Considerations for Estate Regeneration Proposals:

Treverton Estate

1 Introduction

This document identifies the Royal Borough’s Corporate consideration of the case for regenerating the Treverton Estate, as part of the Royal Borough’s Estates Regeneration Programme. This document should be read in conjunction with the Royal Borough’s overarching strategic considerations for Estate Regeneration proposals document. The Royal Borough’s Estates Regeneration

This is a live document reflecting the information, analyses and decisions that are available at this time. Further work being undertaken by the Royal Borough seeks to discover whether there are any viable continued maintenance, infill, partial redevelopment, or full redevelopment options for Treverton that would deliver the Council’s objectives, whilst also meeting the Council’s commitments to the estate’s residents. As this additional information becomes available, this document will be updated accordingly by the Royal Borough’s Housing and Property Team.

This version of the document has also been prepared to support the potential allocation or identification of the Treverton estate within the Royal Borough’s Local Plan Partial Review. A version history is located on page 14 of this document.

The allocation of the site within the development plan would, if found to be “sound”, assist in delivering a flexible range of development options. Any allocation will not however determine the regeneration route to be chosen by the council in respect of the site. The contents of the development plan, and the views of the Planning Authorities (both strategic and local), will be material to any regeneration option choice. Ultimately the regeneration option chosen (if any) will be determined by the Council having regard to a wide range of considerations, including consultation responses.

2 Site Description

The Treverton Estate is situated within the Dalgaro Ward in the northern part of the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea. The site is approximately 2.2ha in area.
Figure 1: Location and potential extent of site

The site is bound to the north-west by Barlby Primary School, to the north-east by Barlby Road, to the east by Ladbroke Grove, to the west by Exmoor Street and to the south by Bruce Close and properties on the northern side of Hewer Street. An internal road, Treverton Street, runs into the site from Ladbroke Grove, providing vehicular access. Treverton Street becomes pedestrianised at its exit on Exmoor Street and there is no vehicular route through the site.

The red-line boundary of the site, in relation to which options are being tested, comprises both unregistered land and six freehold titles. The following section forms a schedule of these landholdings and related considerations such as titles, uses and occupancy.

2.1 Royal Borough land holdings

Five of the registered titles are owned by the council under the following Registered Title numbers:

NGL232629 – The property is described in the Registered Title as “…1 to 55 Treverton Tower and 1 to 55 Raymede Tower, Treverton Street, 319 to 339 Ladbroke Close, 5 Exmoor Street, 1 to 42 Burleigh House, 1 -36 Bruce House and 1 to 42 Balfour House St Charles Square London.” Only part of the land within the Registered Title is included within the red line plan.

- LN40226 – 8 Treverton Street. This property is still registered in the name of the London Residuary Body. The property was vested in the Council by virtue of Section 2(1)(c) of The Education (London Residurary Body) (Transfer of Functions and Property) (No 2) Order 1992
LN40235 – 10 Treverton Street. This property is still registered in the name of the London Residuary Body. The property was vested in the Council by virtue of Section 2(1)(c) of The Education (London Residuary Body) (Transfer of Functions and Property) (No 2) Order 1992

LN40236 – 12 Treverton Street. This property is still registered in the name of the London Residuary Body. The property was vested in the Council by virtue of Section 2(1)(c) of The Education (London Residuary Body) (Transfer of Functions and Property) (No 2) Order 1992

140559 – 2, 4 and 6 (even) Treverton Street Kensington. This property is still registered in the name of the London Residuary Body. The property was vested in the Council by virtue of Section 2(1)(c) of The Education (London Residuary Body) (Transfer of Functions and Property) (No 2) Order 1992

NGL605802 –19 Burleigh House St Charles Square London W10 6HB is privately owned having been transferred by the council on the 10th August 1987. The transfer contains restrictive covenants, detailed below.

Part of the land in title NGL232629 edged green on the title plan being 19 Burleigh House property benefits from, but is subject to, the easements and other rights prescribed by paragraph 2 of Schedule 2 of the Housing Act 1980 and paragraph 2 of Schedule 6 of the Housing Act 1985.

The leases granted for the properties set out below reserve for the council the right to alter, add to or rebuild any adjoining or neighbouring property whether or not forming part of the Estate belonging to the Council or any part of the building NOTWITHSTANDING that such alterations additions or rebuilding may interfere with or diminish the amount of light or air enjoyed by the building or the demised premises.

The council is also granted a right to substitute, divert or otherwise alter the roads and pedestrian access ways on the estate as well as the sewers, drains, pipes, wires and cables and has a right to alter the boundaries of the estate and to make variations to any rights of way or access over the estate or over any adjoining property and to any of the gardens communal amenity areas or any other communal facility on the estate.

Parts of the land are subject to the leases set out in the schedule of leases in the charges register being the following:

- 3 Burleigh House – ground floor flat and garden
- 11 Burleigh House – first floor flat
- 17 Burleigh House – second floor flat
- 23 Burleigh House – second floor flat
- 26 Burleigh House – ground and first floor flat and garden
- 29 Burleigh House – Ground and First Floor Flat and garden
- 30 Burleigh House – Ground and First Floor Flat and garden
- 31 Burleigh House – second floor flat
- 32 Burleigh House – second floor flat
36 Burleigh House – first floor flat
41 Burleigh House – Ground floor flat
42 Burleigh House – First Floor Flat and Ground floor entrance and staircase
5 Exmoor street – second floor flat
5 Exmoor Street – Flat 6 second floor flat
Flat G 319 Ladbroke Grove – second floor flat
Flat J 319 Ladbroke Grove – second floor flat
Flat 4 339 Ladbroke Grove – first and second floor flat
Flat 5 339 Ladbroke Grove – ground floor flat
12 Treverton Tower – second floor flat
13 Treverton Tower – second floor flat
16 Treverton Tower – third floor flat
20 Treverton Tower – third floor flat
21 Treverton Tower – fourth floor flat
23 Treverton Tower – fourth floor flat
28 Treverton Tower – fifth floor flat
32 Treverton Tower – sixth floor flat
36 Treverton Tower – seventh floor flat
49 Treverton Tower – tenth floor flat
14 Raymede Tower – second floor flat
29 Raymede Tower – fifth floor flat
Raymede Tower – sixth floor flat

These properties are subject to all the rights granted in the leases including rights of way, passage and running of water soil gas electricity and other services, support shelter and protection, entry and use of outdoor areas, entry phone, refuse chutes, dust containers or dustbins and other facilities or services, rights in respect of wireless or television aerials and other rights as are granted by those leases.

The access ways and footpaths are subject to rights of way on foot.

There is an electricity substation lease in an area within the basement of Treverton Tower registered with title BGL58713. The lease is for 60 years from the 25th December 1957, expiring on the 24th December 2017.

Further to a housing needs survey completed in March 2016 the following table provides a tenure breakdown of the existing residents located on the Royal Borough owned land.

*Table 1: Summary of Royal Borough tenants*
Table 2: Summary of Leaseholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>Studio</th>
<th>1 Bed</th>
<th>2 Bed</th>
<th>3 Bed</th>
<th>4 Bed</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-18 Burleigh House &amp; 20 Burleigh House</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Exmoor St</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319 Ladbroke Grove</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>329-333 Ladbroke Grove</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>337 &amp; 339 Ladbroke Grove</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymede Tower</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treverton Tower</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2 Non-Royal Borough land-holdings:
The freehold interest in the commercial and residential terrace 341-351 Ladbroke Grove also located to the north east of the site also falls within the potential site boundary. This
area has been considered for inclusion as it could provide continuity of the street frontage along Ladbroke Grove from St Charles Square to Barlby Road. It could also assist in achieving one of the council’s key objectives to create a better sense of place in this location.

Table 3: Residential Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leaseholder / Freeholder interest - Residential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Studio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 St Charles Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>341 – 351 Ladbroke Grove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The red line also includes the freehold interest in the land to the south of the site, 19 St Charles Square

Table 4: Commercial Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leaseholder / Freeholder interest - Commercial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>341 – 351 Ladbroke Grove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3 Land Titles

A report on title has been commissioned and is expected to be issued by the end of September 2016. This will identify all legal interests in the site and allow for an assessment of risk associated with redevelopment and/or disposal of land.

2.4 Land Uses

The site is mainly residential with associated landscaping and play area, but there are also commercial units comprising a launderette, offices, fast food, cab/taxi office, community uses, education, and an art gallery. The potential to re-provide these planning use classes if a development option is to be pursued should be considered through a retail impact assessment.

2.5 Tenant / Leaseholder Status

The estate shown within the potential boundary area comprises of 176 homes including the two towers, of which 148 are managed by the Kensington & Chelsea Tenant Management Organisation (TMO) on behalf of the Council. There are four shared ownership homes on the site, currently owned by Notting Hill Housing Association. The
remainder of the homes are private free/leaseholders. Further work is being undertaken to establish if there are any other leaseholders.

2.6 Operational / Maintenance Considerations

A report will be completed by the Royal Borough’s Tenant Management Organisation (TMO) that examines the current condition and further resources required to maintain the existing buildings for a further 30 years.

3 Site-specific objectives

The following section sets out what the project is trying to achieve, what the objectives were at the start of the project, how these objectives have changed or have been refined over time, and where these changes were approved.

The 21 July 2016 Cabinet Report (Item A07) provided the following recommendations, amongst others:

- “Agree that based on initial options appraisal undertaken there appears to be a compelling case for regeneration: in particular, the partial redevelopment option (retaining the two towers) can deliver on the Council’s objectives, be viable and result in least disturbance to residents”
- “Agree that all the options (including ‘do nothing’, ‘infill / refurbishment’, and ‘redevelopment’) should be further investigated and consulted on with local residents and other stakeholders with the view to selecting a preferred option / scheme that can best meet the Council’s objectives for the site.”

Section 4 of the report sets out the following:

“The Council recognises the intense and growing shortage of all types of housing in London. Kensington and Chelsea continues to have growing demand for all types of housing within middle incomes households, who are largely unable to access either market or affordable housing in the borough. Over 2,767 households are on our waiting list for affordable housing and approximately 1,800 households in temporary accommodation, to whom the Council has a duty to rehouse. The Council is therefore developing an ambitious regeneration programme with the following objectives:

- Contribute towards building the new homes that London and the Royal Borough needs
- Provide the best possible homes for our existing (and future) tenants
- Provide new homes that are affordable to people on low to middle incomes, thereby preserving our “mixed communities” and reducing the risk of “dumbbell communities”
- Use redevelopment as a catalyst to regenerate some of the Borough’s neighbourhoods which would benefit from improvement. Better homes improve health, better public realm reduces crime, more mixed uses offer more job opportunities, and more mixed tenures improve school catchments, educational aspiration and achievement
Build the ‘Conservation Areas of the Future’ through improving the built environment and urban fabric to match the character, architectural quality and built legacy of the borough”

On review of the report, the Royal Borough’s Cabinet agreed with the recommendations as set out above.

A stock condition survey was carried out in 2013 to review the future maintenance requirement on the estate against available resources and confirmed Net Present Value. The stock condition survey report highlighted a need to plan and prioritise where investment should be directed and/or review alternative options for the borough’s assets that do not have a sustainable future.

In order to assist in this prioritisation, the TMO asset management strategy produced an Asset Investment Framework. This starts from the objective that the HRA requires financially sustainable assets that contribute to the long term surplus of the HRA. In addition, assets should meet the strategic needs of the Royal Borough, and meet agreed quality measures. Finally, development opportunities should be identified and exploited to enable future housing.

3.1 The Council’s commitments to residents

The July 2016 Cabinet Report sets out the following:

“There is a strong commitment from the Council to meet its housing needs and objectives, to meet the demand for school places within the borough and to regenerate the site by reintegrating this neighbourhood to have a positive impact on the local environment whilst enabling the existing residents to remain within the community. Therefore, the Council has undertaken to provide tenants, leaseholders and freeholders directly affected by redevelopment proposals with the following assurances:

- The Council will be sensitive to the concerns of the existing community and the desire of any residents to remain near friends and family.
- On any redevelopment scheme at least the same amount of social rented floor space will be provided as currently exists.
- All existing Secure Tenants will be given the option of remaining in the same area, in a property on the same terms and conditions and rent level as their current property.
- Schemes will be phased to maximise the number of people able to move home only once (wherever possible).
- Offer an attractive disturbance package to allow tenants to move at no cost to themselves.
- Repurchase private interest properties at full market value plus CPO compensation, in line with statutory guidance from any leaseholders (or freeholders) who wish to sell their property but are concerned that they may be unable to do so because of the Council’s proposals.
• Wherever viable, offer resident leaseholders or resident freeholders the opportunity to buy a property on a Shared Equity basis on the new development.

4 Options Testing

The following section sets out how the options have been considered and refined over time, and how these decisions have been taken.

4.1 Optioneering Status

The 30 October 2014 Cabinet Report (Item A10) sought approval for:

“…proceed with undertaking a Master Plan.

Delegated Authority to Cabinet Members for Education and Housing, Property and Regeneration to;

• Appoint Master planner (including School Design Team);
• Client Side Team;
• Commission all required surveys and investigations.

To consult with residents and the community with regards to the expanding Barlby Primary School and the regeneration of elements of the adjoining housing estates”

On review of the report, the Royal Borough’s Cabinet resolved to approve the recommendations as set out above. The initial site appraisal (RIBA stage 1) for the partial and full redevelopment options were completed by BPTW. As part of this investigation, it was agreed that options should be reviewed for partial and full redevelopment of the Treverton estate. This design evaluation included the redevelopment of the Barlby Primary School.

On review of the 21 July 2016 Cabinet report, Cabinet approved a proposal to carry out the next stage of design work to appraise four options for the area defined as ‘Barlby/Treverton’; this being the estate referred to in this document, plus the Barlby Primary School site. This involves understanding what development options are viable on this site, while achieving the council’s key housing aims for the borough and minimising impact to existing residents. Cabinet simultaneously approved the decoupling of the Estate and School sites, creating a separate project for the school¹. This report focuses on option appraisals for the estate only.

External architects have been appointed to develop potential design solutions for partial and full redevelopment options, and additional consultants to carry out financial viability

¹ The Barlby School site has been identified for redevelopment, and the options appraisals will include a residential option for part of the school playground, this is estimated to provide £5m to £7m cross subsidy into a school regeneration budget. Part of the existing school site is proposed to be rationalised and allocated for residential development. In accordance with Children’s Services the school land will also be included within the boundary of the proposed residential/commercial development once consent from the Secretary of State has been obtained for appropriation/disposal. This will include c.8m200 square metres on the eastern boundary of the existing school site that will be presented in pursuance of Schedule 14 of the Education Act 2011 and Schedule 1 of the Academies Act 2010 as well as disposal consent under Section 77 of the Schools Standards and Framework Act 1998.
testing of these options. Between the original work undertaken considering the full site, and this additional work, Four options for the estate will have been appraised;

- Continued Maintenance Strategy
- Infill/Refurbishment
- Partial Redevelopment
- Full Redevelopment

The towers, Treverton and Raymede, will remain in situ under appraisal options 1-3, but would be demolished under option 4, full redevelopment. In the partial and full redevelopment options, demolition of the following blocks is proposed for testing;

- Ladbroke Grove 313 – 339
- Treverton Street, 1-18 Burleigh House
- 5 Exmoor Street.
- 341-351 Ladbroke Grove

These options have been (and will continue to be) rigorously tested against the Council’s publicised ambitions and objectives, and the consultation responses received by the Council. The preferred option and associated scheme will be presented for approval to a Cabinet in the future (currently scheduled for Spring 2017).

The current proposals being explored as part of the partial and full redevelopment options include the acquisition and demolition of the privately owned interests at 341 - 351 Ladbroke Grove on the basis that it is anticipated that these regeneration options are likely to have a material impact on the rights of light and visual amenity benefiting those properties, and their exclusion would result in a loss of opportunity in providing additional housing units on the eastern part of the site and meeting the Council’s objectives.

4.1.1 **Continued Maintenance Strategy**

The ‘Continued Maintenance Strategy’ option assesses the merits and feasibility of the Council carrying out no new development on the Treverton estate. It assesses the financial implications of this course of action by examining the expenditure required to maintain the estate in its current condition as well as the forecasted expenditure required to give the buildings a further 25-30 years of life. The NPV of the estate is also established to determine if the current asset is financially sustainable. Finally, the performance of this strategy scenario against the Council’s stated objectives and commitments to residents is also assessed.

An Asset Investment Study was undertaken on behalf of the Royal Borough’s Tenant Management Organisation (TMO) in 2013 to calculate the NPV and to set out the forecast maintenance expenses in order to assess a continued maintenance approach assessing its financial impact. A copy of this study is attached at Appendix E.

The NPV assessment as set out in ‘Asset Investment Study’ provisionally concludes that Treverton is a weak performer, and notes that a more detailed options appraisal should be carried out in the near future.
4.1.2 Infill/extensions

The infill option assesses the feasibility of developing units within the estate boundary, without demolishing any of the existing units. An infill study was undertaken by Pollard Thomas Edwards Architects (PTEA) on behalf of the Royal Borough’s Tenant Management Organisation (TMO) in 2014. A copy of this study is attached at Appendix D and extracts are included throughout this document.

The PTEA study provisionally concluded that there is potential to undertake infill development within several areas of the estate. Each infill option has been subjected to a high-level review by CBRE to assess, in its opinion, the extent to which the Royal Borough’s objectives and commitments to tenants can be met by each option. The options are also reviewed from a planning and financial perspective to assess the likelihood of obtaining consent and the prospects for delivery.

It should be noted that the CBRE opinion is based on a high-level review of the options conducted within a relatively short time period. The views and opinions must be treated as indicative only and should be verified before a decision is taken. Further investigation of this option will take place.

The provisional conclusions on the infill options have been ranked against the Council’s objectives using a Red, Amber, Green (RAG) system. Please see page 13 of the July 2016 Cabinet Report, shown in Appendix A.

4.1.3 Partial redevelopment

The Partial Redevelopment Option examines the merits and feasibility of redeveloping a portion of the Treverton Estate but keeping some of the existing buildings as they are. In this particular case, Treverton and Raymede Towers would be retained and the remaining buildings on the estate would be redeveloped. The financial implications of this option have been assessed as well as how effective the proposed development is at achieving the Council’s stated objectives and commitments to residents.

BPTW worked with the Royal Borough and produced various master plan proposals for the Partial Redevelopment Option. CBRE also produced a report outlining the impact and benefits of a redevelopment proposal that leaves the towers in place. The Partial Redevelopment Option has been assessed based on this information but this option needs to be explored further.

The provisional conclusions on the Partial Redevelopment Option has been ranked against the Council’s objectives using a Red, Amber, Green (RAG) system and presented to Cabinet in July 2016. Please see Appendix A.

4.1.4 Full redevelopment

The Full Redevelopment Option evaluates the merits and feasibility of redeveloping the entire Treverton Estate. This involves the demolition of all existing buildings and development of new residential buildings in their place. In this option, all 162 existing secure tenancy units would be re-provided in the new development. The financial implications of this option are assessed in order to ensure the scheme is viable and the benefits to the council are maximised. The performance of proposed development against the Council’s stated objectives and commitments to residents is also assessed.
BPTW reviewed options for redevelopment of the entire site in further detail. The Full Redevelopment Option will be assessed based on these proposals and further investigatory work may take place if required.

The Full Redevelopment Option has been ranked against the Council’s objectives using a Red, Amber, Green (RAG) system. Again these provisional conclusions were presented to Cabinet in July 2016. Please see Appendix A.

4.2 Supporting technical assessments

The Cabinet approval allowed for further appraisal work that would lead to a final report to be brought back to Cabinet in the summer of 2017. This will enable further detail appraisal work into the options previously considered to complete RIBA stage 2. To this end, the council will appoint technical support to undertake the required due diligence work and to progress the design evolution.

4.3 Housing Needs Assessment and optioneering

A Housing Need Assessment has been completed and will be applied to the architect’s brief for RIBA stages 1 and 2 option.

4.4 Consultations and Engagement undertaken

A series of consultation meetings and correspondence have been carried during 2014/15 with residents, owners and users of the buildings in the designated area. Most recent consultation was the Housing Needs survey completed in March 2016.

Public consultation events, newsletters, web updates, email and postal notifications, as well as wider consultation with the local planning authority and other key stakeholders within the local community will continue. Regular events and public notifications will be scheduled in a communication plan. In addition, a summary of consultation feedback and FAQs will appear on the Council’s website.

Information from previous events and copies of newsletters sent to residents are also available on the Council’s website:

www.rbkc.gov.uk/barlbytre

Consultation on the disposal and/or change of use for the school site playing fields will need to be undertaken before an application for the relevant consent is made to the Secretary of State.

4.5 Consideration of non-residential uses within optioneering

If an option to redevelop the estate is pursued, any existing non-residential uses will be reprovided.

5 Project delivery

This section considers how the project may be delivered

5.1 Use of existing Council powers

Depending upon which option is selected, it may be necessary to obtain land owned by residents and others to enable the renewal of the estate. To do so, the Council will make all efforts to acquire this land by negotiation and private treaty, with mutual agreement
from third party landowners to sell their property. The use of a compulsory purchase order (CPO) or permission from the Secretary of State for use of Section 10A of the Housing Act 1985, would be used only as a last resort.

5.2 Delivery and Funding Partnerships
Not known as yet.

5.3 Decant Policies
Any rehousing will take place in line with the Council’s Decant Policy, which is currently being updated and will be subject of public consultation.

6 Future project activities
This section sets out the project-related activities that are planned or due in the future.

6.1 Programme of work and broad timescales.
Current key milestones have been set out below, and a design programme is being developed should be attached to future reports.

- Design appraisal (RIBA stages 1 and 2) Winter 2016/17
- Internal evaluation Spring 2017
- Cabinet Decision Summer 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confirm appointment of ADAM architects</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sept-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review current RIBA stage 1 cost plan and undertake value</td>
<td>Sept-16</td>
<td>Nov-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>engineering. Agree new scope of works</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review RIBA stage 2 cost plan and undertake value engineering.</td>
<td>Dec-16</td>
<td>April-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree new scope of works</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabinet approval</td>
<td>Mar-17</td>
<td>June-17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2 Governance structures and milestones
As stated earlier in this report, the future delivery of Treverton will be based upon the outcome of detailed investigation and interrogation of the four options and feedback received through public consultation. On completion of the design appraisal, there will be a report submitted to Cabinet which will include consideration by Housing and Property Scrutiny in spring of 2017, which will make a decision on the option that best meets the council’s objectives. The details of the decision will be publically available on the Royal Borough’s website.

6.3 Future stakeholder engagement
The stakeholder participation and consultation strategy is currently being updated, this is anticipated for the end of September 2016 and will be annexed to this report.
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1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 The Council’s initial consideration of options to regenerate the estates and an element of surplus school land were published in October 2014 when Cabinet granted approval to investigate the proposals further. At the same time Cabinet approval was also granted to develop design proposals and obtain planning consent to redevelop the Barlby Primary School and parts of two adjacent housing estates - namely, parts of Treverton and Balfour of Burleigh estates.

1.2 The estates shown within the redline boundary area (Appendix A) comprise 160 homes including the two towers, of which 141 are managed by the TMO on behalf of the Council, plus two commercial premises comprising Café and Convenience Store. A number of the leaseholds within this area are shared ownership with Notting Hill Housing Trust. In addition, a block outside Council ownership containing a number of residential and commercial private interests at 341-351 Ladbroke Grove has been included within the redline area in order to better deliver the Council’s objectives for the site.
A number of wide-ranging proposals have been investigated. These proposals have been derived from options appraisals undertaken to date as part of the review of potential urban design solutions for this important site. In addition to the emerging preferred option of partial redevelopment (i.e. retaining the two towers), these architecturally-led appraisals also examined various opportunities in terms of ‘do nothing’ and ‘infill / refurbishment’ options.

These options have been (and will continue to be) rigorously tested against the Council’s publicised ambitions and objectives and a final preferred option, if appropriate, will be presented for approval to Cabinet in the future (which is currently scheduled for Spring 2017).

From the initial findings, however, there appears to be evidence for a ‘compelling case’ for regeneration of that part of the Balfour of Burleigh and Treverton estates within the proposed redline area and which includes the redevelopment of the Barlby Primary School. This has been demonstrated through the evaluation of the initial outputs of the options and viability appraisals and following consultation with the local planning authority and local community thus far.

To enable the options to be further developed and tested it is necessary to appoint a new design team up to and including RIBA Stage 2 of the design process, via the RBKC architectural framework, in order to develop master plan proposals for the housing land, surplus school land and the private interest block. This will assist the Council with developing and selecting an eventual preferred scheme, which could be ‘do nothing’, ‘refurbishment and infill’, or ‘redevelopment’.

The school proposals relate to the redevelopment and expansion of Barlby Primary School to provide places for 420 pupils; 12 ASD pupils and 26 nursery places, and also the building of a brand new special school for children with severe special educational needs.

In relation to the new school facilities and proposed new layouts, working with Children’s Services and officers, as well as staff of the existing Barlby Primary school, proposals have now been developed to accommodate both new schools within a rationalised shared site, in accordance with the brief set out and approved in March 2014.

School design has now reached the end of RIBA Stage 2 (Concept Design) and the current design proposals have been signed off and approved by Children’s Services (subject to value engineering and affordability).

Cabinet are asked, as part of this paper, to consider delivering the new Barlby School and SEN provision separately from the housing regeneration proposals, allowing the school to be operational earlier.
2 RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1 The Cabinet is recommended to:

i) Agree that based on initial options appraisal undertaken there appears to be a compelling case for regeneration: in particular, the partial redevelopment option (retaining the two towers) can deliver on the Council’s objectives, be viable and result in least disturbance to residents.

ii) Agree that all the options (including ‘do nothing’, ‘infill / refurbishment’, and ‘redevelopment’) should be further investigated and consulted on with local residents and other stakeholders with the view to selecting a preferred option / scheme that can best meet the Council’s objectives for the site.

iii) Agree to move to the next stage of design options for redevelopment by appointing a new design team through the RBKC Architects Framework, and to delegate authority to the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Housing, Property and Regeneration to appoint the design team following completion of the tender process.

iv) Agree to facilitate and advance negotiations with leaseholders, freeholders and private interests within the redline area on a private treaty basis, based upon Open Market Value plus compensation in line with statutory guidelines prior to any CPO designation being approved.

v) Agree to offer a Shared Equity scheme for resident leaseholders within the redline area which will enable those eligible to consider whether they wish to acquire a replacement home within any redevelopment scheme. However, the details of the scheme itself are subject to further viability testing and separate Cabinet approval of the finalised basis of this offer at a later date.

vi) Agree the schools funding strategy, details of which are presented in the Confidential Part B of the report.

vii) Agree to ‘de-couple’ the design and delivery of the schools from the overall estate regeneration proposals and proceed with design, and submit planning application for the schools, in order that the school element can be delivered separately by the Council and to their own timescales.

viii) Delegate authority to the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Housing, Property and Regeneration, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Education, to appointment a new design team to undertake the remaining design development of the two new schools via the RBKC Architects Framework.
Delegate authority to the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Housing, Property and Regeneration to appoint the Client Side Team for this project.

3 REASONS FOR DECISION

3.1 The regeneration proposals for the area are still at a very early stage and subject to the Cabinet approvals requested within this paper, the Council wishes to continue the process of options and financial appraisals in order to identify a ‘preferred’ option / scheme that can be agreed by Cabinet (at a future date and is currently scheduled for Spring 2017).

3.2 Furthermore, the Council will continue to progress the design process for redevelopment options, by progressing further design studies to be developed in more detail. This additional work will be subject to further scrutiny and testing.

4 BACKGROUND

The Council's Objectives

4.1 The Council recognises the intense and growing shortage of all types of housing in London. Kensington and Chelsea continues to have an increased demand for all types of housing, with those on middle incomes largely unable to access either market or affordable housing in the borough. Currently there are more than 2,767 households on the Council's waiting list for affordable housing, and approximately 1,800 households which the Council has a duty to house placed in temporary accommodation. The Council is therefore developing an ambitious regeneration programme in the borough with the following objectives:

- Build the new homes that London and the Royal Borough needs
- Provide the best possible homes for our existing (and future) tenants
- Provide new homes that are affordable to people on low to middle incomes, thereby preserving our “mixed and diverse communities” and reducing the risk of “dumbbell communities”
- Use redevelopment as a catalyst to regenerate some of the Borough’s neighbourhoods which would benefit from improvement. Better homes improve health, better public realm reduces crime, more mixed uses offer more job opportunities, and more mixed tenures improve school catchments, educational aspiration and achievement
- Build the ‘Conservation Areas of the Future’ through improving the built environment and urban fabric to match the character, architectural quality and legacy of the borough.

The Council's Commitments to Residents

4.2 There is a strong commitment from the Council to meet its housing needs and objectives, to meet the demand for school places within the borough and to regenerate the sites by reintegrating the neighbourhoods to have a positive
impact on the local environment whilst enabling the existing residents to remain within the community. Therefore, the Council has undertaken to provide tenants, leaseholders and freeholders in the Treverton and Balfour of Burleigh Estates who may be directly affected by any redevelopment proposals with the following assurances:

- The Council will be sensitive to the concerns of the existing community and the desire of any residents to remain near friends and family.
- On any redevelopment scheme at least the same amount of social rented floor space will be provided as currently exists.
- All existing Secure Tenants will be given the option of remaining in the same area, in a property on the same terms and conditions and rent level as their current property.
- Schemes will be phased to maximise the number of people able to move home only once (wherever possible).
- Offer an attractive disturbance package to allow tenants to move at no cost to themselves.
- Repurchase private interest properties at full market value plus CPO compensation, in line with statutory guidance from any leaseholders (or freeholders) who wish to sell their property but are concerned that they may be unable to do so because of the Council’s proposals.
- Subject to viability, offer resident leaseholders or resident freeholders, who may be directly affected by such redevelopment proposals, the opportunity to buy a property on a Shared Equity basis on the new development.

Key constraints

4.3 The key issue for Kensington and Chelsea is the lack of land on which to develop new housing. As a consequence the Council has made an in principle commitment to a programme to explore redeveloping some low-density Council estates, where there is a strong case for regeneration and can be demonstrated to be financially viable and deliverable. We also need to plan positively for new housing in the Borough, ensuring that we are in accordance with national planning guidance and keeping an up-to-date housing land supply demonstrating sufficient allocated sites in the Local Plan to meet our housing target for the next 15 years. Further alterations to the London Plan published in March 2015 increased the Borough’s annual supply target from 600 to 733 net additional units per annum and this equates to a 15 year supply of 10,995 new homes. Taking undeveloped sites already allocated in the Local Plan into account we need to find land to allocate around a thousand additional units.

4.4 It is therefore important that significant new sources of housing in the borough are formally allocated so that they can be counted towards the land supply figure. An allocation assists greatly when a subsequent planning application is submitted as the principle and quantum of development on the site will have already been agreed. Failure to make positive decisions planning sufficient land for housing significantly increases the risk of housing being granted on appeal in locations or at heights, sizes and designs which are not supported
locally. It can also lead to the Secretary of State intervening to prepare a local plan on the Council’s behalf.

Work to date

4.5 The Barlby / Treverton regeneration scheme is one of four areas under consideration within the Council’s current estate regeneration programme. The Council’s initial plans to regenerate the estates and an element of surplus school land were published in October 2014 when Cabinet granted approval to investigate the proposals further. At the same time Cabinet approval was also granted to develop design proposals and obtain planning consent to redevelop the Barlby Primary School and parts of two adjacent housing estates. Namely, parts of Treverton and Balfour of Burleigh estates, as shown within the redline boundary existing site plan (Appendix A).

4.6 The estates shown within the redline boundary area comprise 160 homes including the two towers, of which 141 are managed by the TMO on behalf of the Council. A number of the leaseholds within this area are shared ownership with Notting Hill Housing Trust. In addition, a block outside Council ownership containing a number of residential and commercial private interests at 341-351 Ladbroke Grove has been included within the redline area in order to deliver the Council’s objectives for the site.

4.7 In addition there is a resident freeholder and a secure tenant in the block adjoining 1-18 Burleigh House. Both these units are outside the proposed regeneration area but are in such close proximity to the proposed development, that consideration will need to be given to the potential for relocation of these residents if a redevelopment is taken forward.

4.8 A number of wide-ranging proposals have been investigated. These proposals have been derived from options appraisals undertaken to date as part of the review of potential urban design solutions for this important site. In addition to comprehensive redevelopment and also the partial redevelopment option, these architecturally-led appraisals also examined various opportunities in terms of ‘Do Nothing’ and ‘Infill /Refurbishment’ options.

4.9 Following initial review of all possible options, and viability analysis of these options, it has been determined that a viable and deliverable scheme can be achieved, subject to further detailed design work being undertaken as part of the next stage.

4.10 The outline proposals demonstrate there are significant potential benefits, in terms of delivering the Council’s objectives whilst at the same time responding to and aligning with feedback from a number of public consultation events. A summary of principles have been set out in the Proposals and Issues section of this paper which outlines works completed during RIBA Stage 0-1.
5 PROPOSAL AND ISSUES

Estate Regeneration

5.1 The Council owns the majority of the land within the redline boundary marked on the existing site plan which comprises part of the proposed estate regeneration. This includes the Council’s housing blocks on:

(a) 313 – 339 Ladbroke Grove
(b) 1-18 Burleigh House and
(c) 5 Exmoor Street.

5.2 The other ownership elements within the proposed redline are the privately owned units within the block at 341 – 351 Ladbroke Grove and the private residential leasehold interests acquired within the estate under ‘right to buy’.

5.3 Part of the existing school site which is proposed to be rationalised, in accordance with Children’s Services and the School’s requirements will also be included within the proposed residential / commercial development once consent from the Secretary of State has been obtained for appropriation / disposal of c.3200 square meters on the eastern boundary of the existing school site pursuant to Schedule 14 of the Education Act 2011 and Schedule 1 to the Academies Act 2010 as well as disposal consent for the playing fields under Section 77 of the Schools Standards and Framework Act 1998.

School Proposals

5.4 The school proposals relate to the redevelopment and expansion of Barlby Primary School to provide places for 420 pupils; 12 ASD pupils and 26 nursery places.

5.5 The current primary school main building is nearing the end of its useful life, and maintenance of it is of increasing concern as patch repairs are not long-lasting and extensive repairs would not be cost effective. That building is not appropriate for 21st century education, with spaces and shapes which make efficient and effective education difficult, and the reliance upon two other buildings is not conducive to cohesive teaching and learning and management.

5.6 The provision of a new special school providing places for 80 pupils with respite accommodation has, for some considerable time, formed a central part of Phase 2 of the Authority’s SEN Strategy. The Royal Borough has been paying substantial sums of money to independent and out-borough special schools for the education of children with autism and/or severe learning difficulties, and not all of the provision is of the desired quality. Furthermore, attendance at such provisions requires funding of often costly and socially and educationally detrimental travel, and sometimes residential accommodation which would not be necessary if the provision were local.
5.7 A local school for local children would not only reduce costs of undesirable transport and sometimes residential provision; it would also significantly improve the educational and social welfare of a good many of the affected pupils.

5.8 School design has now reached the end of RIBA Stage 2 (Concept Design) and approval is now sought, as part of this paper, to progress school design proposals based on a principle to rationalise the shared school site and to agree (in principle) that the remaining surplus school land will be offered for new housing purposes (pending receipt of a satisfactory planning consent and approval from Secretary of State) to approve these proposals.

5.9 The current design proposals have been signed off and approved by Children’s Services (subject to value engineering and affordability).

5.10 It is intended that the Council will retain ownership of the two new schools.

5.11 It is intended that the Council will fund the two new schools, to enable delivery within the required timeframes and will be subject to a financial contribution based on the value of the surplus school land, that will be offered for residential purposes (as agreed by Cabinet in October 2014). Please refer to the Confidential Part B of this paper for further information.

**School Delivery Strategy**

5.12 Children’s Services have confirmed that they would prefer, principally for educational reasons, but also for reasons of revenue cost economy, that the housing regeneration elements of the scheme be ‘de-coupled’ from the schools’ programme to enable the schools to be built at the earliest opportunity.

5.13 If Cabinet agree to deliver the schools separately, Corporate Property will lead the school delivery programme on behalf of Children’s Services. As part of the discussions involved, Corporate Property have confirmed their proposed indicative programme which is outlined below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cabinet approve decoupling and set budget for school.</td>
<td></td>
<td>21 July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirm appointment of School design team</td>
<td></td>
<td>End July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegated authority to appoint School client side and design team.</td>
<td>End July 2016</td>
<td>Early August 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review current School scheme cost plan and undertake value engineering. Agree new scope of works</td>
<td>Early August 2016</td>
<td>End Of August 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue Cabinet report requesting the full project budget for School</td>
<td>September 2016 Cabinet</td>
<td>September 2016 Cabinet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointment of contractor stage 1 (assume 2</td>
<td>September</td>
<td>November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td>Start Date</td>
<td>End Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit planning application and receive permission for new School.</td>
<td>January 2017</td>
<td>April 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIBA Stage 4 (3 months- assuming start during the planning period)</td>
<td>April 2017</td>
<td>June 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegated authority to appoint contractor stage 2</td>
<td>September 2017</td>
<td>September 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor mobilisation and confirm contract conditions</td>
<td>October 2017</td>
<td>October 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction work on new School</td>
<td>Nov 17</td>
<td>April 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.14 The key to achieving this delivery date is, once a decision has been made to de-couple the school delivery from the housing regeneration proposals, we get the client side and design teams appointed and work on the value engineering of the current scheme underway.

5.15 It is assumed that a 2 stage Design and Build procurement route for the contractor which will run concurrently with stage 3. This will provide the Council with much needed construction logistic advice, as well as the ability to market test prices at an early stage in the programme, providing further cost certainty.

5.16 Assumptions/caveats are outlined below:

- Direct appointment of design team via the RBKC Architects Framework (thereby saving 12 weeks on the programme compared to full tender exercise).
- That the Planning decision will not be called in for review by the Secretary of State or the Mayor of London for judicial review.
- That the school will be constructed whilst the existing school is occupied and that no decanting of staff or students/ or temporary accommodation is required.
- Not included: a fit out period for the school following the completion of the contractor. Once the design has been progressed through RIBA stage 3 and a contractor has been appointed we will discuss the option of a programme of beneficial access for fit out and training.

5.17 Once finalised plans have been prepared, ready for a planning application to be submitted for the new schools, consent can be obtained for the appropriation and disposal of the surplus school land. In the meantime, initial contact has already been made with the offices of the Secretary of State in order to commence dialogue and to instigate the process.

6 OPTIONS AND ANALYSIS – ESTATE REGENERATION

6.1 To date a number of wide-ranging proposals have been investigated for the regeneration of the area. These options have been (and will continue to be) rigorously tested against the Council’s publicised ambitions and objectives.
and a final preferred option will be presented for approval to Cabinet in the future (which is currently scheduled for Spring 2017).

6.2 From the initial findings, however, there appears to be a strong case for regeneration of that part of the Balfour of Burleigh and Treverton Estate within the proposed redline area and which includes the redevelopment of the Barlby Primary School. This has been demonstrated through the evaluation of the initial outputs of the options and viability appraisals and following consultation with the local planning authority and local community thus far.

6.3 A summary of the initial options analysis undertaken to date is outlined below. The performance of each option has been assessed against the Council's stated objectives, commitments to residents and other factors such as disruption to residents and the wider community.

**Option 1 – Do Nothing**

6.4 The ‘Do Nothing’ option assesses the merits and feasibility of the Council carrying out no new housing development on the Barlby / Treverton site.

6.5 It assesses the financial implications of this course of action by examining the expenditure required to maintain the estates in their current condition and well as the forecasted expenditure required to give the buildings a further 25-30 years of life.

6.6 An Asset Investment Study was undertaken on behalf of RBKC by the Tenant Management Organisation (TMO) in 2013 to calculate the Net Present Value (NPV) and to set out the forecast maintenance expenses in order to assess this option.

6.7 Emerging Conclusions:
   - As an asset in its existing condition, the Treverton Estate is a weak performer, in terms of energy efficiency and maintenance requirements.
   - Substantial capital expenditure is required to maintain the Estate as it is in both the short-term and over the next 25-30 years.
   - The option does not meet the Council’s key objectives of providing additional affordable housing and better quality homes.
   - The option would result in no disturbance to residents in comparison to options that involve new development on site.
   - The Housing Needs Survey which has been carried out has established that there is a level of overcrowding on the estates. The option therefore will not provide any solution to this overcrowding.
   - The Option is not feasible for the Barlby schools as significant investment and essential planned maintenance work is required.

**Option 2 – Infill / Refurbishment**

6.8 This option assesses the feasibility of developing units within the boundary of the estates, without demolishing any of the existing units. An infill study was
undertaken by Pollard Thomas Edwards Architects (PETA) on behalf of the TMO in 2014.

6.9 The PETA study showed potential to undertake infill development within several areas of the estates. Each infill option has been subjected to a high level review by CBRE to assess the extent to which RBKC’s objectives and commitments to tenants can be met. The options are also reviewed from a planning and financial perspective to assess the likelihood of obtaining consent and the prospects for delivery.

6.10 Emerging conclusions:
- Housing density improved but not optimised to full potential.
- As a result of the above, additional affordable housing not maximised.
- This option does not enable the Council to achieve the vision of creating the ‘Conservation Areas of the Future’ as it does not allow repair or re-planning the urban form to create the desired street pattern.
- East to west route maintained, but opportunities to improve connectivity with surrounds missed.
- Issues of poorly defined public realm and green space not addressed comprehensively.
- Loss of green space may need to be offset by improvements within the estates, including the re-provision of better quality play space where this is lost.
- Lack of comprehensive approach constrains ability to maximise height and massing, as individual blocks will be considered against the existing low rise housing on the estates.

Option 3 – Partial Redevelopment

6.11 The Partial Redevelopment option examines the merits and feasibility of redeveloping a portion of the Treverton and Balfour of Burleigh estates but keeping some of the existing buildings as they are.

6.12 In this particular case, Treverton and Raymede Towers would be retained and the remaining buildings on the estates would be redeveloped. The financial implications of this option have been assessed as well as how effective the proposed development is at achieving the Council’s stated objectives and commitments to residents.

6.13 BPTW Architects, working with RBKC produced various master plan proposals for the Partial Redevelopment option. CBRE also produced a report outlining the impact and benefits of a redevelopment proposal that leaves the towers in place. The Partial Redevelopment option has been assessed based on this information.

6.14 Emerging Conclusions:
- Creates an additional circa 250 - 350 residential units.
- Maximises delivery of additional affordable housing. Development of new market housing can cross subsidise additional affordable housing and make a financial contribution to the cost of the two new schools.
• In this option all existing secure Council tenant units will be re-provided.
• Disturbance to residents is reduced compared to a Full Redevelopment option.
• Treverton and Raymede Towers are in relatively good structural condition. However, the scheme can pay for some important improvements to the existing towers.
• In the Partial Redevelopment option, the construction programme is 2-3 years shorter than in the Full Redevelopment option resulting in lower costs for the Council and less disturbance to residents.
• Any tenants that need to be decanted can potentially be moved to their new homes in one move only. Partial redevelopment delivers more additional housing of all tenures. Providing the same or more social rented houses whilst increasing intermediate homes for the community.

Option 4 – Full Redevelopment

6.15 The Full Redevelopment option evaluates the merits and feasibility of redeveloping the entire Treverton and parts of Balfour of Burleigh estates, as shown with the existing site plan and redline boundary. This involves the demolition of all existing buildings and development of two new schools and new residential buildings in their place.

6.16 In this option, all 162 existing secure tenancy units would be reprovided in the new development.

6.17 The financial implications of this option are assessed in order to ensure the scheme is viable and the benefits to the Council are maximised.

6.18 The performance of proposed development against the Council’s stated objectives and commitments to residents is also assessed.

6.19 BPTW architects have created several master plan proposals where the entire site is redeveloped. The full Redevelopment option has been assessed based on these proposals.

6.20 Emerging Conclusions

• The Full Redevelopment option will create circa 300 new homes of which circa 140 additional.
• The Full Redevelopment option allows the most coherent and efficient master plan to be created and excellent quality homes for all current and future tenants.
• This creates better urban design for the area and increases the chances of the area becoming a ‘conservation area of the future’.
• It also has the potential to simplify construction logistics and phasing.
• If the whole site is redeveloped, 162 social rented units will have to be re-provided, as opposed to approximately 42 in the Partial Redevelopment option. The cost of re-providing these units results in little resources being left over to provide additional affordable housing.
- The total new additional affordable housing will be significantly lower than in the Partial Redevelopment option.
- The Full Redevelopment option will result in the greatest disruption to residents compared to all other options.
- As all the units would be demolished, an extensive decant programme would be required. This would result in a phased decant programme where residents might have to move temporarily / twice or be relocated off site.
- The overall construction programme would also be longer resulting in disturbance to residents over a more extensive period of time.

**Conclusions**

6.21 In order to demonstrate clarity and transparency within the Council’s assessment of each option, a RAG (Red, Amber, Green) status has been used, as outlined below;

6.22 **RED**: Fails to meet the Council’s stated objectives, commitments to residents and other factors, such as noise and disruption.

6.23 **AMBER**: Meets some of the Council’s stated objectives, commitments to residents and other factors, such as noise and disruption.

6.24 **GREEN**: Meets or exceeds the Council’s stated objectives, commitments to residents and other factors, such as noise and disruption.

6.25 Table – summary of options comparison study:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Option 1 Do Nothing</th>
<th>Option 2 Infill/Refurbishment</th>
<th>Option 3 Partial redevelopment</th>
<th>Option 4 Full redevelopment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Build new homes</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide new affordable homes</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best possible homes for existing and future tenants</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalyst for regeneration (improve health, public realm, reduce crime, more job opportunities)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.26 In high level terms and pending further design and viability appraisals, it has been shown at this stage that the Partial Redevelopment option can best meet the Council’s aspirations for this important site, and likely to be able to deliver the following:

- Additional circa 250 - 300 new homes (both affordable intermediate rent and open market).
- Re-provision of all existing RBKC social rented units (currently assumes 42 social rented units excluding the two towers).
- Ground floor and other improvements to both retained towers.
- Replacement retail / commercial units.
- Two new schools based on:
  - redevelopment and expansion of Barlby Primary School to provide places for 420 pupils; 12 ASD pupils and 26 nursery places.
  - The provision of a new special education needs school providing places for 70 – 80 pupils with respite accommodation.
- Enhanced public realm, with private and communal open spaces (including re-provision of community play and shared garden facilities)
- Improved connections and pedestrian links.

7 CONSULTATION

7.1 There have been three consultation events for residents (each event held twice) in March 2015, June 2015 and December 2015 to present the outcomes of the redevelopment options. A summary of the responses to consultation held in December 2015 is attached as Appendix B.

7.2 Regular events and public notifications will continue going forward, in order that residents and local community can continue to be consulted on all options before the Cabinet takes a decision on the preferred option for estate regeneration. Residents will be informed of the Council’s planned consultation and decision making programme and timetable and feedback to each consultation will be provided at each interval of the next phase of work.

7.3 A summary of consultation feedback and FAQs appear on the Council’s website.
7.4 A Housing Needs Survey has also been undertaken over a 10 week period to assess residents housing needs in greater detail which will assist the Council in considering the options during next stage.

7.5 Consultation on the disposal and or change of use of the playing fields on the school site will need to be undertaken before application for the relevant consent is made to the Secretary of State.

8 EQUALITY IMPLICATIONS

8.1 It will be necessary to carry out an Equality Impact Assessment should a decision to redevelop be taken in the future and in advance of that decision being implemented.

8.2 During the next phase of work consideration will be made of which of the following groups may be directly or indirectly impacted by any proposals. An initial screening of groups requiring consideration is shown below:

8.3 Older households may find the prospect of a move from a long settled home extremely daunting and this will require a sensitive approach from officers dealing with re-housing. Older households may also require more practical help with moving and a package of appropriate assistance will be developed and made available. In addition, older households may wish to be re-housed near to neighbours, friends of relatives who provide support and these considerations will be taken into account when arranging alternative housing. Some older people may have had adaptations carried out to their homes due to restricted mobility and these will be replicated in the new homes in advance of any individual being asked to move in.

8.4 Households with children: Proximity to schools will be taken into account where considering re-housing for families with school aged children. In addition, where there are children with special needs or a disability, adaptations may be required to the new property and these will be assessed at an early stage and carried out before occupation. Remaining near to support mechanisms may also be particularly important to these families. Moving home may be particularly stressful and so it is likely to be desirable to enable these families to have to move only once.

8.5 Disability: Those residents with an existing physical disability and an adapted property will have suitable adaptations made to their new home in advance of being required to move. Overall any new development will have a positive effect as any new properties would meet lifetime homes standards and 10% of any new properties would be wheelchair adaptable.

8.6 Gender: Unlikely to have any impact.

8.7 Gender reassignment: Unlikely to have any impact.

8.8 Marriage and Civil Partnership: Unlikely to have any impact.
8.9 **Pregnancy and maternity**: Where a member of the household is pregnant at the time they are required to move, and the sex of the unborn child is known, any additional bedroom requirement will be taken into account when allocating the new home.

8.10 **Race**: Some residents may not have English as a first language. Where this is identified translation and interpretation services will be supplied in line with the Council’s Translation and Interpretation Service Policy.

8.11 **Religion/belief**: Where a resident’s religion or belief requires design adaptations to a property these will be taken into account wherever it is reasonable to do so.

8.12 **Sex**: Unlikely to have any impact.

8.13 **Sexual Orientation**: Unlikely to have any impact.

8.14 **Other considerations**: Some residents will be affected by the new Housing and Planning Bill 2016, Pay to Stay (if they are in employment).

8.15 Majority of the occupants of split households are under the age of 35yrs. If accommodation is offered on the new development or elsewhere, they will be affected by the LHA (if they are not in employment).

8.16 The Council will also consult local organisations and other key stakeholders in relation to equalities to ensure that any relevant matters are identified and dealt with, prior to commencement of any works.

9 **PROCUREMENT PROCESS**

**Appointment of New Design Team**

9.1 A bespoke framework is currently being procured for the Royal Borough for architectural design services and associated professional consultancy services. The Framework will operate for a maximum of four years, to a maximum value of approximately 200 million pounds.

9.2 It is envisaged that the Council’s capital projects and wider housing and regeneration schemes can use this service to commission architects, wider design teams and associated professional consultants.

9.3 The Framework operates via two functions: direct call-off and mini-competition. Direct call-off will be used generally for smaller, more urgent projects or pieces of work, possibly early stage options and feasibilities. An individual supplier would be called-off to provide specific services detailed at the outset. A mini-competition would tend to be used for projects or wider schemes of greater complexity and value. All suppliers would be invited to submit proposals to the competition, terms of which would be detailed at the outset of each competition.
9.4 The Framework will commence from mid July 2016 onwards, within the region of 8-10 suppliers.

9.5 The procurement of the Framework includes an element of a design contest - meaning that Tenderers can be judged and selected on their architectural design abilities. Procurement began in March 2016 with issue of OJEU Notice and request for registration of interest and return of a Pre-Qualification Questionnaire. Interest was strong and varied, with over 151 questionnaires returned. These were reviewed, scored and shortlisted. This resulted in a list of 16no tenderers. These 16 were then invited to the next stage - invitation to participate in negotiation. This is made up of Initial Tender, Negotiation meetings and confirmation of Final Tender, along with the submission of an entry or proposal for the Design Contest. If the Tender elements are satisfactorily completed, then the Tenderer is able to have its entry judged. The Design Contest is the ultimate stage which decides the scoring and ranking of the Tenderers, and therefore selection of Suppliers to the Framework.

9.6 15no Tenderers submitted an Initial Tender, and Negotiation meetings complete by 23 June 2016.

9.7 A design brief for the Barlby/ Treverton scheme was issued in early June - requesting that Tenderers respond to the master planning / urban design and provide architectural design elements and approach. Entries were received on Tuesday, 28 June. Entries are currently being reviewed, with scores and ranking completed by early July. Formal notifications will be issued on w/c 4 July onwards, along with the Winner of the Design Contest. With standstill period, the Framework will commence from mid July. At this point the Winner of Barlby Treverton will be called-off and detailed scope/ brief re-confirmed, with the chosen Supplier providing back confirmation of fees, design team and proposals.

9.8 Therefore, to enable the redevelopment options to be further developed Cabinet approval is sought to delegate authority to the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Housing, Property and Regeneration to progress appointment of a new design team up to and including RIBA Stage 2 of the design process, via the RBKC architectural framework, in order to develop master plan proposals for the housing land, surplus school land and the private interest block. This will assist the Council with developing and selecting an eventual preferred scheme.

9.9 This procurement exercise was directed by legal representatives, Sharpe Pritchard and undertaken in accordance with the Public Contracts Regulations 2015.

10  PLANNING IMPLICATIONS

10.1 The Executive Director, Planning and Borough Development recognises the significant potential the area has for providing improved or new homes and public realm which together could contribute to housing need, improving the
urban fabric of the borough and acting as a catalyst for other regeneration in the area.

10.2 The opportunity to progress appraisal of options and then embed the Council’s preferred approach in the Local Plan Review should be taken to ensure that the new Local Plan fully reflects the Council’s spatial aspirations for the area, appraisal and analysis work is not duplicated and the Council positively plans for the new housing it is required to provide to contribute to its own local need and that of wider of London.

10.3 The costs of the local planning authority fully engaging in this phase of the project should also be fully covered in the project costings, rather than from revenue budgets, as they would be for other developments of this scale promoted by other landowners.

10.4 The total fee for this would be £120k and if Cabinet agree that the school should be decoupled from the estate regeneration, then this is likely to increase the planning (LPA) cost as effectively this will be two separate work streams.

10.5 Strategic Developments Team Leader:- Alison Flight,
Alison.flight@rbkc.gov.uk
Tel: 020 7361 2084

11 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

11.1 Secretary of State’s consent is required pursuant to Schedule 14 of the Education Act 2011 and Schedule 1 to the Academies Act 2010 for the appropriation and disposal of that part of the school site which is surplus to requirements and which will be brought within the proposed redevelopment as well as consent for the change of use and/or disposal of the playing fields under Section 77 of the Schools Standards and Framework Act 1998. Consultation with the relevant stakeholders on any proposals regarding the change of use/disposal of playing fields must be undertaken within one year of the application for consent.

11.2 Legal Officer:- Jennifer Muller - Jennifer.muller@rbkc.gov.uk
Tel: 0207 361 2185

12 FINANCIAL AND RESOURCES IMPLICATIONS

12.1 The newly appointed design team may need to revisit some of the design proposals, surveys and investigations. Following the appointment of the new design team, a review of potential costs will be undertaken which may result in a budgetary increase being required.

12.2 Housing Finance – Group Manager:- Steve Mellor –
steve.mellor@rbkc.gov.uk
Tel: 0207 361 2370
12.3  Corporate Finance – Director of Corporate Finance and Systems:- Lyn Myers  
– lyn.myers@rbkc.gov.uk  
Tel: 0207 361 2370

Local Government Act 1972 (as amended)  
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Director of Housing

Richard Egan  
Interim Director of Corporate Property Services

Ian Heggs  
Tri-borough Director of Schools Commission

Contact officer  
Paul Tsangarakis  
Senior Project Manager  
Housing Strategy and Regeneration  
020 7361 3497  
paul.tsangarakis@rbkc.gov.uk
PRESENT

Cabinet Members

Councillor Nicholas Paget-Brown (Leader of the Council), Chairman
Councillor Rock Feilding-Mellen (Deputy Leader, Housing, Property and Regeneration)
Councillor Tim Ahern (Environment, Environmental Services and Leisure)
Councillor Elizabeth Campbell (Family and Children’s Services)
Councillor Timothy Coleridge (Planning Policy, Transport and Arts)
Councillor Gerard Hargreaves (Civil Society)
Councillor Warwick Lightfoot (Finance and Strategy)
Councillor Mary Weale (Adult Social Care and Public Health)
Councillor Emma Will (Education and Libraries)

Other Members in attendance

Councillor Mason (Chairman, Cabinet and Corporate Services Scrutiny Committee)
Councillor Rossi (Chairman, Public Realm Scrutiny Committee)

PART A (PUBLIC) MINUTES

A1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillor Paul Warrick.

A2. MEMBERS’ DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Weale declared a non pecuniary interest in agenda item A12, as she is a governor of St Mary Abbots School.

A3. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 23 JUNE 2016

The minutes of the meeting held on 23 June 2016 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman, subject to the following amendment to the minutes of the meeting held on 26 May 2016 –

A6. APPROVAL OF RBKC’S PARKS STRATEGY 2016 TO 2025 – 04814

Delete "Members commented on .......the proposals to use the Friends of Holland Park for commercial activity;..." and replace with “Members commented on .......the proposals, and welcomed the Friends' will to fund appropriate projects”.
A4. REVENUE AND CAPITAL OUTTURN 2015-16 - KD04820

This paper reported the 2015-16 outturn spending on revenue and capital compared to the 2015-16 budget. Revenue budgets have underspent by £14.5 million and the capital programme has underspent by £35.9 million.

RESOLVED – Cabinet

(i) noted the General Fund underspend of £14.5 million for 2015-16;

(ii) noted the General Fund working balance of £10 million – the Council’s agreed minimum;

(iii) noted the capital outturn of £47.9 million which resulted in an underspend of £35.9 million of which £35 million is carried forward to 2016-17 and beyond (slippage); and

(iv) agreed to delegate authority to the Town Clerk (Section 151 Officer) to amend the outturn position or reserve transfers if changes are agreed as part of the Council’s annual external audit of the Statement of Accounts.

Reasons for the decision

This is substantially a ‘for information’ report.

Action by: TC

A5. BUDGET MONITORING 2016-17 QUARTER 1 OVERVIEW – KD04821

Cabinet approval was sought to agree budget virements and/or transfers to/from reserves as outlined in the report.

RESOLVED – Cabinet

(i) noted the financial position as set out for the whole authority in paragraph 5 and Annex I and for the individual services in appendices 1-10; and

Corporate Services

(ii) confirmed the inclusion of the ‘acquisition of private property interests – Barlby Treverton site and Barlby Primary School redevelopment’ in the 2016-17 capital programme. This key decision was approved by Cabinet in July 2015.

Reasons for the decision

The services report quarterly on the budgeted versus actual forecast year-end position to Cabinet. Though mainly for information, the report does if required, set out requests for in-year budget and funding changes.

Action by: TC
A6. REVIEW OF THE TEMPORARY CLOSURE OF THAMESBROOK - RESPONSE TO WORKING PARTY REPORT

This report provided Cabinet with a response to the recommendations of the Working Party report on the review of the temporary closure of Thamesbrook.

RESOLVED – Cabinet noted the contents of the Thamesbrook Nursing Home Working Party Report setting out responses to the recommendations.

Reasons for the decision

This is the formal response to the recommendations set out in the joint review by the Adult Social Care and Health Scrutiny Committee and the Housing and Property Scrutiny Committee.

Action by: DCP

A7. BARLBY/TREVERTON REGENERATION: OPTIONS APPRAISAL AND NEXT STEPS - KD04808

This report updated Cabinet on current progress and the emerging conclusions from the Options Appraisal stage, and sought agreement to next steps and way forward.

Councillor Feilding-Mellen introduced the report and the options appraisal undertaken, which show a growing case for the partial redevelopment option. He advised that they were confident that the locations of the two schools could be fixed within the site and recommended that the programme for the two schools is decoupled from the housing. This would enable the schools to be delivered to the Council’s own timescales.

Members were pleased with the proposals and that all options were still under consideration, recognising the Council’s need to plan positively for new housing in the borough and to meet its housing target of 10,995 new homes over the next 15 years.

RESOLVED – Cabinet

(i) agreed that based on initial options appraisal undertaken there appears to be a compelling case for regeneration: in particular, the partial redevelopment option (retaining the two towers) can deliver on the Council’s objectives, be viable and result in least disturbance to residents;

(ii) agreed that all the options (including ‘do nothing’, ‘infill/refurbishment’, and ‘redevelopment’) should be further investigated and consulted on with local residents and other stakeholders with the view to selecting a preferred option/scheme that can best meet the Council’s objectives for the site;
(iii) agreed to move to the next stage of design options for redevelopment by appointing a new design team through the RBKC Architects Framework, and to delegate authority to the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Housing, Property and Regeneration to appoint the design team following completion of the tender process;

(iv) agreed to facilitate and advance negotiations with leaseholders, freeholders and private interests within the redline area on a private treaty basis, based upon Open Market Value plus compensation in line with statutory guidelines prior to any CPO designation being approved;

(v) agreed to offer a Shared Equity scheme for resident leaseholders within the redline area which will enable those eligible to consider whether they wish to acquire a replacement home within any redevelopment scheme. However, the details of the scheme itself are subject to further viability testing and separate Cabinet approval of the finalised basis of this offer at a later date;

(vi) agreed the schools funding strategy, details of which are presented in the exempt Part B of the report;

(vii) agreed to ‘de-couple’ the design and delivery of the schools from the overall estate regeneration proposals and proceed with design, and submit planning application for the schools, in order that the school element can be delivered separately by the Council and to their own timescales;

(viii) delegated authority to the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Housing, Property and Regeneration, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Education, to appointment a new design team to undertake the remaining design development of the two new schools via the RBKC Architects Framework; and

(ix) delegated authority to the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Housing, Property and Regeneration to appoint the Client Side Team for this project.

Reasons for the decision

The regeneration proposals for the area are still at a very early stage and approval of the proposals requested within the report will allow the Council to continue the process of options and financial appraisals in order to identify a ‘preferred’ option/scheme that can be agreed by Cabinet at a future date.

Action by: DH/DCP/DSC
A8. LEIGHTON HOUSE MUSEUM – PHASE III CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT UPDATE – KD04323

This report sought agreement to proceed with the two year development phase of the Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF) project for Phase 3 at Leighton House Museum and set out the fundraising strategy and timeline for implementation.

Cabinet noted the progress with the Heritage Lottery Fund application and the need to progress with the development phase of the project. The HLF grant will only part-fund the total costs of the development phase – additional match funding will need to be provided by the Council. Cabinet also noted that should a decision be made to not proceed with the HLF part funded Development Phase, funding would need to be provided by the Council. It is unlikely that Council fundraising alone would be able to generate the funds required for the project.

RESOLVED – Cabinet

(i) approved the further progression of the Phase 3 capital improvement project at Leighton House Museum allowing the two year ‘Development Phase’, as defined by the Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF), to be undertaken;

(ii) noted the fundraising approach and timeline for implementation;

(iii) agreed to delegate authority to the Town Clerk and Executive Director for Environment, Leisure and Resident’s Services to:

(a) proceed with the project through RIBA Stage 3 and on completion submit a planning application in respect of the project, and if approved to start RIBA stage 4;

(b) to enter into a contract with the Heritage Lottery Fund enabling the drawdown of funding of £337,400 in support of the Development Phase; and

(c) to submit an application to the HLF for round 2 funding on completion of the development phase, subject to the identification of sufficient match funding by the Council.

Reasons for the decision

If the Council chose not to proceed with the phase III capital improvement works, circa £1 million will need to be spent on major repairs to the Perrin Wing which should be undertaken as soon as is practically possible. Additionally, an opportunity would be missed to upgrade the house to offer a better visitor experience and increase income generating potential.

Action by: EDELRS
A9. PEMBROKE ROAD/WARWICK ROAD ESTATE – FUNDING FOR ACQUISITIONS – KD04843

This report sought approval for funding for further purchases in 2016/17 in Broadwood Terrace and Chesterton Square, and to grant delegated authority to the Cabinet Member for Housing, Property and Regeneration to agree the terms of each acquisition.

RESOLVED – Cabinet

(i) agreed funding for acquisition of additional leaseholder interests at Chesterton Square and Broadwood Terrace, in accordance with the amount set out in the exempt appendix; and

(ii) agreed to delegate authority to the Cabinet Member for Housing, Property and Regeneration to agree the terms of each acquisition.

Reasons for the decision

The reason for seeking additional funding is that the Council has made a commitment to purchase residential leaseholder interests from owners who wish to sell their properties. Having regard to negotiations in hand, further funding is required to facilitate additional purchases in 2016/17.

Action by: DCPS

A10. CHELSEA SPORTS CENTRE WET SIDE IMPROVEMENTS – KD04845

This report sought a decision to award the contract for major refurbishment works to the wet side changing rooms and pool hall at Chelsea Sports Centre.

Cabinet noted a petition presented to the Council with 426 signatories and the following prayer - ‘We, the undersigned, strongly object to the proposals to convert the changing-rooms at the Chelsea Pool into a “unisex village” of individual cubicles and shared shower facilities. We believe that no regard has been shown for the unique character of the Chelsea Pool so cherished by its community of regular swimmers. The camaraderie and support that has long-flourished in the relaxed atmosphere of open, same-sex changing rooms will be lost, and with it the invaluable social function that the Chelsea Pool fulfils beyond its function as a swimming pool’.

Councillor Ahern outlined the improvement works to the changing rooms and pool hall proposed in the report, and the background to this decision. He drew attention to the petition which records the strength of feeling at the loss of the single sex changing rooms, and the addendum (agenda item A10b) which refers to late responses to the consultation.

Members agreed that the current facilities were unsuitable and recognised the various advantages of the village change arrangement. The quality and style of the facilities will be much improved and will address some of the fundamental issues with the current configuration. They will provide more
space; the changing rooms and pool hall will be easier to manage; and in terms of cleaning, will be easier to patrol. Members acknowledged the concerns raised by users during the consultation and in the petition, noting that officers have responded to a number of these concerns and have made amendments to the proposals as a result. Nevertheless, this was an impressive scheme and would provide excellent, much needed facilities for the wet side changing rooms and pool hall.

RESOLVED – Cabinet

(i) approved option 3 (as detailed in the report). This option requires the Council to set aside the capital sum of £1,700,000 for the completion of this project; and

(ii) approved for the Council to enter into a Works Agency Agreement with Greenwich Leisure Limited thereby providing a contractual commitment for the expenditure, and also authorised the Head of Leisure Services to exercise all powers of the Council under the contract.

Reasons for the decision

A Cabinet decision is required to approve the capital expenditure and the procurement and delivery strategy for this project. A Cabinet decision is also required to approve the Works Agency Agreement with Greenwich Leisure Limited.

Action by: EDELRS

A11. GRANT OF NEW LEASES AT FOUR SITES TO THE CONTRACTED SERVICE PROVIDER OF EARLY YEARS CHILDCARE – KD04844

This report sought approval to the Council granting 4Children leases at each respective site on the terms outlined in the exempt appendix.

RESOLVED – Cabinet approved terms agreed for the grant of leases to 4Children at St. Quintin, Clare Gardens, Cheyne and Violet Mitchell. The terms are outlined in the exempt appendix.

Reasons for the decision

The subject sites are required to support 4Children in delivery of the contract. The leases will grant the contractor formal rights to occupy and use the properties for delivery of the contract.

Action by: DCPS
A12. ST MARY ABBOTS CHURCH: REPAIR OF BOUNDARY WALL TO CHURCH GARDENS/ST MARY ABBOTS SCHOOL/DRAYSON MEWS – KD04798

This report sought authority to enter into a contract for works, and secondly proceed with works to repair the boundary wall at St Mary Abbots Church, subject to agreement on recovery of costs from the Church.

Councillor Weale declared a non pecuniary interest as a governor of St Mary Abbots School.

RESOLVED – Cabinet

(i) approved spend against an existing approved capital bid by entering into a contract with Core Construction for the repair and rebuilding of the boundary wall between St Mary Abbots Garden/St Mary Abbots School and Drayson Mews on the terms set out in the exempt appendix; and

(ii) noted that the Cabinet member for Facilities Management and Procurement Policy under his delegated authority will be asked to approve the Council entering into a contract for further required repairs to the Church wall and railings facing Kensington Church Street once he extent and cost of those works are fully understood.

Action by: DCPS

A13. KENSINGTON TOWN HALL REPLACEMENT OF BOILERS AND CHP – KD04800

This report sought approval to undertake a project to replace the boilers and to investigate the feasibility of also installing a combined heat and power unit (CHP) at Kensington Town Hall.

RESOLVED – Cabinet

(i) approved the requested funding for the undertaking of the Kensington Town Hall Boilers and CHP Project. The estimated cost of the works will be £1,000,000;

(ii) approved the appointment of Ingleton Wood as the Professional Services Team to conduct design, specification production, a tendering exercise, construction management and enabling works for the Replacement of Boiler Plant and including a CHP unit at Kensington Town Hall; and

(iii) noted that the expenditure of the remaining funds will be approved by the Cabinet Member for Facilities Management and Procurement Policy by way of key decisions, in accordance with the exempt appendix.

Action by: DCPS
A14. PURCHASE OF FREEHOLD INTEREST IN PROPERTY – 71-73 LOTS ROAD, CHELSEA – KD04835

This report sought approval for the Council to purchase the freehold of 71-73 Lots Road, Chelsea. The property adjoins the Council’s existing freehold interest at Lots Road depot. The terms of the acquisition are described in the exempt appendix.

RESOLVED – Cabinet

(i) agreed to the acquisition of 71-73 Lots Road; and
(ii) agreed to delegate authority for any minor alterations to the Heads of Terms to the Interim Director for Corporate Property Services in consultation with the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Housing, Property and Regeneration.

Action by: DCPS

A15. ADVERTISING HOARDING – 240 ACKLAM ROAD – KD04842

This report sought approval to the subletting of the land at 240 Acklam Road to Promomedia.

RESOLVED – Cabinet approved the subletting of the land at 240 Acklam Road to Promomedia under the terms listed in the exempt appendix.

Action by: DCPS

A16. VITAL IMPROVEMENTS (VI) – PROGRESS REPORT

This report presented progress on initiatives that make up the Vital Improvements suite.

Cabinet noted the report.

Action by: DSLS

A17. LETS START SCHEME – OUTSTANDING DEBTS – KD04837

This report summarised the level of outstanding debts arising from the Lets Start scheme, which closed in 2010. Recommendations regarding the pursuance of these debts are set out in the exempt appendix.

RESOLVED – Cabinet agreed the recommendations set out in the exempt appendix.

Action by: DH

A18. ANY OTHER ORAL OR WRITTEN PUBLIC ITEMS WHICH THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT

There were none.
A19. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC


Cabinet resolved that the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following specific items of business on the grounds that they may involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part I of Schedule 12A to the Act, as amended:

B1. EXEMPT MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 23 JUNE 2016

Public summary of the decision:

The exempt minutes of the meeting held on 23 June 2016 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

B2. BARLBY/TREVERTON REGENERATION: OPTIONS APPRAISAL AND NEXT STEPS - KD04808

Public summary of the decision:

See minute A7 above.

B3. LEIGHTON HOUSE MUSEUM – PHASE III CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT UPDATE - KD04323

Public summary of the decision:

See minute A8 above.

B4. PEMBROKE ROAD/WARWICK ROAD ESTATE – FUNDING FOR ACQUISITIONS - KD04843

Public summary of the decision:

See minute A9 above.

B5. CHELSEA SPORTS CENTRE WETSIDE IMPROVEMENTS – KD04845

Public summary of the decision:

See minute A10 above.

B6. GRANT OF NEW LEASES AT FOUR SITES TO THE CONTRACTED SERVICE PROVIDER OF EARLY YEARS CHILD CARE – KD04844

Public summary of the decision:

See minute A11 above.
B7. ST. MARY ABBOTS CHURCH: REPAIR OF BOUNDARY WALL TO CHURCH GARDENS/ST. MARY ABBOTS SCHOOL/DRAYSON MEWS – KD04798

Public summary of the decision:
See minute A12 above.

B8. KENSINGTON TOWN HALL REPLACEMENT OF BOILERS AND CHP – KD04800

Public summary of the decision:
See minute A13 above.

B9. PURCHASE OF FREEHOLD INTEREST IN PROPERTY – 71-73 LOTS ROAD, CHELSEA – KD04835

Public summary of the decision:
See minute A14 above.

B10. ADVERTISING HOARDING, 240 ACKLAM ROAD – KD04842

Public summary of the decision:
See minute A15 above.

B11. LETS START SCHEME – OUTSTANDING DEBTS – KD04837

Public summary of the decision:
See minute A17 above.

The meeting ended at 7.10pm
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Introduction and brief

Pollard Thomas Edwards architects (PTEa) were invited by Kensington and Chelsea Tenants Management Organisation (K&CTMO) in October 2013 to review the Treverton Estate, North Kensington. K&CTMO is working with a panel of architects to assess the potential of its current estates and assets.

By reviewing a range of local authority owned estates, the Borough of Kensington and Chelsea intend to both improve existing housing stock and create additional new housing in the borough. In particular, a demand for middle-income housing has been identified, to bridge the gap between the very wealthy and poorer neighbourhoods that make up this area of North Kensington, and the borough in general.

Treverton and Raymede Towers have refurbishment work scheduled in approximately 5 years time. Therefore if an appraisal of options can be established at this stage, then it will be possible to coordinate this with future planned maintenance. The project brief is primarily to identify infill to the existing estate. However, through a subsequent meeting with K&CTMO, it was agreed to also review future capacity of the site with complete demolition, and rebuilding.

Our architectural brief is to broadly review the site with a view to identifying future development sites. Through future development, it may be possible to generate income that would fund refurbishment of existing buildings and external improvements.

The proposals are grouped:
- small infill sites
- infill with partial demolition
- total redevelopment of the site

Pollard Thomas Edwards architects (PTEa) is a London practice committed to making our towns and cities better places to live in. PTEa offers a unique combination of commercial acumen, design talent and social commitment. Our rigorous, questioning approach produces design solutions that are intelligent, imaginative and which add value and joy. We work closely and collaboratively with our clients, to forge fruitful long term relationships. We place great importance not only on the way that buildings look, but also on the way that they are made, the way they are used and their graceful ageing. PTEa combines high quality design with explicit social purpose, and marries an understanding of whole community needs with an acute commercial instinct.
The Treverton Estate is located to the east of Ladbroke Grove, about 10 minutes north of the underground station. The estate adjoins Barby School, a low rise 20th century building accessed via Treverton Street. To the south, is the Balfour of Burleigh estate; three storey homes set back from Bruce Close, with mature landscaped hedges and trees. Parking and playspaces are laid out in courtyards created by blocks that face St Charles Square further south.

Hewer Street forms part of the southern boundary. The boundary is formed by the rear wall of residential buildings that have been created from substantial 19th century industrial buildings, and a small terrace of new houses. Many of these buildings have windows (often obscured or guarded) on the boundary of the Treverton estate site. Historic maps show how Hewer Street continued to meet Ladbroke Grove before the building of the estate.
Site photos

1. View looking towards Treverton Street
2. Shops on Ladbroke Grove
3. Treverton and Raymeade Towers
4. Play areas within the estate
5. Play area to the rear of Ladbroke Grove
6. Bins have no storage
7. Basement access
8. Garages limit access to gardens beyond
9. Pedestrian route from Ladbroke Grove
10. The rear of Hewer Street adjoins the estate
11. Hewer Street
12. New homes on Hewer Street
13. Hewer Street is walled off from the estate
14. Hospital buildings on Exmoor Street
15. Ladbroke Grove looking north
16. Residential building conversions on Hewer Street
17. Hewer Street

Surrounding Streets
Historic maps

1870
1870 MAP SHOW THE AREA BEFORE ANY BUILDING DEVELOPMENT. ONLY PORTOBELLO LANE (NOW ROAD) EXISTS CROSSING FIELDS.

1915 - 1916
MAP SHOWS THE VICTORIAN STREETS SET OUT AROUND ST CHARLES SQUARE, THE CONVENT AND INFIRMARY

1954 - 1955
1950s MAP SHOWING THE STREETS TO BE DEMOLISHED FOR THE TREVERTON ESTATE
Analysis of existing site

Constraints

- poorly laid out external areas
- multiple routes and paths for vehicles and pedestrians
- garages and parking at Raymede Tower cut-off pedestrian access to the landscaped areas
- very close and dense neighbours – particularly to south west of site on Hewer Street
- Towers have no clear routes to entrances at base
- Ladbroke Grove flats turn their back on the estate

Opportunities

- central location with 10-15 minute walk to Ladbroke Grove underground. PTAL rating is 4-5
- established community
- tower blocks have architectural qualities and are well maintained
- large areas of open space around the two towers could be redesigned to improve their use

Observations

- the majority of homes are small (1 and 2 bedroom flats)
- no private gardens
- low take up of parking and garages
- relatively low numbers of leaseholders
- well maintained public realm with high quality play spaces

Legend

- Estate Boundary
- Block Boundary

OS map extract Crown Copyright. Reproduction in whole or in part is prohibited without prior permission of Ordnance Survey License reference number LA086460 2013
Infill opportunities

Infill of site 01

Options A and B

We identified site 01 as the first potential area of land that could accommodate a new building. The existing road winds around to the north of Treverton Tower, but is then blocked at the Exmoor Street junction. Two areas of open space, one to the north of the road and one to the south of the towers are defined by the road layout.

Both are laid out with planting, but neither has easily accessible useable gardens for residents, neither are there any private outdoor spaces at ground floor.

If this road was realigned to the south of the tower, a site could be created by the reorganisation of the landscape and playground areas. A north-south orientated terrace of houses or block of flats could redefine the western edge of the landscaped areas and create a private garden area for the flats at 5 Exmoor Street.
Infill of site 02

**Option C**

The area to the north of Treverton Tower currently is laid out as access road and garages. By realigning the road, and reorganising car parking elsewhere, this land could be used for a small new residential building.

The small block proposed reconnects the existing tower to the street and forms an arrival courtyard for the estate.

Architecturally, it is aligned with the tower, but disconnected so that the tower remains a separate building.

Substantial landscaping and reorganisation of the entrance areas and parking would accompany this option.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPTION C - FLATS ADJACENT TO TREVERTON TOWER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Storey Flats</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Schedule of Accommodation - proposed options A-G**

**Treverton Estate (including Exmoor Street)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Options A</th>
<th>Options B</th>
<th>Options C</th>
<th>Options D</th>
<th>Options E</th>
<th>Options F</th>
<th>Options G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEW BUILD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>unit area (Sq m)</strong></td>
<td>110</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>number of units</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HR</strong></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NIA</strong></td>
<td>880</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>1540</td>
<td>1032</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>1070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GIA</strong></td>
<td>880</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>1540</td>
<td>1032</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>1070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>rent</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>lease</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>1284</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Development Appraisal**

This is a simple comparison of costs and surpluses - refer to notes for clarifications of assumptions.
## Infill of site 03

### Options D and E

The area to the north of Raymede Tower was initially considered for infill. The proposed option D expands the redevelopment site by proposing the demolition of 8 flats at 339 Ladbroke Grove. This creates a larger site that can be designed to address Treverton Street and create a visual connection to Raymede Tower. A six-storey flat block is proposed that creates an entrance courtyard to Raymede Tower.

Option E follows this principle but replaces the entire Ladbroke Grove frontage.

Rebuilding the whole of the Ladbroke Grove elevation offers several benefits to the Treverton Estate:

- these homes are walk-up blocks with small flats or maisonettes
- there is commercial value associated with a Ladbroke Grove address
- this area currently has the lowest density within the estate
- higher quality non-residential space for shops or community uses could be built at ground floor
- new buildings would have limited impact on the towers, which would retain their architectural quality
- this option has limited impact on the landscaped areas of the estate

The addition of new flats (with the demolition of up to 20 older flats and maisonettes) creates opportunities to offer new homes to existing residents, or change the tenure of parts of the estate.

Specific tenure groups discussed with K&C TMO were:

- older residents – possibly in one of the towers
- middle income groups, with a shared ownership tenure
- introduction of private sale homes to generate revenue

### Schedule of Accommodation - proposed options A-G

#### Infill of site 03

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>1 bed flat (2HR)</th>
<th>2 bed flat (3HR)</th>
<th>3 bed flat (5HR)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### OPTIONS A-G

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>1 bed flat (2HR)</th>
<th>2 bed flat (3HR)</th>
<th>3 bed flat (5HR)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### SURPLUS (sales values minus total development cost)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Surplus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>-£570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>£500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>£700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>£500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>£400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>£500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>£700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Commentary

- The addition of new flats (with the demolition of up to 20 older flats and maisonettes) creates opportunities to offer new homes to existing residents, or change the tenure of parts of the estate.
- Specific tenure groups discussed with K&C TMO were:
  - older residents – possibly in one of the towers
  - middle income groups, with a shared ownership tenure
  - introduction of private sale homes to generate revenue
- Rebuilding the whole of the Ladbroke Grove elevation offers several benefits to the Treverton Estate:
  - these homes are walk-up blocks with small flats or maisonettes
  - there is commercial value associated with a Ladbroke Grove address
  - this area currently has the lowest density within the estate
  - higher quality non-residential space for shops or community uses could be built at ground floor
  - new buildings would have limited impact on the towers, which would retain their architectural quality
  - this option has limited impact on the landscaped areas of the estate
Redevelopment opportunities
Option F/G

Following a meeting with K&c TMO, the architect’s brief was expanded to consider total redevelopment. This option was to be considered as a more radical move to improve the quality of peoples’ homes and reintegrate this neighbourhood into the historic street fabric of North Kensington.

The homes within Raymede and Treverton Towers would be reprovided in a predominantly six storey redevelopment. Two layouts are proposed:
- option G has some houses as well as flats but less green space
- option F is all flats, but with two substantial green open spaces

The relative densities and overall flat numbers are similar (213 and 215 respectively), giving an uplift of over 70 new dwellings, after reprovision has been considered.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPTION F</th>
<th>1 bed flat (2HR)</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>66</th>
<th>132</th>
<th>3300</th>
<th>3950</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 bed flat (3HR)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>8470</td>
<td>10164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 bed flat (5HR)</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>2236</td>
<td>2683.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>14006</td>
<td>16807.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPTION G</th>
<th>1 bed flat (2HR)</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>120</th>
<th>3000</th>
<th>3600</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 bed flat (3HR)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>9030</td>
<td>10836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 bed flat (5HR)</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 bed house (5HR)</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>2860</td>
<td>2860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>14890</td>
<td>17296</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Development Appraisal

This is a simple comparison of costs and surpluses - refer to notes for clarifications of assumptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SALES</th>
<th>sales area (based on surplus accommodation)</th>
<th>£7,560,960.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OPTION A</td>
<td>£1,452,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPTION B</td>
<td>£4,237,200.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPTION C</td>
<td>£2,118,600.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPTION D</td>
<td>£11,002,200.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPTION E</td>
<td>£27,731,880.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPTION F</td>
<td>£48,417,638.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPTION G</td>
<td>£50,435,040.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COSTS</th>
<th>Construction, £1650/sqm of total built GIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OPTION A</td>
<td>£1,452,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPTION B</td>
<td>£4,237,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPTION C</td>
<td>£2,118,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPTION D</td>
<td>£11,002,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPTION E</td>
<td>£27,731,880.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPTION F</td>
<td>£28,538,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPTION G</td>
<td>£28,538,400.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surplus (sales values minus total development cost)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OPTION A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPTION B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPTION C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPTION D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPTION E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPTION F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example if options are combined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPTION A, C, E</th>
<th>£5,516,121.60 + £6,283,382.40 + £22,265,136.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL TOTAL</td>
<td>£34,064,640.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3D MASSING MODEL
Neighbouring sites

For this study our focus has been on the land within the Treverton Estate site. However, a future study may look at the areas to the north and south of the estate.

To the north, Barlby School is a 20th century building, predominantly 1-2 storeys high. The school buildings sit within an extensive playground to the south. The Balfour of Burleigh estate is a 1950’s local authority estate comprising low rise flat buildings facing St Charles Street and Bruce Close.

Either or both of these sites could be included within the area for redevelopment. This would create further opportunities for new homes to be created. By creating a larger site for redevelopment, it may be possible to incorporate larger open spaces, a better road layout and high quality modern homes.

To the east of Ladbroke Grove, the Wornington Road area is being redeveloped by Catalyst Housing Group. The later stages of this redevelopment could influence how development of the Treverton Estate proceeds.
Schedules and Development Appraisal

The full schedules for each option are shown in the table below. The overall numbers of habitable rooms and development areas are shown for each option.

We have made a simple financial comparison between surplus areas (after homes lost through demolition are counted) to provide an initial development appraisal.

Notes
- for the purposes of the schedule all 2 bedroom flats are shown at 70 sq m, for a four person flat to meet London Housing design Guide. this could be amended to show a mix of three person and four person in future.
- sales values are estimated at £800 - £850 per square foot, based on a two bedroom flat price of minimum £600,000
- construction costs are estimated at £1500 - £1650 per square metre,
- development costs at 20% include all associated fees, planning, consultants etc
- financial costs are not included
- no allowances to buy out leaseholders, but we have replaced these homes.

For the infill schemes, a combination of options can be chosen, leading to different total numbers for the redeveloped site. See opposite for massing diagrams.

We have taken the worst limits of the sales and construction values.

### Development Appraisal

This is a simple comparison of costs and surpluses - refer to notes for clarifications of assumptions.

### Options A-G

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options A-G</th>
<th>New Build</th>
<th>Demolition</th>
<th>Surplus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>unit area (sq m)</td>
<td>number of units</td>
<td>HR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option A</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 bed house (5HR)</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option B</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 bed flat (2HR)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 bed flat (3HR)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option C</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 bed flat (2HR)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 bed flat (3HR)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option D</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 bed flat (2HR)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 bed flat (3HR)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 bed flat (5HR)</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option E</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 bed flat (2HR)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 bed flat (3HR)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 bed flat (5HR)</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option F</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 bed flat (2HR)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 bed flat (3HR)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 bed flat (5HR)</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option G</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 bed flat (2HR)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 bed flat (3HR)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 bed house (5HR)</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Development Appraisal

This is a simple comparison of costs and surpluses - refer to notes for clarifications of assumptions.

- **Sales area (based on surplus accommodation)**
  - 880
  - 2140
  - 1070
  - 1686
  - 4300
  - 4986
  - 5870

- **Sales values (NIA of surplus x £800/sq ft)**
  - £7,560,960.00
  - £18,386,880.00
  - £9,193,440.00
  - £36,945,600.00
  - £42,839,712.00
  - £50,435,040.00

- **Sales costs at 4%**
  - £302,438.40
  - £735,475.20
  - £367,737.60
  - £1,477,824.00
  - £1,713,588.48
  - £2,017,401.60

- **Subtotal**
  - £7,258,521.60
  - £17,651,404.80
  - £8,825,702.40
  - £35,467,776.00
  - £41,126,123.52
  - £48,417,638.40

- **Costs**
  - Construction, £1650/sqm of total built GIA
    - £1,452,000.00
    - £4,237,200.00
    - £2,118,600.00
    - £11,002,200.00
    - £27,731,880.00
    - £28,538,400.00

  - Development costs 20%
    - £290,400.00
    - £847,440.00
    - £423,720.00
    - £2,200,440.00
    - £5,546,376.00
    - £5,707,680.00

  - Total development cost subtotal
    - £1,742,400.00
    - £5,084,640.00
    - £2,542,320.00
    - £13,202,640.00
    - £33,278,256.00
    - £34,246,080.00

- **Surplus (sales values minus total development cost)**
  - £5,516,121.60
  - £12,566,764.80
  - £6,283,382.40
  - £22,265,136.00
  - £7,847,867.52
  - £14,171,558.40

Example if options are combined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option A, C, E</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Overall Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£5,516,121.60</td>
<td>£6,283,382.40</td>
<td>£14,800,504.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3D Massing Models of Combined Options to Show Combined Development Options

**Option E Combined with Option A**

**Option C and D**

DENSITY CALCULATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Area</th>
<th>1.227 ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Option A**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Hab Rooms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Option B**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Hab Rooms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Option C**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Hab Rooms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Option D**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Hab Rooms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Option E**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Hab Rooms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Option F**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Hab Rooms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Option G**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Hab Rooms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guideline Density (London Plan)**

- 55-225 units/ha
- 200-700 hr/ha
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KCTMO Asset Management Strategy – Programme Planning and Prioritising

**Categorising for investment**

The stock condition survey data shows that over the next five years there are greater investment needs than resources available. There is therefore a need to plan and prioritise where investment should be directed first, or look at alternative options for assets that do not have a sustainable future.

In order to assist in this prioritisation, the TMO asset management strategy included an Asset Investment Framework. This starts from the objective that the HRA requires financially sustainable assets that contribute to the long term surplus of the HRA. In addition to this, assets should meet the strategic needs of RBKC; development opportunities should be identified and exploited; and assets should meet agreed quality measures.

Each item in the framework can be used as a trigger that would lead to a more detailed review and options appraisal, in order for a decision on the long term future of the asset to be made.

The TMO has completed an NPV review for all groups of assets. NPVs have been calculated on the back of all forecast expenditure and rental income over a 30 year period. It has used this information to categorise all assets into groups based on their performance. The weakest performers have been prioritised for options appraisals and referred to RBKC to determine their long term future. These properties are not currently included in the long term capital programme, and will not be until firm decisions are made about their future. Asset groups that have been identified as having significant development or regeneration potential have not been included in the planned programme. They will not be included until the options appraisals are completed by RBKC.

**Using stock condition data for programme planning**

The stock condition information shows a high level summary of when components are due to be replaced based on a surveyors assessment or a known installation date. Each component has an assumed life cycle (e.g. 20 years for a kitchen) and this is used to calculate a year in which it is due for replacement. This is then used to produce a forecast giving an estimate of the costs of programmes.

The data shows the TMO where it should focus its investment and where work is likely to be required. The TMO targets properties which have the highest investment need (by both value of the works and proportion of component failures) and groups these into geographic areas that become the focus for programmes. The TMO tries to combine all external works into one period wherever possible, as this prevents repeatedly erecting scaffolding and lowers the cost overall.

The stock condition data is not the planned programme and just because a component is showing as due for replacement due to it being at the end of its lifecycle, it does not mean it has to be replaced. Rather it is signalling to the TMO that it might need replacing, and doing it at the due date or around that time will reduce responsive repairs and the likelihood of failure.
Before a property can be put into a planned programme a validation survey is carried out. If replacement is not required then a new renewal date is put into the stock condition database and the forecast can be updated.

Where estates are not being planned into programmes because they have been identified for options appraisals or for regeneration, it may be prudent to survey key items that are forecast to need replacement in the near future to confirm the condition of these items and whether any interim work is required to prevent them from failing.
Treverton Estate Asset Investment Summary

Introduction

This report provides a description of the forecast investment needs of Raymede and Treverton Towers at Treverton Estate. It focuses on the works that are likely to be required in order to give the buildings a potential further 25-30 years life, with works that are due in the next 1 to 5 years, and 6 to 10 years.

An NPV assessment has been carried out for this estate, which is shown below. This identifies Treverton as a weak performer where a more detailed options appraisal should be carried out in the near future. Total investment requirements over 30 years are also shown for reference.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Avg NPV</th>
<th>Total 30 year Investment Requirement</th>
<th>Avg Investment Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 Exmoor Street</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>£27,934</td>
<td>£364,280</td>
<td>£36,428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladbroke Grove 319 (A-H),329-333, 339</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>£22,354</td>
<td>£592,225</td>
<td>£37,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymede Tower 1-55</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>£5,320</td>
<td>£2,822,861</td>
<td>£53,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treverton Tower 1-55</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>£3,456</td>
<td>£2,485,533</td>
<td>£55,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treverton Total</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>£8,537</td>
<td>£6,264,899</td>
<td>£50,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Stock Total</td>
<td>6947</td>
<td>£15,129</td>
<td>£327,492,582</td>
<td>£47,142</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The works that are identified in the tables below are taken from the stock condition database and are based on the most recent external surveys; detailed surveys may identify that some of these components have a longer life (and vice versa).

Where ‘catch up’ is identified this is where works are shown as due in the current financial year as they are beyond their lifecycle already, but a survey has not been carried out to validate this. It does not necessarily mean that the item has failed but it would be advisable to plan to replace it.

Generally the works are assumed to be a like for like renewal of components, and the costs reflect this. Where upgrades are assumed this is stated. There are other options for improvements that could also be considered, and a separate cost evaluation would need to be carried out once the improvements are identified and specified.

Although works are identified as due, this does not meant the components have failed at this time – rather it is recommended that they are replaced as they are likely to fail in that time horizon. All items are repairable but over time and without replacement of the key components responsive repair costs will rise. This is particularly true of mechanical and electrical items such as the communal heating and the lifts. Failure to carry out the works will also lead to greater non-decency.

Options for improvements are described at the end of this report.
Summary of all costs

The table below is a summary of the stock condition forecast for the towers at Treverton Estate, over both 30 years and in the short term. It shows that there is an immediate forecast need for investment in some items, and then again in years 6-10. Where no cost is identified it is because there are no works shown due for that year or attribute. At present Treverton is not in a planned programme, while development options are considered.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>Catch up</th>
<th>2015-19</th>
<th>2020-24</th>
<th>2025-29</th>
<th>2030-34</th>
<th>2035-39</th>
<th>2040-44</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exmoor Street</td>
<td>£18,501</td>
<td>£92,268</td>
<td>£95,823</td>
<td>£75,531</td>
<td>£55,535</td>
<td>£48,777</td>
<td>£54,402</td>
<td>£440,837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladbroke Grove</td>
<td>£22,595</td>
<td>£1,348</td>
<td>£20,426</td>
<td>£21,737</td>
<td>£17,420</td>
<td>£9,951</td>
<td>£9,709</td>
<td>£103,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladbroke Grove 339</td>
<td>£24,047</td>
<td>£54,511</td>
<td>£88,827</td>
<td>£27,980</td>
<td>£56,361</td>
<td>£41,676</td>
<td>£56,286</td>
<td>£349,688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymede Tower</td>
<td>£245,204</td>
<td>£284,307</td>
<td>£277,448</td>
<td>£365,373</td>
<td>£342,979</td>
<td>£358,261</td>
<td>£2,429,580</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treverton Tower</td>
<td>£339,456</td>
<td>£174,496</td>
<td>£494,492</td>
<td>£282,149</td>
<td>£555,358</td>
<td>£379,980</td>
<td>£2,509,592</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>£649,803</td>
<td>£606,930</td>
<td>£977,016</td>
<td>£773,282</td>
<td>£1,211,770</td>
<td>£858,638</td>
<td>£5,832,883</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Costs for just the tower blocks.

Raymede Tower

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raymede Tower 1-55</th>
<th>Catch Up</th>
<th>1-5</th>
<th>6-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08 Roof: Flat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£24,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 External Joinery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Rainwater Goods</td>
<td></td>
<td>£11,550</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Walls: External</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£78,829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Windows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£104,902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Doors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£32,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Common Services</td>
<td>£96,250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Common Area: Internal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Common Area: External</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Common Heating &amp; Plumbing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Central Plant</td>
<td>£67,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Lifts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 Bathrooms</td>
<td>£6,315</td>
<td></td>
<td>£6,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 Kitchens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Heating</td>
<td>£51,943</td>
<td></td>
<td>£142,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 General Plumbing</td>
<td>£16,307</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 Electrics</td>
<td>£1,864</td>
<td></td>
<td>£10,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 Alarms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£5,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59 Damp and Condensation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£19,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92 Cyclical Programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£99,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td>£245,204</td>
<td>£284,307</td>
<td>£277,448</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Treverton Tower

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Catch Up</th>
<th>1-5</th>
<th>6-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08 Roof: Flat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£24,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 External Joinery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£11,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Rainwater Goods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£78,829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Walls: External</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£117,829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Windows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£11,182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Doors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£26,558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Common Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£96,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Common Area: Internal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£128,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Common Area: External</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£83,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Common Heating &amp; Plumbing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£12,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Central Plant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£32,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Lifts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£4,876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 Bathrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 Kitchens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£3,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Heating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£3,742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 General Plumbing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£12,494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 Electrics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£5,591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 Alarms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£99,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59 Damp and Condensation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£3,742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92 Cyclical Programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£42,609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td>£339,456</td>
<td>£174,496</td>
<td>£457,937</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SAP Energy Rating**

SAP ratings are a simple measure of estimating the energy efficiency performance of a property. They are expressed on a scale of 1-100 where the higher the number the more efficient a property is. It is calculated from predictions of heating and hot water costs, which depend on insulation, are tightness of the property and the efficiency and control of the heating system.

- Towers – 58 – Range – 46-60
- Exmoor Street – 70 – Range – 62-74

For context, the average for the TMO stock is 69.5

The types of improvements that could be carried out to improve the SAP rating would be:

- New central boiler and heating distribution, including individual controls for the communal systems
- Internal insulation and roof insulation
- New windows to higher energy standards
The above items are included within the costs above, although they are assumed to happen when the components require replacement.

In addition, improvements that are not part of the normal investment programme would have a significant and cost effective impact:

- External wall insulation (i.e. cladding)
- Floor insulation
- LED lighting

These costs are not included with the stock condition estimates.

**Heating and hot water system, including heating Central Plant**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Catch up</th>
<th>Years 1-5</th>
<th>Years 6-10</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treverton</td>
<td>Common Boiler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymede</td>
<td>Common Boiler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treverton</td>
<td>Heat Exchangers (common)</td>
<td>£36,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymede</td>
<td>Heat Exchangers (common)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treverton</td>
<td>Heating Distribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymede</td>
<td>Heating Distribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treverton</td>
<td>Upgrade partial CH to full</td>
<td>£41,933</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymede</td>
<td>Upgrade partial CH to full</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treverton</td>
<td>Hot Water Plumbing</td>
<td>£9,784</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymede</td>
<td>Hot Water Plumbing</td>
<td>£16,307</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>£202,389</td>
<td>£187,900</td>
<td>£84,000</td>
<td>£464,286</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Heating and hot water is supplied to both Treverton and Raymede Towers by a gas fired communal boiler housed in Treverton Tower. It does not serve the other blocks on the estate, which have individual combination boilers.

A number of flats only have partial central heating and require upgrading. Generally this means that one room does not have a radiator. Heating distribution makes up a large part of the costs, for the replacement of radiators and pipes but also individual hydraulic interface units (HIU) in each property. This is showing as due now, as none of the flats have this and it is a key requirement of the TMO investment standard. However, the TMO would most likely plan this so it was carried out at the same time as the communal boiler rather than complete piecemeal investment. We would also seek to upgrade the boiler to a higher and more energy efficient specification to account for individual control. The costs assumed are though for like for like replacement.

**Lifts**

The lifts have recently been replaced at both tower blocks, and so they will not require replacement for another 25 to 30 years.
Windows

Both flats benefit from PVC double glazed windows, although they are of a relatively thin profile with a thinner vacuum than standard, which means they are not as energy efficient as modern windows. These could be replaced like for like or upgraded – the costs assumed are for like for like replacement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Catch up</th>
<th>Years 1-5</th>
<th>Years 6-10</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treverton</td>
<td>Windows – PVCu</td>
<td></td>
<td>£117,829</td>
<td>£117,829</td>
<td>£241,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymede</td>
<td>Windows – PVCu</td>
<td></td>
<td>£123,315</td>
<td>£123,315</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£241,144</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Roof

The roofs at both towers are flat, with the covering requiring renewal on a 30 year cycle. The next renewal is due in years 6-10 and there have been no significant roof leaks reported recently. However, this would be subject to survey and testing, as it may only need patch repairs at the time. These repairs would also be carried out when the external decorations cyclical programme is being carried out, as this would be the most efficient use of contractor time and scaffolding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Catch up</th>
<th>Years 1-5</th>
<th>Years 6-10</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treverton</td>
<td>Roof - Flat</td>
<td></td>
<td>24,640</td>
<td>24,640</td>
<td>49,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymede</td>
<td>Roof - Flat</td>
<td></td>
<td>24,640</td>
<td>24,640</td>
<td>49,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>49,280</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

External Walls

Both towers are of a non traditional construction and will require concrete and brickwork repairs periodically. The stock condition survey has identified that this will be due in years 6-10. However, the costs are an assumption based on the size of the buildings. A more detailed inspection will be required to identify the full extent of the work required, and so the costs below should be treated with caution.

In future years balcony coverings and balustrading on the walkways will require renewal, and could be improved at the same time as other works such as window renewal or wall repairs (these costs are not shown below, as they are in later years).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Catch up</th>
<th>Years 1-5</th>
<th>Years 6-10</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treverton</td>
<td>External Walls – Non-Trad</td>
<td></td>
<td>78,829</td>
<td>78,829</td>
<td>157,658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymede</td>
<td>External Walls – Non-Trad</td>
<td></td>
<td>78,829</td>
<td>78,829</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>157,658</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Communal Services

This item covers mechanical and electrical items in the communal area including lighting and rewires, and the door entry system. Lighting and communal electrics are tested on a ten year cycle, and the tests result in recommendations for action. If the test shows they are not complaint with legislation, then they would need to be actioned in the short term. For example some minor electrical works have been carried out Treverton Tower to ensure that it remains compliant.

At the moment emergency lighting is being shown as at the end of their life cycle, although this does not mean that they have failed. Door entry systems have a 15 year life cycle, so this investment would be repeated in a 30 year period. One improvement option would also be to install a fire alarm, currently not present.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Catch up</th>
<th>Years 1-5</th>
<th>Years 6-10</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treverton</td>
<td>Door-Entry System</td>
<td>41,250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymede</td>
<td></td>
<td>41,250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treverton</td>
<td>Emergency Lighting</td>
<td>27,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymede</td>
<td></td>
<td>27,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>137,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>137,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Central Plant

Other than the communal heating system, the blocks also have water tanks, pumps and pressurisation units. Pumps and pressurisation units tend to have shorter life cycles of 15 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Catch up</th>
<th>Years 1-5</th>
<th>Years 6-10</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treverton</td>
<td>Pressurisation Unit</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymede</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treverton</td>
<td>Pumps</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>72,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymede</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treverton</td>
<td>Water Tanks</td>
<td>47,675</td>
<td></td>
<td>47,675</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymede</td>
<td></td>
<td>67,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>67,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>151,075</td>
<td></td>
<td>195,075</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Potential Improvements

There are a number of potential improvements to the building and estate environment. Costs are unknown for this element, and designs could be sought from an architect or consultant.

Building management system

- Upgrades to lifts, central plant, heating systems and the door entry system could incorporate a building management system so that faults can be diagnosed remotely, and heating temperatures controlled. This would mean the TMO could respond to changing temperatures and switch heating on more easily, and could respond to technical faults more easily.

Telecommunications upgrades
• Building management could also include provision for combine satellite TV, high speed broadband and cable TV to flats. This could help tackle social isolation by giving residents easier access to information.

Thermal insulation

• The thermal performance of the building could be improved through the installation of cladding to the outside of the building.

Entrance doors and canopies

• The entrances could be made more attractive through bringing forward the door, or adding a canopy – however there is limited space at ground level to achieve this.

Additional units on the top floor

• The top floors could accommodate additional units using lightweight structures; however this may need the extension of the lift or an additional lift.

Improvements to ground level environment

• The ground level access could be landscaped and improved to provide a more attractive environment. Currently it is an uninviting cobbled and tarmacked area, and is dominated by hard landscaping. One option would be to give ground floor tenants a garden.