounding sites.

We seek pro-growth, pro-regeneration planning systems. Local authorities with dedicated regeneration teams and experienced staff can speed up the delivery of regeneration schemes. There is scope to enhance the opportunities local authorities have at their disposal to facilitate regeneration even further e.g. landholdings, CPO powers, planning powers. We are keen to work with local authorities to explore these opportunities and further the potential to deliver more regeneration.

As facilitative agents with key roles in enabling regeneration we seek speed and efficiency from both the GLA and HCA, whether making planning decisions, allocating and administering funding or acting as a mediator when required.
Regeneration of the 35 schemes is about more than just bricks and mortar

Regeneration will deliver 70% more new homes for Londoners by 2040.

*See page 27

70% Regeneration schemes will deliver an average of

65% have density levels below the upper limit set by the London Plan

yet…

2016

2031

Regeneration is long and complex

Large scale schemes can take 15 years from initial concept to first home being built

Of residents choose to be re-housed in the new scheme

66%

Key drivers for regeneration

Replace poor quality stock

Address social problems

Increase tenure mix

Improve areas of deprivation

Make better use of public assets
Regeneration can’t be done on a shoestring, it costs £7,000,000,000 to deliver the 35 schemes.

Regeneration schemes will deliver an average of 70% increase in density.

Yet... 65% have density levels below the upper limit set by the London Plan.

As development costs have increased, grant levels per unit have reduced.

Improving facilities for the community.

g15’s current regeneration schemes will deliver:

- 18 community centres
- 4 schools
- 3 GP surgeries
- 5 nurseries

We believe in mixed communities and providing a range of products at different price points.

Partnerships are key to success.
This report looks at 35 recently completed, on-site or planned estate regeneration schemes within Greater London which the g15 members are undertaking. Whilst acknowledging the serious challenges that major regeneration projects encounter, the evidence gathered here highlights the positives that can be achieved through successful regeneration schemes.

More high quality homes
The 35 schemes analysed for this report involve the construction of 34,000 homes by 2040, providing 14,000 additional homes across London. Most of these will be completed within the next five years. By 2021, the g15 is projected to complete a total of 9,248 units through estate regeneration, of which 2,698 will be additional supply, and in total will represent a 41% increase on the existing estates. Of the total units to be completed by 2021, approximately half will be for social/affordable rent. The 14,000 additional units expected to be completed by 2040 will represent a 70% increase on the existing estates. This is the minimum contribution as more schemes will enter the pipeline during the period.

The new schemes vary in size, just under half ranging between 250 and 1,000 homes, with five larger than 2,000 including Metropolitan's Clapham Park and Genesis' Woodberry Down. All 18 schemes with less than 1,000 units are projected to be completed before 2025.

Mixed, balanced communities
As well as increasing units, the g15 is substantially widening the tenure mix on the schemes, with homes for shared ownership and outright sale accounting for the bulk of the growth as well as homes for private rent. This diverse mix will be achieved within the acceptable density levels. The proposed numbers of affordable units (according to government definitions) will increase by 7% from 16,235 before regeneration, to 17,404 after.

As well as being widely distributed across London, the existing estates being redeveloped are varied in size and form, with construction dates spanning from the 1920s to the 1980s, their design reflecting the fashions of the time. Twenty-three of the estates were built in the 1960s and 70s, but only five schemes were solitary tower blocks or high rise slab blocks. A handful were discrete walk-up balcony access flats or low-rise slab blocks, but the majority of existing estates combined a mix of designs covering several eras; towers surrounded by courtyard flats or low-rise slab blocks, assorted blocks of low- and medium-rise flats, or post-war 1950s balcony access flats alongside later low-rise slabs. This results in a diversity of construction approaches and degrees of integration to the surrounding street patterns / urban fabric. The proposed schemes respond in equally varied ways. Several schemes (Notting Hill's Briar Road or Network's Stockwell Park) proposed a combination of infill new build with refurbishment, but the majority required demolition and redevelopment of the whole site. These estates provide scope for additional housing to help ease London's housing crisis, however, the proposals are careful not to push densities to levels where they will impact on residents' quality of life and to ensure the new scheme remains in context with its surroundings.

Several large schemes have been excluded from this report, such as Peabody's planned developments in the London Borough of Bexley's Housing Zone in Thamesmead, which starts on-site in the next year. At the time of writing this is projected to deliver 1,272 new homes of which 591 will be affordable homes. This scheme doubles the original amount of homes that were on the sites.
The g15’s contribution to regenerating London’s estates

Figure 2  Location of g15 members’ regeneration schemes
See appendix 1 for details of schemes and locations
The innovative approach used by Network Homes for the regeneration of Stockwell Park illustrates that it is possible for redevelopment and refurbishment to work in tandem so that the estate is repaired and uplifted, with the community retaining its identity.

This regeneration scheme has many unique features, including a reimagined mixed tenure tower block replacing the former 15 storey Wayland House. Park Heights is a landmark 20 storey tower, topped with a roof garden.

The combination of refurbished and newly developed homes has created a thriving, culturally and economically diverse inner city community. Residents remain loyal to the estate, their sense of belonging reinforced by the improvements that have already taken place.

A total of 457 homes have also been refurbished. Tired, rundown 1960s apartment buildings were renovated, giving residents new kitchens and bathrooms along with new windows and doors. Newly built housing has provided homes across all tenures, including those for first-time buyers and the elderly in the form of a 46-unit extra care scheme which provides 24-hour support.

These successes have been underpinned by a strong local community-led board that works with Network Homes to deliver solutions.

Alleviation of deprivation

Among the 35 schemes reported on, local staff highlighted replacing poor quality stock as the most frequent reason for regeneration. The next most common driver for regeneration was a desire to improve an area of deprivation. An Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) score at the start of regeneration was available for 34 schemes at the Lower Layer Super Output Area level. Of these, all but five had an IMD score that was higher than the corresponding figure for the local authorities in which they were situated, again confirming that the G15’s regeneration activities are focused on areas in London with struggling communities.

As expected, given the objective of transforming communities, the map below indicates that the focus of the G15’s regeneration efforts is within areas with (by London standards) lower property values, such as East Thames’ Weavers Quarter in Barking and Dagenham. Of the 35 schemes in London, 23 are situated in the Middle Layer Super Output Areas (MSOA) where average house prices are less than £500k (the light grey areas on the map Figure 3), which represents the lower to middle range of the market relative to London property prices. Nine schemes are situated in MSOAs where average prices are between £500k and £700k, and only 3 schemes in areas where average prices are between £700k and £1m.
The g15's contribution to regenerating London's estates

Figure 3  Map of g15 regeneration schemes with average house price values

* Copyright—see appendix 2
G15 member: Circle
Case Study: Orchard Village
London Borough of Havering
Reversing the exodus of residents; transforming an unpopular estate into a desirable neighbourhood

The Mardyke Estate was a 1960s estate which had become increasingly dilapidated and a place where few people wanted to live.

The plan for the renamed Orchard Village (one of the biggest housing association-sponsored schemes to be approved by the GLA) called for the demolition of much of the existing estate, replacing the ageing high-rise blocks with new, energy efficient flats in a mix of three and five storeys.

In total 516 new homes are being built across four phases, which will include a mix of tenures including affordable rent, shared ownership and private sale properties. Working closely with residents, Circle designed a scheme that has a new communal square at its centre, which brings together community and healthcare facilities, retail and commercial space, transport links and recreational opportunities.

At the time of transfer, vacant homes on the estate were receiving zero bids on the choice-based lettings register and the Mardyke Estate was considered a “no go area” – the police had identified the estate as a major hot spot for crime and antisocial behaviour, residents could not get takeaway deliveries, and even postmen and couriers were reluctant to make deliveries.

The investment and initiatives described have supported the creation of a vibrant and cohesive community. Orchard Village is now an aspirational location for local people in the borough. The last client satisfaction survey at Orchard Village showed a satisfaction rate of 97%. It is no longer classified as a ‘crime hotspot’ by the Metropolitan Police and pizza deliveries have returned.

Through community development programmes introduced in the first two years of regeneration, Orchard Village is also narrowing the gap in average achievements by both pupils and schools compared to the England average. The percentage of persistent absentees dropped from 7.5% to 3.9% between 2009 and 2010 and Orchard Village saw a reduction in children living in poverty by 12.8% between 2007 and 2009.
2.1 Private investment for public good

The vast bulk of the funding among the 35 regeneration schemes here comes from the g15’s own resources and leveraged finance. The total value of government grants for the 29 schemes identified as receiving subsidy was £462m, which constituted only 10% of the predicted scheme costs of £4.8bn. Obtaining consistently comparable costs is hard, but the global cost for all the schemes including land values, construction, decanting, compensation, leaseholder buy-backs, financing or project management costs will reach over £7bn. The g15 have delivered regeneration projects efficiently, whilst substantially investing their own resources to make best use of the public money available.

Successful estate regeneration requires significant financial commitment from the g15 members, which often spans many years and varying political and economic cycles. As a recent report by Quod/Shelter highlights “some of the most high profile estate redevelopment schemes in London have taken 15 years or more from conception to the first home being built. Major estate renewal schemes have often required tens of millions of pounds of public support before they can succeed” Public subsidy for estate regeneration is minimal and has been reducing for some time. We found that the average grant per unit (GPU) awarded to these schemes under the 2011-15 National Affordable Homes Programme (NAHP) was around 50% less than under the previous 2008-11 programme. Despite the introduction of the affordable rent regime, the post-2011 reduction in average GPU was particularly steep for the social rent tenure.

The seven projects funded under the final NAHP 2015-18 round will receive a slightly higher average GPU in comparison to 2011-15, but this is still 30% lower than the average amount received under the 2008-11 round.

However, whether they will be able to continue to do so is dependent on the ability to secure ongoing funding throughout various stages of the process. In the past European funding sources have helpfully filled gaps, but in the current UK housing climate this is challenging. The recent Future of London report identified five approaches to funding: cross-subsidy, asset optimisation, portfolio diversification, mixing finance sources (early win sale of units or private rental), as well as low-cost borrowing (usually to local authorities but available to registered providers though bonds and their better access to market funding). The scheme profiles (see Appendix 1) illustrate housing associations applying all of these funding approaches.

The availability of central government, or GLA grants fluctuate at the best of times. As the Altered Estates report reminds us over the timescale of a large regeneration project a package of financing is often opportunistically patch-worked together from many sources. From experience it is clear that without these levels of grant, regeneration can only be made to work in high value areas. Low value areas (the outer boroughs of London) or where site conditions constrain increasing density are unviable without grant and this situation appears to be worsening. For some time the amounts of public subsidy has been very small compared to the efforts and finance invested by housing associations. While being prepared for these public sector sources to diminish further and become yet more sporadic, currently profits from outright sales are filling the gap in public subsidy.
G15 member: Family Mosaic
Case Study: Heathside & Lethbridge
London Borough of Lewisham
Adapting funding and the scheme as circumstances change

When Family Mosaic was selected as lead development partner for the regeneration of the Heathside & Lethbridge estate in 2006, it was on the basis of a self-financing model. This became unviable with the onset of the credit crunch so the council and Family Mosaic negotiated an innovative funding agreement with the HCA on an investment basis with the HCA eligible to receive a share of any overage at the end of the scheme.

This regeneration was characterised by a high level of resident involvement at each stage of the scheme. This included the design of the scheme and in each of the six regeneration phases allowing for continuous improvement as the scheme developed.

2.2 Effective partnership

The regeneration process is dependent on collaboration with a wide range of public and private sector participants, most notably construction firms or housing developers. Only two of the g15 undertook all of their recent regeneration projects independently. The vehicles for collaboration vary, depending on who takes the lead and carries the risk. Joint-ventures for the specific purpose of regenerating an estate are an increasingly common mechanism.

Of the schemes we looked at, only five (see table below) were estates wholly owned by the housing association prior to regeneration. However regeneration schemes sometimes rely on a joint approach to achieve the end goal, e.g. the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea contributed park land to make the Worthington Green scheme feasible.

Partnership between local authorities and housing associations is critical on the complex issue of decanting. Where local authorities don’t have temporary homes or enabling sites available, regeneration programmes take longer, and the phases are more fragmented.

Association-owned regeneration estates included in the study:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Association</th>
<th>Estate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catalyst</td>
<td>Worthington Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Thames</td>
<td>New Union Wharf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peabody</td>
<td>St John’s Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>Fulneck Estate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lisgar Terrace</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This South Acton scheme illustrates that an ethos of partnership working is a pre-requisite for undertaking large and complex regeneration schemes without losing sight of residents’ needs.

A key success factor for the regeneration of local authority-owned estates is the authority’s capacity to work with the housing association and/or developer to help minimise any disruption and confusion amongst residents, especially during the challenging decanting stage.

The dedicated regeneration team provided by the London Borough of Ealing formed a close working partnership with L&Q/Countryside Properties. Ealing’s Regeneration Manager has played an invaluable role in applying their understanding of the council’s priorities to act as a ‘sounding board’ to screen proposals for viability pre-planning. Ealing’s Planning Officers are also integral to the project delivery team, engaging in extensive pre-application discussions with L&Q which resulted in the scheme receiving unanimous planning approval.

Effective working relationships were developed through almost daily interactions on issues such as allocating tenants to new homes and carrying out joint home visits. The regeneration team from Ealing will soon be moving into a new office on the South Acton site, along with L&Q and Countryside Properties, bringing this partnership even closer together.

The appointment of an Independent Residents Advisor helped provide cohesion to the collaborative effort and played an effective role in holding all three organisations to account for the commitments they had made to residents. The advisor was also involved in running the evening housing surgeries that were held on-site and helped develop L&Q’s understanding of how to meet the needs of more vulnerable residents.

The bi-monthly Community Board acts as a formal mechanism for the partnership to provide updates on the various activities undertaken by the three different organisations and to offer residents the opportunity to challenge and ask questions. This forum consists of a diverse range of stakeholders, including twelve residents, local councillors, a representative from the local community group and the Independent Residents Advisor.
2.3 Residents at the heart of regeneration

The case studies show the great efforts invested in working with communities to ensure they are involved in decision making, kept informed of progress and resolving the difficulties which inevitably arise. Yet we are aware unproductive communication with residents has been a common difficulty with projects. Managing expectations and reconciling residents’ perceptions to the intentions of the project, is often made harder by apprehensions and sometimes unrealistic hopes some residents hold about the regeneration. The provision of units for outright sale on the new scheme has proved a source of tension in several cases due to the fear that the existing communities would be broken up. This is not limited to worries about new homeowners, we are aware residents have concerns that new socially-rented units could be let to ‘incomers’ rather than local people.

Another difficulty we have experienced is the tendency for levels of resident participation to fade over the duration of a regeneration project, some residents may experience ‘consultation fatigue’ over long-term projects. Many efforts are made to counter this by establishing the accuracy of residents’ understanding of the regeneration process, with practical actions to reinvigorate residents’ participation, and where necessary increasing interaction through meetings, other forms of face-to-face contact and by improving the consistency and regularity of communications. Proactive contact to gather residents’ input in the planning and design process has proved particularly effective in fostering high levels of engagement. For example, at a number of schemes – including Peabody’s St John’s Hill and Southern’s Lisgar Terrace – resident-led post-occupancy feedback improved the design of later phases. In our experience residents are also far more likely to maintain trust in the consultation if they could see evidence that their feedback and suggestions are incorporated into the planning and design process.
"When tenants moved into Phase 1 in September 2015 the East Thames survey revealed a 95% satisfaction rate. The 2016 regeneration survey showed; 79% of tenants are satisfied or very satisfied with the progress of the regeneration, 86% feel that the construction work has been considerate to tenants, 86% feel that we communicate enough with them."

Findings from resident survey, New Union Wharf East Thames

In our view effective resident consultation involves: early engagement, enabling residents to provide detailed input and appointing a dedicated team to manage interactions. Resident-led steering or working groups such as at Affinity Sutton's The Lavenders, or A2Dominion's Green Man Lane schemes often prove to be an effective vehicle for giving residents a voice on potential designs and the overall management of the regeneration process. Residents especially value workshops where residents can agree the details of the homes they would be moving to and opportunities to convey their particular housing needs. Residents appreciate where specific changes are made to designs in response to their feedback. Sensitive communication of the difficult decisions that are bound to occur in regeneration is important. Some residents may feel as if they have lost out, for example, where reduced under-occupation (in reality residents' spare rooms) is required to balance the needs of existing residents against those of new tenants or those on local authority waiting lists.

We are aware of the diverse nature of London's communities and pay specific attention to the needs of vulnerable groups, and ethnic minorities in enabling an inclusive and effective consultation process. We use recreation, art and cultural activities to build a strong community spirit with the potential to be sustained beyond the regeneration process, as shown by A2Dominion's Stanwell New Start project.

“The whole process has been great. We were contacted on New Year’s Eve about the house and moved in three months later. We really couldn’t have asked for anything more.”

Affinity Sutton resident, The Lavenders
The old Market Estate was a failing estate suffering from significant problems with social deprivation, crime and anti-social behaviour, all exacerbated by the poor design. The regeneration involved 271 homes being replaced with 421 homes, comprising 271 for social rent, 61 for shared ownership and 89 private sale dwellings. The scheme also includes 11 commercial units that have all now been let out to local businesses and retail stores. The Group also spent approximately £1m on neighbouring Caledonian Park on improvements, including the play area, improved landscaping and layout and design, all aimed at increasing the usage of the park.

This has meant the provision of a substantial number of additional homes on the estate. All residents with secure tenancies remained on the estate and were able to move directly from their old home to a new one.

Design plans were amended as the scheme progressed to enable the provision of extra affordable housing. Major investment was made in non-housing areas in order to address social problems and there was a wider consultation involving the park users group and other stakeholders including the police and other local landlords.

Residents were very supportive of the regeneration proposals, in part due to the attractive offer of new homes along with resident guarantees and protected rights. This was reflected in the 80% plus vote in favour of regeneration in a residents’ ballot. A number of commitments were made in relation to property sizes and maximising the number of houses with approximately 50 houses being built on the scheme. All properties were built to Parker Morris (standards for size) plus 10% and featured a garden or balcony.

Although the density of the estate has increased, a lot of the previous problems with anti-social behaviour have been significantly reduced. The design of the new scheme has directly enabled the improved management of the estate, which now follows a traditional street pattern. Gone are the large external communal spaces which proved difficult to police.

The situation remains challenging as the old estate had a high concentration of vulnerable residents who have moved into new homes and this area of Islington still has a high level of deprivation. In this sense the regeneration of the estate and area is on-going but the resident-led design process has created a safer and more pleasant environment for residents.
**G15 member: A2Dominion**

Case Study: Stanwell New Start
Spelthorne District Council, Surrey

Reversing residents’ mistrust

The Stanwell New Start scheme is an excellent demonstration of how a responsive and participative approach to community engagement can help alleviate residents’ concerns and foster support for regeneration.

At the outset of the consultation, the majority of residents were firmly against undertaking the proposed regeneration and a perceived lack of vision for the new scheme fuelled the fears of those residents who opposed it. In addition, it was later recognised that the initial consultation event had tried to move the process on too far, too soon.

In response to this difficult start to the consultation, A2Dominion adopted a more comprehensive approach to engagement with the Stanwell community. It offered one-to-one meetings with the regeneration team for all residents and set up a drop-in centre on the estate that was staffed two days a week so that residents could visit to discuss anything that was concerning them.

More detailed consultation events followed which sought to address the issues arising from the one-to-one meetings. A2Dominion also ran a series of workshops to consult with residents on specific aspects of the regeneration design and targeted events to record the history of the area (known as ‘The Stanwell History Project’). Some aspects of the regeneration proposals were altered in response to residents’ feedback by incorporating their suggested changes.

Relations between A2Dominion and the Stanwell residents were dramatically turned around as a result of the extensive and inclusive consultation efforts and the scheme would subsequently record support ratings of approximately 90%.

---

7 The Stanwell New Start scheme is in Spelthorne, Surrey and is outside the Greater London catchment. For the purposes of this report it has been excluded from the quantitative data analysis.
Transforming the lives of people in positive ways

While the g15 has a strong record in delivering projects that are transforming the lives of people in positive ways, there is no denying that urban regeneration is a complex and challenging process. It is disruptive, expensive and engages many different interests. It can therefore become the source of controversy, disagreement and problems that are hard to resolve. At times that gives rise to negative perceptions that residents’ views are ignored; that residents are unfairly displaced or priced out of new estates; that housing is lost leading to overcrowding; or indeed that schemes are subject to cherry picking and profiteering.

While such perceptions may often be inaccurate or unfair, it is clear that organisations involved in regeneration projects must work to ensure that they avoid such pitfalls and demonstrate to the communities involved that their interests are at the heart of new plans. In this section, with the aid of a number of case studies, we explore how the g15 members are working to overcome the problems and negative perceptions that sometimes emerge in the context of regeneration.

"Can't believe your luck, it's just lovely, the heating, I haven't even had the heating on, even when it's freezing my flat is warm. The whole building itself is lovely, to have an outside area it's just lovely to be able to come outside of your flat. Warm nights I'm looking forward to, to be able to sit out here."

Peabody resident,
St John's Hill
3.1 Maintaining affordability

One criticism sometimes levelled against regeneration schemes is that they involve the loss of low rent, affordable housing in favour of new units for market sale. However, the first priority for housing associations is to support the housing needs of people on low incomes. To that end the construction of social/affordable rent units on the 35 g15 projects examined here is projected to grow quite steeply over the next decade, before plateauing slightly in the period to 2031 and beyond (a consequence of the end of the NAHP). The rate of completion of units for outright sale units is also forecast to be high until 2026 before levelling off in the period to 2031, although the rate of growth is expected to rise again as we approach 2040. The trend for cumulative completion numbers shows the capacity for the g15 to ‘ramp up’ its regeneration activity over time.

The selected case studies go some way to counter the belief that redevelopment is simply about building more units, and more about creating places that will remain affordable for existing communities.

We care about the long-term impacts of regeneration on our residents, particularly in relation to resident affordability. We know the delivery of new homes is likely to result in changes to service charges and energy bills. We have experience in assisting residents with financial management through financial inclusion teams and use our knowledge and expertise to raise resident awareness of changes to service charges and rents. Our support has extended to assisting residents who have been affected by recent welfare reforms as the following case study shows.

Figure 4 Scaling up output - cumulative unit completions by tenure (forecast for 2016-2040)

The dashed lines after 2021 beyond this date illustrates forecast development.
The London Borough of Ealing took the decision to redevelop the Green Man Lane estate and appointed A2Dominion and Rydon Construction as joint venture development partners. Since the regeneration commenced in 2009 there have been a number of external factors impacting on the project to which the A2Dominion team adapted and responded accordingly. In particular, the introduction of the Benefit Cap in 2013 affected a number of residents occupying the first phase at Jigsaw.

A2Dominion made additional support available to help these residents adapt to the changes. Affordability was a key consideration in the allocations process for Jigsaw, particularly in ensuring that prospective residents fully understood the rents and costs for the property they were being offered. A2Dominion’s Tenancy Support Officers were on hand at sign-up and also at ‘Welcome to your Home’ events to offer further advice and support. A2Dominion responded to the introduction of the Universal Credit pilot scheme in Ealing with a support service to assist residents with their budgeting.

Aside from assisting residents affected by welfare reforms, Jigsaw is an excellent example of how housing associations support local authorities and the local community with wider priorities. In 2013 the project was extended to include the rebuilding of the neighbouring school. A2Dominion responded by ensuring the regeneration process didn’t disrupt children’s education. The construction of a new school was an immediate priority for the local authority and this led to a change in the order of decant and demolitions in order to free up the adjoining land for the construction of the new school while the old school remained open.
Another frequently cited complaint about regeneration is that projects can lead to the forced displacement of settled communities. The renewal of existing estates is undoubtedly disruptive. Increasing levels of homelessness and the urgent need for homes is influencing the nature of regeneration. We can no longer hold homes or blocks empty for long periods and have less capacity for decanting, which in turn is increasing the numbers of residents on non-assured tenancies. However, looking at the eight schemes that had completed the process of rehousing residents, we found that the vast majority were offered the option to stay. Around two thirds chose to be rehoused within the new scheme itself.

The figure below shows the split of housing products available across all 35 schemes before regeneration began and the split of products that are planned after regeneration. While the total number of homes will increase by more than two-thirds there will be a decrease (around 17%) in the number of units for social or affordable rent. However, this reduction will be more than offset by the construction of approximately 4,000 units for shared ownership.

Figure 5 Increasing tenure mix - tenure of units before and after regeneration
This reflects the rapid transformation of London’s tenure balance over the last few years especially since the introduction of Affordable Rent in 2010, and the reduction of Intermediate Rent (particularly in London, which also has fluctuating quantities of shared/affordable home ownership related to funding programmes\(^8\)). Commentators predict these fluid trends are likely to continue\(^9\). It is too soon for any of the schemes at hand to contain Starter Homes, but these will undoubtedly be added into the pipeline. These variations in tenure, as through various phases of construction, reinforce that while the built form of the homes may be fixed at planning stage, the nature of the tenure of those living in them will be fluid.

Analysis of the regeneration of housing associations’ own schemes (as opposed to local authority-owned schemes), shows that all but one had proportions of affordable homes (social rent/affordable rent) after regeneration that met or exceeded the target specified in the relevant Local Plan. This illustrated that housing associations such as those in the g15 strive to deliver housing for those on low incomes. Where it is possible we aim to meet the levels of affordable housing required in the local area as dictated by our local authority partners\(^10\).

It is accepted that mixing communities shouldn’t impact on the overall development values and viability of a housing scheme. A recent report\(^11\) found that there were no tangible negatives arising from the creation of mixed balanced communities, be it on resident satisfaction or property prices. Good ‘tenure blind’ design is challenging negative perceptions that affordable housing impacts on sales values of market housing. Yet there are perceived negatives and positives in this approach and evidence\(^12\) is still being gathered on the merit of mixed tenures beyond the economics of their use to subsidise social housing.

“There is a whole community here who have collaborated to bring this scheme together for the good of all; all the choices have truly been collective. When the development is finished, residents will be left with an estate to be proud of. Residents have taken ownership of the decisions around their estates by becoming involved and this will be the lasting legacy of this project with L&Q”.

L&Q resident, Haggerston

---

\(^8\) GLA affordable housing programme outturn 20160301
\(^10\) Levels of affordable housing before and after regeneration are based on number of units rather than number of habitable rooms and could be a reason for net loss in affordable housing. Re-profiling of schemes’ units by habitable room is determined by local need i.e. proportions of 1,2,3,4 bedroom properties deemed necessary for the scheme and wider community.
\(^11\) ‘Tenure Integration in Housing’, NHBC Foundation 2015
\(^12\) ‘Where Next for Mix?’ University of Birmingham, forthcoming report (due 2017)
G15 member: L&Q
Case Study: Haggerston
London Borough of Hackney
A comprehensive package of guarantees to the existing community

As part of the L&Q approach to this regeneration project, a range of offers were made to residents in the form of a package of benefits. These were contained in the official Offer Document. As well as opportunities to contribute to the design of the development the package also contained:

- A level of scrutiny of all aspects of the project via the Local Management Forum (LMF) and the Estates Development and Management Committee (EDMC).
- A commitment to larger good quality homes, including the provision of lifetime homes.
- A guaranteed security of tenure.
- Options to safeguard former leaseholders.
- Guaranteed rent and service charge levels for 10 years.

- 100 day promise (for 100 days L&Q provided operatives on-site on a daily basis to improve the standard of the original properties and make essential repairs).
- Additional rights of succession.
- A local L&Q presence for the lifetime of the project comprising a local office for a minimum of two days per week staffed by two staff members.
- Initial and on-going support for the LMF for local projects, which has funded local dance projects, youth projects and activities, trips and activities for older residents, local art projects, art installations for the estate, a local food co-operative and citizen advocacy training projects.

The benefits to residents from these measures are numerous. The LMF and the former EDMC are accountable bodies to which residents can voice their concerns about the regeneration process and request that any problems be resolved. The LMF and local L&Q presence on-site continue to provide these services to residents who have moved into their new homes.

The guaranteed security of tenure gives residents the peace of mind that they will be living in a good quality home for the long-term, whilst the 10 year guaranteed rent and service charge levels help to reduce financial burdens and facilitate greater certainty in financial planning.
3.3 Fair treatment

It is understandable that existing social residents are unwilling to accept any reduction in their tenancy conditions. Yet often tenure changes perceived as detrimental arise not as a result of regeneration, but national policy decisions (removal of lifetime tenancies) or other externalities. It is often the case that the regeneration policies / conditions for a specific estate are set by the local authority in the case of stock transfers or via a competitive tender process if the housing association was appointed as a regeneration partner.

The g15’s standard approach is to offer existing residents, with assured or secure tenancies, a replacement home on the new development or an alternative property from elsewhere in the association’s, or the local authority’s stock. However, it was common for residents not on secure tenancies to be re-housed elsewhere. The decision to return or not is very much the residents’ choice. In our experience, in the early stages of regeneration residents are often keen to move away from unpopular estates but this slows as improvements are made to the area.

Existing occupants are offered home-loss or disturbance payments as compensation for having to move as part of the redevelopment. It was also common for the g15 members to ‘phase in’ rent or service charge increases to help ease the financial burden if residents were moving to homes with higher rents or service charges following regeneration.

3.4 Leaseholders and freeholders

The future of leaseholders and freeholders on the existing estate is often a difficult aspect of any regeneration scheme. However the g15 has shown a high degree of flexibility in accommodating their requirements, usually offering leaseholders the opportunity to buy a new home on the regenerated estate using the equity owned in their existing property. These offers have included both ‘nil rent’ and ‘with rent’ shared ownership or shared equity options and opportunities for staircasing. Other offers made to leaseholders have included purchasing the leaseholder’s existing property at market value plus compensation and making a direct swap of their existing property for a new property on the regenerated site.

Improvements to the neighbourhood and local housing values brought about by the regeneration itself can have negative impacts, either through increased market related rents or house prices diminishing leaseholders’ ability to buy locally. These are, of course, wider housing market trends but the typically low values where these regeneration schemes are located make this leap upwards especially noticeable.

Housing associations have a toolkit of mechanisms to help residents with increased rents and service charges, or to share some of the increased property values with leaseholders. In any situation, the g15 would want to find a way to support residents that want to remain in their community. Conflict and arguments of fairness may arise where there are Buy to Let leaseholders receiving compensation when they don’t live on the estate and are using their property for rental investment.
G15 member: Catalyst
Case Study: Havelock Estate
London Borough of Ealing
Devising relocation solutions for existing homeowners

The Havelock Estate had a large number of leaseholders and freeholders whose needs had to be accommodated by Catalyst in order to make regeneration of the estate viable. It offers a useful case study of solutions g15 members have devised for regeneration schemes involving a high number of homeowners.

A significant number of the existing leaseholders on the Havelock Estate needed to be bought-out by the freeholder - the London Borough of Ealing - in order that the regeneration could proceed, and some freehold properties were also required, these included some good quality, traditionally-built houses with large gardens, extensions and garden rooms.

To compensate resident leaseholders and freeholders whose homes were required to enable the works, and to address their housing requirements, Catalyst developed a bespoke ‘fixed equity’ offer for resident leaseholders and freeholders, the key terms of which were:

- An independent valuation of their current property.
- Compensation at market value plus 10%.
- An opportunity to buy a new home (of same number of bedrooms) with any gap in value met by Catalyst (resulting in a ‘fixed equity product’).
- No interest or rent to be paid on the fixed equity.
- The possibility to staircase to 100%.
- Sum is paid back to Catalyst upon sale of the home (or at 99-years).
- Offer could be applied to the purchase of properties outside of the regeneration area.

In addition to the above terms, dedicated relocation staff were available on-site to assist homeowners and tenants in making the move as easy as possible.

Havelock Estate is also illustrative of how regeneration can enable value uplift in a low-value suburban area – in this case, a neighbourhood which previously had a very poor reputation associated with anti-social behaviour and crime – by building on positive features of the neighbourhood (in this case the adjacent Grand Union canal, the forthcoming Crossrail service and the strong sense of community) without ‘cramming in’ new housing units through over-densification i.e. creating value through establishing and delivering a vision of ‘place’.
3.5 Appropriate density

There is consensus that London's housing density needs to increase and that this can be achieved through a variety of built forms. As L&Q’s South Acton scheme shows, with careful design it is possible to provide family housing at high density. London is a relatively low rise, medium density city and it has been estimated that new infill homes on existing estates could generate only about one year of London’s housing supply, showing that intensification of some degree is necessary. Yet relying on rebuilding or infilling existing estates would require a scale of demolition and high density housing that is difficult to conceive. The decision to demolish and rebuild an entire development is not made lightly. If the optimum solution is to rebuild from scratch then there is careful consideration of what form and density the new housing should best take.

Few of the pre-regeneration schemes consisted of tower blocks surrounded by acres of unused space. Most would be considered low or medium density with only four approaching high density. Virtually all of the estates will be rebuilt at a much higher density in terms of dwellings per hectare (dph). A recent Savills report examining the relative merits of two different methods of local authority estate regeneration – replacing all existing buildings versus reintegrating the estates into the surrounding urban fabric – found that the latter approach would enable an average density uplift of 73%, from 78 dph to 135 dph, and can therefore be considered an efficient use of land.

The density uplift for our 35 schemes compare very favourably to Savills’ suggested benchmark, as 17 of the 23 schemes (where dph figures were available) had a dph of 135 or more. Urban schemes such as East Thames’ New Union Wharf, increased densities to above 220 dph. A dph figure on the original estate was available for 10 schemes, of which 8 had a dph of less than 135. This gave an average dph uplift of 133% indicating an effective use of available public land.

"I really like the open plan, it’s bigger, it’s nicer, rooms are a little bit bigger, we have a nice balcony that we didn’t have before. It’s more spacious, I never thought it would be like this."

Peabody resident, St John’s Hill

---

15 When Brownfield Isn’t Enough: Strategic Options for London’s Growth, Quod/Shelter 2016
http://www.quod.com/brownfield-not-enough
16 ‘Completing London’s Streets: How the regeneration and intensification of housing estates could increase London’s supply of homes and benefit residents’, Savills January 2016
http://pdf.euro.savills.co.uk/uk/residential—other/completing-london-s-streets-080116.pdf
17 This figure is skewed by the extreme density uplift at Peabody’s Silchester scheme. If Silchester was excluded the average density uplift across all schemes would be 70%.
Yet most of the schemes will not constitute over-development as defined by the guidelines from the Mayor’s London Plan. The majority of the schemes we looked at have good – if not excellent – proximity to transport facilities, with over half having a public transport accessibility (PTAL) rating of 3 or above. Higher PTAL ratings allow a developer to build to higher densities, but the vast majority of the schemes were built less densely than the upper dph limit allowed by the London Plan. The density levels will have resulted from historic design constraints (planning requirements or commitments to retain levels of parking and other amenities). These examples demonstrate that the g15 are developing land efficiently and meeting the guidance in a sustained way.

Density of dwelling per hectare is a crude measure of the appropriate local density. Comparing habitable rooms per hectare or floorspace is a better indication of the suitability of a scheme to the actual needs of local residents. Affinity Sutton’s Sherwood Close is an example where large numbers of bedsits were replaced with family sized homes. Residents are often more concerned about increases in population / occupation density and the additional strain placed on local facilities and services. This is where the contribution made through section 106 and CIL payments, and the provision of community facilities and public amenities help mitigate this added pressure.

“The Packington Estate is being transformed from isolated blocks of intimidating and soulless housing into a living community with real heart and purpose. I never in my life thought I would get a home as spacious as this and it is by far the best of its type in London, it really feels like a palace!”

Hyde resident, Packington
G15 member: Affinity Sutton
Case Study: The Lavenders
London Borough of Sutton
Keeping regeneration viable during turbulent economic conditions

Affinity Sutton demolished 295 homes on a 1960s estate suffering from chronic social and economic problems. The regeneration process involved close co-operation with Sutton council which was spending 66% of its social services budget on the estate.

Over 80% of the residents wanted the estate to be demolished and replaced with new homes and improved landscaping. The £130m regeneration project was funded through an innovative self-financing partnership approach and weathered the storm of the 2008 financial crash through the use of grants and changes to tenure to keep the project viable.

An influential process of resident involvement designed a new masterplan consisting of a range of new homes for affordable rent, part buy/part rent and outright sale. Project team meetings were chaired by a resident to ensure the community were fully involved in the process.

Construction started in 2005, with phase one completed in 2011. The end result will be 645 new homes, with many of the original residents returning to the estate, with this established community already taking ownership of a busy new community centre. An additional benefit to the local community of this project was that it enabled the regeneration of other smaller sites not within the original estate.
The St John’s Hill estate, originally built in 1936, eventually became unsuitable for modern living. Small rooms, an inconvenient layout, damp and condensation were just some of the problems experienced by residents.

The new scheme will increase the number of homes from 351 to 528 through careful design — all with balconies or gardens — and features high-quality landscaping, a wild garden, vegetable beds, a play area and a central open space with a new community centre. Around 10% of homes will be wheelchair accessible, and energy-efficient measures include photovoltaic panels and a district heating system. Car parking spaces will be provided at surface level and underground. This careful design increased the existing density from 155 to 233 dwellings per hectare. The completed regeneration will have 528 homes of which 221 will be social/affordable rent, 58 shared ownership and 249 for private sale.

St John’s Hill has a committed and engaged residents’ steering group who have remained involved throughout the development. It has provided meaningful input and has given residents an important role. The group was also involved in selecting the architect and later the contractor, and also the artist for the public art.

Throughout the construction the contractor hosted a number of events including a “meet the contractor” event, summer parties and sent out regular newsletters.
Regeneration can’t be done on a shoestring and key to the viability of a regeneration scheme is access to finance. Public subsidy is also critical to the delivery of schemes, especially of costly projects where there may be issues around funding affordable housing or dealing with large numbers of leaseholders. Regeneration requires substantial up-front investment; a challenge when there is uncertainty as to whether a scheme will proceed and the project may take up to 15 years before the first home is built. This is also true as a project evolves and the timely availability of external funding can speed up completion. Keeping a realistic but tight timeframe is therefore key to success as well as the flexibility to adapt to changing political and economic market conditions, particularly for larger projects, which take years to complete.

Our analysis has identified that regeneration is only viable in locations where potential value up-lift is high enough to subsidise the re-provision of homes for low-cost rent. Yet it is apparent that housing associations will undertake estate regeneration even if it is financially risky to do so. Critically, this shows that housing associations’ regeneration business model, its underlying long-term drivers and the necessary freedom to adjust or supplement investment are not well understood. This is not through a lack of transparency but more that the variety and inventiveness of approaches makes generalizing about regeneration business cases or acceptable margins hard. Where the private sector may require 20% profit on sales to be extracted, housing associations are committed to reinvesting all surpluses made.

These differences in approach are increasingly being exposed. For example, some boroughs have new planning policies that require developers who do not meet their affordable housing targets to supply fully public, unredacted viability assessments at planning application stage.

It has been suggested that a positive aspect of housing associations’ model is the ability to allocate this reinvestment flexibly to mitigate the emergent challenges faced by individual business cases, for example splitting profits between building more affordable homes immediately and to cover project risk (with this money reinvested in more housing once the project is realised).18

The idea that the g15 only undertake regeneration to create ‘a quick buck’ is not borne out by the time and risk expended on these proposals. Rather, their investment of both funds and staff resources are examples of patient equity19. This should be considered alongside earlier discussion that despite the decline in grant, the g15 members continue to invest in all aspects of regeneration projects; delivery of housing, community facilities and other community investment interventions.

---

18 'City Villages: More homes, better communities', Adonis, A. & Davies, B. 2015 (eds), IPPR 2015
19 'Completing London’s Streets: How the regeneration and intensification of housing estates could increase London’s supply of homes and benefit residents', Savills 2016
“We are delighted that the Stonegrove and Spur Road scheme is progressing because it will bring about major benefits for all who live there. We have been able to achieve this agreement because there is great optimism about the future of Barnet, whatever the problems in the national economy. It is very good news for residents and a real vote of confidence in the borough.”

Cllr. Mike Freer
Barnet Council Leader,
Stonegrove
3.7 Resident engagement

Those delivering regeneration schemes have also been criticised for not adequately engaging or consulting with residents and local stakeholders prior to, or during, the regeneration process, or undertake engagement in a perfunctory way.

As the multiple case studies show, getting regeneration right is highly dependent on maintaining an open and honest relationship with existing occupants. They have shown that opportunities for resident consultation are extensive and that residents’ suggestions are frequently incorporated into plans. Housing association engagement staff are skilled at presenting residents with realistic options that they can understand and comment on in a timely way within a complex, unpredictable decision-making process.

When options are successfully communicated, not only is the regeneration project itself likely to proceed more smoothly, but the resultant community outcomes will be more positive and long-lasting.

Housing associations are not the only agents involved in delivering regeneration schemes. Successful resident engagement can only be achieved if we work in partnership with architects, construction partners (where relevant), and crucially the local authority. Building and fostering long-term strategic partnerships are therefore absolutely vital for the progress and successful delivery of schemes.
G15 member: Catalyst
Case Study: Wornington Green
Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea
Residents acting as advocates for a project

Wornington Green is an estate owned by Catalyst located in North Kensington. It demonstrates that resident support can be crucial to successful regeneration.

There were initially some very vocal opponents of the proposals but the scheme was supported by a strong Residents Steering Group. Regular communications built trust and proved key in alleviating resident concerns, which were strongly motivated by the fear that the community would be broken up and the area gentrified. Catalyst continues to fund an independent residents advisor (selected by residents) and capacity building support for the Residents Steering Group.

Amicable community relations between Catalyst and Wornington Green residents were maintained through a full range of pre and post-planning consultations with the existing Residents Association and the wider community, which allowed the existing residents to inform the design of the new homes and be involved in the selection process for a construction partner.

Catalyst also funded a Community Investment Coordinator post to lead on community consultation and day to day involvement. A youth engagement officer attracted funding to run a range of young people’s projects. Catalyst also provided a very high level of support for existing residents using its housing management team and other specialist and local agencies e.g. Age UK.

Wornington Green overcame a number of planning challenges and the final design required the relocation of an existing Council-owned park to the centre of the new neighbourhood and resulted in Catalyst winning the Mayors Housing Design award 2015.

The end result of the Wornington Green regeneration was a genuinely tenure-blind scheme with homes re-provided for tenants next to very high value ones for market sale.
We bring extensive knowledge and experience to the task of regeneration.

The evidence gathered here underlines the significant value and long-term commitment that housing associations like those that comprise the g15 are able to bring to communities and urban renewal. Unlike commercial developers, housing associations are underpinned by a social ethos. Our ‘raison d’être’ is to build homes that people can afford and want to live in.

In pursuit of that goal we bring extensive knowledge and experience to the task of regeneration. In addition, we bring a special expertise in building trust with communities, being flexible and inventive, and working collaboratively with partners. We do not come with a ‘one size fits all’ strategy. Rather we provide a more bespoke approach that examines each project on its own merits and applies the solutions that work best in any individual case. Even as the economic environment becomes harder, with reduced investment in projects and affordable housing and an uncertain policy outlook, we remain fully committed to our mission.

While regeneration projects are an important aspect of what we do, they are but one element in a wider body of work aimed at providing new high quality homes in and outside of London. According to a report by Quod/Shelter\(^\text{20}\) if “the entire housing gap [was to be filled] by rebuilding run-down social housing estates at twice their current density, it would mean demolishing over 25,000 existing homes a year or 7% of London’s post war council estates… estate redevelopment done well takes time, and so this pace of change is difficult to conceive”.

We estimate that estate regeneration constitutes approximately one-sixth of our pipeline delivery. The Quod/Shelter report reiterates that a range of solutions are required to meet London’s housing shortage including development on brownfield land and the green belt, densifying suburbs, building high density town centres, garden cities as well as estate redevelopment. We agree a number of solutions are required and are currently embarking on large scale projects that are akin to the construction

\(^\text{20}\) ‘When Brownfield Isn’t Enough: Strategic Options for London’s Growth’, Quod in partnership with Shelter 2016
of new ‘garden cities’ in Barking Riverside, Ebbsfleet and elsewhere. These have the potential to provide even more homes on very large sites. The lessons that we have learned in renewing existing communities are vital in informing the way we go about the construction and development of these new sites; the importance of working in partnership, the need for persistence and invention, and the need to view any project about the construction of new homes through the prism of the people that will live in them.

So estate regeneration is critical to our wider work. Yet we cannot deliver regeneration on our own. To play our full part in securing for London and elsewhere the provision of new homes that is so needed, we need the support of local and central government.

That is why we ask for:

1. a stable policy environment which provides the flexibility we need to deliver new projects;
2. certainty over rental income to provide the finance necessary for new homes;
3. increased public subsidy and greater flexibility over how funding may be used;
4. active support in targeting estates that would benefit from regeneration; and
5. leadership and partnership in the planning and delivery of successful schemes.
Appendix 1: g15 members’ regeneration schemes
The g15’s contribution to regenerating London’s estates

1. A2Dominion – Jigsaw at Green Man Lane
2. A2Dominion – Stanwell New Start
3. Affinity Sutton – Sherwood Close
4. Affinity Sutton – The Lavenders
5. Catalyst – Church End & Roundwood
6. Catalyst – Havelock Road
7. Catalyst – Mill Farm
8. Catalyst – South Kilburn
9. Catalyst – Wornington Green
10. Circle – Orchard Village
11. East Thames – Weavers Quarter
12. East Thames – New Union Wharf
13. East Thames – Ocean Estate Site H
14. Family Mosaic – Heathside & Lethbridge
15. Family Mosaic – Stonegrove
16. Genesis – Grahame Park
17. Genesis – Woodberry Down
18. Hyde – Packington
19. L&Q – Dollis Valley
20. L&Q – Haggerston
21. L&Q – South Acton
22. Metropolitan – Clapham Park
23. Metropolitan – West Hendon
24. Network Homes – Rectory Park
25. Network Homes – South Kilburn
26. Network Homes – Stockwell Park
27. Notting Hill – Allen Court
28. Notting Hill – Aylesbury Estate (First Development Site & Plot 18)
29. Notting Hill – Barham Park
30. Notting Hill – Briar Road
31. Notting Hill - Lingham Place
32. Peabody – Silchester
33. Peabody – St John’s Hill
34. Southern – Stepney Green Estate (Fulneck & Beveridge Mews)
35. Southern – Lisgar Terrace
36. Southern – Market Estate
### Jigsaw at Green Man Lane
**A2Dominion**

- **Local authority:** Ealing
- **Architect:** Conran & Partners
- **Original scheme:** 1970s
- **Total scheme costs:** £170m
- **Start–completion:** 2010–2023
- **Funding:** Cross subsidy and grant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure mix before:</th>
<th>Social/Leaseholder: 390/66</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenure mix after:</td>
<td>Social: 335 (44%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ORS: 305 (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SO/SE: 67 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density before/after:</td>
<td>78/131 dph</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Number of homes before and after:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before</th>
<th>After</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>456</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>+69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Stanwell New Start
**A2Dominion**

- **Local Authority:** Spelthorne
- **Architect:** Levitt Bernstein /OSP Architecture
- **Original scheme:** 1940s and 1970s
- **Total scheme costs:** £54m
- **Start–completion:** 2009–2017
- **Funding:** Cross-subsidy and grant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure mix before:</th>
<th>Social/PRS: 96/78</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenure mix after:</td>
<td>Social: 72 (26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ORS: 23 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SO/SE: 18 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density before/after:</td>
<td>Low-Med/40 dph</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Number of homes before and after:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before</th>
<th>After</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>+60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sherwood Close
**Affinity Sutton**

- **Local authority:** Ealing
- **Architect:** Feilden Clegg Bradley Studios
- **Original scheme:** 1960s
- **Total scheme costs:** £118m
- **Start–completion:** 2016–2020
- **Funding:** Cross-subsidy without grant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure mix before:</th>
<th>Social/Leaseholders: 160/49</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenure mix after:</td>
<td>Social: 109 (36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ORS: 191 (63%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SO/SE: 5 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density before/after:</td>
<td>Medium/190 dph</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Number of homes before and after:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before</th>
<th>After</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>+46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### The Lavenders
**Affinity Sutton**

- **Local authority:** Sutton
- **Architect:** Pollard Thomas Edwards
- **Original scheme:** 1960s
- **Total scheme costs:** £174m
- **Start–completion:** 2009–2017
- **Funding:** Cross-subsidy, grant and own reserves

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure mix before:</th>
<th>Social/Leaseholders: 431/40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenure mix after:</td>
<td>Social: 191 (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AR: 146 (23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ORS: 243 (43%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SO/SE: 65 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density before/after:</td>
<td>Medium/~</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Number of homes before and after:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before</th>
<th>After</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>471</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>+37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Church End & Roundwood
**Catalyst**

- **Local authority:** Brent
- **Architect:** PRP
- **Original scheme:** 1930s–1980s
- **Total scheme costs:** £12m
- **Start–completion:** 2004–2013
- **Funding:** Cross-subsidy and grant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure mix before:</th>
<th>Social/Leaseholders: 1,400/100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenure mix after:</td>
<td>Social: 1,269 (83%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leaseholders: 100 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SO/SE: 161 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density before/after:</td>
<td>Medium/Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Number of homes before and after:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before</th>
<th>After</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,530</td>
<td>+2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Havelock Road
**Catalyst**

- **Local authority:** Ealing
- **Architect:** Pollard Thomas Edwards
- **Original scheme:** 1960s
- **Total scheme costs:** £240m
- **Start–completion:** 2015–2025
- **Funding:** Cross-subsidy without grant, asset–based subsidy and own reserves

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure mix before:</th>
<th>Social/Leaseholders: 481/364</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenure mix after:</td>
<td>Social: 430 (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leaseholders: 156 (14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ORS: 450 (42%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SO/SE: 42 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density before/after:</td>
<td>Low/Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Number of homes before and after:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before</th>
<th>After</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>845</td>
<td>1,078</td>
<td>+28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The g15’s contribution to regenerating London’s estates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Local authority</th>
<th>Architect</th>
<th>Original scheme</th>
<th>Total scheme costs</th>
<th>Start–completion</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Tenure mix before</th>
<th>Tenure mix after</th>
<th>Density before/after</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mill Farm</strong></td>
<td>Harrow</td>
<td>Pollard Thomas Edwards</td>
<td>1950s</td>
<td>£35m</td>
<td>2009–2018</td>
<td>Cross-subsidy and grant</td>
<td>Social/Leaseholders: 100/10</td>
<td>Social/Leaseholders: 85/35</td>
<td>Low/Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South Kilburn (part)</strong></td>
<td>Brent</td>
<td>Alison Brooks and Lifschtz</td>
<td>1950s</td>
<td>£63m</td>
<td>2013–2015</td>
<td>Cross-subsidy and grant</td>
<td>Social/Leaseholders: 96/24</td>
<td>Social: 122 (59%)</td>
<td>High/High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Worthington Green/Portobello Square</strong></td>
<td>Kensington &amp; Chelsea</td>
<td>PRP (Masterplan &amp; Phase 1)</td>
<td>1960s-1980s</td>
<td>£400m</td>
<td>2011–2021</td>
<td>Cross-subsidy and grant</td>
<td>Social: 538</td>
<td>Social: 358 (54%)</td>
<td>Medium/High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weavers Quarter</strong></td>
<td>Barking &amp; Dagenham</td>
<td>Levitt Bernstein &amp; Allies &amp; Morrison</td>
<td>1950s</td>
<td>£96m</td>
<td>2015–2019</td>
<td>Cross-subsidy, grant and own reserves</td>
<td>Social: 357</td>
<td>Social: 358 (54%)</td>
<td>High/High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Union Wharf</strong></td>
<td>Tower Hamlets</td>
<td>Hill Partnerships</td>
<td>1970s</td>
<td>£126m</td>
<td>2013–2021</td>
<td>Cross-subsidy, grant and own reserves</td>
<td>AR: 35 (7%)</td>
<td>Social: 189</td>
<td>High/High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of homes before and after:

- **Mill Farm**: 110 to 159 (+45%)
- **South Kilburn (part)**: 120 to 208 (+73%)
- **Worthington Green/Portobello Square**: 538 to 1,000 (+86%)
- **Weavers Quarter**: 382 to 421 (+10%)
- **New Union Wharf**: 189 to 399 (+111%)

AR - Affordable rent  SO - Shared ownership  SE - Shared equity  IMR - Intermediate market rent  PRS - Private rented sector  ORS - Outright sale
Ocean Estate Site H
East Thames

Local authority: Tower Hamlets
Architect: Levitt Bernstein
Original scheme: 1970s
Total scheme costs: £74m
Start-completion: 2015–2018
Funding: Cross-subsidy and grant

Tenure mix before:
Social/Leaseholders: 82/38
Social: 92 (41%)
ORS: 104 (46%)
SO/SE: 29 (13%)

Density before/after: Low/224 dph

Number of homes before and after:
120 → 225
+88%

Heathside & Lethbridge
Family Mosaic

Local authority: Lewisham
Architect: PRP/BPTW
Original scheme: 1950s and 1960s
Total scheme costs: £272m
Start-completion: 2010–2022
Funding: Cross-subsidy, grant, asset based subsidy and own reserves

Tenure mix before:
Social/Leaseholders: 527/111
Social: 199 (17%)
AR: 248 (21%)
ORS: 616 (52%)
SO/SE: 129 (11%)

Density before/after: 105/197 dph

Number of homes before and after:
638 → 1,192
+87%

Stonegrove
Family Mosaic

Local authority: Barnet
Architect: Sprunt
Original scheme: 1960s and 1970s
Total scheme costs: £72m
Start-completion: 2006–2018
Funding: Cross-subsidy and grant

Tenure mix before:
Social/Leaseholders: 510/93
Social: 345 (34%)
ORS: 498 (50%)
SO/SE: 156 (16%)

Density before/after: 50/77 dph

Number of homes before and after:
603 → 999
+66%

Grahame Park
Genesis

Local authority: Barnet
Architect: Jestico & Whiles
Original scheme: 1960s and 1970s
Total scheme costs: £1.1bn
Start-completion: 2007–2031
Funding: Cross-subsidy and third party low cost borrowing

Tenure mix before:
Social/Leaseholders: 1,365/412
Social: 82/38
ORS: 1,572 (35%)
RPS: 151 (3%)
SO/SE: 345 (12%)

Density before/after: Medium

Number of homes before and after:
1,777 → 2,851
+60%

Woodberry Down
Genesis

Local authority: Hackney
Architect: Fletcher Priest
Original scheme: 1950s
Total scheme costs: £589m
Start-completion: 2007–2040
Funding: Cross-subsidy

Tenure mix before:
Social/Leaseholders: 1,980/5,500
Social: 1,115 (20%)
ORS: 3,342 (61%)
SO/SE: 1,043 (19%)

Density before/after: Medium

Number of homes before and after:
1,980 → 5,500
+178%

Packington
Hyde

Local authority: Islington
Architect: Pollard Thomas Edwards
Original scheme: 1970s
Total scheme costs: £238m
Start-completion: 2008–2017
Funding: Cross-subsidy and grant

Tenure mix before:
Social/Leaseholders: 499/39
Social: 452 (57%)
ORS: 300 (38%)
SO/SE: 39 (5%)

Density before/after: Medium/141 dph

Number of homes before and after:
538 → 791
+47%
### Dollis Valley
**L&Q**

- **Local authority:** Barnet
- **Architect:** Alison Brooks / HTA
- **Original scheme:** 1960s
- **Total scheme costs:** £121m
- **Start–completion:** 2010–2025
- **Funding:** Cross-subsidy without grant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure mix before:</th>
<th>Social/AR:</th>
<th>Leaseholders:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social:</td>
<td>230 (37%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORS:</td>
<td>366 (59%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO/SE:</td>
<td>20 (3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure mix after:</th>
<th>Social/AR:</th>
<th>Leaseholders:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social:</td>
<td>249 (32%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORS:</td>
<td>44 (6%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRS:</td>
<td>209 (27%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Density before/after:</th>
<th>220 dph</th>
<th>119 dph</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of homes before and after:</th>
<th>436</th>
<th>+41%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Haggerston
**L&Q**

- **Local authority:** Hackney
- **Architect:** PRP
- **Original scheme:** 1930s
- **Total scheme costs:** £303m
- **Start–completion:** 2008–2016
- **Funding:** Cross-subsidy, grant, third party

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure mix before:</th>
<th>Social/AR:</th>
<th>Leaseholders:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social:</td>
<td>485</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORS:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO/SE:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure mix after:</th>
<th>Social/AR:</th>
<th>Leaseholders:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social:</td>
<td>262 (12%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leasingholders:</td>
<td>1,645 (75%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO/SE:</td>
<td>287 (13%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Density before/after:</th>
<th>50 dph</th>
<th>160 dph</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of homes before and after:</th>
<th>485</th>
<th>+59%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### South Acton
**L&Q**

- **Local authority:** Ealing
- **Architect:** Alison Brooks
- **Original scheme:** 1940s–1980s
- **Total scheme costs:** £873m
- **Start–completion:** 2011–2026
- **Funding:** Cross-subsidy and grant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure mix before:</th>
<th>Social/AR:</th>
<th>Leaseholders:</th>
<th>ORS:</th>
<th>PRS:</th>
<th>SO/SE:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social:</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORS:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO/SE:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure mix after:</th>
<th>Social/AR:</th>
<th>Leaseholders:</th>
<th>ORS:</th>
<th>PRS:</th>
<th>SO/SE:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social:</td>
<td>230 (37%)</td>
<td>1,541 (54%)</td>
<td>1,403</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaseholders:</td>
<td>243 (32%)</td>
<td>375</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORS:</td>
<td>852 (30%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO/SE:</td>
<td>143 (13%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Density before/after:</th>
<th>95 dph</th>
<th>180 dph</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of homes before and after:</th>
<th>1,778</th>
<th>+60%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Clapham Park
**Metropolitan**

- **Local authority:** Lambeth
- **Architect:** PRP
- **Original scheme:** Inter-war and post-war
- **Total scheme costs:** £1.7bn
- **Start–completion:** 2010–2025
- **Funding:** Cross-subsidy without grant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure mix before:</th>
<th>Social/Leaseholders:</th>
<th>Leaseholders:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social:</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORS:</td>
<td>366 (59%)</td>
<td>(3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure mix after:</th>
<th>Social/Leaseholders:</th>
<th>Leaseholders:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social:</td>
<td>220 (37%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORS:</td>
<td>356 (59%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO/SE:</td>
<td>20 (3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Density before/after:</th>
<th>95 dph</th>
<th>119 dph</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of homes before and after:</th>
<th>2,036</th>
<th>+112%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### West Hendon
**Metropolitan**

- **Local authority:** Barnet
- **Architect:** Allies and Morrison
- **Original scheme:** 1960s
- **Total scheme costs:** £334m
- **Start–completion:** 2011–2027
- **Funding:** JV with private housebuilder

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure mix before:</th>
<th>Social/Leaseholders:</th>
<th>Leaseholders:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social:</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORS:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO/SE:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure mix after:</th>
<th>Social/Leaseholders:</th>
<th>Leaseholders:</th>
<th>ORS:</th>
<th>PRS:</th>
<th>SO/SE:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social:</td>
<td>262 (12%)</td>
<td>1,645 (75%)</td>
<td>287</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leasingholders:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORS:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO/SE:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Density before/after:</th>
<th>50 dph</th>
<th>160 dph</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of homes before and after:</th>
<th>485</th>
<th>+59%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Rectory Park
**Network Homes**

- **Local authority:** Ealing
- **Architect:** BPTW
- **Original scheme:** 1950s and 1970s
- **Total scheme costs:** £114m
- **Start–completion:** 2012–2020
- **Funding:** Cross-subsidy, grant, third party

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure mix before:</th>
<th>Social/AR:</th>
<th>Leaseholders:</th>
<th>ORS:</th>
<th>PRS:</th>
<th>SO/SE:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social/AR:</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>375</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaseholders:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORS:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO/SE:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure mix after:</th>
<th>Social/AR:</th>
<th>Leaseholders:</th>
<th>ORS:</th>
<th>PRS:</th>
<th>SO/SE:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social/AR:</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>1,035 (54%)</td>
<td>1,541</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaseholders:</td>
<td>262 (12%)</td>
<td>375</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORS:</td>
<td>852 (30%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO/SE:</td>
<td>143 (13%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Density before/after:</th>
<th>50 dph</th>
<th>160 dph</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of homes before and after:</th>
<th>2,036</th>
<th>+112%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
South Kilburn
Network Homes
Local authority: Brent
Architect: Lifschutz Davidson Sandilands/ Alison Brooks
Original scheme: 1970s
Total scheme costs: £318m
Start–completion: 2016–2022
Funding: Cross-subsidy without grant and third party low cost borrowing
Tenure mix before:
Social/Leaseholders: 256/16
Social: 103 (45%)
Leaseholders: 16 (7%)
ORS: 110 (48%)
Tenure mix after:
Social: 728 (51%)
AR: 84 (6%)
Leaseholders: 267 (19%)
ORS: 221 (15%)
SO/SE: 139 (10%)
Density before/after: High/189 dph
Number of homes before and after:
272
229
-16%

Barham Park
Network Homes
Local authority: Lambeth
Architect: PRP
Original scheme: 1940s and 1960s
Total scheme costs: £158m
Start–completion: 2009–2017
Funding: Cross-subsidy, grant and third party low cost borrowing
Tenure mix before:
Social/Leaseholders: 861/267
Social: 612 (72%)
PR: 247 (29%)
ORS: 26 (3%)
Tenure mix after:
Social: 815 (71%)
AR: 56 (5%)
PRS: 330 (30%)
ORS: 61 (6%)
SO/SE: 46 (5%)
Density before/after: High/188 dph
Number of homes before and after:
1,128
1,439
+28%

Stockwell Park
Network Homes
Local authority: Lambeth
Architect: PRP
Original scheme: 1940s and 1960s
Total scheme costs: £158m
Start–completion: 2009–2017
Funding: Cross-subsidy, grant and third party low cost borrowing
Tenure mix before:
Social/Leaseholders: 1,163
Social: 1,163 (100%)
Tenure mix after:
Social: 1,265 (100%)
Density before/after: Low/–
Number of homes before and after:
1,128
1,265
+9%

Allen Court
Notting Hill
Local authority: Ealing
Architect: HTA
Original scheme: 1960s
Total scheme costs: £8m
Funding: Cross-subsidy, grant and own reserves
Tenure mix before:
Social/Leaseholders: 64/2
Social: 45 (51%)
PR: 44 (49%)
Density before/after: Medium/173 dph
Number of homes before and after:
66
89
+35%

Aylesbury Estate
(First Development Site & Plot 18)
Notting Hill
Local authority: Southwark
Architect: HTA
Original scheme: 1960s–1970s
Total scheme costs: £318m
Start–completion: 2014–2017
Funding: Cross-subsidy, grant and third party low cost borrowing
Tenure mix before:
Social/Leaseholders: 529/70
Social: 349 (37%)
IMR: 48 (6%)
PR: 426 (48%)
ORS: 126 (13%)
Tenure mix after:
Social: 122 (36%)
PR: 151 (45%)
ORS: 65 (19%)
Density before/after: High/222 dph
Number of homes before and after:
599
949
+58%

Briar Road
Notting Hill
Local authority: Havering
Architect: PCKO
Original scheme: 1960s
Total scheme costs: £20m
Funding: Cross-subsidy, grant and own reserves
Tenure mix before:
Social/Leaseholders: 1,163
Social: 1,163 (100%)
Density before/after: Low/–
Number of homes before and after:
1,128
1,265
+9%

Meeting the challenge of urban renewal
### Lingham Place
**Notting Hill**
- **Local authority:** Havering
- **Original scheme:** 1950s
- **Total scheme costs:** £22m
- **Start–completion:** 2013–2015
- **Funding:** Cross-subsidy, grant and own reserves
- **Tenure mix before:** Social/Leaseholders: 198/17
  - AR: 14 (84%)
  - SO/SE: 54 (16%)
- **Density before/after:** Low/257 dph
- **Number of homes before and after:**
  - Before: 215
  - After: 345
  - Increase: +60%

### Silchester
**Peabody**
- **Local authority:** Kensington and Chelsea
- **Architect:** Haworth Tompkins
- **Original scheme:** 1960s
- **Total scheme costs:** £35m
- **Start–completion:** 2013–2016
- **Funding:** Cross-subsidy and grant
- **Tenure mix before:** Social/Leaseholders: 11/3
  - Social: 45 (40%)
  - ORS: 28 (25%)
  - SO/SE: 39 (35%)
- **Density before/after:** 15/212 dph
- **Number of homes before and after:**
  - Before: 14
  - After: 112
  - Increase: +700%

### St John’s Hill
**Peabody**
- **Local authority:** Wandsworth
- **Architect:** Hawkins & Brown
- **Original scheme:** 1930s
- **Total scheme costs:** £177m
- **Start–completion:** 2013–2021
- **Funding:** Cross-subsidy and grant
- **Tenure mix before:** Social/IMR: 234/117
  - Social: 221 (42%)
  - ORS: 249 (47%)
  - S0/SE: 58 (11%)
- **Density before/after:** 159/233 dph
- **Number of homes before and after:**
  - Before: 351
  - After: 528
  - Increase: +50%
Appendix 2: project approach and methodology

The research was conducted by the research teams at L&Q and Affinity Sutton and consisted of an evidence gathering exercise with additional analysis of data on the g15 members’ regeneration schemes provided by development and regeneration staff. Excluded from the scope were refurbishment schemes or those that involved the redevelopment of brownfield land and therefore did not have residents on site.

The project was split into four key phases:

Phase one – Identification and characterisation of schemes
Largely a quantitative exercise, identifying:
- Current on-site schemes or those completed between 2013 and 2015 (inclusive).
- Details on 39 schemes were submitted, 35 within Greater London.
- Decade of construction, building type, density, units by tenure (before and after regeneration), funding and information on rehousing of existing residents.
- Data gathered in phase one was verified and explored further at a roundtable discussion in March attended by g15 regeneration/development directors.

Phase two – first follow-up questionnaire
Largely a qualitative exercise focussed on the following aspects of the identified schemes and broader regeneration experiences:
- Definition and drivers for regeneration.

Phase three – second follow up questionnaire and data analysis
- A mix of qualitative and quantitative analysis of data on financing models and grant subsidies and land value.
- Analysis of the g15 funding data

Phase four - validation of findings and developing ‘asks and offers’ with partners
- Discussion of findings with the g15’s development directors and CEOs
- Roundtable discussion with select local authority partners and one-to-one meetings with GLA and DCLG representatives.
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