Considerations for Estate Regeneration Proposals:

Silchester East and West

1. Introduction
This document identifies the Royal Borough’s Corporate consideration of the case for regenerating the Silchester East and West 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.

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 or redevelopment options for Silchester East and West 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 Silchester East and West estate within the Royal Borough’s Local Plan Partial Review. A version history is located on page 8 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 potential boundary of the site, in relation to which options are being tested, comprises both Royal Borough and non- the Royal Borough owned land.

The following section forms a schedule of these landholdings and related considerations such as titles, uses and occupancy.

2.1. Royal Borough land-holdings
- 1-45 Bramley House, 2-9,10-15,16-21 and 22-27 Darfield Way;
- 1-80 Frinstead House;
- 1-20 Kingsnorth House;
- 1-80 Markland House;
- 2-42, 14-24, 26-36, 38-48 evens and 29-41 odds Shalfleet Drive;
- 13-21A Silchester Road;
2.2. Non-Royal Borough land-holdings

- Bugsies, Pig and Whistle Pub;
- Westway land as defined in site plan;
- The Latymer Community Church;
- 19 and 21A Silchester Road;
- 1-12 Arthur Court, Bridge Close;
- 1-11 Charlotte Mews, 1-14 Colvin House;
- 1-24 Goodrich Court, 63,67,69,71,73,75,77 and 79 Bramley Road;
- 80-90 Waynflete Square;
- Yard north-east end of Silchester Road and
- 54 Blechynden Street.

2.3. Land Title

Copies of Land registry entries have been obtained and a Title Report is being prepared.

2.4. Land Uses

The site is mainly residential but there is also commercial, office use, community use, education use and artist studios.

2.5. Tenant / Leaseholder Status

There are 413 tenants and 90 leaseholders in Council owned property. There are 2 freeholders in ex-Right to Buy properties. The properties owned by Registered Providers are a mixture of social rent, intermediate rent, shared ownership and leasehold properties which have been 100% staircased – exact numbers of units are not yet known.

2.6. Operational / Maintenance Considerations

A report on the proposed continued maintenance strategy for the next 30 years has been obtained. This will inform discussion with residents about what they can expect if the current maintenance strategy were to continue. This option will be considered alongside any potential redevelopment options.

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 Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea

Estates Regeneration

The 16 July 2015 Cabinet Report sought approval for:

- “the appointment and funding of a property consultant and associated project/design team to take [options appraisal work for the Silchester East and West site] forward and produce the necessary Options Appraisal and accompanying viability reports”; and

- “the approval of a professional fees budget to Options Appraisal stage (RIBA Stages 0 and 1). Once this has been completed a further report will be provided to Cabinet providing recommendations which depending upon the outcome of the Options Appraisal exercise, may request a further approval to progress to preparation of a planning application”.

Item A8 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 has an ever growing demand for all types of housing with those on middle incomes unable to access owner occupation and approximately 1,800 cases in temporary accommodation to whom the Council has duty to rehouse. 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 of redeveloping selected low-density Council estates. The Silchester Estate… is one of the areas the Council now proposes to consider for redevelopment.

The purpose of the initial Options Appraisal is to better understand the potential for the area to be redeveloped to optimise on the following Council objectives:

- To provide additional affordable housing, thereby preserving our mixed communities.
- To tackle the underlying causes of deprivation by improving health outcomes, employment opportunities, educational attainment and aspiration, and by reducing crime and the fear of crime.
- To build the “conservation areas of the future” by reflecting and matching the high quality urban design in the rest of the borough.”

On review of the report, the Royal Borough’s Cabinet resolved to:

- To fund the appointment of a Lead Property Consultant, incorporating an architectural practice to enable an Options Appraisal exercise to be undertaken;
- To set aside a budget of £200,000 to facilitate the commissioning of the Options Appraisal; and
- That approval to incur expenditure against this budget is delegated to the Cabinet Member for Housing, Property and Regeneration.

During the optioneering work, the objectives of the Royal Borough’s Estate Regeneration programme was further refined, and is reflected within Section 4.1 of the Cabinet Report of 26 May 2016 (extract below). The options presented to the Cabinet were assessed against these objectives:
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 with: those on middle incomes largely unable to access either market or affordable housing in the borough; over 2767 households 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.”

Further to these overarching project objectives, section 4.5 of 26 May 2016 Cabinet report sets out a number of assurances that have been provided to the Council's tenants, leaseholders and freeholders directly affected by the redevelopment proposals. These include:

- "The Council has undertaken to provide its 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 Council 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 so as to maximise the number of people who will be able to move home only once;
- Offer an attractive disturbance package to allow tenants to move at no cost to themselves;
• Repurchase properties at full market value from any leaseholders (or freeholders) who wish to sell their homes but fear they are unable to do so because of the Council’s proposals.

• Wherever viable, offer resident leaseholders the opportunity to buy a Shared Equity property on the new development.

• “...resident leaseholders and freeholders on the Silchester Estate will be offered the opportunity of acquiring a new Shared Equity home on any future redevelopment of the estate.”

On review of the report, the Royal Borough’s Cabinet resolved to approve further more detailed work to assess a range of options, stating the following conditions:

• (III of Cabinet Report) agreed that, in addition to the Council’s stated commitments for all estate regeneration projects across the borough, the full redevelopment of the Silchester Estate can only be chosen as the preferred option if all resident leaseholders and freeholders will be offered the opportunity to buy a new property on the redevelopment through a Shared Equity offer. Therefore, if the Silchester Estate is redeveloped, the existing community of Council tenants and resident leaseholders and freeholders will be able to remain in the redevelopment;

• (IV of Cabinet Report) agreed that if any leaseholders (or freeholders) in properties originally purchased through the Right to Buy wish to sell their property now but have concerns regarding their ability to sell on the open market as a result of the underlying possibility of regeneration, then the Council will offer to acquire that property at full market value and that an initial budget of £2 million is identified to facilitate such purchases.”

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

In July 2015 the Royal Borough’s Cabinet took a decision to carry out an options appraisal for the area defined as ‘Silchester East and West’. This involved understanding whether there are any viable schemes for the redevelopment of the estate; six redevelopment options were considered (three comprising just Royal Borough owned land, and three comprising Royal Borough and other land ownerships). These were:

1. Royal Borough owned land/stock – optimum redevelopment of all medium and low rise residential accommodation, but retaining the four tower blocks;

2. Royal Borough owned land/stock – optimum redevelopment of all medium and low rise residential accommodation, together with the demolition and redevelopment of the four tower blocks, but not including any new tower blocks within the proposals;

3. Royal Borough owned land/stock – as per (2) above but providing for a number of replacement tower blocks, although not necessarily on the current sites/footprints of the existing towers;
4. All land/stock (Royal Borough and other ownership) otherwise as per (1) above;
5. All land/stock (Royal Borough and other ownership) otherwise as per (2) above;
6. All land/stock (Royal Borough and other ownership) otherwise as per (3) above.

In May 2016 the Council’s Cabinet reviewed the options assessment work to date. Options 2 and 3 above were rejected, as they did not represent viable redevelopment options. The Royal Borough’s Cabinet resolved to undertake more detailed redevelopment work to test how the following options would deliver on the Royal Borough’s objectives, and meet the Council’s commitments to the estate’s residents:

- to continue with the current maintenance strategy for the Silchester Estate;
- to improve the Silchester Estate through refurbishments and in-fill development; and
- to pursue one of the viable options for the comprehensive redevelopment of the Silchester Estate.

As such, further work has been commissioned which considers six options:

1. Continue with the current maintenance plan;
2. Refurbishment of existing Council residential blocks and infill Council owned land;
3. Royal Borough owned land/stock – optimum redevelopment of all medium and low rise residential accommodation, but retaining the four tower blocks (Previously option 1);
4. All land/stock (Royal Borough and other ownership) – optimum redevelopment of all medium and low rise residential accommodation but retaining the four tower blocks (previously option 4);
5. All land/stock (Royal Borough and other ownership) replacing existing properties inclusive of the four tower blocks and replacing with new mid-rise buildings (previously option 5);
6. All land/stock (Royal Borough and other ownership) replacing existing properties inclusive of the four tower blocks and replacing with mainly mid-rise buildings (previously option 6).

4.2. Supporting technical assessments

External architects were appointed to develop design solutions for redevelopment, and external consultants were employed to carry out financial viability testing of all options. The same methodology will be employed for RIBA Stage 1, with the addition of external architects/consultants to develop the infill option.

4.3. Housing Needs Assessment and optioneering

A Housing Needs Assessment has not yet been carried out, and it may not be possible to commission this at this stage.

4.4. Consultations and Engagement
A letter (for information) was sent to all residents directly affected by the initial options appraisal in June 2015 and all the owners and users of the other buildings in the designated area were contacted.

There were two well attended ‘drop in’ events held on 13th and 15th July, 2015 to respond to residents’ questions and concerns.

Two further drop-in events took place on 30 November 2015 and 18 January 2016 to give residents the opportunity to meet the architects. Both events were well attended; 33 people attended the first drop in and 91 attended the second. Those who attended were invited to complete a feedback form and 35 of these were completed. The feedback was analysed and a report produced summarising the findings; this is contained in Appendix A Three, of the Cabinet Report dated 26 May 2016

Once the initial piece of work was completed, two drop-in events were held to display the work and seek feedback from the local community. These were held on 7 and 17 March 2016 at two different venues with representatives attending from Porphyrios Associates, CBRE and council members and officers. A total of 120 people attended and were invited to complete feedback forms. In addition, the display materials were made available on the Council’s website together with the facility to complete a feedback form. 90 completed feedback forms were received and analysed. The feedback report is detailed within Appendix A Four of the Cabinet Report dated 26 May 2016.

An informal discussion has been held with each of the potentially affected third party land owners. Westway Trust has submitted a written response and this is shown in Appendix “A Five” of the 26 May 2016 Cabinet Report.

Further public consultation exercises, resident ‘drop in’ events and informal discussions with third party land owners have taken place since the May 2016 Cabinet Report.

Formal consultation exercises were undertaken on 28 and 30 January 2017 which sought feedback on the redevelopment options, and the impact of the various third party land parcels which could be included/ excluded from the masterplan area. A report from the London Communication Agency summarising the attendance and feedback is awaited.

4.5. Consideration of non-residential uses within optioneering

The non-residential properties will be considered for inclusion on the basis of the contribution they can make to the overall masterplan and the impact on financial viability.

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
Discussions are ongoing with other landowners about the potential for their land to be brought into any development scheme.

Dependent upon the outcome of the options appraisal exercise, the Council may decide to procure a development/funding partner to deliver the selected project.

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.**

It is the intention that a report based upon the outcome of the further optioneering work, and upon the feedback received through public consultation, will be considered by the Royal Borough’s Cabinet in September 2017. This report will be seeking approval to pursue one or more of the six options being considered for the Silchester East and West Estate, and details will be publically available on the Royal Borough’s website. This will include further stakeholder engagement, see section 6.3 below. A programme of forward work is being developed and will form part of the project documentation.

6.2. **Governance structures and milestones**

Following the development of the options study, which will be undertaken by the appointed Project Team, a report will be submitted to Cabinet which will include consideration by Housing and Property Scrutiny.

6.3. **Future stakeholder engagement**

A stakeholder participation and consultation strategy is contained within the project documentation.

7. **Appendices**

A. Executive Decision Report – the Royal Borough’s Cabinet 16 July 2015
B. Appendix to Executive Decision Report – the Royal Borough’s Cabinet 16 July 2015
C. Minutes - the Royal Borough’s Cabinet 16 July 2015
D. Executive Decision Report – the Royal Borough’s Cabinet 26 May 2016
E. Appendix to Executive Decision Report – the Royal Borough’s Cabinet 26 May 2016
F. Minutes - the Royal Borough’s Cabinet 26 May 2016
G. Silchester East and West Newsletter – November 2015
H. Silchester East and West Newsletter – April 2016
I. Silchester East and West Newsletter – June 2016
J. Land Ownership Plan – February 2016
K. RIBA Stage 1 Consultant Team Brief

8. **Version History**

October 2016 – for the Royal Borough’s Local Plan Partial Review

January 2017 – for the Royal Borough’s Local Plan Partial Review (Publication Draft)
## Executive Decision Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision maker(s) at each authority and date of Cabinet meeting, Cabinet Member meeting or (in the case of individual Cabinet Member decisions) the earliest date the decision will be taken</th>
<th>Cabinet 16 July 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date of decision</td>
<td>16 July 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forward Plan reference</td>
<td>KD04596</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report title (decision subject)</th>
<th>SILCHESTER ESTATE – ESTATE REDEVELOPMENT OPTIONS APPRAISAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Reporting officer | Laura Johnson, Director of Housing  
Michael Clark, Director of Tri Borough FM and Director for Corporate Property |
| Key decision | Yes |
| Access to information classification | Public |
1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Council has recently committed to a programme of new house-building on selected estates in its ownership in order to meet the following objectives: to provide better quality homes for existing and future tenants; to deliver additional affordable housing; to tackle the root causes of social deprivation; and to improve the urban design and built environment of those estates.

The Royal Borough has almost completed the first redevelopment scheme in this area (the ex-Silchester Garages site) with its partner the Peabody Trust. This scheme has been well received within the area and some informal local feedback has asked the council about what happens next. The Council therefore wishes to explore further redevelopment opportunities in the area through an Options Appraisal exercise, working with local residents and stakeholders.

This report requests that the Cabinet approves the appointment and funding of a property consultant and associated project/design team to take this work forward and produce the necessary Options Appraisal and accompanying viability reports.

The report also proposes the approval of a professional fees budget to Options Appraisal stage (RIBA Stages 0 and 1). Once this has been completed a further report will be provided to Cabinet providing recommendations which depending upon the outcome of the Options Appraisal exercise, may request a further approval to progress to preparation of a planning application.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1 The Cabinet agrees to fund the appointment of a Lead Property Consultant, incorporating an architectural practice to enable an Options Appraisal exercise to be undertaken.

2.2 The Cabinet agrees to set aside a budget of £200,000 to facilitate the commissioning of the Options Appraisal.

2.3 It is further recommended that approval to incur expenditure against this budget be delegated to the Cabinet Member for Housing, Property and Regeneration.

3 REASONS FOR DECISION

3.1 In order to explore the potential for further redevelopment and regeneration in the Silchester area, it is necessary for the council to agree to fund and undertake an Options Appraisal as discussed, below.
4 BACKGROUND

4.1 The Council recognises the intense and growing shortage of all types of housing in London. Kensington and Chelsea has an ever growing demand for all types of housing with those on middle incomes unable to access owner occupation and approximately 1,800 cases in temporary accommodation to whom the Council has duty to rehouse. 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 of redeveloping selected low-density Council estates. The Silchester Estate, as shown in Appendix One, is one of the areas the Council now proposes to consider for redevelopment.

4.2 The purpose of the initial Options Appraisal is to better understand the potential for the area to be redeveloped to optimise on the following Council objectives:

- To provide additional affordable housing, thereby preserving our mixed communities.
- To tackle the underlying causes of deprivation by improving health outcomes, employment opportunities, educational attainment and aspiration, and by reducing crime and the fear of crime.
- To build the "conservation areas of the future" by reflecting and matching the high quality urban design in the rest of the borough.

4.3 The Plan attached as Appendix One to this report, details the Silchester Estates location and the various other sites/buildings within the immediate area. This will form the basis the "red line" for the Options Appraisal exercise. There are three main sites that are proposed to be included in the exercise.

4.3 The tables below set out the individual blocks and numbers of units, for all of the council owned residential accommodation proposed to be included within the three sites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Silchester West Estate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block/Address</th>
<th>Number of units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 – 27 Darfield Way</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – 48 (even) Shalfleet Drive</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 – 41 (odd) Shalfleet Drive</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – 11 Waynflete Square</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 80 Dixon House</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 80 Frinstead House</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 80 Markland House</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>347</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Silchester East Estate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block/Address</th>
<th>Number of units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – 21 Kingsnorth House</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 80 Whitstable House</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>101</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Bramley House/Silchester Road

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block/Address</th>
<th>Number of units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – 45 Bramley House</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 – 17 (odd), 21 Silchester Road</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>49</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 5 PROPOSAL AND ISSUES

### 5.1

It is proposed that an Options Appraisal exercise be carried out on the Silchester Estates and sites as set out in the Plan at Annex 1 in order to establish:

- The capacity for additional new homes;
- The opportunity for improvement to the built environment;
- The opportunity to provide decanting for existing homes;
- Improvements to any remaining council housing stock;
- The replacement of out-dated existing housing stock, such as studios or bedsits;
- An acceptable offer to leaseholders and the impact of this on financial viability;
- Overall financial viability in terms of the ability to be “self-funding” and inform the potential procurement/delivery option(s).

### 5.2

A number of potential design based scenarios should be considered, and the Options Appraisal exercise will need to address each one of these in terms of the outcomes report. These possible scenarios include:

1. RBKC owned land/stock – optimum redevelopment of all medium and low rise residential accommodation, but retaining the four tower blocks;
2. RBKC owned land/stock – optimum redevelopment of all medium and low rise residential accommodation, together with the demolition and redevelopment of the four tower blocks, but not including any new tower blocks within the proposals;
3. RBKC owned land/stock – as per (2) above but providing for a number of replacement tower blocks, although not necessarily on the current sites/footprints of the existing towers;
4. All land/stock (RBKC and other ownership) otherwise as per (1) above;
5. All land/stock (RBKC and other ownership) otherwise as per (2) above;
6) All land/stock (RBKC and other ownership) otherwise as per (3) above.

5.3 There may be some sub-variations within each/some of these scenarios that are proposed during the course of preparing the options, and the Lead Property Consultant will be required to evaluate these as well as the main scenarios. Similarly the consultants may themselves propose scenarios that are not listed above. They will be encouraged to put these forward for further consideration and evaluation.

5.4 It is therefore proposed to appoint, via a suitable competitive tendering process, a Lead Property Consultant to provide and procure a specified scope of services to progress the options appraisal process:

- Architectural/master-planning services – a suitable practice will be appointed via a separate, one-off selection/interview process managed by the Lead Property Consultant but also involving council nominees; other technical services, including quantity surveying/cost advisor; structural engineering; mechanical & electrical engineering; planning consultant; highways engineering, and rights of light/day lighting advice;

- Commercial and investment advice, including financial viability, residential sales and marketing;

- Acting as a Project Manager to manage the process and provide advice on the viability, programme and commercial aspects of the options appraisal, as well as considering development phasing and resident decanting issues.

5.6 In terms of modelling financial viability, the Lead Property Consultant will use the various financial, decanting and compensation, and other related assumptions previously agreed by the Council for other potential redevelopment schemes (e.g. Pembroke Road, the Barlby Road/Treverton Estate schemes) to ensure consistency in approach.

OPTIONS AND ANALYSIS

6.1 As for other Council led residential regeneration initiatives, the benefits of the options appraisal approach are:

- a better understanding of the opportunities and challenges for redevelopment of either the properties owned by the Council or a wider area;
- a high level understanding of the costs of development;
- high level advice on the optimum delivery route should there be a desire to proceed with a redevelopment proposal.
- maximising the potential of the Royal Borough"s assets and long term investments.
6.2 The required outputs from completion of the Options Appraisal exercise are as follows:

a) the quantum of new residential accommodation, both replacement and additional;
b) the quantum of other uses and their costs and values;
c) adherence to the Royal Borough's Regeneration and Integration Vision, urban design principles and new residential accommodation design and operation requirements;
d) redevelopment phasing, including the identification of “early win” sites and a decanting programme;
e) financial viability – including estimated “development” surpluses/deficits generated by each option to demonstrate the comparable viability of the scheme;
f) able to demonstrate viability in the context of deliverability via a “Joint Venture” with the council.

7 CONSULTATION

7.1 The Housing Regeneration team is taking a proactive approach both in terms of delivering the initial message to residents and other stakeholders and establishing structures to carry out meaningful consultation as the proposals develop.

There is a well established Residents' Association for the Silchester Estate and a Residents' Associations for Bramley House. The chairs of both associations have been contacted and officers will be attending association meeting in the near future.

A letter has been sent to all residents directly affected by the „red line“ around the options appraisal area and a complementary letter to the owners and users of the other buildings in the designated area. There is dedicated telephone line and email for enquiries. In addition two drops in are planned for 13 and 15 July, 2015.

8 EQUALITY IMPLICATIONS

8.1 There are no equality implications at this stage as we are proposing to undertake an appraisal which will have no direct impact on any particular group and is design to provide the council with information to inform decision making.

9 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

9.1 At this stage there are no immediate legal implications. The appointment of consultants will need to be done in compliance with the Council’s Contract Regulation. Redevelopment is likely to involve buying back properties previously sold.
10 FINANCIAL AND RESOURCES IMPLICATIONS

10.1 At this early stage of the project the detailed costs that are likely to be involved in delivering whatever regeneration option(s) is decided upon are clearly not available. Following appointment of the Lead Property Consultant and their progression of the Options Appraisal exercise and collation of development advice and financial assumptions, costs will start to be identified, reviewed and refined, and reported to the various council corporate forums.

10.2 The £200,000 budget proposed in paragraph 2.3 above is just for this options appraisal process and assumes that Cabinet will have to decide whether or not there is a viable redevelopment option to progress with before agreeing any additional budget.

10.3 The project will be managed by an In-house Project Team the costs of this Team are included within the cost indicators at 2.3 above.

Laura Johnson
Director of Housing
Minutes of a meeting of the Cabinet held in Committee Room 1, Kensington Town Hall, London W8 7NX at 6.30pm on 16 July 2015

PRESENT

Cabinet Members
Councillor Nicholas Paget-Brown (Leader of the Council), Chairman
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 Joanna Gardner (Community Safety, IT and Corporate Services)
Councillor Gerard Hargreaves (Voluntary Organisations and Resident Engagement)
Councillor Warwick Lightfoot (Finance and Strategy)
Councillor Mary Weale (Adult Social Care and Public Health)

Other Members in attendance
Councillor B Campbell (Lead Member)
Councillor Mason (Chairman of Cabinet and Corporate Services Scrutiny Committee)
Councillor Rossi (Chairman of Public Realm Scrutiny Committee)
Councillor Rutherford (Lead Member)
Councillor Williams (Chairman of Adult Social Care and Health Scrutiny Committee)

PART A (PUBLIC) MINUTES

A1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE
Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Feilding-Mellen and Will; and from Councillor Pascall (Lead Member).

Apologies for lateness were received from Councillor Gardner.

A2. MEMBERS' DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST
There were none.

A3. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 11 JUNE 2015
The minutes of the meeting held on 11 June 2015 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

A4. REVENUE AND CAPITAL OUTTURN 2014-15 OVERVIEW - KD04576
This paper reported the 2014-15 outturn spending on revenue and capital compared to the 2014-15 budget.
RESOLVED – Cabinet agreed to note:

(i) The net General Fund underspend of £23.4 million for 2014-15;
(ii) The General Fund working balance of £10 million – the Council’s agreed minimum; and
(iii) The capital outturn of £61.3 million which resulted in an underspend of £17.7 million of which £16.2 million is carried forward to 2015-16.

Reasons for the decision

This report was for information.

Action by: TC

A5. BUDGET MONITORING 2015-16 QUARTER 1 - KD04518

This report provided a short summary of the Council’s forecast financial position.

Members commented on the forecast overspend in Children’s Services, noting that this was in part due the increase in unaccompanied asylum seeking children - a trend mirrored across London. In addition, SEN transport has been experiencing increased demand because of national changes and due to the number of service users.

Members noted that certain parts of the budget are demand led and consequently, very expensive. Notwithstanding this fact, Members were pleased to acknowledge that there was no reduction in service as a result of officers managing their budgets tightly and acquiring underspends.

RESOLVED – Cabinet agreed to

(i) note the financial position as set out for the whole authority in paragraph 5 and Annex I;
(ii) confirm the inclusion of the acquisition of a retail unit at the Silchester Garage Site in the capital programme 2015-16 (originally approved by Cabinet in July 2014); and
(iii) approve the transfer of the ‘Unified Communications’ scheme to upgrade the telephone system from the pipeline into the main capital programme (£150k).

Reasons for the decision

Services report quarterly on the budgeted versus forecast actual financial position to Cabinet. Though mainly for information, the report may also set out requests for in-year budget and funding changes.

Action by: TC
A6. ADULT SOCIAL CARE SHARED SERVICES STRATEGIC BUSINESS CASE - KD04569

This report set out the business case for funding for the Adult Social Care Shared Services change portfolios across the three councils, to deliver the Adult Social Care vision over the next three years.

In introducing the report, Councillor Weale was pleased to recommend the business case, as she believed that it would offer a good return on investment. In addition, the funding facility to resource ASC transformation, business improvement and efficiency savings portfolios over a three year period 2015-2018, would deliver at least £46 million in savings.

RESOLVED – Cabinet agreed

(i) to note that the Cabinet Member for WCC supports this business case, and the creation of a strategic funding facility of £6.22M over a three year period 2015–2018, funded from each Council’s reserves, pro rata to planned savings for that Council. The WCC contribution to this facility is £2.41M;

(ii) to note that the Cabinet Member for WCC supports ASC plans for 2015-16, and the release from WCC reserves of £737K in 2015-16 from WCC reserves to execute these plans;

(iii) to note that LBHF Cabinet supports this business case, and the creation of a strategic funding facility of £6.22M over a three year period 2015–2018, funded from each Council’s reserves, pro rata to planned savings for that Council. The LBHF contribution to this facility is £2.46M;

(iv) to note that LBHF Cabinet supports ASC plans for 2015-16, and the release of £833K in 2015-16 from LBHF reserves to execute these plans;

(v) to support this business case, and the creation of a strategic funding facility of £6.22M over a three year period 2015–2018, funded from each Council’s reserves, pro rata to planned savings for that Council. The RBKC contribution to this facility is £1.35M;

(vi) to support Adult Social Care plans for 2015-16, and the release of £499K in 2015-16 from RBKC reserves to execute these plans;

(vii) to note that Adult Social Care will report regularly to officers and members on spend and outcomes, and is accountable to Shared Services Board for delivery based on this investment;

(viii) to support the requirement for corporate change functions across the three Councils to contribute significant capacity and capability, as part of the ASC change resource pool; and
(ix) to support a streamlined approach to the use of our Human Resources processes so that ASC is able to swiftly and easily hire appropriately skilled resources.

**Reasons for the decision**

Adult Social Care requires investment to transform and improve services, implement policy reforms and deliver savings plans. The funding facility is required to resource Adult Social Care transformation, business improvement and efficiency savings portfolios over a three year period 2015-2018, to deliver at least £46M in savings.

The release of funds in 2015-16 is required to support the delivery of Adult Social Care 2015-16 change plans.

*Action by: EDASC*

**A7. THE FUTURE OF THAMESBROOK NURSING AND RESIDENTIAL HOME - KD04488**

In July 2014 Cabinet approved the continued temporary closure of Thamesbrook and suspension of works relating to Legionella and the building services while a detailed options appraisal was carried out by officers in Adult Social Care and Corporate Property. In light of the options appraisal, consultation results, and the Council’s overarching *Modernising Older People’s Housing and Accommodation with Care Services Strategy (2013)*, this report and the exempt appendix sought approval to permanently close Thamesbrook nursing and residential home and commit to the delivery of extra care housing in the south of the Royal Borough.

Councillor Weale reported on the exhaustive consultation carried out on the options appraisal and the proposal to move towards a new era in how elderly people are supported. She strongly supported the direction of travel in the report.

Members noted that there was a thorough discussion on the issues at the Adult Social Care and Health Scrutiny Committee and members’ comments had been incorporated in the report. Councillor Williams, Chairman of the Scrutiny Committee confirmed that of the four options, Members had overwhelming support for option three. He added that careful thought would need to be made on how to market the site – either on the open market for housing or to an extra care provider.

Officers confirmed that they have been instructed to market the site for extra care housing, and have commenced a soft marketing exercise with those types of providers. Councillor Lightfoot highlighted the financial considerations in the decision to close Thamesbrook and to lead to more affordable extra care housing.
RESOLVED – Cabinet agreed

(i) To approve the permanent closure of Thamesbrook nursing and residential home and release of the site from the Adult Social Care operational estate;

(ii) To authorise officers to explore options for block-purchasing the 20 new nursing beds currently being developed at Ellesmere House, SW3, in addition to the existing block contract for residential dementia beds; and

(iii) To commit to the delivery of affordable extra care housing in the south of the Royal Borough.

Reasons for the decision

A decision is now required on the long-term future of the home and proposed service provision, in light of the Council’s overarching Modernising Older People’s Housing and Accommodation with Care Services Strategy (2013), the results of the options appraisal and the outcome of the public consultation.

Action by: EDASC

A8. SILCHESTER ESTATE – ESTATE REDEVELOPMENT OPTIONS APPRAISAL - KD04596

This report requested the appointment and funding of a property consultant and associated project/design team to take the work forward for the redevelopment of this area and produce the necessary Options Appraisal and accompanying viability reports.

Members noted that the property consultant would be appointed within the next month and it was intended that a report on the results of the options appraisal would be submitted to Cabinet in towards the end of the year/early spring 2016. All tenants and leaseholders in the area have been written to, and consultation meetings were being arranged. Key themes emerging from a recent meeting included rehousing concerns, affordable new property and information gathering. Ward councillors have been briefed.

RESOLVED – Cabinet agreed –

(i) To fund the appointment of a Lead Property Consultant, incorporating an architectural practice to enable an Options Appraisal exercise to be undertaken;

(ii) To set aside a budget of £200,000 to facilitate the commissioning of the Options Appraisal; and

(iii) That approval to incur expenditure against this budget is delegated to the Cabinet Member for Housing, Property and Regeneration.
REASONS FOR THE DECISION
In order to explore the potential for further redevelopment and regeneration in the Silchester area, it is necessary for the Council to agree to fund and undertake an Options Appraisal as discussed in the report.

Action by: DH

A9. AGREEING THE ARTICLES OF ASSOCIATION FOR THE COUNCIL OWNED COMPANY - KD04588

This report sought approval for the articles for establishing the Council Owned Company and to confirm the name and directors of the company in order for the company to be set up and registered.

In the course of the discussion, concerns were expressed that the articles were not clear on the process for the appointment of the directors, and this needed to be spelt out under reserve matters.

Cabinet agreed to delegate approval of the final detail of the articles as highlighted above to the Deputy Leader. Officers agreed to circulate the final wording to Cabinet Members prior to final approval.

RESOLVED –

(i) Cabinet approved the articles at appendix A, and agreed to delegate the approval of the detail relating to the appointment of the directors to the Deputy Leader; and

(ii) Cabinet agreed that the company shall be called Kensington and Chelsea Estates Limited.

Reasons for the decision
Cabinet approval of the recommendations is required as this is the next process required in establishing the company.

Action by: DH

A10. BUSINESS CASE FOR PURCHASING PROPERTIES FOR THE PROVISION OF TEMPORARY ACCOMMODATION - KD04592

This report and the exempt appendix sought agreement to the business case for purchasing properties on the private market for the provision of temporary accommodation. This would help to improve quality, increase supply, offer stability to homeless households and contain costs.

Members noted the type of properties that would fall within the criteria to qualify for purchase, taking into account the stock of properties available, and the need to keep repairs and maintenance costs low. Officers would report periodically on the properties that have been purchased.

Should the scheme prove to be successful, a decision may be taken on whether to extend its scope.
RESOLVED – Cabinet agreed

(i) To authorise the Director of Housing to acquire properties on the open market for the purpose of providing temporary accommodation, at a maximum cost of £10 million, including the purchase price, initial repairs and refurbishment and acquisition costs on the basis set out in the business plan. The maximum price of £450,000 per property will be applied;

(ii) That provision of £10 million is included in the Capital Programme for the purchase of such properties. This will be funded through internal borrowing. The majority of the budget is likely to be spent in 2016/17;

(iii) To authorise the Director of Housing to select an agent to identify and acquire the properties;

(iv) To authorise the Director of Housing to invite and evaluate tenders for the management and repair of properties to be used for temporary accommodation; and

(v) To authorise the Director of Housing to agree the acquisition of individual properties, subject to a maximum purchase price of £450,000 per property and subject to a satisfactory legal report on title.

Reasons for the decision

Acquiring a portfolio of permanent properties can enable the Council to provide and control suitable quality accommodation for homeless households, reduce the risk of legal challenge and help contain the increasing costs of procuring temporary accommodation.

Action by: DH

A11. APPOINTMENT OF A CLIENT-SIDE TEAM CONSULTANCY SERVICE AND ADDITIONAL DESIGN TEAM FEES FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE EDENHAM WAY SITE - KD04587

This report and the exempt appendix sought approval to allocate funding for client side consultancy services for Edenham Way.

Members noted that officers hoped to bring details on the final scheme in the autumn.

RESOLVED – Cabinet agreed

(i) To approve the requested funding to enable client side consultancy services to be procured for the Edenham Way site using the Homes and Communities Property Framework to ensure both quality and value for money;

(ii) That delegated authority is given to the Cabinet Member for Housing, Property and Regeneration to appoint the agreed client side team,
commission any further surveys or investigations required and approve the scheme to be taken forward to the next design stage;

(iii) That additional funding is made available for the design team in light of the increase in scope and scale of the project;

(iv) That a provision is made within the budget for surveys to be commissioned and carried out; and

(v) That a 5% contingency for the design team fees is added to the budget. This will be retained by the Council and subject to the change control process.

Reasons for the decision

This approval is required in order to allow the development of the Edenham Way site for housing to progress and optimise the number of residential units.

Action by: DH

A12. ACQUISITION OF PRIVATE PROPERTY INTERESTS – BARLBY TREVERTON SITE AND BARLBY SCHOOL REDEVELOPMENT – KD04579

This report and the exempt appendix sought approval to the Council commencing private treaty negotiations to acquire a number of private property interests as set out in the report, both adjacent to the Council’s land, and within the existing estate in order to achieve regeneration of the wider estate.

RESOLVED – Cabinet agreed

(i) To authorise private treaty negotiations for the purchase of the various private property interests as set out in the exempt appendix;

(ii) To sanction the purchase of three property interests referred to in the exempt appendix where owners of private property interests have indicated a willingness to sell to the Council on commercially acceptable terms; and

(iii) To approve authorisation of expenditure to undertake the purchases as set out in the exempt appendix, subject to the provisions stated.

Reasons for the decision

This recommendation is made based upon the merits of including private property interests within the proposed scheme in order to optimise the benefits to the borough in terms of improvement to existing education facilities, and delivery of new homes. At the same time this action would remove the uncertainty for residents and owners prior to any planning application being submitted, as well as potential claims for blight as a result of the emerging proposals.

Action by: DCPCS

This report and the exempt appendix sought approval to appropriate for planning purposes under section 122 of the Local Government Act 1972, the Council’s property at Marlborough School Sloane Avenue for the purpose of facilitating the construction of a new school and commercial building on the land for which planning permission has been granted by the Council as local planning authority.

RESOLVED - Cabinet agreed to appropriate for planning purposes under section 122 of the Local Government Act 1972, the Council’s property at Marlborough School for the purpose of securing the construction of a school and commercial building in accordance with planning consent granted by the local planning authority and which is required for the proper planning of the area.

Reasons for the decision

By exercising its appropriation powers the Council will ensure its development of the land for a new school and commercial building proceeds in accordance with the planning permission already granted.

Action by: DCPCS

A14. KENSINGTON TOWN HALL – CONFERENCE CENTRE AND CIVIC HALL REFURBISHMENT - KD04580 AND KD04548

This report and the exempt appendix sought approval for the Council to refurbish the Kensington Conference Centre and the Civic areas within Kensington Town Hall.

Members were pleased to note the extensive works to introduce natural daylight into the Great and Small Halls, and that these would lead to a brighter, lighter and more commercially rentable facility than that currently available. They also reminded officers of the need to consult with amenity societies in view of the proposed relocation of the garden, as the Town Hall falls within Kensington Conservation Area.

RESOLVED – Cabinet agreed

(i) To transfer the capital programme pipeline bid for the Conference Centre (phased over 2016/17 and 2017/18 years) into the main capital programme;

(ii) To appoint Amey Community Limited as the client agent on behalf of the Council and accept their fee proposal as set out in the exempt appendix;

(iii) To approve Amey Community Limited appointing Kilburn Nightingale as architects and lead consultants. Fees are as set out in the exempt appendix;
(iv) To authorise the delegation of the expenditure budget to the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Housing, Property and Regeneration in the award of further contracts associated with these works, as detailed in the exempt appendix; and

(v) To approve the release of funds from the Property Strategy Reserve, to cover the temporary loss of income from lettings which cannot be contained within existing revenue budgets.

**Reasons for the decision**

This decision is required in order to carry out the final phases of the Council’s major refurbishment and modernisation of the Conference Centre and Civic areas. The works will provide facilities that are operationally effective and sustainable for long-term use; generate additional income streams and with reference to the external grounds, foster a sense of community by introducing soft landscaping with spaces for social gathering or general recreation for local residents or visitors to the Kensington Town Hall site.

**Action by:** DCPCS

**A15. GRANT OF PEPPERCORN LEASE – 205 HOLLAND PARK AVENUE, LONDON W11 - KD04550**

This report and the exempt appendix sought approval to formalise the grant of a lease at a peppercorn rent to the Council, pursuant to an agreement dated 23 March 2012 under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

RESOLVED – Cabinet approved the formalising of the new lease under the Heads of Terms contained in the exempt appendix.

**Reasons for the decision**

The site at 205 Holland Park Avenue is in the ownership of Redrow Homes. Planning permission to redevelop has been granted and the office block previously located at the site has been demolished. Construction is in progress and due to complete in the autumn. The B1 units are expected to be delivered to the Council by August/September 2015.

The B1 units when delivered will be held in the Council’s Investment Portfolio. Cabinet approval of the new lease will ensure that the developer satisfies the section 106 planning obligation requirement and the Council meets its objectives as this presents an opportunity to increase the availability of affordable workspace within the borough.

**Action by:** DCPCS

**A16. LETTING OF BAYS 1 AND 2 ACKLAM GARAGES, ACKLAM ROAD, W10 - KD04578**

This report and the exempt appendix sought approval to the letting of bays 1 and 2 Acklam Garages, Acklam Road.
RESOLVED – Cabinet approved a new 25 year lease on parking bays 1 and 2 Acklam Garages for storage purposes.

**Reason for the decision**

Approving this letting will secure a good income for the Council on previously unused basement space.

**Action by: DCPCS**

**A17. VITAL IMPROVEMENTS – PROGRESS REPORT**

This report was the first of two for 2015-16 on the progress of initiatives that make up the Royal Borough's Vital Improvements suite.

Members noted that overall, the picture was relatively encouraging. Comments were made about a number of the initiatives flagged as red, amber/red status, notably Tri-borough Managed Services.

**Action by: DSLS**


This paper presented information on Vital Signs indicators at the end of 2014-15, highlights those where performance is significantly below expected levels and summarises performance against the larger set of corporate performance indicators.

Members noted that increasing numbers of comments from residents on the state of litter in the streets were being received. The Chairman stated that officers need to collect that data and report back to Councillor Ahern. In addition they need to identify any hotspots and see if any patterns are emerging.

Members noted that officers would report on a narrower set of indicators in January 2016 and the annual report in a year’s time.

Members noted the report.

**Action by: DSLS**

**A19. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC**

**Local Government Act 1972, as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985**

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 11 JUNE 2015**

Public summary of the decision:
The exempt minutes of the meeting held on 11 June 2015 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

B2. DISPOSAL OF FOUR HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT PROPERTIES AND CONVERSION OF ONE PROPERTY TO INTERMEDIATE RENT WITH AN ADDITIONAL UNIT – KD04573

Public summary of the decision:
Cabinet agreed the recommendations set out in the report.

B3. THE FUTURE OF THAMESBROOK NURSING AND RESIDENTIAL HOME

Public summary of the decision:
See minute A7 above.

B4. BUSINESS CASE FOR PURCHASING PROPERTIES FOR THE PROVISION OF TEMPORARY ACCOMMODATION

Public summary of the decision:
See minute A10 above.

B5. APPOINTMENT OF A CLIENT SIDE TEAM CONSULTANCY SERVICE AND ADDITIONAL DESIGN TEAM FEES FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE EDENHAM WAY SITE

Public summary of the decision:
See minute A11 above.

B6. ACQUISITION OF PRIVATE PROPERTY INTERESTS – BARLBY TREVERTON SITE AND BARLBY SCHOOL REDEVELOPMENT

Public summary of the decision:
See minute A12 above.

B7. MARLBOROUGH SCHOOL AND COMMERCIAL BUILDING – APPROPRIATION POWERS UNDER SECTION 122 OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972

Public summary of the decision:
See minute A13 above.

B8. KENSINGTON TOWN HALL – CONFERENCE CENTRE AND CIVIC HALL REFURBISHMENT PROJECT

Public summary of the decision:
See minute A14 above.

B9. GRANT OF PEPPERCORN LEASE – 205 HOLLAND PARK AVENUE W11

Public summary of the decision:
See minute A15 above.
B10. LETTING OF BAYS 1 AND 2 ACKLAM GARAGES, ACKLAM ROAD, W10

Public summary of the decision:
See minute A16 above.

The meeting ended at 8.30 pm

Chairman
<table>
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<th>Report for Cabinet 26 May 2016.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
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<td></td>
<td>Forward Plan reference: KD04812/16/K/A.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Report title (decision subject)</strong></th>
<th>SILCHESTER EAST AND WEST – OUTCOME OF ESTATE REDEVELOPMENT OPTIONS APPRAISAL AND PROPOSALS FOR FURTHER WORK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reporting officer</strong></td>
<td>Laura Johnson, Director of Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key decision</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to information classification</strong></td>
<td>Public (Part A) with Confidential/Exempt (Part B) Appendix Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 Cabinet agreed a report on 16 July 2015 which sought permission and the associated budget to carry out a redevelopment options appraisal for Silchester East and West (the Silchester Estate).

1.2 The brief for the options appraisal considered two differing land options, with three sub-options for redevelopment on each land parcel. CBRE were appointed to provide client side and project management functions and they in turn appointed Porphyrios Associates under a compliant sub consultancy agreement to provide the architectural design work.

1.3 A project team was set up which met regularly to take the project forward. Once the architectural designs had been developed, planning commentary and a financial viability study was developed for each option.

1.4 A matrix was developed to fully assess each option against the Council’s objectives and commitments to residents, and the process has concluded that there are a number of potentially viable options that would deliver on those objectives while also meeting those commitments.

1.5 Initial consultation has been carried out with local residents and there is some support for redevelopment but many residents said that a refurbishment option for the estate should also be considered.

1.6 This report seeks permission to carry out more detailed work on the following options: to continue with the current maintenance strategy (ie the ‘Do Nothing’ option), to include a new option of improvements to the estate through refurbishments and in-fill development, and to continue with more detailed consideration of the viable options for redevelopment.

1.7 This report also acknowledges the need to take forward the work in conjunction with allocating the relevant sites as part of the current review of the Local Plan. This will involve potentially allocating the sites for development and/or refurbishment including identifying the possible number of additional residential units achievable as a range, together with any other supporting uses, and the appropriate infrastructure and planning obligations to allow delivery to happen.
2. RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1 In order to deliver on the Council’s estate regeneration objectives of providing excellent new homes for its existing and future tenants, delivering much needed additional housing across all tenures (private and affordable), and building “the conservation areas of the future”, Cabinet agrees that further more detailed work needs to be done to test how the following options would deliver on those objectives and meet the Council’s commitments to the Estate’s residents:

- To continue with the current maintenance strategy for the Silchester Estate
- To improve the Silchester Estate through refurbishments and in-fill development
- To pursue one of the viable options for the comprehensive redevelopment of the Silchester Estate

2.2 The Cabinet agrees a budget for fees shown in Part B of this report from the HRA to progress the next stage of work which will further test those options and then report back to Cabinet with a preferred option. In addition, £2 million from the General Fund is requested to facilitate leaseholder (and freeholder) buy backs. At this early stage it should be noted that the preferred option could be to continue with the existing maintenance strategy. A breakdown of budget headlines is shown in Appendix B Six.

2.3 The Cabinet agrees that, in addition to the Council’s stated commitments for all estate regeneration projects across the borough, the full redevelopment of the Silchester Estate can only be chosen as the preferred option if all resident leaseholders and freeholders will be offered the opportunity to buy a new property on the redevelopment through a Shared Equity offer. Therefore, if the Silchester Estate is redeveloped, the existing community of Council tenants and resident leaseholders and freeholders will be able to remain together in the redevelopment.

2.4 The Cabinet agrees that if any leaseholders (or freeholders) in properties originally purchased through the Right to Buy wish to sell their property now but have concerns regarding their ability to sell on the open market as a result of the underlying possibility of regeneration, then the Council will offer to acquire that property at full market value and that an initial budget of £2 million is identified to facilitate such purchases.
2.5 The Cabinet agrees that any void properties arising on the list of addresses shown below will be relet to those who have approached the Council as Homeless and require temporary accommodation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-45 Bramley House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88 Bramley Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-9,10-15, 16-21 and 22-27 Darfield Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-80 Dixon House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-80 Frinstead House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-20 Kingsnorth House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-80 Markland House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-12, 14-24, 26-36, 38-48 evens and 29-41 odds Shalfleet Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-17 and 21 Silchester Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-11, 12-17, 43-49, 50-56, 57-63 and 64-76 Wayneflete Sq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-80 Whitstable House</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.6 Delegate authority to the Cabinet Member for Housing, Property and Regeneration to appoint an appropriate client side and design team once an acceptable financial proposal has been properly procured.

3. REASONS FOR DECISION

3.1 The initial redevelopment options appraisal has shown that there are a number of redevelopment options which are viable, which will deliver on the Council’s regeneration objectives, and that will meet its commitments to residents of the Estate. Following feedback from the public consultation events, the Council now also wants to examine whether the refurbishment and infill option could match the delivery on its objectives, while resulting in less disturbance for the Estate’s existing residents. All the options need to continue being evaluated not just against each other, but also against the option of continuing with the current maintenance strategy. This report is seeking approval to commit the resources needed to test these options in detail and to recommend a preferred option.

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 growing demand for all types of housing with: those on middle incomes largely unable to access either market or affordable housing in the borough; over 2767 households 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.

Key Constraints

4.2 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 of redeveloping selected low-density Council estates, where a scheme to regenerate such estates can be demonstrated to be financially viable. The area identified as Silchester East and West, as shown in Appendix A One, is one of the areas the Council now proposes to consider for redevelopment.

4.3 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.

**The Council’s Commitments to Residents**

4.5 The Council has undertaken to provide its 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 Council 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 so as to maximise the number of people who will be able to move home only once.
- Offer an attractive disturbance package to allow tenants to move at no cost to themselves.
- Repurchase properties at full market value from any leaseholders (or freeholders) who wish to sell their homes but fear they are unable to do so because of the Council’s proposals.
- Wherever viable, offer resident leaseholders the opportunity to buy a Shared Equity property on the new development.

It should also be noted that one of the recommendations in this report is to confirm that resident leaseholders and freeholders on the Silchester Estate will be offered the opportunity of acquiring a new Shared Equity home on any future redevelopment of the estate.
Work undertaken so far

4.6 Cabinet agreed in July 2015 that an Options Appraisal be commissioned to consider six high level options. The objective of the Appraisal was to consider the redevelopment potential of the following Options:

**Option One** - All land and stock owned by the Royal Borough – optimum redevelopment of all medium and low rise residential accommodation, but retaining the four tower blocks;

**Option Two** - All land and stock owned by the Royal Borough – optimum redevelopment of all medium and low rise residential accommodation, together with the demolition and redevelopment of the four existing tower blocks, but not including any new tower blocks within the proposals;

**Option Three** - All land and stock owned by the Royal Borough – optimum redevelopment of all medium and low rise residential accommodation but providing for a number of replacement tower blocks, although not necessarily on the current sites/footprints of the existing towers;

**Option Four** - All land and stock within the identified area - optimum redevelopment of all medium and low rise residential accommodation, but retaining the four existing tower blocks;

**Option Five** - All land and stock within the identified area - optimum redevelopment of all medium and low rise residential accommodation, together with the demolition and redevelopment of the four existing tower blocks, but not including any new tower blocks within the proposals;

**Option Six** - All land and stock within the identified area - optimum redevelopment of all medium and low rise residential accommodation, but replacing the four tower blocks with new towers.

4.7 CBRE was appointed as client side team and project managers to oversee the options appraisal process. They appointed Porphyrios Associates to provide the architectural input. Porphyrios Associates were given the brief by the Council to reintegrate the existing estate with the rest of the Royal Borough and fulfil the Council’s vision for Conservations areas of the future. Each option was then considered against a set of criteria, including ability to comply with the
commitment to residents that the Council entered into as shown in para 4.5 above, compliance with planning policy and financial viability. Each option then received a rating against each criteria of either red (does not achieve desired outcomes), amber (may be able to achieve desired outcomes) or green (good chance of achieving desired outcomes). The table below shows a summary of the rating of each option:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Meets commitment to estate residents</th>
<th>Financially viable</th>
<th>Meets planning requirements</th>
<th>Delivers more and better affordable housing</th>
<th>Delivers conservation areas of the future</th>
<th>Creates high quality green and public spaces</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>green</td>
<td>yellow</td>
<td>red</td>
<td>red</td>
<td>red</td>
<td>red</td>
<td>Pursue (refine)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>red</td>
<td>red</td>
<td>red</td>
<td>red</td>
<td>red</td>
<td>red</td>
<td>Not pursue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>green</td>
<td>yellow</td>
<td>red</td>
<td>red</td>
<td>red</td>
<td>red</td>
<td>Not pursue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>red</td>
<td>red</td>
<td>red</td>
<td>green</td>
<td>green</td>
<td>green</td>
<td>Pursue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>red</td>
<td>red</td>
<td>red</td>
<td>red</td>
<td>red</td>
<td>red</td>
<td>Pursue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>green</td>
<td>yellow</td>
<td>red</td>
<td>red</td>
<td>red</td>
<td>red</td>
<td>Pursue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Option (1), although marginal, provides the potential for an option that can be delivered on land solely owned by the Council. It is possible this option can be refined to become financially viable. Options (4), (5) and (6) are viable, although option (6) involves development of new towers, which may not be desirable. The initial options work has also identified that some land parcels are more important than others for redevelopment. It would be desirable to carry out further work to fully understand this, and possibly develop an option or options looking at a different area involving some, but less, third party land. A 'Do Nothing ' situation would also need to be considered as part of the next phase of work. A strong theme from the consultation was for a refurbishment option to be developed and this will also form part of the next phase of work. An extract from the final report on this initial options appraisal is shown in Appendix A Two and the full report in confidential Appendix B Seven.

5. **PROPOSAL AND ISSUES**

5.1 A large housing regeneration scheme of the scale and nature being explored for the Silchester Estate presents a number of opportunities and challenges. Land is at a premium within the Royal Borough and building new homes of any tenure, and
particularly affordable homes, presents a huge challenge. However a large estate regeneration scheme has the potential for a significant number of new homes to be developed and for a proportion of these new homes to be affordable.

5.2 Many of the Council’s existing affordable homes are becoming increasingly less popular with residents, particularly those which comprise studios or are in high rise or walk up blocks. Traditional ‘street properties’ are typically much more popular amongst tenants bidding for new homes, and a regeneration scheme presents an opportunity to provide better and more popular housing for both current and future tenants. On the Silchester Estate, the consultation has suggested that the four tower blocks and Bramley House are particularly unpopular with residents. As part of the next phase of work further work will be carried out to fully understand the extent of this view.

5.3 A regeneration scheme which includes a large number of properties is likely to take some years to plan, develop and implement. This means those residents directly affected will inevitably be faced with the anxiety and uncertainty about the future of their home for some time, when ultimately a decision could be made not to embark on a scheme. The Council is sensitive to these concerns and will be working closely with both residents’ associations and individual residents to try to address their concerns. In addition, an Independent Tenants’ and Leaseholder Adviser is being appointed who will be able to provide residents with an impartial view of any proposals coming forward.

5.4 Rehousing is clearly a key anxiety for both tenants and leaseholders. A project of the size being considered would be carried out on a phased basis over a number of years and would be unlikely to commence for at least 2 years. Careful phasing of the scheme would allow the vast majority of residents to be able to move once only into a new property.

5.5 Carrying out the work required to reach the point where the Council might take a decision to proceed with redevelopment will inevitably take some time. This means continuing uncertainty for those who live in properties potentially affected. During this period of uncertainty it is highly likely that there will be void properties in the blocks affected, for example voids arising where under-occupying tenants have been rehoused. Offering these properties to households awaiting permanent rehousing is often problematic. If in-going tenants are not told about the proposals, but find out having moved in, this would leave the Council open to criticism.
Further, the Council might then be required to decant these new tenants and afford them compensation. Conversely, where potential in-going tenants are informed, this often leads to a high number of refusals, leading to extended void periods.

The Council has the option of reletting these properties to those who have approached the Council as Homeless and require temporary accommodation. Should this approach be adopted, there will be a slightly reduced number of families to be rehoused should one of the redevelopment options be pursued and a correspondingly smaller amount of compensation to be paid.

The Council is currently finding it extremely challenging to procure temporary affordable accommodation in borough and many of those approaching as Homeless require local accommodation due to their engagement with support services, such as Children’s Services, Disability or employment support. There are currently twelve households that require a transfer to local temporary accommodation for these reasons. Further, the Council is losing a further twenty two units of vital local temporary accommodation. There is also a growing problem with households subjected to the benefit cap who have limited resources to cover rental cost, currently rely on Discretionary Housing Payments (DHP) to cover the shortfall, and need to be transferred to more affordable temporary accommodation.

Using void properties as temporary accommodation provides a small but valuable resource for these cases. A number of households that require local accommodation will be able to better access important support services, and moving households subject to the benefit cap to more affordable temporary accommodation will provide them with more affordable accommodation, and benefit the public purse in reducing temporary accommodation and DHP costs. Should the Council decide not to proceed with a redevelopment option; the properties can then be relet as settled accommodation. The Council currently has 2767 cases on the waiting list for accommodation.

Taking these properties out of the pool for permanent reletting will have an impact on those awaiting settled accommodation. However, since April 2010 a total of 39 units on the Silchester Estate have become void and been relet from a total of 2982 properties allocated over the period. At the present time, 13 secure tenants residing on the Silchester Estate are registered on the Council’s Housing Register for re-housing to more suitable accommodation. The marginal loss of relets on the Silchester Estate as a result of suspending allocations is outweighed by the contribution it will
make to meeting the demand for local temporary accommodation (in terms of both property supply and the cost of temporary accommodation procurement and placement).

5.6 There are a number of properties that have been sold through the Right to Buy and subsequently let at market rent. A number of private tenants attended the consultation and expressed concern about their future. The Council has no statutory duty towards these tenants. It is hoped that the new Intermediate Rent properties could be suitable for some of those private tenants who cannot otherwise afford market rents in the area and the Council will consider this issue as part of the strategy for keeping the current community together.

5.7 Options 4, 5 and 6 would require extensive dialogue and joint working with third party land owners to deliver. The third party land owners comprise four Registered Providers; Notting Hill Housing, Octavia, Catalyst, London and Quadrant. The Westway Trust also lease part of the land on a long lease from the Council. The Latymer Community Church is privately owned. There are leaseholders who hold long leases for the artists’ studios in Blechydnden Street, the Pig and Whistle and Bugsie’s. In addition there are two houses which are owned freehold. Preliminary discussions have been held with third party land owners and the next phase of work will involve developing a strategy for engaging in more detailed discussions. We also need to ensure that realistic and deliverable options are being taken forward for consideration as part of the site allocation work for the Consolidated Local Plan review.

6. OPTIONS AND ANALYSIS

6.1 There is general agreement that some form of intervention in the Silchester Estate is both desirable and viable. At this stage, there are a number of options which merit more thorough consideration.

6.2 The aim of the next phase of work is to develop a more detailed understanding of the extent to which each option can meet the Council’s objectives and commitments, complement the Local Plan review and also address the concerns of local residents.

7. CONSULTATION

7.1 There is a well established Residents’ Association for the Silchester Estate and a Residents’ Associations for Bramley House. There has been regular contact between officers and the chairs of both associations.
7.2 A letter was sent to all residents directly affected by the initial options appraisal in June 2015 and all the owners and users of the other buildings in the designated area were contacted.

7.3 There were two well attended ‘drop in’ events held on 13th and 15th July, 2015 to respond to residents’ questions and concerns.

7.4 Two further drop ins took place on 30 November 2015 and 18 January 2016 to give residents the opportunity to meet the architects. Both these events were well attended, with 33 people attending the first drop in and 91 attending the second. Those who attended were invited to complete a feedback form and 35 of these were completed. The feedback has been analysed and the report which was produced summarising this is shown in Appendix A Three.

7.5 Once the initial piece of work was completed, two drop in events were held to display the work and seek feedback from the local community. These were held on 7 and 17 March, 2016 at two different venues and representatives from Prophyrios Associates, CBRE and council members and officers were present. A total of 120 people attended and were invited to complete feedback forms. In addition the display materials were made available on the Council’s website together with the facility to complete a feedback form. 90 completed feedback forms were received and analysed. The feedback report is shown in Appendix A Four.

7.6 An informal discussion has been held with each of the potentially affected third party land owners. Westway Trust has submitted a written response and this is shown in Appendix A Five.

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.

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:

**Age:**
**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 rehousing. 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 rehoused 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.

**Households with children** proximity to schools will be taken into account where considering rehousing 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.

**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.

**Gender:** Unlikely to have any impact.

**Gender reassignment:** Unlikely to have any impact.

**Marriage and Civil Partnership:** Unlikely to have any impact.

**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 know, any additional bedroom requirement will be taken into account when allocating the new home.

**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.

**Religion/belief:** Where a residents religion or belief require design adaptations to a property these will be taken into account wherever it is reasonable to do so.

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

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

Home visits will be carried out to all affected tenants to identify their future housing requirements and this will include a discussion of any particular needs. Where needs are identified, individualised responses will be identified taking into account best practise. In addition, tenants will be invited to complete monitoring information which will be stored both anonymously and confidentially so that the overall impact of any scheme on protected groups can be monitored.

### 9. PLANNING IMPLICATIONS

**9.1** 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.

**9.2** 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.

**9.3** The costs of the local planning authority fully engaging in this phase of the project are fully covered in the project costings, rather than from revenue budgets, as they would be for other developments of this scale.

### 10. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

**10.1** The Council has taken Counsels advice on the proposal in para 2.6 to use future void properties as temporary accommodation only. Advice received is that so doing does not amount to a pre determination by the Council of which option it is likely to pursue.
The Council has a duty under S.105 Housing Act 1985 to have procedures in place for the consultation with residents on proposals affecting their estate.

11. FINANCIAL AND RESOURCES IMPLICATIONS

11.1 An estimation of cost for the next stage of the options appraisal has been undertaken and further details are shown in Part B of this report.

11.2 Corporate Finance has been consulted and comments as follows:

The £2 million requested to purchase properties from any leaseholders wishing to sell is additional to the existing capital programme agreed by March 2016 Council. At this stage it is proposed that this capital investment (ahead of any future regeneration) is funded from available capital receipts. If there are insufficient capital receipts then this spending will potentially be funded from borrowing which will have revenue cost implications. This will be reviewed as part of quarterly capital programme monitoring which is considered by Cabinet in April/May, July, October and February each year.

12. PROCUREMENT

12.1 The Council has entered into a contract with CBRE to provide client side services for all of the Council’s current regeneration schemes. This followed on from a procurement process using the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) Property Panels Framework. It is therefore proposed that should Cabinet agree that further work should be carried out on the options identified in 2.1 then officers will enter into financial negotiations with CBRE to agree a sum for the work within the terms of the contract. There will be a further report to the Cabinet Member for Housing, Property and Regeneration to seek permission to appoint the client side and design team once satisfactory terms have been agreed.

Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) – Background papers used in the preparation of this report

[Note: Please list only those that are not already in the public domain, i.e. you do not need to include Government publications, previous public reports etc.]
Contact officer(s): Ruth Angel, Senior Project Manager, Housing Department, Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea.

Tel: 02073612628

Email: ruth.angel@rbkc.gov.uk
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Appendix A Three
Silchester East and West

Feedback from ‘meet the architect’ events held on 30 November 2015 and 18 January 2016

Introduction

The Council has commissioned an options appraisal for Silchester East and West, Bramley House and the surrounding area. There have been two opportunities for local residents and other stakeholders to meet with the appointed architects, Porphyrios Associates. This report gives a summary of the feedback from those events.

Feedback

A total of 33 tenants and leaseholders attended the first event and 92 people attended the second event.

Attendees were asked to complete a feedback form, which had three sections; the first asking attendees what they like about the estate, the second asking attendees what they would like to change about the estate and the last section inviting any further comments. The comments made on the forms were a good reflection of the variety of issues and concerns raised by those who attended the two drop-ins.

The properties

Residents value, and would like to change, various aspects of the properties and there was a mixture of responses. The main things noted were:

- the flats are spacious
- the flats are well built
- there is plenty of storage space
- the flats are well designed
- there is good access to private outdoor space
- there is a great view

The main things people said they would like to change were:

- the tower blocks should either be refurbished or demolished
- the flats need better soundproofing
- there were a lot of issues about Bramley House including that the flats are too small, windows and pipework need attention, there is inadequate insulation and the block is dark and uninviting.

The estate

The main things people said they like were:
- location, local to everything including sports facilities, local shop and local pub
- the sense of community and particularly the diversity of the community and the fact that in many cases generations of the same family have lived in the area
- the green space on the estate, particularly Waynflete Square
- the outdoor space for children
- the estate is well maintained
- there is little crime and antisocial behaviour

The main things people would like to see changed were:
- safety should be improved
- antisocial behaviour and drug dealing should be dealt with more effectively
- maintenance of the lifts should be improved
- the roads should be better maintained

Those who attended were also asked if they had any other comments. A number of people commented that they think the area is a good place to live.

One said:
‘The estate feels like a good place to live.’

Another said:
‘Whitstable House is a great building to house many people, in a big building tower. Saving space and great location near to tube and shops. It helps people with low income to be able to rent the social housing in a great area!’

A large number of people raised concerns about having to move. Some people said they did not want to move, others that if they had to move they wanted to move only once, there were concerns expressed about being moved out of the area and concerns about the community being broken up.

There were a number of concerns expressed about the motivation for redevelopment.

One person said:
‘We should not embrace change just for the sake of it and knock down good properties.’

An extract from a copy of a letter sent by two residents to Porphyrios Associates sums up the views of many:

‘As people who care passionately about our estate, we only want to see any regeneration if it means as good, or better homes for everyone on our estate, tenants, leaseholders and freeholders, low rise and high rise. If some blocks are to come down and not others we would expect the remaining blocks to have a significant amount of work done on them to bring them up to a similar standard as the new homes.’
Appendix A Four
Report on feedback from exhibitions at end of options appraisal

Introduction

In July 2015 the Council commissioned a redevelopment options appraisal for the area shown in Appendix One, known as Silchester East and West. CBRE was appointed to provide the client side team and in turn appointed Porphyrios Associates to carry out the architectural modelling aspect of the project. The brief was to consider six high level options, three of which considered the opportunities for Council owned land, and the second three considered opportunities for both Council owned and third party land.

Once the proposals were developed two exhibitions were held to display the proposals and seek feedback. Representatives from Porphyrios Associates, CBRE and officers from the Royal Borough were present to answer any questions.

The events

Flyers were distributed to all tenants, leaseholders and freeholders living in properties potentially affected by the proposals inviting them to attend a drop in exhibition. This includes those living in properties owned by the Royal Borough and those owned by others. Business owners who are potentially affected were also invited. There were two events, one on 7 March 2016 between 4pm and 7.30pm in the Latymer Community Church on Bramley Road and the second on 17 March 2016 between 4pm and 7.30 in the Harrow Club on Freston Road.

A series of display boards were prepared for both events. These consisted of boards explaining the Council’s vision and commitments to residents and a number of boards displaying the work that both the architects, and Council’s consultants, CBRE, had carried out. Copies of the boards can be found on the Council’s website.

Representatives from Porphyrios Associates and CBRE were present at the events together with Council officers from Housing Regeneration and Corporate Property. Residents were invited to complete a feedback form which is shown in Appendix Two.

Feedback

A total of 93 tenants, leaseholders, freeholders, community representatives and business owners attended the event on 7 March and 33 attended the event on 17 March. Six people attended both events, so a total of 120 different people came to the two events.

A breakdown of attendees’ connection to the area is shown below:
85 were council tenants, leaseholders or freeholders in properties initially bought through the Right to Buy, 2 residents from properties potentially affected not owned by the Council 24 residents who live outside the redline 5 community representatives 3 councillors 1 person from a business in the area

The table below shows the geographical distribution of attendees amalgamated for both events.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block/Road</th>
<th>Number of attendees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abingdon Road</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balliol Road</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barandon Walk</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bramley Road</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bramley House</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bourne Terrace Mews</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte Mews</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarendon Walk</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalgaro Gardens</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darfield Way</td>
<td>4 – 1 person attended both drop ins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denbigh Road</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixon House</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elgin Crescent</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frinstead House</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highlever Road</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingsnorth House</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster Road</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latimer Road</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markland House</td>
<td>12 – 1 person attended both events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottingwood House</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipping House</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portobello Road</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Ann’s Road</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Quintin Avenue</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shalfleet Drive</td>
<td>4 – 2 people attended both events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silchester Road</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talbot Grove House</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waynflete Square</td>
<td>15 – 2 people attended both events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitstable House</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-residents</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not state their connection with the area</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, the display materials were available on line, together with the facility to complete and submit a feedback form.

In total there were 90 completed feedback forms received. The breakdown of those who completed forms was:
Council tenant or leaseholder living in low rise 30
Council tenant or leaseholder living in high rise 24
Resident in surrounding area 20
One response was from Councillor Blakeman, a Ward Councillor for Notting Dale. One response was from the St Quintin and Woodlands Neighbourhood Forum and the St Helen’s Residents’ Association. These last two have been excluded from the analysis and have been reproduced in full in Appendixes Three and Four respectively.

The form had three sections; the first asking attendees what they like about the proposals, the second asking attendees what they dislike about the proposals and the last section inviting any further comments. For each of the questions on the feedback form, attendees were able to write about as many different issues as they wished. There were a variety of responses and respondents expressed similar ideas and concerns in differing ways, so this report attempts to pull out common themes. Some comments have been used to illustrate the common themes emerging and all comments can be seen in Appendix Five.

The comments made on the forms were a good reflection of the variety of issues and concerns raised verbally by those who attended the two drop-ins.

**Overall impressions**

A number of people responded with their overall impressions and there was a wide diversity of opinion. Many people greeted the idea of redevelopment warmly, whilst many others were extremely negative.

Some of the positive comments were:

‘I think that it is in everyone’s interest to be regenerated, I am all for the programme.’

‘I like that the area under study will be changed for the better and replace the old and unsightly housing, especially the 4 towers, with something of better quality that fits with the wider area of RBKC.’

‘I like the idea of re-building the tower blocks to mid-rise and ensuring all the residents are re-accommodated as defined in option 5. Being well connected and having new garden spaces.’

‘Option 5 is amazing, I would love to see this one, the space on our estate has been used very well to accommodate lots of homes, and there is still so much green space, it by far the best option and I fully back it 100%.’

There were a number of people who expressed their dislike of all options, with 15 people responding that there was nothing they liked and an additional two who said they dislike everything about the proposals. Some of the negative responses were:
‘I don’t like the arrogant vision that has been imposed on my neighbourhood and the patronising assumption that it is an improvement.’

‘This is an estate that works and should be respected and preserved.’

‘Here’s the thing. Silchester is a unique eco-system. It’s a model council estate that could only exist here, cheek by jowl with Westfield, Portobello, the Westway, and the Passport To Pimlico Neighbourhood David Cameron is about to return to. When the dreamers in municipal planning departments sought to build council estates where people could create communities who live in harmony and with dignity, their vision was pretty much what we have now. It ain’t broke so let’s not fix it.’

The options

A number of people stated which option/s they like or dislike. Many people said they thought Option 5 was the most preferable with a total of 24 people saying they like Option 5. In addition three people said they like Option 1. Two people said that they dislike Options 3 and 6 as they propose building new towers.

The inclusion or exclusion of the existing four towers seems to be a key factor for many people in responding to the options. Seven people said they like Option 4 because it retains the towers and two more said they dislike the options that propose demolition of the towers. A much larger number however expressed the contrary view. 17 said that they prefer Options 2 and 5 as they remove the tower blocks and five said they dislike the options that leave the towers in place. One respondent said:

‘I live in one of the towers and beside the view, it’s horrible to live in, its damp, cold, no community feeling and they are not very nice to look at, plus the lifts are awful, always breaking down, the balconies look like they are about to fall off and the windows so unsafe, even to the point where we lost a child from our block to the windows.’

In addition, there were two written comments and a number of questions at the drop-ins about the future of Frinstead House, with most people expressing the view that Frinstead should not be left if the other towers are demolished. One person said:

‘I note that Frinstead House is left in a mysterious limbo in Option 5. How can this option receive green lights on all 6 criteria when it does not even attempt to tackle this major issue?’

A total of 22 said that they would like to see an option developed that considers renovating the existing homes. One person commented:

24
'There appears to be a huge bias towards knocking everything down and starting again. Where are the discussions regarding the improvements that could be made to our homes without the use of bulldozers? The only reference to this is in 'option 0'. The 27 words under is negative ‘Do Nothing’ title very clearly show that this option is not going to be considered. Instead of spending millions starting again, why is there no consideration for spending just a small % of that improving what we already have?'

Another said:

‘Is there no possibility for infill on this site where you could add extra homes without demolishing any existing residences, while respecting the existing green spaces? Is there no options or methods that can be used to build roof extensions on top of the existing homes?’

Masterplanning/Architecture/Design

There was a mixture of comments about the proposed architecture, with some people saying that it would be a huge improvement on the design of the existing estate, while others actively disliked the indicative architectural style shown at the drop-ins.

Some of the positive comments are:

‘Option 5 seems by far the best one as it suggests demolition of the 4 rundown towers while providing more homes, more green space’.

‘I like that the estate will be brought together instead of being all over the place and separate, option 5 is by far the nicest option and if it’s to go ahead’.

‘The replacement of poor quality high rise blocks and the creation of a sense of place.’

However, 10 people said they dislike the proposed design. One said:

‘The proposed style of architecture, though purely indicative, appears to be a weak form of pastiche which apes the houses and mansion blocks to the north of the site and borough. If we must have comprehensive redevelopment of the area generally, can RBKC please act as inspired clients and commission meaningful architecture, inspired by the best of the surrounding context but in an appearance and style modern, interesting and progressive. Let us have some modern architecture, of fine materials, crafted and carefully responsive to its surroundings’.
Eight people said that they thought the proposed new homes would be too tall and too close together and therefore would only allow a small amount of daylight and sunlight into the proposed new gardens. Two respondents said that they thought the housing was too near the Westway, and three expressed concern that the new homes would not be as big as the existing homes. One person said:

‘Will the accommodation provided be of the same quality as the flats now? They have large windows, light and spacious and have balconies. Will the flats provided to tenants of the tower blocks (if they are knocked down) have balconies? Will they have some protection from the grease, grime and fumes from the Westway? At present my kitchen gets very dirty from the grease on the Westway.’

The proposals for enclosed communal gardens drew a mixed response. 11 people said they liked this aspect of the proposals. One person said:

‘I like the options that make the most use of garden squares, which I think is important for these estates to have, to balance our being so close to the Westway.’

Another said:

‘Plans for the new gardens were also lovely.’

Four people said they disliked the communal gardens, but this was strongly related to the corresponding loss of green space that is open to all. Eight people said they disliked the proposed removal of Waynflete Square and another eight said they disliked the overall loss of outside space open to all. One comment was:

‘None of the options show any decent-sized green space accessible to all. Every year the Silchester Residents’ Association holds an event for 200+ people on Waynflete Square and we all value the public open space. The small area “Bramley Square” on Bramley Road is right next to a busy road. We would prefer all the open spaces in the development to be accessible to everyone, rather than semi-private enclosed gardens accessible only to residents surrounding those gardens, and we would like there to be at least one sizeable area of green space accessible to all.’

Another person commented:

‘A major issue with all the options is that public space has been sacrificed for private. The whole joy of Waynflete Square is that it is a large public green space open to all. It is overlooked by the residents of the square but it belongs to all of us, the kids who play there, the mums who use it to get out of the house, the teenagers fumbling towards a first kiss, those who work or
live in St Quintins and use it as a thoroughfare, those who pass through for the first time and stop to listen to a blackbird, anyone and everyone. This has been replaced in the current plans by private communal gardens. It is not the same thing at all.’

Five people said they liked the proposal for new the public gardens at Bramley Square but six said they disliked this aspect of the proposals as the new square is designed next to the road. This was associated with fears of safety and pollution due to the proximity of traffic.

There was again a mixed response to the proposals to reintroduce streets through the site with five people saying they like this aspect of the proposals and four saying they dislike the large number of roads. Some of the comments from those who say they like the proposals for the roads were:

‘I like the idea of creating two new public gardens as well as the creation of new roads connecting Silchester and Freston Roads.’

‘[I like] The green spaces and the re-introduction of roads, connecting Silchester Road to Freston Road. The elimination of dead end roads ie by Bramley under the Westway as this attracts people hanging about and is used as a get away.’

Four people said they dislike the proposal to join up Silchester and Freston Roads and concerns were expressed about safety. One person commented:

‘I strongly dislike the joining up of Silchester and Freston Roads as it will expose an already heavily polluted area to even more traffic fumes and create a potential rat run for motorists avoiding the congestion that can build up on Bramley Road. It’s hard to see the rationale for this in the options as they stand.’

Two people said that they thought all the options would result in an area that was safer than currently.

Community

A strong theme from the comments was the fear that the community would be broken up, with 15 people expressing some aspect of concern. One person said:

‘I can only describe the options as major heart surgery being carried out to a community that will be lost forever. If a new community is created, it could take a few generations if at all. You will be breaking up a community that has come together over 50 years.’

Loss of facilities
There were a number of differing concerns about the loss of facilities that are currently found in the area. Five people commented that the proposals had no provision for parking. Six people said they dislike the loss of local facilities, such as the local shop, pub and community centre. Four people said they dislike proposals 4-6 as they result in the loss of garden areas and sport facilities currently provided by Westway Development Trust. Two more people said they disliked these options as they propose using land that the Westway Development Trust holds in trust to the community. Two people said they fear the loss of mature trees and one person said they dislike the disregard of the facility currently used by ACAVA (Association for Cultural Advancement through Visual Arts). One of the comments reads:

‘We realise that these are “high level” options, but the indicative aspirational drawing shows that the area around “Bramley Square” just had a few small shops around it. We already have a range of shops available which will increase once the Tesco at More West has opened. If we have another 600 people living in this area what we will need is more community space, health facilities, nurseries and easily accessible school places, not more shops. If the Latymer Community Church is to come down then the new facility needs to be the same size with the same facilities and the new facility needs to be built first so that the community doesn’t have a period without the community hub. The same applies to ADKC, and all other buildings that are essential for the community. It is not a good precedent that the More West development is nearing completion but none of the community facilities or the Tesco are anywhere close to opening, and the Silchester Residents' Association has been without its residents’ rooms at the base of Frinstead House for over two years just when we need it the most. The Westway Sports Centre already has a very long waiting list for its facilities and there is no indication that any of the sports pitches would be re-provided. The Pig and Whistle is a valued pub of the “working men’s” variety, so even if there is a commitment to re-provide a pub, this does not equate to re-providing the same community resource unless it is offered to the existing landlords on the same terms.’

In addition, three people said that they disliked the proposals as there was no consideration of any additional facilities that may be required by the increased population.

**Additional housing**

Five people said that they liked the proposal to provide more housing, particularly affordable housing and in addition two said that they disliked the fact that there was no additional affordable housing being proposed. Two people said that they though the increase in homes would cause the area to become congested. One person raised the issue of buy to leave properties through a comment which reads:
'No-one in this Borough wants to see their community diminished to provide housing which then remains empty. Yet by your own planners' admission, up to 30% of these new flats are sold as investments overseas. Before you come to neighbourhoods like mine and suggest that you knock them down, make sure you can promise that people will actually live in these properties. A first step would be to ask your development partners to market these properties at the local estate agents (of which we have a great many) rather than property markets in the Far East.'

Disruption and uncertainty

A frequently expressed concern was the disruption that a redevelopment of the scale proposed would cause and the fear that this would be likely to last for many years, with 11 people expressing this. In addition three people said they disliked that there was nothing definite about the proposals. There were also concerns about the likely timetable. One commented:

'It would be helpful to see a clear, and diagrammatic explanation of all the stages that any scheme such as this has to go through before works commence, and some indicative time scales E.g. options go to Council Cabinet 1-2 months Next stage (whatever it is) 3-6 months. At least then people would have an idea of the bare minimum length of time before anything happens as we have heard anything from two years to four years. Even if it's not possible to give indicative times at this stage, it would be helpful at least to know all the stages that are necessary.'

Rehousing

Two people said that they like the commitments regarding moving that the Council is making to both tenants and leaseholders. However, 14 people expressed some concern about the uncertainty associated with moving and rehousing. In addition, four people expressly mentioned that there is no guarantee of an equity share offer for leaseholders. One person said:

I hope there will be enough affordable social housing included in the plans, I have lived in this borough all my life'.

Another comment reads:

'We accept that it isn't possible immediately to give full information about the vague commitments given by the Council but a huge amount of uncertainty is being created by people not knowing what might happen in the future if their home is affected. For example, does the council commitment to purchase leasehold properties at full market value apply from
today or sometime in the future? A key to holding the community together will be what exactly the offer is to resident leaseholders regarding shared equity, and what offers you can make regarding intermediate rents. Working on the offers that you can give to all the different stakeholders needs to be given priority, and communicating clearly what these offers are.’

Presentation issues

There were a number of things people disliked in terms of the way information was presented. Four people said there was not enough detail and three people said there was no satisfactory explanation of why the proposals would be an improvement on the current layout. One comment that expanded on this reads:

‘We would like to see your evidence base for any assertions that form the basis for the options. For example, Cllr. Rock Fielding-Mellen suggested that there was evidence that enclosed gardens are used more than ones that are open to everyone, but our experience of Avondale Park/Holland Park etc is that they are very well-used, whereas we rarely see anyone come in or go out of a garden square except on Open Gardens Weekends. Another thing that is often mentioned is community safety/crime, but again whenever we look at the OWL neighbourhood watch updates the crimes all seem to take place in other areas and very rarely on our estate. Options 4, 5, and 6 all show “Bramley Square” i.e. a small strip of grass next to the road. We can’t think of a single place in the Borough where a space such as this is used or valued, so what is the rationale behind it?’

Three people also said that they felt the watercolours for the new buildings were not accurate as they did not show buildings of 12 storeys. One comment reads:

‘We cannot see what the 12 storey blocks will look like in the artists’ plans- the smaller blocks already look big enough – what will they be like at double the height?’

A clear and simple glossary of terms being used to accompany displays was requested.

Consultation

There were a number of concerns about the consultation raised through the comments section - that decision had already been made, and that the feedback from the community had not been taken on board. There were a number of requests for transparency to the process, and specific requests to see the details of the viability studies. The issue that many residents do not have English as a first language, and the need to provide appropriate translated materials was also raised. One suggestion was that all feedback is tabulated to show what was being asked, and how the Council is intending to respond.
Key conclusions

There seems to be general agreement that some form of intervention is needed and welcomed for the Silchester Estate, although there is considerable disagreement about the form this should take. One respondent said:

"People on the estate are delighted that someone appears to be considering their welfare."

One key conclusion from this consultation is the overall recommendation that this piece of work should continue but should also develop the ‘Do Nothing’ Option in sufficient detail that residents understand what this would mean going forward. In addition, there has been a view expressed by many that a refurbishment option should be fully developed. In terms of the options, a strong view was expressed that those options which involve the demolition of the towers were preferred to those where they remain. The table below shows a summary of the key themes that have emerged through the consultation and the Council’s proposed responses:
## Summary of Key Themes and Council’s proposed response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Themes</th>
<th>Council’s Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some significant intervention is needed for the estate</td>
<td>➢ Continue with further work to look at options for radical intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 5 is option with the most support</td>
<td>➢ Continue to investigate and develop Option 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Options that involve demolition of the towers are most popular</td>
<td>➢ Continue to investigate and develop Option 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Include working through practicality of demolishing Frinstead House.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Carry out survey of tower block residents to better understand what concerns are, and level of support for demolition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There was a mixture of responses to the masterplan and some felt that there was insufficient explanation of why the design would be an improvement on the existing design of the estate</td>
<td>➢ Arrange for consultation exercise to explain the Council’s vision for Conservation Areas of the Future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Arrange for architects to carry out a series of talks and visits for both Silchester RA and Bramley House RA to explain why proposed design would be better than existing estate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There were a number of concerns about size of new social rented properties and any properties to replace current leasehold properties</td>
<td>➢ Arrange for existing sample properties to be measured and consider how this compares to current London Plan Standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns about number and position of 12 storey blocks</td>
<td>➢ Further development of the proposals will identify the height</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern</td>
<td>Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern about overall loss of green space</td>
<td>➢ Arrange for existing green space to be measured so that it can be compared with provision of green space in any proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern about position of open green space</td>
<td>➢ Future options work will consider alternatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>next to a road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of community/concerns about rehousing/</td>
<td>➢ Develop Charter for residents together with ITLA to set out undertakings to tenants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loss of social rented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertainty about Equity Share offer</td>
<td>➢ An undertaking regarding an Equity Share offer for resident leaseholders will be considered once there is greater clarity about the financial basis of any viable options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of communal facilities</td>
<td>➢ Develop vision for retail and communal facilities together with existing stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of parking</td>
<td>➢ Parking position for estate regeneration is being developed on a programme wide basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of WDT facilities through options that</td>
<td>➢ Clarify which Westway Trust facilities would be lost through any proposed option and develop high level view on how these would be replaced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>take in wider land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure of any additional affordable homes</td>
<td>➢ There will be flexibility about the tenure for any additional affordable housing and this will be kept under review whilst proposals are being developed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danger of buy to leave properties</td>
<td>➢ The Council is aware of this as a key issue and will continue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
to review the most pragmatic way of dealing with this.

| Concerns about disruption | ➢ Develop phasing proposals.  
|                           | ➢ Look at good practice elsewhere to minimise disruption on an occupied estate. |
| Concerns about display materials | ➢ Allow enough time to show Silchester RA and Bramley House RA proposed display materials in advance of public exhibitions so that any comments can be taken on board. |
| Contacting residents who do not have English as a first language | ➢ Set up recording system to identify those who do not have English as a first language and which language they do have. Identify translation resources and position regarding provision. |
| Timetable | ➢ Develop proposed timetable which is made publicly available and regularly updated. |
| Glossary of terms | ➢ Develop glossary of housing regeneration terms to be published on Council’s website and regularly updated. |
Appendix A Four (i) – Silchester East and West
Appendix A Four (ii)

Silchester East and West
March 2016

We have carried out a housing study of six high level options to develop the estate to see whether any of them could be viable. The study has shown that there are three options that could be viable. Currently, no decisions have been made regarding a preferred option. To help us to take the work forward we would like to know what you think about the possible options.

All of the feedback we receive we be used in a report to the Council’s Cabinet in April.

What do you like about the options?

What do you dislike about the options?
Please use the space below for any other questions or comments

About you:

Please tick which applies:

☐ I am a council tenant or leaseholder living on the Silchester Estate

If yes  ☐ I live in a low-rise flat  ☐ I live in a high-rise flat

☐ I am a resident living in the surrounding area

☐ I have a business in the local area

☐ Other

Please hand your completed form to a member of staff or put it in the box provided.

You can also email any comments or questions to yourhomeyourfuture@rbkc.gov.uk
Appendix A Four (iii)

SILCHESTER AREA OPTIONS APPRAISAL
WARD COUNCILLOR RESPONSE

What do you like about the options?

- The commitment to create the conservation areas of the future – but I note that blocks of up to twelve storeys are proposed. If the Kensington “mansion block” is to be used as a model, these do not exceed eight storeys
- The commitment to estate residents to enable secure tenants and resident leaseholders to be rehoused in the new development together as a community. However, this undertaking excludes all residents in temporary accommodation for whom the Council has accepted a duty to rehouse, many residents on fixed-term tenancies, all residents of the homes owned by the other Registered Providers and long-standing private tenants of buy-to-let leaseholders. In total there are around 680 dwellings on the site. Of these, only secure TMO tenants have a firm assurance of a home on the new estate, a total of around 375 households. Even resident leaseholders in TMO blocks have not received a firm offer of a new home. This means that some 300 households would have to move, 45% of the existing community. The Council does not like the term “social cleansing” but these figures imply a very significant enforced exodus of households from the Silchester area
- The commitment to create high quality green and public spaces – but this should not be at the expense of destroying the current high quality green and public spaces with their existing mature trees and gardens
- The intention to provide some homes for intermediate rent to address some of the needs of Generation Rent.

What do you dislike about the options?

- The intention to provide no additional homes at a social rent
- The new roadway joining Silchester Road to Freston Road. This is unnecessary, will bring additional vehicular traffic into an area with already poor air quality and will be used as a rat run to avoid congestion on Bramley Road at certain times of the day
- The cul-de-sac on the western side (Options 4, 5 and 6) whose only purpose seems to be to justify the new road joining Silchester Road with Freston Road
- The loss of the sporting facilities provided by Westway Trust
- The proposed street patterns. These do not replicate the historical patterns (see attached map of the Holy Trinity Notting Hill parish)
- The destruction of the much-loved and much-used communal facility of Waynflete Square
- The destruction of mature trees, gardens and green open spaces
- The two proposed public “squares”. Bramley Square beside the main road will be unsafe for children, subject to pollution from the highway and offer no privacy for residents’ community events. The rectangular shape is unattractive
- The proposed Silchester Square, which is in the shadow of the elevated motorway, with its poor air quality and “waterfalls” of contaminated rain water from the motorway during heavy downpours
- The private gardens on the eastern side of Bramley Road that will receive almost no sunlight at any time of the day and consequently will be dark and dank, with little opportunity for vegetation to flourish
- Demolition of the tower blocks. These should be retained and refurbished, as at Grenfell Tower on Lancaster West Estate. The Silchester tower blocks are more
robustly built than Grenfell Tower and each flat already has its own outside space. The flats meet Parker Morris standards and any problems at the blocks stem entirely from poor maintenance, especially of the lifts. Retaining the tower blocks will be environmentally-friendly, preserve embodied carbon and achieve regeneration more quickly and less contentiously than full demolition and reconstruction. It will also be far more cost effective and obviate the need to over-develop on a fully reconstructed estate.

- The implications of the financial viability commitment to deliver the regeneration without public subsidy. If total demolition is chosen, the number of dwellings for market sale will require an unsustainable additional density on a site already subject to the worst air quality in the Borough. This means there will be insufficient green open space to mediate the poor air quality. The density required to fund reconstruction fully will also mean building far too close to the elevated motorway, the motorway slipway and the two railway lines. The Council has refused to provide the viability calculations but, based on published research, the cost of demolishing just one 80-dwelling tower block would be around £4 million. The cost of re-providing those 80 homes would be around £20 million. Some additional 50 market properties would therefore need to be sold to meet these costs alone. [At Grenfell Tower, 120 homes were refurbished at a cost of less than £11 million, which also provided 9 new homes, a nursery and a state of the art boxing club.] Furthermore, the market sales will also have to fund community consultation, design, plans and planning, CIL and Section 106, buying out leaseholders, buying out other landlords, buying out and replacing the Pig and Whistle public house, ACAVA artists’ studios, Buggsi’s convenience store, St. Christopher’s Training Centre, the Latymer Community Church, Westway tennis courts, Westway fives court, decanting residents, relocation expenses, demolition, rehousing, phasing, project management, site preparation, remediation, addressing abnormal site conditions, ground works, landscaping, reconstruction, replacing and adding extra infrastructure facilities, marketing, lettings, sales etc. We are not convinced that Option 5 is in fact viable, or any other of the options that demolish the tower blocks. A local housing campaigner has requested the viability calculations under the Freedom of Information Act and we await these with interest.

Other questions or comments.

- We were advised at the consultation that the options tabled had been drawn up before the initial comments from residents were available to Porphyrios. Options now need to be drawn up to take account of residents’ comments; otherwise the consultation process will be seen as just a box-ticking exercise that will be ignored by the Council.
- There is no option for refurbishment and infill development on the table and this omission must be rectified (see the High Court judgment in the case of Cressingham Gardens).
- For the avoidance of doubt I am also attaching the RBKC Labour Group’s policy on estate regeneration since it is claimed that Labour supports unequivocally the Council’s regeneration policies.

RBKC LABOUR GROUP POLICY ON REGENERATION OF TMO ESTATES
The selection of estates for regeneration will be guided and confirmed against a clear set of published criteria, the most important of which are:

(a) that the regeneration will result in a significant increase in social rented housing in order to reach Borough targets for “affordable” homes as set out in the London Plan and to address the Council’s Housing Allocations register; and
(b) that the estate has been subject to a financial viability assessment to prove that it is beyond repair and regeneration through demolition is the only way to provide this increase in social housing. This assessment will be publicly available.

Any programme to redevelop Council/TMO estates will only progress where the following conditions are met:

- The process will begin with an extensive consultation with residents and other stakeholders, leading to the production of an agreed Supplementary Planning Document
- The development will not deviate from the terms of the SPD (unless to make improvements and then only with the full agreement of all stakeholders)
- The new estate will be built to the highest possible standards, with an assurance that the Council is not building something that will become a slum in 30 years
- The preferred option will be environmentally-friendly, involving retrofitting, in-fill development and additional storeys to preserve embodied carbon wherever possible, to achieve regeneration more quickly and less contentiously than full demolition and reconstruction
- All current infrastructure – such as shops, nurseries, public houses, community rooms etc. - shall be replaced and additional primary care facilities provided where there is evidence of need
- Regenerated estates may be rebuilt to a higher density, but should retain at least as much public open green space and playgrounds as before
- Where density is significantly higher than before, additional infrastructure facilities should be included as required
- Once built, the new estate will be properly maintained and not allowed to run down. This will become more complex over time, as the maintenance and repair of private sector homes will differ from the maintenance and repair programmes of TMO/Council-managed properties
- As well as providing additional “affordable” housing and homes for market sale and rent, there will be a net increase in the provision of social rented homes
- The Council should introduce London Living Rents for all the “affordable” rented housing other than those currently let at the social rent
- The Council will not use dwellings that become void and are then allocated as Temporary Accommodation as the estate is redeveloped as a reason to reduce the provision of social rented homes in the new development; the total number of social tenancies must be increased not decreased
- Homes for social and other sub-market rent will not be located on the worse parts of the estate and will be indistinguishable in quality from the rest of the estate
- No property for sale will be marketed out of the UK and/or as a Buy-to-Lease and/or Buy-to-Let investment. A restrictive covenant to this effect shall be placed on the lease and this will be strictly monitored and enforced by the Council
- The existing resident community will be retained on site. To this end the following criteria will apply:
- All TMO tenants (with secure tenancies and fixed-term tenancies) who wish will be rehoused on the regenerated estate, on the same tenure and rent levels and ideally after only one move
- Adult children living with parents who are secure tenants will be rehoused on the regenerated estate, either separately or with their parents
- Residents for whom the Council has accepted a duty to rehouse who are living in temporary accommodation on the estate will be offered tenancies on the regenerated estate
- Older tenants who are currently under-occupying but not subject to the spare room subsidy (“bedroom tax”) will be rehoused in a home with one additional bedroom as they wish
- All resident leaseholders who wish may buy a comparable sized unit on the regenerated estate. Where required, the Council will provide a ‘top up’ of shared equity to bridge any differential in market value between the existing and new unit at no cost to the leaseholder. This retained equity will not be subject to charge and will be returned to the Council on the sale of the property
- The Council will assist returning resident leaseholders to find alternative homes during the construction period
- Long-standing tenants of Right-to-Buy landlords on the estate will have priority for a new London Living Rental home on the regenerated estate.

**About me**

I am an elected Notting Dale ward councillor and I live next door to the redline Silchester area.

**Councillor Judith Blakeman**

*28 March 2016*
Appendix A Four (iv)

The St Helens Residents Association/St Quintin and Woodlands Neighbourhood Forum has over 400 members. The area that we cover lies immediately north of the Silchester Estate. Our response to proposals to 'regenerate' the estate is as follows:

1. We defer to the views of residents of the estate in terms of the balance of demolition and replacement of buildings. Our perception of the estate is that it is a product of local authority house-building during a period when design and space standards compare well with the present day. If the majority view of existing Silchester tenants and leaseholders is in favour of a modest refurbishment scheme, minimising the extent of decanting and forced relocation of existing tenants and leaseholders, then we would support this option.

2. From the perspective of residents in the StQW/SHRA neighbourhood, Option 2 has attractions in removing the existing towers and redeveloping the estate with new 5-10 storey buildings. This is deemed by RBKC to be a 'non-viable' option. We consider that local residents should have access to the viability assessments obtained by RBKC as these are essential in forming a view on the options presented to the public.

3. We are unclear as to the basis on which RBKC would take back land currently leased to the Westway Trust, and currently used for sports purposes (e.g. tennis courts). As far as we can understand from our own recent conversations with the Trust, they were not made aware of Options 4, 5 and 6 until after the feasibility studies were concluded.

4. The images of a 'regenerated' estate shown at the exhibition and as part of the consultation are unconvincing and unimaginative. The layout of 'finger blocks' with narrow open spaces between them are reminiscent of the layout of the White City Estate. The images accompanying the plans show mansion blocks of 7 storeys, whereas the 'viable' option 5 refers to heights of 5-12 storeys. The latter building heights would create a canyon-like effect with little sunlight reaching ground level.

5. If the 'red line' for development ultimately includes the Westway Trust land, it would be interesting to see whether required densities could be achieved with a perimeter block of 5-12 storeys rather than the currently proposed layout of finger blocks. This would leave space for a more coherent layout of public open space in the middle of the development.

6. We welcome the fact that the RBKC is seeing to build a 'conservation area for the future' and is not contemplating extreme densities and very tall buildings such as those inherent in the Draft Local Plan for the Old Oak and Park Royal Development Corporation area, currently out for consultation.

Henry Peterson. Chair, St Quintin and Woodlands Neighbourhood Forum and St Helens Residents Association.

www.stqw.org

Please tick which applies: Other
### Appendix A Four (v)

#### Questions or comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General – positive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I think that it is in everyone’s interest to be regenerated. I am all for the programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB The majority of general positive comments are shown under the ‘Masterplan’ section.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General – negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are you serious? Which one of these options would YOU choose if you were living on this estate and faced total demolition and destruction of your home and neighbourhood? Is this just a ploy to make us believe you are being honest and transparent? First you make your decision to demolish our homes and now you are asking us how we would like you to do it? Its like telling us ‘we’re going to stab you with a sharp knife, now tell us where you want to be stabbed! Do you want it in the back, the heart, or right in between the eyes!’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find it hard to like suggestions that destroy an entire community, make somewhere that is pleasant to live unpleasant and unsafe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t like the arrogant vision that has been imposed on my neighbourhood and the patronising assumption that it is an improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regeneration is a good thing but if you want to stay true to the meaning of it which is rebirth or regrowth of something that has died or been lost, then this cannot be called regeneration. The estate has not died. It is very much alive and thriving so why kill it? There must be other alternatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There appears to be a huge bias towards knocking everything down and starting again. Where are the discussions regarding the improvements that could be made to our homes without the use of bulldozers? The only reference to this is in ‘option 0’. The 27 words under is negative ‘Do Nothing’ title very clearly show that this option is not going to be considered. Instead of spending millions starting again, why is there no consideration for spending just a small % of that improving what we already have?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is an estate that works and should be respected and preserved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People on the estate are delighted that someone appears to be considering their welfare. I know that both social tenants and leaseholders are disappointed by the TMO’s programme of maintenance and improvements. It is common knowledge that most of the building is of a very high quality, but tenants have persistent niggling issues. Knocking everything down and starting again is obviously one solution, but it does seem a bit drastic. For example, our six little cottages in Silchester Road are built on a 12 inch raft of reinforced concrete, to correct the legendary subsidence of Notting Dale. (It is no coincidence that this was a pottery and brick making district back in the day.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I question the Council’s apparent dislike for the architecture of Silchester. It was built to a high spec, by some of the finest architects of the time, in a quest to improve the lives of the working class residents of Notting Dale. It is testimony to the success of those ideals that so many families remain from that time, that the residents take such pride in the estate and that the community has welcomed people from all over the world, with open arms: even me, a middle class boy from Worlds End and his family. George Clark, Channel 4’s Restoration Man, looked for years to buy a house here. You seek the conservation areas of the future. Perhaps you have one right under your noses. Perhaps too, the Council should rethink its attitude to tower blocks. Trellick Tower has become a magnet for aspirational professionals. Why not Whitstable, Dixon, Markham and Frinstead?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Here’s the thing. Silchester is a unique eco-system. It’s a model council estate that could only exist here, cheek by jowl with Westfield, Portobello, the Westway, and the Passport To Pimlico Neighbourhood. David Cameron is about to return to. When the dreamers in municipal planning departments sought to build council estates where people could create communities who live in harmony and with dignity, their vision was pretty much what we have now. It ain’t broke so let’s not fix it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What's to like? These proposals are repulsive, repugnant, profiteering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing properties – negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I live in one of the towers and beside the view, its horrible to live in, its damp, cold, no community feeling and they are not very nice to look at, plus the lifts are awful, always breaking down, the balconies look like they are about to fall off and the windows so unsafe, even to the point where we lost a child from our block to the windows.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like that the area under study will be changed for the better and replace the old and unsightly housing, especially the 4 towers, with something of better quality that fits with the wider area of RBKC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I live in Bramley House, I believe it would be best for the Council to pull it down as repairing the buildings would be a waste of money.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frinstead House should definitely disappear as it is impossible to integrate it into the new More West development, it is just too close.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frinstead House once demolished should not be replaced in the same spot as it is far too close to More West which already provides more than 100 homes and whose communal garden would become unmanageable with so many residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I note that Frinstead House is left in a mysterious limbo in Option 5. How can this option receive green lights on all 6 criteria when it does not even attempt to tackle this major issue?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Refurbishments</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think one of the questions is how to make the existing four tower blocks as liveable as Keeling House is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The tower blocks need renovating – leave everything else as it is so community is not forced to leave the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please replace the lifts in Whitstable. Stop doing pointless aesthetic/visual refurbishments and save the money for functional refurbishments instead.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All 4 tower blocks need proper refurbishment. They need new windows and lifts, surely the costs of that will be much less than demolishing!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a leaseholder of Bramley House I am very concerned that a beautiful building is to be knocked down rather than repaired just has £100,000 of public money is being spent on regeneration of the public grounds of the building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whilst I can see the argument for pulling down building which are in poor condition, I strongly dislike the idea of pulling down dwellings which are in excellent condition and would hope the council will get the architects to explore the viability of retaining these in the next phase of consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Waynflete Square</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave Waynflete Square as it is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waynflete Square is a safe, friendly place to live with great connections and a lovely green space. I love my flat and don’t want it to change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is nothing wrong with the flats in Waynflete Square – they are well built and comfortable and there is a great community here. I love my flat and want to stay there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Infill</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there no possibility for infill on this site where you could add extra homes without demolishing any existing residences, while respecting the existing green spaces? Is there no options or methods that can be used to build roof extensions on top of the existing homes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Masterplan</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like the idea of re-building the tower blocks to mid-rise and ensuring all the residents are re-accommodated as defined in option 5. Being well connected and having new garden spaces.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Option 5 seems by far the best one as it suggests demolition of the 4 rundown towers while providing more homes, more green space. I like that the estate will be brought together instead of being all over the place and separate, option 5 is by far the nicest option and if its to go ahead, I like options 5. The area looks much safer and I do not like the towers. The replacement of poor quality high rise blocks and the creation of a sense of place. Option 5 is amazing, I would love to see this one, the space on our estate has been used very well to accommodate lots of homes, and there is still so much green space, it by far the best option and I fully back it 100%. What are the criteria for ‘Conservation Areas of the Future’? Its the White City Estate with Neo-Georgian facades, but much higher. The options are all based around ‘traditional street patterns’ and lack anything that gives the area a strong identity and focus. It is disappointing that all the options seem to be variations on one theme, rather than given any kind of selection. I prefer the evolution of the current neighbourhood, where smaller housing developments were sporadically built throughout the twentieth century. This has given us a variety in an organic, chaotic, charming and human neighbourhood. Rather than an unnecessarily large ‘masterplan’ redevelopment that resembles what’s happening in Kings Cross – homogeneity, where everything looks the same and it’ll take decades for it to settle and mature.

Architecture

The proposed style of architecture, though purely indicative, appears to be a weak form of pastiche which apes the houses and mansion blocks to the north of the site and borough. If we must have comprehensive redevelopment of the area generally, can RBKC please act as inspired clients and commission meaningful architecture, inspired by the best of the surrounding context but in an appearance and style modern, interesting and progressive. Let us have some modern architecture, of fine materials, crafted and carefully responsive to its surroundings. The buildings are dishonest – Neo-Georgian facades mask block so flats behind. Unimaginative – need to reflect some local history (loss of tower blocks)

Design of homes

Will the accommodation provided be of the same quality as the flats now? They have large windows, light and spacious and have balconies. Will the flats provided to tenants of the tower blocks (if they are knocked down) have balconies? Will they have some protection from the grease, grime and fumes from the Westway? At present my kitchen gets very dirty from the grease on the Westway. I hope the size of the new flats will not be too small as tends to happen now.

you seem to think that this will make existing leaseholders happy! The current flats consist of good size living rooms and bedrooms, some even with roof terraces. By building more flats you decrease the size of the current flats making cells for families to live in. Would new flats have more or less living space than the old flat. All buildings should be mixed tenor/tenure blind

Open space

A major issue with all the options is that public space has been sacrificed for private. The whole joy of Waynflete Square is that it is a large public green space open to all. It is overlooked by the residents of the square but it belongs to all of us, the kids who play there, the mums who use it to get out of the house, the teenagers fumbling towards a first kiss, those who work or live in St Quintins and use it as a thoroughfare, those who pass through for the first time and stop to listen to a blackbird, anyone and everyone. This has been replaced in the current plans by private communal gardens (modelled on those up the hill in W11, I imagine). It is not the same thing at all.

I like the options that make the most use of garden squares, which I think is important for these estates to have, to balance our being so close to the Westway. I also like the options that bring the estate together in a more uniform way, such as option 5. The options that redevelop the unsightly towers are very welcome. Plans for the new gardens were also lovely.
### Roads

...extending Freston Road would be a nuisance to the residents as this would mean even more traffic, danger to the school students in the end of Freston Road in return for very little benefit of better connectivity.

I strongly dislike the joining up of Silchester and Freston Roads as it will expose an already heavily polluted area to even more traffic fumes and create a potential rat run for motorists avoiding the congestion that can build up on Bramley Road. It's hard to see the rationale for this in the options as they stand.

I like the idea of creating two new public gardens as well as the creation of new roads connecting Silchester and Freston Roads.

The green spaces and the re-introduction of roads, connecting Silchester Road to Freston Road. The elimination of dead end roads ie by Bramley under the Westway as this attracts people hanging about and is used as a get away.

### Community

Families must be kept together, including adult children and elderly parents. On the same estate if no in the same home.

I just hope my children and I can stay on the estate.

I can only describe the options as major heart surgery being carried out to a community that will be lost forever. If a new community is created, it could take a few generations if at all. You will be breaking up a community that has come together over 50 years.

I hope ‘enables Secure Tenants and resident leaseholders to be rehoused in the new development, together as a community’ does not mean existing residents will be housed together in a small section of higher-rise blocks right next to the Westway, losing their green space, community hubs and quality of life/space standards.

I would be happy with any option that provides me with rehousing equivalent to the 2 bedroom terraced house and garage which I now currently occupy.

Much seems to be made by the council of the rights of the secure tenants of the council who can be rehoused in a new home on the estate. But within this area there is very varied tenure including:

- Secure tenants of the council
- Resident leaseholders
- Those in temporary accommodation, where other housing associations are renting from non-resident leaseholders who have bought from the council
- Long-standing tenants of non-resident leaseholders
- Tenants of other housing associations within the red line. We are very concerned that all of these residents are valuable people, and that there is a potential grave inequity in the offer, and the level of support given to different categories of resident. For example:
  - how far the remit of the Independent Tenant and Leaseholder Advisor’s will extend
  - how the council will go about consulting with and informing residents of other housing associations who may not have a Residents’ Association.

If you are serious about the "concerns of the existing community and the desire to remain near friends and family" we need to be able to help all of the above residents to stay in the area if they wish to do so.

We accept that it isn't possible immediately to give full information about the vague commitments given by the Council but a huge amount of uncertainty is being created by people not knowing what might happen in the future if their home is affected. For example, does the council commitment to purchase leasehold properties at full market value apply from today or sometime in the future? A key to holding
the community together will be what exactly the offer is to resident leaseholders regarding shared equity, and what offers you can make regarding intermediate rents. Working on the offers that you can give to all the different stakeholders needs to be given priority, and communicating clearly what these offers are.

I am concerned that people who have the option to buy flats will get to pick the better flats and tenants will be left with the more noisy flats.

Facilities

Will the pub, community rooms, studios etc be reprovided before the regen starts?
The feedback from the original consultation, indicated that the residents here value particularly a) the long standing community  b) the open public green space. It's like a village with a village green, a shop, a church and a pub. Do you feel that is reflected in any of the designs?

None of the options show any decent-sized green space accessible to all. Every year the Silchester Residents’ Association holds an event for 200+ people on Waynflete Square and we all value the public open space. The small area “Bramley Square” on Bramley Road is right next to a busy road. We would prefer all the open spaces in the development to be accessible to everyone, rather than semi-private enclosed gardens accessible only to residents surrounding those gardens, and we would like there to be at least one sizeable area of green space accessible to all.

We realise that these are “high level” options, but the indicative aspirational drawing shows that the area around “Bramley Square” just had a few small shops around it. We already have a range of shops available which will increase once the Tesco at More West has opened. If we have another 600 people living in this area what we will need is more community space, health facilities, nurseries and easily accessible school places, not more shops. If the Latymer Community Church is to come down then the new facility needs to be the same size with the same facilities and the new facility needs to be built first so that the community doesn’t have a period without the community hub. The same applies to ADKC, and all other buildings that are essential for the community. It is not a good precedent that the More West development is nearing completion but none of the community facilities or the Tesco are anywhere close to opening, and the Silchester Residents’ Association has been without its residents rooms at the base of Frinstead House for over two years just when we need it the most. The Westway Sports Centre already has a very long waiting list for its facilities and there is no indication that any of the sports pitches would be re-provided. The Pig and Whistle is a valued pub of the “working men’s” variety, so even if there is a commitment to re-provide a pub, this does not equate to re-providing the same community resource unless it is offered to the existing landlords on the same terms.

Concerns about moving

Would like to move into a new property but would prefer to only move once.
I hope there will be enough affordable social housing included in the plans, I have lived in this borough all my life.
If the building work is to go ahead, where are all the residents to be housed in the meantime? Can they be promised they will be moved back (perhaps with a written contract)?

Upheaval

I prefer for nothing to happen as I see it as a complete and utter upheaval and inconvenience.
It will make living in the most polluted part of the most polluted borough worse with all the demolition, asbestos disposal etc.

Consultation

It feels as if decisions have already been made – communication has not been great. I am a resident of Kingsnorth house, happy and don’t want to see any regeneration.
I think if you continue with the development plans, I would like some honest and realistic timescales for completion/how long we have before we are moved into the new development.
At the consultation the architects and RBKC officers clearly gave people the answers they want to hear rather than entirely truthful ones. This is unacceptable.
They do not reflect the feedback from previous consultations. You clearly have NOT listed to us.
I was not surprised to find viable solutions to regeneration as that is what the architects are paid to do. It was always my opinion that once regeneration was announced, it was a done deal and this exercise was simply to find the best way to do it.

I deeply resent living in fear of losing my home of which I own freehold and the time I will have to spend fighting this ill thought out project. I don’t feel we have been property consulted and I don’t think that the plans are transparent enough. I would like to see all the viability studies and back up that support this project.

We need far more transparency about the proposed regeneration and justifications for any options that you choose and we need guarantees not just promises.

We are also very concerned about the lack of engagement so far with anyone who doesn’t understand written English; and what efforts will be made to engage with these people.

We are giving a lot of effort to engaging with this process and would like to see that our efforts are actually being heard and acted upon. Mary was frankly insulted when a representative of the architects implied that we could hold our community event on Bramley Square as it showed a complete lack of understanding of what that event might entail and made her feel as though he wasn’t listening. It would be helpful to see the community feedback tabulated in the kind of format e.g.

Residents said: We want more public community space
The council did: Put a community space of x metres by y metres in the revised brief

**Financial viability**

The issue of ‘financial viability’ is clearly critical, yet it is kept in the dark, away from those most affected by the developments, due to ‘commercial sensitivity’. People have a right to know the sums that are affecting their lives, especially when the evidence suggests these sums are often fiddled or plain wrong.

It is a good idea to show the criteria by which the various options will be judged: financial, planning, green space etc. I would like to see the workings behind these judgements. When might we be able to see that?

**Display materials**

We cannot see what the 12 storey blocks will look like in the artists’ plans- the smaller blocks already look big enough – what will they be like at double the height?

The plans say 5-12 storeys but the different heights of buildings are not shown.

We would like to see your evidence base for any assertions that form the basis for the options. For example, Cllr. Rock Fielding-Mellen suggested that there was evidence that enclosed gardens are used more than ones that are open to everyone, but our experience of Avondale Park/Holland Park etc is that they are very well-used, whereas we rarely see anyone come in or go out of a garden square except on Open Gardens Weekends.

Another thing that is often mentioned is community safety/crime, but again whenever we look at the OWL neighbourhood watch updates the crimes all seem to take place in other areas and very rarely on our estate.

Options 4, 5, and 6 all show “Bramley Square” i.e. a small strip of grass next to the road. We can’t think of a single place in the Borough where a space such as this is used or valued, so what is the rationale behind it?

We would also like to see a clear and simple glossary of terms used by the Council so that we can understand what you mean by them when you use them e.g. affordable housing, private/public/communal gardens.

**Timetable**

It would be helpful to see a clear, and diagrammatic explanation of all the stages that any scheme such as this has to go through before works commence, and some indicative time scales. E.g. options go to Council Cabinet 1-2 months
Next stage (whatever it is) 3-6 months
At least then people would have an idea of the bare minimum length of time before anything happens as we have heard anything from two years to four years.

Even if it’s not possible to give indicative times at this stage, it would be helpful at least to know all the stages that are necessary.

### Increase in affordable housing

Whilst one of the criteria is that the proposals must deliver more and better affordable housing, no mention is made of increased *social* housing, but only of ‘new private and affordable homes’. Does ‘affordable’ mean ‘social’? Are there any plans to increase the provision of social housing in the estate, or simply to retain the existing quantity?

### Sale of market properties

One thing literally everyone agrees on: from the most ruthless Hedgie at the top of the Hill, to the most feckless scrounger blagging down the Lane; from me a DJ servicing the filthy rich to my neighbour, an unsung care-worker;

No-one in this Borough wants to see their community diminished to provide housing which then remains empty. Yet by your own planners’ admission, up to 30% of these new flats are sold as investments overseas. Before you come to neighbourhoods like mine and suggest that you knock them down, make sure you can promise that people will actually live in these properties. A first step would be to ask your development partners to market these properties at the local estate agents (of which we have a great many) rather than property markets in the Far East.
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About the Trust

Westway Trust is a charity committed to enhancing the 23 acres of space under the Westway flyover to benefit local people, making it a great environment to live, work, play and visit.

We exist to harness the creativity, heritage and diversity of the area to maintain and improve the places and spaces we look after. Through good stewardship and collaboration with every part of the community Westway Trust helps this vibrant part of London to continue to thrive.

We already receive more than one million visitors each year to the estate, and we want to expand the community, cultural, retail, sporting and enterprise opportunities here together with improvements to the public realm so that it is a place the community is proud of and even more visitors can enjoy.

Over the next 15 years, we aim to use our land and property assets to deliver enterprise, retail, and community, cultural and sporting opportunities together with improvements to the public realm.

Achieving best value from the estate

As a charity we don’t make profit. All of the income we generate from the estate is reinvested into good stewardship of the estate, projects and services like apprenticeships, learning and education programmes, childcare support, sporting and health programmes. We also operate a significant and growing grant-giving programme. Land and property are our most valuable assets, so having the ability to manage our assets carefully, and to develop the estate to realise much needed facilities as well as a sustainable flow of future income or capital receipts is vital if we are to deliver on our ambitions. Charity law also underlines this point, as we are obliged to achieve best value for the assets we hold.

We don’t consider property just as an income generator, what happens on the estate has to satisfy community aims and aspirations too. We use the spaces under the Westway as places where the community can thrive through events, education, sporting activity, green and open spaces, charity and voluntary services and start up business endeavour. Achieving a happy and balanced combination of maximising and sustaining income generation whilst fulfilling a diverse range of social, economic and environmental aims is central to our purpose.

Unfortunately, the options presented for the redevelopment of the Silchester Estate that involve the development of part of the Westway estate (options 4, 5 and 6) do not currently achieve best value for Westway Trust and our beneficiaries, nor do they support our aims of enhancing our sports and wellbeing offer.

The Royal Borough has made a bold assumption about the future use of the Westway land without consulting with us first. This lack of prior consultation is unfortunate. The plans we have for that part of our estate vary considerably from what has been presented by the Royal Borough.

Our plans seek to improve the sporting offer and create more housing and office/commercial space to help meet local demands and generate income to give back to the local community. We believe these achieve the balance of creating best value through developing office space and housing alongside a much improved sporting offer.
The Trust has undertaken capacity planning, massing studies and an initial master plan for this part of the estate and we believe we can realise over 170,000 square feet on the land. The development capacity on this site is significant, indeed it has the most potential of anywhere on the estate. We would like the opportunity to work in partnership with the Royal Borough to look more imaginatively at the potential of our joint development ambitions.

By working together we could deliver more (affordable) housing opportunities whilst creating more space on the existing estate for greening, landscaping, family-sized properties and gardens whilst re-providing and enhancing the existing services which are so valued by the local area.

We consider ourselves a good partner for the Royal Borough. We work together to deliver many of our shared ambitions. We provide support to local people and groups that the Royal Borough is sometimes unable to. We support charities and start-up businesses through affordable workspace, attractive rent policies and wrap around/support services. Being a self-financing social enterprise we can attract other sources of external funding because we can match fund and are not reliant on government or public funding. In fact we often deliver programmes the Royal Borough can no longer afford to do. We are therefore surprised and disappointed to discover that the Royal Borough has been consulting on a proposal that includes developing on our land without giving us the opportunity to provide early input into the plans.

We urge the Royal Borough to pause the process and consider a joint master plan with us and any land/property owners impacted by the proposals as a key next step.

The importance of enhancing our sports offer

One of our key strategic aims is promoting healthy and active lifestyles. We have over 600,000 visits to our sports and fitness centres every year. We provide scholarships to budding young athletes and 270 young people are on our football education course. We not only provide opportunities for competitive sport, but we also have secured significant inward investment to deliver health and well-being outreach programmes. Hundreds of people were referred by their GP last year to sessions with our health and fitness trainers. A further 2,000 people with health issues were prescribed subsidised gym sessions. And, in 2014, we were recognised as the ‘UK’s best rehabilitation facility’ in the National Fitness Awards.

As well as the social impact we achieve through our facilities, there is a financial consideration to be taken into account. Income from the sports and fitness operation contributes to our overall business plan, and will do so more in the future with our proposed partnership with a not-for-profit sports operating partner. This income is critical to the commitments we have to our wider community programmes. Compromising our ability to generate income from the proposed site, compromises our ability to provide community benefit elsewhere on the estate.

In addition, option 4, 5 and 6 of the proposals do not seem to chime with the Local Plan. 9.3.13 of the Local Plan says the Royal Borough is ‘committed to ensuring that the existing sports facilities in the area are not degraded.’ The current proposals in options 4, 5 and 6 remove sporting provision.

Options 4, 5, and 6 commit to building a road on Westway sports provision. This provision includes football pitches, tennis courts, fives and basketball that attract 58,000 local participants each year. Last year we increased the numbers of people using these particular facilities by 7,000. Users include local schools, community groups including the Latimer Education Centre, girls football teams, QPR FC, Street League, Open Age, Hammersmith and Fulham Mind, Metro Blind Sport, EPIC and St Quintin’s Centre for disabled children and young people.

What we provide is highly valued by the local community. However, it needs upgrading and it is not nearly enough. Our football pitches are so popular we have a waiting list of 130 local clubs and groups. The Royal Borough has 20,000 obese adults, one in five is physically inactive and a third of schoolchildren are overweight or obese. In addition, we have more people setting up home here. The arrival of Imperial West brings with it thousands of new students and new housing in the area which will open up many new opportunities for our
sports offer. Rather than remove or displace the sport facilities, our vision is to develop, intensify and enhance the facilities on this site.

We have not yet been shown a proposal from the Royal Borough that sets out where displaced pitches and courts might be housed or the types of pitches and courts the Royal Borough wants to develop. Westway Trust will not only object to removal of sports facilities, Sport England will also object. Sport England is a statutory consultee on all planning applications for development affecting playing field land. This requires planning authorities to consult it when a planning application impacting pitches is received. It is Sport England’s policy to object to a planning application that sees the loss or diminution of playing field land.

Much of our vision for sport was formulated with the Royal Borough in December 2012 when we developed a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for the Westway estate.

We have used the SDP to develop our current plans for sport which seek to extend our offer and create a hub where many sports come together in one location. We plan to offer more indoor facilities on the Silchester Estate plans and expand our skate park provision into an international quality urban sports park at the western end of the estate. In addition, we have recently announced our intention to develop a new and improved Community Riding Centre at the western end of the estate, on Stable way, as a demonstration of our ambition. We are embarking on finding a partner to run the Sports and Fitness operation. A decision on which not-for-profit partner we choose will be taken in July 2016. Our intention is to involve our new partner in any development of the sports offer and our ambitions.

We have established partnerships with Sport England, the Lawn Tennis Association, the Tennis Foundation, the FA and the British Equestrian Federation and are well on our way to developing more and ambitious plans with our partners. All of which we are willing to share and collaborate upon.

**Enhancing the area as a great place to live**

Furthermore, we are happy to share our learning/insight from consultations with local people over the last year about the type of place they want to create and live in, in North Kensington.

We have run two sets of consultation about the place in the last year. Our findings show that there is a demand for the creation of more community, arts and cultural space where people can come together regularly. People have a strong desire to see environmental improvement at every opportunity, to promote a greener Westway, and for us and the Royal Borough to collaborate innovatively on ways to mitigate against the noise and pollution impacts of the motorway. Creating more affordable housing has been established as a key priority and the chance to create more employment opportunities in any new development would be very welcome.

While much of our consultation has focused on the eastern end of the estate, there is useful feedback about enhancing the area of North Kensington that we are more than willing to share.

**Environmental impact**

On the point of environmental impact, the Royal Borough’s proposals – options 4, 5 and 6 - involving Westway land replace sports facilities with a road and some green space. Creating an additional road in an already polluted part of London is not supported by the local residents consulted. The proposals do not seem to adequately address the issues of pollution and impact of the motorway nor do they satisfy the Royal Borough’s Local Plan which states on point 8.3.18 ‘Poor air quality from the pollution from vehicular traffic on the Westway is an issue. This is more serious for the houses a little way from the Westway, rather than the land adjacent to the units under the Westway, as the structure acts as a protective barrier. However, the entire borough is an Air Quality Management Area, and therefore all development proposals must have regard to the Council’s Air Quality Management Plan.’ We have not been shown any evidence from the proposals that seeks to address the environmental impact concerns.
In addition, any green space that is created in options 4, 5 and 6 significantly dilutes the sports provision. Green space is not a substitute for marked out playing fields. Furthermore, we do not believe it is an ‘either or’ argument to suggest that green space should substitute sports facilities. Communities need convenient access to both.

**Financial considerations**

We also have comments on some of the specific aspects of the proposals.

On financial transparency, there is no explanation of how the Royal Borough reached the decisions about options based on financial viability. Given you are including Westway land in some of your equations it would be good for us to have sight of that. We expect you may have under-estimated the cost of purchasing the land from the Trust.

There needs to be a more forthcoming explanation of the Red, Amber, Green (RAG) rating. It is very unclear how the Royal Borough has reached the decisions it has with the RAG status. Understanding the assumptions, particularly on the options that impact Westway land, is important so that we can best advise the Royal Borough.

The Royal Borough has not been transparent about the financing of the redevelopment. We would welcome a discussion about potential partners – private or otherwise.

**Community feedback**

Finally, we would like to see the response from the community at large. We have been in contact with various groups and individuals but given that some of the proposals are identified on Westway land, we believe it is reasonable to request sight of what residents have said about the proposals so we can ensure our dialogue reflects local concerns and aspirations.

**Appendix: site map of current sports facilities**
Football = 🏑
Tennis = 🎟
Basketball = 🏀
Fives = 🏀
Gardens = 🏡
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1.0 Introduction

1.1 CBRE (the consultant) has been appointed by the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea (the Council) as consultant to provide an options appraisal report for RIBA Stage 0: Strategic Definition in respect of the “Silchester Estates”.

1.2 The Council prepared a brief entitled “Silchester Estates Area Redevelopment Options Appraisal” which formed the brief for the consultant and this Stage 0 Report.

1.3 The inception date for the consultant’s appointment was 19th August 2015 with initiation of the project programme commencing mid-October 2015.

1.4 The project brief is to test options for the provision of:
   a. Re-provide existing homes;
   b. New private sale and affordable housing;
   c. Potential for retail/commercial accommodation (quantum undefined);
   d. Related infrastructure and public open space; and
   e. Delivers a viable regeneration project.

1.5 The outcome of this report and its recommendations will determine the case for entering into Stage 1 to carry our further options appraisal work. It will form a key document to inform decision making throughout the Council’s governance procedures.
2.1 The Council’s aspiration has been set-out as follows (Ref. the Council’s Tender):
“We wish to reintegrate estates into the wider neighbourhood community of streets and squares in order to provide good traditional homes in the conservation areas of the future”.

2.2 The over-arching objectives of the client brief are to deliver:
- Quality homes: provide best possible homes for existing and future tenants;
- Additional homes: provide the additional homes of all tenures that the borough needs;
- Affordable homes: providing new affordable (social and intermediate) homes, especially for those on ordinary incomes, who are currently not catered for by the market or social housing, in addition to re-providing existing affordable housing;
- Quality neighbourhoods: design beautiful new places to form better-connected, better-designed, street-based neighbourhoods to be conservation areas of the future, while reflecting and integrating with local context;
- Regeneration: use development to tackle some of the causes of social deprivation by:
  i. Increasing level of economic activity via provision of right type of business space in mixed-use neighbourhoods.
  ii. Increasing levels of social integration in the borough.
- Financial: increasing net present value of and income from the borough’s housing assets.

2.3 The Council has committed that tenants, leaseholders and freeholders can be assured that the Council will be:
- Sensitive to the concerns of the existing community and the desire to remain near friends and family;
- Provide at least the same amount of social rented floor space as currently provided;
- Give all existing Secure Tenants the option of remaining in the same area, in a property on the same terms and conditions, and rent level;
- Phase moving so that the majority of people only need to move home once;
- Offer an attractive package to allow tenants to move at no cost;
- Repurchase properties at full market value from any leaseholders who wish to sell their homes but fear they are unable to do so because of the Council’s proposals; and
- Wherever viable, offer resident leaseholders the opportunity to buy a Shared Equity property on the new development.
3.0 The Client’s Brief

3.1 As part of the client brief, CBRE appointed Porphyrios Associates as Architect / Master planner to act in a sub-consultancy capacity to prepare masterplan (design) options against the client’s objectives.

3.2 The Architect has provided indicative high level designs for each option, on a block plan basis for appraisal and assessment by the project team and client to determine whether they meet the client’s brief.

3.3 CBRE has provided high-level commercial advice including viability, residential sales and marketing, planning, commercial and investment advice as required to undertake the feasibility exercise. Please note that this is undertaken at high-level and by its nature creates some generalisations in order to compare the various options on an equal basis. This will be refined in Stage 1, if progressed.

3.4 CBRE, in undertaking this review, has provided a Report with sufficient information regarding the options to ensure that this provides the client with the required information to make an informed decision to initiate the next stage or not.

3.5 As part of this process, CBRE and Porphyrios Associates have undertaken two presentations to the client to inform them regarding methodology and high-level viability. Input received from these presentations and monthly progress meetings have contributed to the understanding of the project parameters and the recommendations.

3.6 Further, four public consultation meetings have been held to engage with the local community and understand their aspirations for the Silchester Estate. These discussions are not recorded in this Report but are available if requested.
4.0 The Options

4.1 The brief required a high level assessment of six regeneration options as set out below; three included only Council-owned land/stock and three comprised all land within the below red line plan (see Figure 1 Study Area).

Figure 1: Study Area: All areas coloured yellow denote non-Council ownership land (excluded in Options 1 – 3).

Ref. issued by RBKC.

4.2 For the purposes of all options, Latimer Educational Centre (denoted brown on Fig1) is a listed building and therefore is excluded from any viability study.

4.3 No services and site area constraints have been reviewed and these have been noted in the project risk register with the statement that this should be addressed in detail at Stage 1, if progressed.

4.4 The study was informed by a detailed housing accommodation schedule held by the client for both the Council owned and non-Council owned land to determine the number of affordable housing units that should be re-provided. However, further clarification is required as to the precise unit mix of accommodation within private ownership.

4.5 It is acknowledged that there are non-residential uses within the current study area which may need to be provided for within any of the masterplan options moving forward. For the purposes of this Report, this issue is noted but recognised as a Stage 1 issue.
4.0 The Options

COUNCIL OWNED LAND/STOCK

4.6 **Option 1:** Retaining all existing towers:

The complete redevelopment of all medium and low rise residential accommodation within the Council’s ownership, plus external “visual” enhancements to each of the four tower blocks (via a provisional sum spend allowance) to include the ground floor communal entry and service/refuse areas, and public realm.

4.7 **Option 2:** Demolishing but not replacing towers:

The complete redevelopment of all medium and low rise residential accommodation, together with the demolition of the four existing tower blocks with the resultant sites included within the overall proposal for new residential accommodation, but not including any new towers within the redevelopment proposals; and, option refined to:

- Retain buildings of place-making merit: Following the first client presentation, it was recognised that certain buildings may have merit for retention in any masterplan, e.g. Bramley House. An architectural review of this building concluded that its architectural merit did not merit retention.

4.8 **Option 3:** Demolishing and replacing all towers with new towers:

The complete redevelopment of all medium and low rise residential accommodation, together with the demolition of the four existing tower blocks and their replacement with appropriate “new” tower blocks, although not necessarily on their current sites/footprints.

ALL LAND/STOCK - COUNCIL OWNED AND NON-COUNCIL OWNED LAND

4.9 **Option 4:** Retaining towers:

As Option 1 above, but including the non-Council owned land/stock indicated by Red Line Plan (see Figure 1 Study Area; all areas coloured green denote private ownership).

4.10 **Option 5:** Demolishing but not replacing towers: as Option 2 above, but including all land/stock.

4.11 **Option 6:** Demolishing and replacing towers with new towers: as Option 3 above, but including all land/stock.
5.0 Methodology and Assessment Approach

5.1 The masterplan vision set out by Porphyrios Architects for the Silchester Estates to respond to the Council’s vision is for a mid-rise (say five to twelve storey), high-density neighbourhood which extends the existing surrounding historic urban fabric into a rich and varied urban culture.

5.2 The masterplan should provide a community of buildings, varied in scale and character that acts as a frame / backdrop to a hierarchy of public, semi-public and private open spaces and greens. The masterplan needs to create a ‘heart’ to the community which will become a valued focal point within the neighbourhood, and attract a mixed-use retail and commercial offer to animate the space.

5.3 The brief is an opportunity to realise an exemplary urban scheme, which addresses urban and social regeneration, and creates a dialogue between urban living and nature. The masterplan proposes creating a series of buildings, streets and spaces that contribute to and continue the historic character of Kensington.

5.4 The methodology adopted to approach the brief has been to create a robust masterplan framework which is informed by a review of the historic development of the Silchester area; understanding legibility and permeability of movement across the area; structuring roads (with related underground infrastructure) that acts as a constraint; and, ensuring that the estate is not a cul-de-sac but becomes integrated into the surrounding urban fabric of Notting Hill.

5.5 This framework creates a structure into which each of the redevelopment options can then be assessed. It is noted that this is a high-level study and that issues will be identified, in terms of masterplan design refinement, which will need to be addressed in Stage 1, alongside ‘do nothing’ and ‘refurbishment’ options.

5.6 A framework to enable an assessment of each of the options undertook the following steps (refer to Figure 2):

5.6.1 Establishing a robust framework
a. A robust framework needs to establish the right connections and spaces to the surrounding city;
b. It requires the right size, scale and density of the “urban block”;
c. It must have the right urban “grain”;
d. A place that is easy to understand, safe, interesting and enjoyable; and
e. Ultimately, the urban framework of streets, squares, parks and spaces is as important as the buildings and land-uses themselves.

5.6.2 Encouraging accessibility and connectivity
a. Accessibility, connectivity and permeability are fundamental to the regeneration of the Silchester Estate;
b. There needs to be access to an integrated layout system;
c. An emphasis on walking, cycling and public transport;
d. A clear definition of public and private areas; and
e. The right structure and sequence of places.
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5.6.3 Safeguarding adaptability
a. Silchester will provide a development that includes both private and affordable housing of different tenures;
b. A choice of solutions that is adaptable; and
c. The masterplan is sustainable because it is designed to respond to changes in use and massing.

5.6.4 Fostering community and belonging
a. At Silchester a careful balance is made between city functions and local needs;
b. A strong local sense of place reinforces economic values and helps deliver a high-quality urban development; and
c. Regeneration must retain a strong sense of place, ownership and pride.

5.6.5 Achieving character and place-making
a. At Silchester it is important to engage local residents;
b. Make plans which are safe, welcoming and inclusive; and
c. Instil an emphasis on quality in design, construction and long-term environmental management.

5.7 The Silchester Estates framework
After careful consideration of the Silchester Estates and an understanding the constraints and opportunities, a robust framework is proposed. The framework:

a. Provides a traditional street network that connects the Estate to the surrounding neighbourhoods;
b. Features a perimeter vehicular road (the Collector) that connects Silchester Road to Freston Road;
c. Eliminates dead-ends and cul-de-sacs, providing instead a key through-route;
d. Creates additional pedestrian routes to the northwest of the Estate below the Westway, providing essential links to the north and west;
e. The circulation network results in urban block layouts that give scale and orientation to the estate;
f. The scale of the urban blocks are humane and in keeping with the emerging urban grain;
g. The orientation provides maximum southerly exposure for the streets and green spaces;
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h. A high-density mid-rise development is proposed with a typical range of 5-10 floors across the Estate (with the option of rising to 12 storeys in appropriate places);

i. Two public squares are proposed, Bramley Square at the heart of the scheme and Silchester Square to the northeast of the Estate;

j. Provides a clear definition of public and private areas. A hierarchy of streets and public squares define the public realm. The private realm is formed of private dwellings that form a street edge while communal/private gardens make up the green spaces in the urban blocks;

k. Places a clear emphasis between city functions and local needs. A strong local sense of place reinforces economic values and helps deliver a high quality urban environment; and

l. Creates a neighbourhood that is safe, legible and pleasurable through considered design.

Figure 2: Framework
6.0 Planning Policy Context

INTRODUCTION

6.1 This section provides a high-level overview of the following, based upon the work undertaken to date. If the decision is taken by Cabinet to progress further, considerations relating to planning, including planning strategy, will continue as the project evolves:

a. Planning policy review
b. Options appraisal overview
c. Recommended planning next steps
d. Key planning risks

Assessment of and Consultation on, Full Spectrum of Options

6.2 The work undertaken as part of Stage 0 has focused on testing whether, based on a number of high level assumptions, it would be feasible to redevelop the estate. If the Royal Borough takes the decision to progress testing to allow a number of options to be refined, it will be essential to set the consideration of these options within alternative options being to 'do nothing' (i.e. to continue with the current maintenance strategy) or to refurbish the estate (including any potential “in-fill” development).

6.3 This range of options (do nothing, refurbishment, redevelopment) will need to be objectively tested, and will also need to be subject to thorough consultation with the community. This is critical in order to ensure any decisions taken by the client are procedurally robust.

6.4 CBRE is engaging with the client to establish the nature and extent of work likely to be required in advancing plans for redevelopment (if that is the option that is selected). A 'case for regeneration' will be required, and we anticipate this will comprise the following three strands:

a) The case from a Corporate (Council objectives and commitments) perspective
b) The case from a planning policy perspective
c) The case from a CPO perspective

6.5 The current working assumption (on which discussions are ongoing) is that the process of testing a full spectrum of options (including “do nothing” and refurbishment) will form a key part of the Corporate case, culminating in the identification of a preferred option (which may be ‘do nothing’). The planning policy and CPO cases will be set within the context of the Corporate case and will focus on satisfying the relevant policy and legislative requirements in relation to the preferred option. We would anticipate the local planning authority wanting to have sight of all three strands of the case - which should also be set within an overarching HRA estate-wide strategy.
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**PLANNING POLICY REVIEW**

6.6 Provided below is an overview of the site’s planning policy context and the implications of this for the potential redevelopment of the site.

6.7 Basis for decision making: Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that proposals are determined in accordance with the Development Plan, unless Material Considerations indicate otherwise.

**Development Plan**

6.8 The Development Plan for the Royal Borough currently comprises the:


b. Consolidated Local Plan for the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea (July 2015)

c. ‘Saved’ policies of the Royal Borough’s Unitary Development Plan (‘UDP’) (May 2002; as amended in September 2007 and December 2010)

6.9 Neighbourhood Plans will also form part of the Development Plan where these have been adopted. At the current time no Neighbourhood Plan exists where the site is located.

**Material Considerations**

6.10 Relevant material considerations for the potential redevelopment of the site may include:

a. The National Planning Practice Framework (NPPF) (this sets out the Government’s policy on planning)

b. Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)

c. Ministerial Statements

d. Emerging planning policy changes, including RBKC’s partial review of the local plan (note: the weight any emerging policy is given will depend upon how far progressed it is in the plan-making process)

e. Mayoral and Local Supplementary Planning Guidance Notes and Supplementary Planning Documents

f. Evidence Base Documents

6.11 Material considerations carry less ‘weight’ in planning terms by comparison with the Development Plan. It is relevant to note that whilst RBKC’s partial review of the local plan is at a very early (Issues and Options) stage in the process, the Silchester Estate has been identified for potential inclusion as a site allocation. CBRE (on behalf of the client) is in the process of making representations to the emerging policies.
6.0 Planning Policy Context

**KEY PLANNING POLICIES AND IMPLICATIONS**

6.12 Some of the key planning policies and material considerations which will be relevant to all masterplan options are summarised below.

**Estate Renewal**

6.13 London Plan Policy 3.14 requires estate renewal to take account of regeneration benefits to the local community; the proportion of affordable housing in surrounding area; and the amount of affordable housing intended to be provided elsewhere in the Borough. Existing accommodation should be replaced by better quality accommodation and should provide at least an equivalent amount of affordable floorspace.

6.14 Local Plan Policy CH4 (Estate Renewal) requires a compelling case to be made for renewal. The planning Case for Renewal needs to demonstrate that the long-term benefits outweigh the considerable uncertainty and disruption such projects will cause. In particular, redevelopment will need to:

a. Provide the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing.

b. Achieve no net loss of existing social rented housing as a minimum.

c. Determine mix of re-provided social rent housing on the basis of the housing needs of existing tenants, and additional housing on the Borough’s identified housing needs.

d. Be accompanied by a financial appraisal where the renewal is funded through the provision of private housing or other commercial development.

**Implications**

6.15 To meet the requirements of planning policy, redevelopment will need to address the above points. A Case for Renewal will need to be prepared and submitted as part of any planning application which demonstrates that the long-term benefits of redevelopment outweigh the uncertainty/disruption which might arise.

**North Kensington Regeneration Area**

6.16 RBKC has identified North Kensington as a key area for regeneration. Both the Local Plan and the London Plan encourage development and investment in this area of the Borough.

**Implications**

6.17 Planning policy provides in principle support for any development which seeks to regenerate the area, subject to meeting other relevant development management policies, including Policy CH4.

**Vision for Latimer**

6.18 RBKC’s Local Plan sets out a vision for the ‘Latimer’ area of the Borough which incorporates the site. Key aspects of this vision are:
6.1 Planning Policy Context

a. Reinstatement of traditional street pattern to improve connectivity within and connections through the area;
b. Existing tenants guaranteed new homes;
c. Funding provision of good quality affordable homes through private housing;
d. Creation of neighbourhood centre;
e. Good open space and community facilities;
f. Excellent architecture and urban design;
g. Improved provision of accessible public open space.

Implications
6.19 In order to maximise the acceptability of redevelopment in planning terms, development should seek to address the key elements of the vision insofar as possible.

Plan-Led Approach
6.20 London Plan Policy 3.7 requires sites of 5 hectare+/sites capable of accommodating 500+ units to be progressed through a plan-led process. London Plan Policy 7.7 also recommends a plan-led approach to tall buildings.

Implications
6.21 The North Kensington Regeneration Area and the Vision for Latimer set out in the Local Plan (and summarised above) may be sufficient to satisfy this requirement, as may any emerging site allocation developed through the Partial Review of the Local Plan which is currently underway. The GLA’s position on this policy requirement would need to be established through pre-application discussions at the earliest opportunity.

Extent and Disposition of Third Party Ownership
6.22 At this point in time, RBKC does not benefit from full control of the land within the study area identified.

Implications
6.23 The disposition of third party land across the site will need to be carefully considered in terms of the masterplan and strategy for delivery.

Existing Community Uses
6.24 Local planning policy sets out a presumption in favour of retaining the existing community space at the site (Westway Trust (WT) facilities, Latimer Education Centre, Latymer Christian Centre, ADKC, etc.) unless it can be robustly demonstrated that the community floorspace is no longer required.
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**Implications**

6.25 The future plans and intentions of the existing community facility providers should be established. If these providers express a will to remain on the site, it is recommended that their floorspace is retained or re-provided on the site where possible. It should be noted that the provision of appropriate social and green infrastructure should be integral to any masterplan option to support the scale of development proposed. Further, more detailed work would be required in order to establish the scale and nature of need, with input from the local community through consultation.

**Existing Commercial Uses**

6.26 Local planning policy resists the loss of retail, public house and employment floorspace in this location.

**Implications**

6.27 The new proposals should incorporate at least an equivalent quantum of retail, public house and employment floorspace respectively, unless there are compelling reasons not to do so. Further work would be needed to establish a commercially attractive and sustainable quantum and mix of non-residential floorspace.

**Residential Density**

6.28 Both the London Plan (Policy 3.4) and the Local Plan (Policy CL 1) require new housing development to optimise density, whilst ensuring that it is sensitive to its context in design terms.

6.29 The London Plan uses the ‘density matrix’ as a measure of density relative to the urban character of the location, and its level of public transport accessibility. The site is considered ‘Urban’ in character and has a PTAL (Public Transport Accessibility Level) ranging from 2-4, though the majority of the site has a PTAL of 3. This site context suggests that a density of 200-450 habitable rooms per hectare may be appropriate for the majority of the site. According to the matrix, a higher density of 200–700 habitable rooms per hectare may be suitable near to Latimer Road Underground station.

**Implications**

6.30 The indicative densities which result from the density matrix provide a guide rather than a strict limit for development. There are many examples of these densities being exceeded where there is a strong planning and design/townscape case for doing so. Given the Mayor’s strategic interest in density, there is a risk of Mayoral intervention on the decision (in relation to a planning application) for schemes which fall below the density matrix, with implications in terms of (inter alia) outcome, programme and costs. In order to minimise the likelihood of Mayoral call-in, for any scheme the density of development should not fall below the minimum density range, as this would not be considered to be ‘optimising’ housing delivery as required by planning policy.
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6.31 High level assessments of the options prepared to date indicate that the proposed densities are consistent with the Mayor’s density matrix. This should be reviewed in due course as the masterplan options are refined.

**Height**

6.32 RBKC’s Local Plan does not promote the development of new tall buildings. The Council’s Building Heights SPD sets out the Council’s approach to tall buildings at various different scales, including ‘local landmark’ (up to 1.5 times taller than the context), ‘district landmark’ (1.5-4 times taller than the context), and ‘metropolitan landmark’ (over 4 times taller than the context). The existing towers at the site are critiqued in the SPD as failing to relate to neighbours in terms of scale, height, pattern and character.

6.33 London Plan policy is slightly more receptive to new tall buildings which may be acceptable if they are high quality, integrate well into their surroundings and address any pertinent environmental issues. As mentioned above, Policy 7.7 recommends a plan-led approach to tall buildings.

**Implications**

6.34 Though there are few examples of new tall buildings to the north, south and east of the site, there is a significant amount of new, high rise development coming forward to the west of the site at White City. However, these are located within the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham, which has a different policy approach to tall buildings.

6.35 The provision of new tall buildings on the site would need to be considered against the prevailing policy/ guidance context. Tall buildings are unlikely to be considered as part of an outline planning application, given the need to understand detailed design and this may influence the nature of any planning application involving a tall building(s).

**Heritage**

6.36 There are Listed Buildings within the site (e.g. Latimer Education Centre).

**Implications**

6.37 Any works to or affecting the Listed Buildings would need to preserve and enhance their setting. Their heritage significance should be assessed at an early stage to understand potentially acceptable levels of intervention of the heritage fabric. The presence of Listed Buildings would also need to be taken into account in terms of the format and structure of any planning applications.

**Other Considerations**

6.38 Other issues may include (but would not be limited to): affordable housing, viability, decant and phasing, physical integration within the wider context, environment, transport, open space, and CIL/planning obligations.
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OPTIONS APPRAISAL OVERVIEW

6.39 A high level appraisal has been undertaken which assesses each of the options from a planning perspective based on the key considerations above.

6.40 This assessment makes a number of assumptions, the most pertinent of which are outlined below:

a. That the options will be assessed against the currently adopted Development Plan, as defined above;

b. No pre-application engagement with RBKC Planning or any other statutory consultees (e.g. GLA) has taken place at this stage; and

c. The proposed type and quantum of affordable housing (as a proportion of the net additional housing) has not been fully determined.

6.41 The planning assessment commentary is included in Section 7.0 and is summarised within the table at Section 9.0 of this document.
7.0 Options Assessment

7.1 The brief for each option was constructed within framework detailed within Section 5 of this report to create a series of buildings, streets and spaces. Each option masterplan was then extruded to create 3D models that could be extrapolated to identify a quantum of new build, which was then used to inform the viability assessment.

7.2 For ease of reference the plan and 3D model is incorporated with the assessment of each option below.

COUNCIL OWNED LAND/STOCK

7.3 Options 1-3 retain all non-RBKC owned land inclusive of the current sports facilities with the redevelopment of RBKC only land. These options either retain the existing tower blocks or remove them, with one option providing replacement tower blocks in alternative locations.

7.4 It is important to note that in options 1-3 a perimeter road connecting Silchester Road to Freston Road is located adjacent to the current sports facilities, to improve connectivity and integration with surroundings.

7.5 At the centre of these options is the creation of Bramley Square (and Silchester Square within two of the options) with the adjacent buildings designed to enable sunlight to space created.

7.6 OPTION 1 – Retain all existing towers

a. This option retains the four existing circa 20-storey towers within Silchester Estate with associated improvements to be considered.

b. The urban framework is segmented by retention of both non-Council owned land and the existing towers and the resultant street pattern is not cohesive

c. The perimeter road which connects Silchester Road to Freston Road has been designed to retain non-Council owned land.

d. Connectivity benefits reduced compared to ‘all land’ options.

e. Limited uplift in residential, and consequently limited uplift in affordable housing.

f. Unclear whether this option is financially viable.

g. The listed building is retained and enhanced through refurbishment

h. Public spaces are provided at the proposed Bramley Square and Silchester Square.

i. Retention of towers reduces the potential disruption to residents.

j. Improvements, retail provision and place-making opportunities for Bramley Square may be more limited than options 4 – 6.

k. Mid-rise scale of development may to be acceptable in townscape terms, however, the retention of towers and low-rise non-Council blocks may lower the overall townscape benefits of the scheme.
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Figure 3: Option 1 Masterplan

7.7 **OPTION 2 – Demolishing but not replacing towers**

a. This option demolishes all four towers.

b. The perimeter Connector road that connects Silchester Road to Freston Road has been designed to retain non-Council owned land improving connectivity and integration with surroundings.

c. Connectivity benefits reduced compared to all other options; Bramley Road in particular experiencing no significant improvement.

d. This option is not considered financially viable.

e. Listed building retained and enhanced through refurbishment, and setting improved by removal of towers.

f. Limited opportunities for a new public square at the centre of scheme and new neighbourhood centre. ‘Silchester Square’ has been created at the north-east of the site, however, it is unclear whether this is likely to be a desire line.

g. Questionable relationship between existing massing of non-Council land to the west of Bramley Road and new development at the north-west of the site.

h. Very limited uplift in residential which is assumed will not deliver an uplift in affordable housing.
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Figure 4: Option 2 Masterplan

7.8 **OPTION 3 – Demolishing and replacing all towers with new towers**

a. This option incorporates redeveloping accommodation owned by the Council replacing it with a mixture of mid-rise buildings (5-10 storeys) and new tower blocks.

b. The urban framework is segmented by the retention of non-Council owned land and the resultant street pattern is not cohesive.

c. The perimeter road that connects Silchester Road to Freston Road has been designed to retain non-Council owned land improving connectivity and integration with surroundings.

d. Connectivity benefits reduced compared to ‘all land’ options.

e. Two new circa 20-storey towers are indicated; a tower to the north along the Westway and in the vicinity of Frinstead House, although their locations and height should be seen as indicative only. The impact of any new towers on the character of the surrounding area, including Oxford Gardens Conservation Area will need to be assessed.

f. This option is not considered financially viable.

g. Listed building retained and enhanced through refurbishment, and setting improved by removal of towers.

h. Public spaces are provided at Bramley Square and Silchester Square.

i. Connectivity benefits reduced compared to ‘all land’ options (Option 1 -3).

j. Improvements, retail provision and place-making opportunities for Bramley Square may be limited compared to options 4 – 6.
7.0 Options Assessment

k. Limited uplift in residential, does not appear to be deliverable in viability terms and is therefore unlikely to deliver any additional affordable housing if pursued.

l. Mid-rise scale of development may be acceptable in townscape terms, however, the new towers and low rise non-Council blocks may lower the overall townscape benefits of the scheme.

![Figure 5: Option 3 Masterplan](image)

**COUNCIL AND NON-COUNCIL OWNED LAND/STOCK**

7.9 It is important to note that in Options 4 to 6 the perimeter road, connecting Silchester Road to Freston Road, has been re-located abutting the elevated Westway (onto the Westway Development Trust’s land) in order to maximise the consolidated land area that could come forward for development.

7.10 It is noted that this will result in the loss of the current sport facilities and landscaping. This issue, along with the provision of public open space, will need to be addressed in greater detail in Stage 1, if progressed.

7.11 At the very centre of these options is the creation of two new squares (Bramley and Silchester Square) which will become the ‘heart’ of the masterplan. The proposed building surrounding these squares are four to five storeys (and then rising up towards the Westway) to ensure that the buildings do not dominate, and to allow for sun light into the spaces created. It is envisaged that Bramley Square, located near Latimer Road Underground Station, will attract a mixed-use retail/ commercial response to animate the square.
7.12 **OPTION 4 – Retaining all existing towers**

- This option is based on demolishing all buildings excluding the four existing towers, and developing all Council and non-Council owned land.
- The perimeter road that connects Silchester Road to Freston Road improves connectivity and integration with surroundings.
- The urban framework is interrupted by the existing towers with the street pattern being adjusted locally around the existing towers, however creates well connected series of streets and garden squares integrated with the surrounding areas.
- This option is financially viable and partly delivers on objectives.
- The listed building is retained and enhanced through refurbishment.
- Public spaces are provided at Bramley Square and Silchester Square. Improvements, retail provision and place-making opportunities for Bramley Square optimised.
- Retention of towers reduces the potential disruption to residents.
- Reasonable uplift in residential floorspace. The proportion of new affordable housing is not yet clear, but it would be possible to achieve some uplift.
- Mid-rise scale of development may be acceptable in townscape terms, however, the retention of towers and low rise non-Council blocks may lower the overall townscape benefits of the scheme.
- Disruption for residents of all housing other than towers.

![Figure 6: Option 4 Masterplan](image_url)
7.0 Options Assessment

7.13 **OPTION 5 – Demolishing but not replacing towers**

a. This option is based on demolishing all buildings in all ownerships (including the four towers) and developing all land.

b. The layout has a clear urban framework guided by the principles of regeneration: connectivity, permeability, private/public, mid-rise, high density and place-making.

c. This option formulates a cohesive urban layout that is based on streets, squares and green places. It creates well connected series of streets and garden squares that are integrated with the surrounding area.

d. The option provides a high-density mid-rise development with a range of 5-12 storey buildings across the Estate.

e. It offers the ability to increase density without compromising its urban cohesion.

f. The perimeter road that connects Silchester Road to Freston Road improves connectivity and integration with surroundings.

g. This option provides a financially viable scheme which can deliver the objectives.

h. Listed building retained and enhanced through refurbishment, and setting improved by removal of towers.

i. Public spaces are provided at Bramley Square and Silchester Square. Improvements, retail provision and place-making opportunities for Bramley Square optimised.

j. Mid-rise scale of development may be acceptable in townscape terms.

k. This option provides a greater delivery of new affordable and private housing, with all commitments to estate residents able to be met, and social housing re-provided.

l. Requires increased levels of demolition and re-provision resulting in disruption to all residents.

m. Need to consider any loss of public open space and seek to re-provide.
7.0 Options Assessment

7.14 **OPTION 6 - Demolishing and replacing towers with new towers**

a. This option is based on demolishing all buildings and replacing the existing towers with four new circa 20-storey towers.

b. The towers are proposed with an indicative location of three towers to the north of the Estate along the Westway and one location in the vicinity of the Frinstead House (potentially making best use of the high accessibility to the Underground Station).

c. The layout has a clear urban framework guided by the principles of regeneration: connectivity, permeability, private/public, mid-rise, high density and place-making.

d. The option introduces new towers which potentially will dominate the urban environment and create an environment similar to the existing context.

e. The perimeter road that connects Silchester Road to Freston Road improves connectivity and integration with surroundings.

f. The layout provides well-connected series of streets and garden squares that are integrated with the surrounding area however; the new towers may detract from creating a conservation area of the future.

g. This option provides a greater delivery of new affordable and private housing, with all commitments to estate residents able to be met, and social housing re-provided.

h. This is a financially viable scheme that can partly deliver on objectives.

i. Listed building retained and enhanced through refurbishment, and setting improved by removal of towers.
7.0 Options Assessment

j. Public spaces are provided at Bramley Square and Silchester Square. Improvements, retail provision and place-making opportunities for Bramley Square optimised.

k. Significant uplift in residential. The proportion of new affordable housing is not yet clear, but we assume that this is likely to be significantly higher than most other options.

l. Requires increased levels of demolition and re-provision.

m. Need to consider any loss of public open space and seek to re-provide.

n. Impact of new towers on amenity of other new residential, especially the tower at the top of Bramley Road with a low rise block to immediate south.

Figure 8: Option 6 Masterplan
8.0 Financial Viability

METHODOLOGY

8.1 This section outlines CBRE’s methodology, approach and initial conclusions to assessing viability of the development options considered to date.

8.2 In order to evaluate development viability we have used the residual appraisal methodology which is the standard industry approach.

8.3 Using the ‘residual’ land value method enables one to calculate how much a ‘developer’ can pay for the site(s) whilst achieving a market average risk adjusted return.

8.4 Our analysis is predicated on the need to rehouse existing tenants on the redevelopment as well as the ability to offer resident leaseholders the option to return to the scheme on a shared equity basis.

APPROACH

8.5 The financial model is predicated on the basis of the following approach:

a. Residual appraisal undertaken to derive the land value for each option.

b. All options assume delivery with a ‘Development Partner’ with appropriate assumptions made in respect of market level returns.

c. The estimated floor area of the existing affordable units is assumed to be re-provided.

d. Sensitivity analysis has been prepared to calculate impact of providing ‘net additional’ affordable housing, over and above re-provision.

e. Scenarios which incorporate land where sites are in 3rd party ownership assume a Joint Landowners Agreement can be reached between all parties.

EXCLUSIONS

8.6 The following cost headings have been excluded from the viability assessment. These elements will be considered in further detail should the Council give approval to progress the design and more becomes known about the scheme:

- Public realm improvements
- Major strategic (site wide) infrastructure
- Abnormal costs (e.g. remediation)
- Cost / value inflation (viability is based on today’s costs and values)

8.7 It should be noted that there is a risk that following further due diligence, some of the above costs could be substantial and have a material effect on viability. Although it should be noted that a contingency allowance has been included within the viability assessment.
8.1 Financial Viability

VIABILITY CONCLUSIONS

8.8 Following a comparative assessment of the options, the conclusions are as follows:
   - Options 2 and 3 (Council only land) are unviable
   - Option 1 (Council only land) is potentially deliverable but marginal
   - Options 4, 5 and 6 (Council and non-Council owned land) are viable

8.9 Emerging conclusions from the viability assessment indicate that viability is linked to being able to provide sufficient density of new homes and ensuring that only a deliverable quantum of additional affordable housing is provided.

Key Considerations

8.10 The analysis demonstrates that based on the assumptions outlined, there are some potentially viable options for the redevelopment of the Silchester Estate. However viability and consequently overall deliverability should be considered in the context of:
   a. Refinement of options including design, density and mix of uses
   b. Reaching a satisfactory agreement with private landowners
   c. Detailed assessment of development costs including site wide infrastructure and abnormals
   d. Delivering to an appropriate density

8.11 The viability analysis and delivery advice is provided on a high level basis to give an indicative opinion of project viability which is appropriate at this stage of the feasibility assessment.

8.12 The valuation advice provided does not constitute a formal Red Book Valuation falling within the provisions of the RICS Valuation Standards.
9.0 Conclusion

9.1 The RIBA Stage 0 (Strategic Definition) assessment was undertaken against several criteria in order to inform the Council as to the deliverability of a redevelopment option for the Silchester Estate.

9.2 The following details the basis by which each of the options have been assessed in order to determine which options should, if confirmed by Cabinet, be investigated in further detail at Stage 1: -

a. Meets commitment to estate residents;
b. Capable of being financially viable;
c. Meets planning requirements;
d. Delivers more and improved affordable housing;
e. Delivers conservation areas of the future; and
f. Creates high quality green and public spaces.

9.3 This study illustrates that there are various options, refinement of options, or/and combinations of options that could be taken forward to give greater clarity in terms of undertaking the regeneration of the Silchester Estate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Meets commitment to estate residents</th>
<th>Financially viable</th>
<th>Meets planning requirements</th>
<th>Delivers more and better affordable housing</th>
<th>Delivers conservation areas of the future</th>
<th>Creates high quality green and public spaces</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>green</td>
<td>yellow</td>
<td>green</td>
<td>green</td>
<td>red</td>
<td>red</td>
<td>Pursue (refine)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>red</td>
<td>red</td>
<td>red</td>
<td>green</td>
<td>red</td>
<td>green</td>
<td>Not pursue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>red</td>
<td>new tower</td>
<td>green</td>
<td>green</td>
<td>red</td>
<td>red</td>
<td>Not pursue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>green</td>
<td>yellow</td>
<td>green</td>
<td>green</td>
<td>green</td>
<td>green</td>
<td>Pursue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>green</td>
<td>yellow</td>
<td>green</td>
<td>green</td>
<td>green</td>
<td>green</td>
<td>Pursue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>green</td>
<td>new towers</td>
<td>green</td>
<td>green</td>
<td>red</td>
<td>green</td>
<td>Pursue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.4 It is the consultant’s view that the Council should progress with this project into RIBA Stage 1 (Preparation and Brief) and Stage 2 (Concept Design) and recommends: -

- Pursuing Options 1, 4, 5 and 6 alongside ‘do nothing’ and ‘refurbishment’ options; and
- Not pursuing Options 2 and 3.
Minutes of a meeting of the Cabinet held in Committee Room 1, Kensington Town Hall, London W8 7NX at 6.30pm on 26 May 2016

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 Paul Warrick (Facilities Management and Procurement Policy)
Councillor Emma Will (Education and Libraries)

Other Members in attendance
Councillor Judith Blakeman (Notting Dale ward)
Councillors Charles Williams (Chairman of Adult Social Care and Health Scrutiny Committee)

PART A (PUBLIC) MINUTES

A1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillor Pascall (Lead Member).

A2. MEMBERS’ DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were none.

A3. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 20 APRIL 2016

The minutes of the meeting held on 20 April 2016 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

A4. SILCHESTER EAST AND WEST – OUTCOME OF ESTATE REDEVELOPMENT OPTIONS APPRAISAL AND PROPOSALS FOR FURTHER WORK - KD04812

This report set out the results of the work undertaken so far following the decision to commission an options appraisal to test the viability of six high level redevelopment options for Silchester East and West in July 2015. The report sought permission to carry out more detailed work on the following options: to continue with the current maintenance strategy, to include a new option of improvements to the estate through refurbishments and in-
fill development, and to continue with more detailed consideration of the viable options for redevelopment.

Councillor Feilding-Mellen, Cabinet Member for Housing, Property and Regeneration introduced the report which summarised the findings of the initial feasibility study that was commissioned in 2015. He stated that the purpose of that study was not to determine the best redevelopment option for the Silchester Estate, but rather to discover whether there were any viable redevelopment options for the estate that would deliver on the Council’s objectives and meet the Council’s commitments to the estate’s residents. He reiterated the Council’s objectives and commitments to residents – to build more new homes, particularly additional affordable homes, and to invest in providing the best quality homes for current and future tenants. The Council will only try to do that through redevelopment when it can be certain that it can rehouse all its existing tenants in or very near the redevelopment on the same rent levels and terms. Therefore estate regeneration will not result in the disbursement of settled communities. Bearing all that in mind, the feasibility study has concluded that there are a number of viable redevelopment options that meet these criteria and should be further examined. He referred to the extensive and significant consultation with the local community that was carried out during this process, and acknowledged the very mixed feelings that many feel about some of the options. It was essential that the Council listened to the feedback received from the community and did its best to address the many reasonable concerns that have been expressed. The report consequently recommends that the Council not only proceeds with further testing of the full redevelopment options but also recommends –

- that the Council explores and considers whether a lighter-touch intervention involving refurbishment and some in-fill can deliver on its objectives and commitments with less disturbance to residents;
- that the Council can only proceed with full redevelopment if it can offer resident leaseholders/freeholders the opportunity to buy back through a Shared Equity Scheme; and
- the Council will offer to buy leaseholders’/freeholders’ properties at full market value if they want to sell and are worried they cannot because the Council is looking at regeneration options.

Mr Derek White, Chair of the Silchester Residents’ Association addressed the meeting. He stated that so far, the work carried out by the Council has involved ‘consultation’, rather than partnership or co-design. If the Council is serious about involving residents in plans that directly affect their future, the Residents’ Association wants –

- a commitment to genuine transparency, honesty and a positive working relationship, including access to the viability assessments;
- to be fully involved in all decisions as key stakeholders and significant partners. This would include taking an active part in the choice of architects and of all key players; and to be presented with a properly
costed range of options on which the community can be balloted before any regeneration takes place;

- access to advisors as appropriate and necessary; and
- a commitment to genuine engagement throughout, up to and including construction and beyond, into maintaining the entirety of the community.

Nahid Ashby, long term tenant at Silchester Estate, addressed the meeting. She referred to the fact that the borough is one of the most densely populated areas in Europe, and queried how the Council proposed to provide services for all those on the estate, such as nurseries, primary schools and doctors? She referred to the suggested London Plan density matrix of 200-450 habitable rooms per hectare which has been exceeded on the recently completed development on the Silchester Garages site, and hoped that this would not be replicated with the rest of Silchester. She suggested that “town cramming” leads to undesirable results such as loss of urban open space, localised congestion, excessive noise, and a general loss of amenity such as light. Most of Silchester is in the shadow of the Westway which generates high pollution, and she was also concerned about the loss of mature trees on the estate and the open spaces, wildlife and bird population that are threatened by this regeneration. The tenants understand the need for more housing but argue that these could be built without having to destroy perfectly serviceable buildings and thriving communities.

In response Councillor Feilding-Mellen stated that the options are very likely to be significantly changed as the Council engages with the residents. All options sit within the density matrix in the London Plan. The current redevelopment options give as much if not more green space than currently available on the estate. Much more work will need to be done, including testing the question of open space. He stated that officers, consultants and the design team would work with the Residents’ Association as the Council takes the work forward.

Members raised a number of comments on the report. Councillor Ahern was keen to see a design that protects the estate whilst also protects air quality. If the scheme proceeds, Councillor Weale wished to see it involve public health. Councillor Coleridge noted that his understanding was that the potential regeneration would take so long because the Council intended to ensure as many households as possible only had to move once straight into their new homes, in order to keep the existing community together.

Councillor Feilding-Mellen responded that phased rehousing would result with roughly the same families on the estate at the end, although he could not guarantee that no families would move into temporary accommodation before being able to return to a new home on the redevelopment, if it does go ahead. He referred to the points raised by Councillor Blakeman in the report, but said that with regard to tenants and leaseholders of housing associations or of private landlords, he could not recommend that
Cabinet gives any firm commitments at this early stage of the process. If the Council proceeds to the next stage, it will work closely with landowners and non-resident leaseholders on those issues.

The Chairman thanked both Mr White and Ms Ashby for their contributions. He stated that the Council recognises the long established community in Silchester and is conscious that the estate has a number of things that need to be preserved. The Council is very aware of the concerns and is moving to the next stage taking all these factors into consideration.

RESOLVED – Cabinet

(i) agreed that in order to deliver on the Council’s estate regeneration objectives of providing excellent new homes for its existing and future tenants, delivering much needed additional housing across all tenures (private and affordable), and building “the conservation areas of the future”, further more detailed work needs to be done to test how the following options would deliver on those objectives and meet the Council’s commitments to the estate’s residents:

- to continue with the current maintenance strategy for the Silchester Estate;
- to improve the Silchester Estate through refurbishments and in-fill development; and
- to pursue one of the viable options for the comprehensive redevelopment of the Silchester Estate

(ii) agreed a budget for fees shown in part B of the report from the HRA to progress the next stage of work which will further test these options and then report to Cabinet with a preferred option. In addition, £2 million from the General Fund was agreed to facilitate leaseholder (and freeholder) buy backs. At this early stage it should be noted that the preferred option could be to continue with the existing maintenance strategy. A breakdown of budget headlines is shown in appendix B6;

(iii) agreed that, in addition to the Council’s stated commitments for all estate regeneration projects across the borough, the full redevelopment of the Silchester Estate can only be chosen as the preferred option if all resident leaseholders and freeholders will be offered the opportunity to buy a new property on the redevelopment through a Shared Equity offer. Therefore, if the Silchester Estate is redeveloped, the existing community of Council tenants and resident leaseholders and freeholders will be able to remain in the redevelopment;

(iv) agreed that if any leaseholders (or freeholders) in properties originally purchased through the Right to Buy wish to sell their property now but have concerns regarding their ability to sell on the open market as a result of the underlying possibility of regeneration,
then the Council will offer to acquire that property at full market value and that an initial budget of £2 million is identified to facilitate such purchases;

(v) agreed that any void properties arising on the list of addresses shown below will be relet to those who have approached the Council as homeless and require temporary accommodation; and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-45 Bramley House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88 Bramley Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-9,10-15, 16-21 and 22-27 Darfield Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-80 Dixon House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-80 Frinstead House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-20 Kingsnorth House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-80 Markland House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-12, 14-24, 26-36, 38-48 evens and 29-41 odds Shalfleet Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-17 and 21 Silchester Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-11, 12-17, 43-49, 50-56, 57-63 and 64-76 Wayneflete Sq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-80 Whitstable House</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(vi) delegated authority to the Cabinet Member for Housing, Property and Regeneration to appoint an appropriate client side and design team once an acceptable financial proposal has been properly procured.

**Reasons for the decision**

The initial redevelopment options appraisal has shown that there are a number of redevelopment options which are viable, which will deliver on the Council’s regeneration objectives, and that will meet its commitments to residents of the Estate. Following feedback from the public consultation events, the Council now also wants to examine whether the refurbishment and infill option could match the delivery on its objectives, while resulting in less disturbance for the Estate’s existing residents. All the options need to continue being evaluated not just against each other, but also against the option of continuing with the current maintenance strategy. The report seeks approval to commit the resources needed to test these options in detail and to recommend a preferred option.

*Action by: DH*
A5. **SCHOOL ORGANISATION AND INVESTMENT STRATEGY – KD04723**

This report presented the School Organisation and Investment Strategy for implementation.

RESOLVED – Cabinet approved the School Organisation and Investment Strategy 2016, attached as appendix 1.

**Reasons for the decision**

In line with its statutory duty, the Royal Borough must ensure that there are sufficient school places for resident children of statutory school age who require one. This strategy sets out how the Royal Borough is currently meeting this requirement and its proposals for the future.

*Action by: DS*

---

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

This report sought approval of the proposed Parks Strategy.

In introducing the report, Councillor Ahern explained that the current strategy was no longer fit for purpose and the new strategy will build on the successes achieved in the previous one. Members commented on the vision set out within the strategy; the innovative income generation schemes; the proposals to use the Friends of Holland Park for commercial activity; and the welcome plans for the secondary parks.

RESOLVED – Cabinet approved the Parks Strategy 2016 – 2025.

**Reasons for the decision**

The current Royal Borough’s ten year Parks Strategy (2006 to 2015) came to an end on 31 December 2015.

*Action by: DSN*

---

A7. **15 GERTRUDE STREET, SW10 – GRAT OF NEW LEASE – KD04797**

This report sought approval to the Council granting a new lease of 15 Gertrude Street, SW10.

RESOLVED – Cabinet approved the grant of a new lease of 15 Gertrude Street, SW10 for a term of 15 years on the terms set out in the exempt appendix.

**Reasons for the decision**

The lettings of this property fulfils one of the objectives of the Council of generating income. The asset is held in the General Fund. This recommendation represents best consideration reasonably obtainable.

*Action by: IHCPS*
A8. PURCHASE OF FREEHOLD INTEREST IN PROPERTY – 65-69 LOTS ROAD, CHELSEA - KD04809

This report sought approval for the Council to purchase the freehold of 65-69 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 agreed -

(i) to the acquisition of 65-69 Lots Road; and

(ii) to delegate authority for any minor alterations to the heads of terms to the Cabinet Member for Housing, Property and Regeneration.

Reasons for the decision

The acquisition will allow the Council to develop much needed affordable extra care housing in the south of the borough, as well as improving as underutilised site with a mixed use scheme, which in turn will make a better contribution to the adjoining conservation area than the current car pound and highways storage facilities.

Action by: IHCPS

A9. LEASE RENEWAL – 359 KING’S ROAD, LONDON SW3 – KD04582

This report sought approval for the grant of a further five year term already granted within the Landlord and Tenant Act 1054 to the current tenant. The Heads of Terms are contained in the exempt appendix.

RESOLVED – Cabinet approved the grant of a new lease under the Heads of Terms contained in the exempt appendix.

Reasons for the decision

Officers believe that the best rent and terms obtainable in the current market using available comparable evidence has been secured for the Council.

Action by: IHCPS

A10. ANY OTHER ORAL OR WRITTEN PUBLIC ITEMS WHICH THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT

There were none.

A11. 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 20 APRIL 2016

Public summary of the decision:

The exempt minutes of the meeting held on 20 April 2016 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

B2. SILCHESTER EAST AND WEST – OUTCOME OF ESTATE REDEVELOPMENT OPTIONS APPRAISAL AND PROPOSALS FOR FURTHER WORK – KD04812

Public summary of the decision:

See minute A4 above.

B3. 15 GERTRUDE STREET, SW10 – GRANT OF NEW LEASE - KD04797

Public summary of the decision:

See minute A7 above.

B4. PURCHASE OF FREEHOLD INTEREST IN PROPERTY 65-69 LOTS ROAD, CHELSEA – KD04809

Public summary of the decision:

See minute A8 above.

B5. LEASE RENEWAL – 359 KINGS ROAD, SW3 5ES – KD04584

Public summary of the decision:

See minute A9 above.

The meeting ended at 7.40pm

Chairman
Silchester East and West newsletter

Issue 1
November 2015

We wrote to you in July to tell you that the Council would be carrying out a housing study into the possibility of redeveloping the Silchester Estate. It is important to stress that right now no decision has been taken to redevelop your estate. At this stage, we are just carrying out a study to understand if there are viable options for the sort of redevelopment that would deliver on the Council’s key objectives of:

- providing better homes for existing and future tenants
- delivering additional affordable housing
- improving the urban design, quality of local facilities and built environment of the area.

The Council has already confirmed that it will not go ahead with development unless it would be possible to rehouse all its affected tenants in new homes on the redevelopment or in the local area. Therefore, no Council tenants will be forced to leave the area even if redevelopment does proceed. More information on the Council’s pledges is included towards the end of this newsletter.

This newsletter is to keep you informed about progress.

Appointment of architects (and CBRE)

The Council is making good progress in taking the housing study forward and has appointed CBRE as lead advisers for the project. CBRE is one of the largest property advisory consultancies in the world and has been advising the public sector since the 1960s.

CBRE has appointed Porphyrios Associates to carry out the high level design work which will be needed at this early stage. Porphyrios Associates is an award winning architectural practice, based in London. It has successfully completed the masterplan for King’s Cross Central with a sensitive design that retains its historic character whilst achieving the high densities needed in a central location without high rise buildings. Porphyrios Associates has also completed masterplans for Rochester Riverside and Trowbridge in Wiltshire and designed an affordable housing scheme of 119 homes at Highbury Gardens in the London Borough of Islington. You can find out more about Porphyrios on their website [www.porphyrios.co.uk](http://www.porphyrios.co.uk).

Meet the architects

We would like to invite you to meet with the architects on **Monday 30 November 2015 between 4pm and 7pm. This will be held at More West Sales & Marketing Office, Archway, Bramley Road, London W10 6SZ (opposite Latimer Road Station)**. The aim of the session is to give you a chance to talk to the architects and other consultants so you can share what you know about living in the area, what you
like and what you would like to see changed. **The architects will not have any proposals to display at this session.**

**Our pledge to residents**

Many residents have expressed understandable concern about the Council’s desire to look at the potential for regeneration in Silchester East and West and the immediate surrounding areas.

It is important to emphasise that no decisions have been made yet. The Council wants to understand fully the opportunities for regeneration before making any decisions.

The Council has pledged that it will only go ahead with a regeneration project where it can:

- Rehouse all Secure (Council) Tenants, whose current homes need to be redeveloped, within or very near to the area to be redeveloped. No existing Council tenants will be forced out of the local area if redevelopment of the estate does go ahead.
- Provide better quality homes. The Council’s vision for all its estate regeneration projects is to build the conservation areas of the future by reflecting and matching the high quality urban design in the rest of the borough. The Council is proud of the borough’s existing mixed-tenure neighbourhoods where social tenants, private tenants and home owners live side by side and wants to protect them for the future. The Council will design any new development as mixed tenure and aim to develop traditional streets and squares, emulating the best local architecture.
- Ensure that any rehoused Council tenants are given new homes with the same rent levels and tenancy terms and conditions as they currently have.
- Consult affected residents at the earliest feasible opportunity and involve affected residents throughout the appraisal, design, and development processes.

With regards to the **leaseholders**, the Council has committed to the following:

- If and when a formal decision has been reached to go ahead with redevelopment, the Council will offer to buy out leaseholders on the same terms and conditions as if a Compulsory Purchase Order had been obtained. This means that resident leaseholders would be entitled to the market value of their property plus ten per cent (up to £51,000). They would also receive a disturbance payment to cover the reasonable costs associated with moving house. Non-resident leaseholders would be entitled to market value plus an additional 7.5 per cent (up to £75,000).
- Whenever viable, to consider offering an equity share option to resident leaseholders, who wish to remain in the area but cannot afford to buy a new property.
Independent advice

We realise that residents have lots of questions and concerns and are often unsure about the information supplied by Council officers. The Council therefore wants to work with residents to appoint an independent adviser for tenants and leaseholders. An independent adviser is usually an organisation, rather than an individual, that has experience of working with both tenants and leaseholders on housing regeneration schemes.

The sort of things that the organisation would do, are to:

- Look at the Council’s Decant Policy for both tenants and leaseholders and compare this with what is offered on other similar regeneration schemes. (The Decant Policy explains the process when residents have to move out of their homes due to redevelopment).
- Attend meetings to ensure the Council explains what is being offered in plain English and to help tenants and leaseholders understand the detail.
- Where residents have concerns, feed these back to the Council.

The adviser will be able to meet individually with residents to discuss their particular circumstances.

We are talking to both the Silchester Residents’ Association and the Bramley House Residents’ Association to take the appointment forward.

If you would like any further information about the appointment of an Independent Tenants and Leaseholder Adviser please contact Ruth Angel on 020 7361 2628 or by email YourHomeYourFuture@rbkc.gov.uk

Keeping you informed

Council officers will be attending meetings organised by the Silchester Residents’ Association and the Bramley House Residents’ Association.

We will be asking the architects to provide an exhibition of the work they have undertaken in the spring and we will write to you nearer the time. We will also publish details on our website.
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A big thank you to everyone who came along to the two events in March to see the work that the architects have carried out to date. A total of 120 people attended and others have viewed the exhibition materials on the Council’s website. We have received lots of feedback on the options shown, which is extremely useful. If you missed the events and would like to see the options, they can be viewed at www.rbkc.gov.uk/silchestereastandwest.

What happens next?

A report is being drafted for the Council’s Cabinet, which will be discussed at the Cabinet meeting on 26 May 2016 (not April as previously stated). This will outline the work that has taken place so far, and the feedback from the local community. The report will also set out proposals for any further work and Cabinet will need to decide whether to go ahead.

We will write to you again after Cabinet to let you know what has been decided.

Our pledge to residents

One of the common themes that emerged through the consultation was concern that residents would be forced to leave the area.

The Council has pledged that it will only go ahead with a regeneration project where it can:

- rehouse all Secure (Council) Tenants, whose current homes need to be redeveloped, within or very near to the area to be redeveloped. No existing Council tenants will be forced out of the local area if redevelopment of their estate does go ahead
- provide better quality homes. The Council’s vision for all its estate regeneration projects is to build the conservation areas of the future by reflecting and matching the high quality urban design in the rest of the borough. The Council is proud of the borough’s existing mixed-tenure neighbourhoods where social tenants, private tenants and home owners live side by side and wants to protect them for the future. The Council will design any new development as mixed tenure and aim to develop traditional streets and squares, emulating the best local architecture.
- ensure that any rehoused Council tenants are given new homes with the same rent levels and tenancy terms and conditions as they currently have.
- consult affected residents at the earliest feasible opportunity and involve affected residents throughout the appraisal, design, and development processes.

The Council’s commitment to leaseholders
If and when a formal decision has been reached to go ahead with redevelopment, the Council will offer to buy out leaseholders on the same terms and conditions as if a Compulsory Purchase Order had been obtained. This means that resident leaseholders would be entitled to the market value of their property plus ten per cent (up to £51,000). They would also receive a disturbance payment to cover the reasonable costs associated with moving house. Non-resident leaseholders would be entitled to market value plus an additional 7.5 per cent (up to £75,000).

Whenever viable, to consider offering an equity share option to resident leaseholders, who wish to remain in the area but cannot afford to buy a new property.

The Council is working with both the Silchester Residents’ Association and the Bramley Road Residents’ Association to appoint an independent adviser for tenants and leaseholders. An independent adviser is usually an organisation, rather than an individual, that has experience of working with both tenants and leaseholders on housing regeneration schemes.

The sort of things that the organisation would do, are to:

- look at the Council’s Decant Policy for both tenants and leaseholders and compare this with what is offered on other similar regeneration schemes. (The Decant Policy explains the process when residents have to move out of their homes due to redevelopment)
- attend meetings to ensure the Council explains what is being offered in plain English and to help tenants and leaseholders understand the detail
- feedback any residents’ concerns to the Council.

The adviser will be able to meet individually with residents to discuss their particular circumstances.

**Any questions?**

You can email yourhomeyourfuture@rbkc.gov.uk or call 020 7361 3014 with any questions.

www.rbkc.gov.uk/silchestereastandwest
The Council’s Cabinet met on 26 May and agreed to further exploration of the possible redevelopment of the Silchester Estate.

The work we have carried out so far has generated a high level of interest from local residents. Most people seem to agree that some improvement of the estate is highly desirable. Many residents, however, also asked that the Council consider a refurbishment option, particularly for the four tower blocks and Bramley House. As a consequence, the next stage of work will consider:

- What it would mean if we just continue with the current maintenance and management programme. This is known as the ‘Do Nothing’ option.

- How we could improve the existing housing without major redevelopment and whether new housing could be built around the current blocks (infill). This could result in less disturbance for the Estate’s residents than full redevelopment.

- A variety of options to redevelop the estate. More work will be carried out on four of the options presented at the exhibitions in March.

The four are:
- option one which just looks at the Council owned land and redevelops the low rise blocks leaving the four towers in place
- option four which looks at all of the land in the study area and leaves the four towers in place
- option five which looks at redeveloping all of the land in the study area, including the four towers
- option six which looks at redeveloping all of the land in the study area with mainly mid-rise but replacing some of the towers.

As we examine these options further we expect them to change and evolve with input and involvement from the local community.

Our commitment to residents

Cabinet confirmed that full redevelopment could only go ahead if all the Council’s secure tenants could be accommodated in new homes on the site with the same terms and rent levels and if the resident leaseholders and freeholders could be offered the opportunity to buy a new property on the redevelopment through a shared equity offer.

Leaseholders who wish to sell their property

We understand that the possibility of redevelopment can make it difficult for any leaseholders or freeholders who are trying to sell their property or would like to do so. If this applies to you, then the Council would be happy to discuss the possibility of buying your property at full market value. For more information contact Martin Mortimer on 020 7361 3521 or email martin.mortimer@rbkc.gov.uk

Feedback from the March drop-in sessions

Thank you to everyone who came to our drop-in events in March or gave us feedback via the website. Many people greeted the idea of development warmly, whilst many others strongly opposed it. Understandably, you had lots of questions and raised a number of concerns. Here are some of the most common and how we plan to address them:
Feedback from the March

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some people felt that there was insufficient explanation of why our early options would be an improvement on the existing design of the estate.</td>
<td>We will be arranging for members of the Council’s team to come to residents’ association meetings and discuss this further.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There was concern about the overall loss of green space and the proposed position of open green space in some of the options shown.</td>
<td>We will measure existing green space so it can be compared with the provision of green space in our developing proposals. We will also explore alternative positions, away from the roads.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some of the early options mentioned blocks of up to 12 storeys. There were concerns about the number and position of these blocks.</td>
<td>Further development of the proposals will identify the height and position of any proposed new blocks, so that we can give people clearer information at future consultation events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There were a number of concerns about the size of new properties.</td>
<td>We will arrange for existing sample properties to be measured and consider how this compares to current planning standards for new homes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What happens next?

The Council will appoint development consultants and architects to carry out the next phase of work to be carried out.

Between June and the end of September the Council will:
- agree a workplan and timetable for the next stage
- work with the Silchester Residents’ Association to appoint an Independent Tenant and Leaseholder Adviser
- meet with third party land owners

By the end of 2016 the Council will:
- carry out more detailed work on all the options outlined on page one and evaluate them against each other
- continue to keep residents and stakeholders involved

Early 2017 the Council will:
- start to work towards a preferred option
- continue to keep residents and stakeholders involved

Spring 2017 Officers will:
- report to Cabinet on results of this phase of work.

We will write to you regularly to keep you up-to-date with developments. In the meantime, if you have any queries you can email yourhomeyourfuture@rbkc.gov.uk or call 020 7361 3014.

Any questions?
You can email yourhomeyourfuture@rbkc.gov.uk or call 020 7361 3014 with any questions. www.rbkc.gov.uk/silchestereastandwest
English

Information from this document can be made available in alternative formats and in different languages. If you require further assistance please use the contact details below.

Arabic

يمكن توفير المعلومات التي وردت في هذا المستند بصيغة مبوبة ولغات أخرى. إذا كنت في حاجة إلى مزيد من المساعدة، الرجاء استخدام بيانات الاتصال الواردة أدناه.

Farsi

اطلاعات حواری در این مدارک به صورتی دیگر و به زبان‌های مختلف در دسترس می‌باشد. در صورت نیاز به کمک بیشتر، لطفاً از جزئیات طرفداری در دو استفاده کنید.

French

Les informations présentées dans ce document peuvent vous être fournies dans d'autres formats et d'autres langues. Si vous avez besoin d'une aide complémentaire, veuillez utiliser les coordonnées ci-dessous.

Portuguese

A informação presente neste documento pode ser disponibilizada em formatos alternativos e em línguas diferentes. Se desejar mais assistência, use por favor os contactos fornecidos abaixo.

Somali

Maclumaadka dokumentigan waxaa lagu heli karaa qaabab kale iyo luuqado kala duwan.Haddii aad u baahan tahay caawinaad intaa dhaafsiisan fadlan isticmaal xiriirkaa faahfaahinta hoose.

Spanish

La información en este documento puede facilitarse en formatos alternativos y en diferentes idiomas. Si necesita más ayuda por favor utilice la siguiente información de contacto.

Housingline
T: 020 7361 3008
E: housing@rbkc.gov.uk
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This document sets out the RIBA Stage 1 objectives and deliverables to be undertaken by the Architect and the Client side team. The Client side team disciplines are identified within this document setting out the deliverables to be provided for RIBA Stage 1.

The details contained herein this document is subject to change in line with the natural progression of the project. Further, as part of this process, the strategy for engaging with third party land owners will be developed in order to inform, progress, consider and assess the viability of each of the options.

1. **Housing Regeneration Principles**

The Royal Borough has embarked on an ambitious housing regeneration programme. The overarching principles are:

> *We wish to reintegrate estates into the wider neighbourhood community of streets and squares in order to provide good traditional homes in the conservation areas of the future.*

This means:

1. Quality homes: provide best possible homes for existing & future tenants;
2. Quality neighbourhoods: design beautiful new places to form better-connected, better-designed, street-based neighbourhoods to be conservation areas of the future, while reflecting and integrating with local context;
3. Additional homes: provide the additional homes of all tenures that the borough needs;
4. Affordable homes: providing new affordable homes, including for those on ordinary incomes, who are currently not catered for by the market or social housing;
5. Regeneration: use development to tackle some of the causes of social deprivation in our most deprived neighbourhoods:
   a. Improving chances of better social outcomes for residents.
   b. Increasing level of economic activity via provision of right type of business space in mixed-use neighbourhoods.
c. Increasing level of social integration in borough.

6. Financial: increasing net present value of and income from borough’s housing assets.

**RIBA Stage 1: Design & Preparation - Objectives**

The Royal Borough has completed an options appraisal looking at six high level options for the redevelopment of the area known as ‘Silchester East and West’ to obtain an initial view as to whether any form of redevelopment is both deliverable and affordable. The options appraisal (RIBA Stage 0: Strategic Definition report) concluded that there are at least four viable options for redevelopment of the estate.

As a consequence, the next stage of work is now to be commissioned to consider the following options in further detail:

**Option One:** *Retention of existing estate (continued maintenance only option)*

The implications of continuing with our asset management strategy for the next thirty years with particular emphasis on the suitability and the costs of maintenance of current Council owned buildings.

**Option Two:** *Refurbishment/Infill option of existing estate*

Some areas of the estate, particularly the tower blocks and Bramley House, appear to be in poor condition and would benefit from a higher level of investment. It may be that other parts of the estate would benefit from work to bring them nearer modern building standards and make them fit for purpose for the next thirty years.

This option will also consider the opportunities for infill development on the estate to provide new housing.

**Option Three:** *Retaining all existing towers (Option 1 of Stage 0 Report)*

This option is based upon complete redevelopment of the land owned by the Royal Borough only with the exception of the four existing towers, which would be refurbished under this option.

**Option Four:** *Retaining all existing towers (Option 4 of Stage 0 Report)*

Redevelopment of all land, including the land owned by the Royal Borough and third party land and retaining and refurbishing the four tower blocks. Up to two further sub options may be required to consider land parcels with some, but not all, of the third party land.
Option Five: **Demolishing and not replacing towers (Option 5 of Stage 0 Report)**

Redevelopment of all land owned and not owned by the Royal Borough and replacing all existing properties. Towers to be replaced with new mid-rise buildings. For this option, further advice is required on the practicality and cost of demolishing Frinstead House. Up to two further sub options may be required to consider land parcels with some, but not all, of the third party land. Any additional options will be agreed before work commences and so Provisional Cost sums are required.

Option Six: **Demolishing and replacing towers with new towers (Option 6 of Stage 0 Report)**

Redevelopment of the land owned and not owned by the Royal Borough together with the replacement of the four towers. This is to understand whether this option provides a significantly higher number of new properties.

For option one, the Royal Borough will commission this work through its Managing Agents, i.e. KCTMO. The Client Side Team will be required to comment on the report and work with the Royal Borough to identify whether there are any omissions and to ensure that option one can be considered against other options on a comparable and consistent basis.

The refurbishment and infill option will be developed by the Client Side Team based on the stock information supplied by KCTMO, together with the sub consultants agreed with the Client.

The appointed Architect will develop the redevelopment options as agreed with the Client.

**Other requirements**

(i) **Size of social rented properties**

For each redevelopment option, an assessment is to be undertaken to establish whether the Royal Borough is able to guarantee under that option that any new social rented properties will be at least as large as existing social rented properties. Consequently, the Client side team will make arrangements to visit a sample of up to 10 existing properties which will be measured and reviewed against current housing design standards. Access will be arranged by Royal Borough with the survey being undertaken by the Client side team or their appointed sub consultant.
(ii) Open space

In light of concerns about the provision of open space, a measurement of the existing open space (quantitative and qualitative) is required to be undertaken by the appointed Architect for the purposes of comparison of existing against the emerging design options. The Architect will be required to:

1. Measure the existing space (quantitatively and qualitatively using an appropriate set of qualitative indicators);

2. Provide measurements for the proposed provision for open space for each of the design options. In addition, there will be a corresponding requirement to provide a qualitative assessment of the proposed new open space compared to the existing. This should be undertaken by the Architect with validation from the Client side team and should allow for comparison between options.

(iii) Provision for resident leaseholders and freeholders

The Royal Borough has decided that full redevelopment options should only be pursued if all resident leaseholders and freeholders were to be offered the opportunity to buy a new property on the redevelopment through a Shared Equity offer. This requirement should be considered as part of the appraisal of options.

(iv) Addressing stakeholder concerns

More generally, the Client side team and the appointed Architect will be expected to work with the Royal Borough to assess and respond to many of the issues and concerns that have been raised by local residents and stakeholders so far and any new issues that will be raised going forward. Addressing these issues and concerns will require ongoing and iterative engagement and consultation with the local community during this work. The report should address stakeholder engagement.

(v) Third party landowners

3. The Client side team and the appointed Architect is also expected to work with the Royal Borough throughout this stage to engage with third party landowners to understand and test their needs and aspirations, to establish and develop potential solutions which could meet those requirements.

In the case of options Four, Five and Six consideration must be given as to which parcels of land not owned by the Royal Borough are more crucial to redevelopment than others. It may be that sub options are developed which exclude some of the land owned by third parties.
(vi) **Key drivers**

For each option the following key drivers must be considered:

i. Re-provide existing social rented homes to allow all those who wish to remain or take a temporary decant and return to the new development and also deliver additional affordable housing;

ii. New homes for private sale to create sufficient cross subsidy to make the scheme financially viable;

iii. The potential for retail/commercial premises to contribute to the sense of place, sense of arrival to Latimer Road Station and economic activity in the area; and

iv. Related infrastructure and public open and green space.

**RIBA Stage 1 Client Side Team**

**Project Management**

The Client side team Project Manager will provide the Project level Programme for the agreed sub-consultants, undertake a procurement exercise to obtain proposals for required consultants’ input (scope, cost and timeframe), for approval and appointment by the Royal Borough, which will be measureable against a set of programme deliverables. The Client side team Project Manager will ensure that each discipline is producing work to the agreed delivery dates detailed within the Project level Programme and to the required standard.

The Client side team Project Manager will:

- Prepare the RIBA Stage 1 programme for all sub-consultants for approval prior to commencement of the programme
- Risk management – identify, manage and mitigate through active Risk Register for all sub-consultants
- Manage financial drawdowns / cash flow for appointed sub-consultants
- Co-ordinate all necessary meetings, including:
  - a. Design team meetings;
  - b. Risk meetings; and
  - c. Workshops.
- Prepare and issue Agendas and Minutes of Meetings;
- Providing regular reporting and updates as required; and
- Manage document sharing appropriate to the project’s needs.
The following consultants are required to input into this phase of work as follows:

1. **Architectural**

The Royal Borough will appoint the Architect. The Client side team Project Manager will be responsible for:

1. Managing the procurement process for an Architect on behalf of the Royal Borough;
2. Supporting the Royal Borough in the appointment of the Architect; and
3. Managing the Architect’s work through to a satisfactory conclusion.

The Architect will undertake studies necessary to deliver Feasibility Options for options 3-6 and will undertake the following:

- Develop a master plan for each option to include:
  - a. Phasing and decanting strategy
  - b. Distribution and mix of unit sizes
  - c. Distribution and mix of tenures
  - d. Public open space analysis (measure existing against each proposal)
  - e. Density analysis (height, scale, massing)
- Issue options for the Royal Borough’s preliminary approval (or elimination). For each option this will include:
  - a. 3D massing; and
  - b. Typical street elevations and visuals.

The Client side team will:

- Review alternative design options and associated cost implications; and
- Provide information to the Royal Borough’s other consultants for the preparation of preliminary construction cost estimate.

The Architect will attend:

- Fortnightly Design Team Meetings
- Up to 4 public consultation meetings/presentations
- Up to 4 committee meetings/presentations

The Architect is required to work up the proposals in sufficient detail to show:

- Proposed residential blocks and relationship to green and open space
- Proposed commercial space
- Proposed community space
- The number of properties per tenure that the scheme can accommodate
- High level designs for external views to aid consultation exercises
It may also be necessary for the designs to be illustrated through a model or a 3D computer model. A PC sum should be included and exact requirement will be agreed whilst the options are being formulated.

2. Site surveys

The appointed Architect will work with the Client side team to ascertain what site surveys are to be undertaken at RIBA Stage 1 or 2. The Client side team will procure the surveys for the Royal Borough’s approval and appointment. The surveys could include, but is not limited to, the following:

- Position and extent of utilities, including any TfL requirements
- UXB
- Ecology/Trees
- Archaeology
- Asbestos
- Noise and vibration
- Air Quality

3. Planning

The Client side team Planning consultants will provide planning consultancy advice to ensure that the options developed are capable of: a. advising on the planning strategy/approach; and b. delivering a positive planning approval. This involves:

1. Providing ongoing planning advice to the project team;
2. Highlighting any issues which may prejudice the Royal Borough’s ability to secure planning permission in order that they can be resolved/de-risked;
3. Provide advice on planning strategy and how to progress the site through the planning system;
4. Regular meeting attendance with the Royal Borough and project team (which will be confirmed and implemented by the Client side team); and
5. Attendance at up to 4 public consultation events, and review and input into the production of public consultation material prepared by others.

The options developed at this stage will be the subject of pre application advice from the Royal Borough’s planners. The Client side team Planning consultants will therefore be required to assist in the preparation of materials to obtain the pre application advice, attend meetings with planners and advise the project team on how to mitigate any concerns raised.

The Client side team Planning consultants will also be required to provide high level consideration to the likely Section 106 contributions/CIL payments to inform the viability work.
4. Land Parcel Study

The Client side team will facilitate a workshop for the Royal Borough’s officers to consider which land parcels are more crucial than others with the objective of refining the brief. This workshop will be undertaken in conjunction with the appointed Architect (to prepare early massing and density analysis) to help define the masterplan and identify which options should be continued and which should be discontinued. This activity may result in the development of a set of sub options that will need to be considered within RIBA Stage 1.

6. Commercial advice

Part of the aspiration is to provide more commercial and community facilities. The Client side team Financial Viability consultants will be required to provide commercial advice on the enhanced commercial offer for the area so that units can be designed and positioned appropriately. Furthermore, advice on private residential provision will also be required.

7. Quantity surveyor

The Client side team will engage quantity surveyor input to provide an initial indicative construction cost estimates for each of the options under consideration. Additionally, the quantity surveyor will:

- Provide a high level cost for the demolition of Frinstead House including advice on the potential options to the approach, programme and cost implications of such; and
- Undertake an exercise to review and cost the refurbishment of the existing buildings and also cost an infill option of the existing estate.

8. Viability Assessments & Residential Development Advice

The Client side team Development and Advisory consultants will be required to provide viability assessment against the options during this phase of work.

9. Public Consultation

Up to 4 public consultation events will be undertaken during RIBA Stage 1 which will be managed by the Royal Borough’s in-house team, supported by the both the Client side team and the appointed Architects.

The Architect will on request by the Royal Borough: -
• provide presentation boards and visuals of the Options; and
• Host, attend and engage at events to support the successful delivery of the consultation process alongside the Client side team.

The Royal Borough’s in-house team will: -
• Manage the communications strategy for stakeholder and community engagement, advising and guiding the Consultant and CBRE on key messaging and approach in consultation with the Legal Advisers;
• Set out the attendance requirements for stakeholder presentations and public consultation event by the Project Delivery Team; and
• Obtain visuals and presentation boards from the Consultant for public consultation events.

The Client side team will coordinate the issue of consultation presentation material requested by the Royal Borough’s in-house team from the appointed Architect or any other sub-consultants appointed by the Client side team.

The Royal Borough’s in-house team, in consultation with Legal Advisers, will manage the stakeholder and communications strategy to ensure concise and clear communication which is both informative and sensitive. This will include: -
• Publicity;
• Residents’ information leaflets and updates; and
• FOI requests.

Meetings
Regular meetings will be held throughout Stage 1 and will include, but not be limited to: -

1. Design team meetings (fortnightly) – these are to be arranged, minuted and hosted by the Architect.
2. Royal Borough project meetings (monthly) – these are to be attended by Client side team Project Management, with Planning and Financial Viability consultants attending as and when required.
3. Risk meetings (monthly) – these to be arranged, recorded and hosted by the Client side team.
4. Committee meetings / presentations. 4 events are included within the Architect’s fees and any attendance required at additional events will be chargeable on an hourly rate basis.
5. Public Consultation meetings / presentations (4No)

RIBA Stage 1 Deliverables
The Architect will deliver RIBA Stage 1 deliverables in line with this document and the RIBA Guidelines to also include no less than: -

- Report setting out high level advantages, disadvantages, considerations, and opportunities of each option to also include: -
  - A minimum of 8 CGIs / watercolours across the final options for consideration to progress to RIBA Stage 2;
  - Prepare area schedule;
  - Prepare massing and height schedule;
  - Site plans of all options;
  - Open space schedule;
  - Residential typologies including a selection of layouts; and
  - Establish a list of suggested key materials for the project.
  - Materials required for consultation as agreed with the Client.

- Other information required by the Client side team to enable viability testing to be undertaken throughout RIBA Stage 1 will be required as and when requested.

- Information will be required by the cost consultant as and requested during RIBA Stage 1 to allow for constructions cost planning of the options.

Conclusion
The activities undertaken at RIBA Stage 1 will provide the Royal Borough with clarity as to which options considered are viable and deliverable, and which meet the aspirations and objectives set. Ultimately this process will identify the most feasible Option(s) which could be progressed to RIBA Stage 2 Concept Design based upon: -

1. Viability;
2. Acquisition strategy for land not owned by the Royal Borough, where required;
3. Planning approach;
4. Surveys (which will inform the design development process in respects of constraints and opportunities);
5. Cost – indicative construction cost estimates; and
6. Deliverability and meeting the Royal Borough’s aspirations and objectives.
A RIBA Stage 1 Report will be produced at the end of this stage of work which will detail the options explored, provide reasoning as to which options are to be discounted and identify an option(s) to progress to RIBA Stage 2.