

London Borough of Harrow

Mill Farm Estate

Report

December 2007

Contents

- 1. Introduction**
- 2. Refurbishment & Part Development Options**
- 3. Redevelopment options for part / all of the estate**
- 4. Summary Analysis, Feedback and Conclusions**

Appendices

- A Curtins Report on Structural Issues**
- B Schedule of Refurbishment Works**
- C Option 1 – Plan Showing Layout**
- D Financial / other assumptions used for options**
- E Option 2 – Plan Showing Layout**
- F Option 3a – Plan Showing Layout**
- G Option 3b – Plan Showing Layout**
- H Option 4a – Plan Showing Layout**
- I Option 4b – Plan Showing Layout**
- J Impact on HRA from stock disposals**

1 Introduction

1.1 Background

1.1.1 Tribal Consulting was appointed in June 2007 by the London Borough of Harrow to carry out an assessment of the future options for the Mill Farm estate.

1.1.2 This report summarises the findings of the work carried out during summer and presented at a community day on 8 September and in the following week.

1.1.3 The London Borough of Harrow completed its borough-wide option appraisal in 2006 and made a commitment at that time to carry out its decent homes programme from its own resources supported by prudential borrowing. However it also made a commitment to review a number of its more rundown estates and other housing stock with a view to coming up with some alternative options for those particular properties. One of these estates is Mill Farm Close.

1.2 Summary of Stock & Brief

1.2.1 The Mill Farm estate comprises 145 dwellings, of which 27 are leasehold flats and 15 freehold houses (in Miller Close) sold under the Right to Buy. The Council owns the remaining 103 units which are let at social rents and held in the Council's Housing Revenue Account (HRA). A breakdown of the dwellings by size and location is provided below.

Tenanted	0 Bed	1 Bed	2 bed	3 bed	4 Bed	Total
Mill Farm Close	18	14	43	11		86
62 Rickmansworth Road		6				6
Miller Close				6	5	11
	18	20	43	17	5	103

Leasehold & Freehold	0 Bed	1 Bed	2 bed	3 bed	4 Bed	Total
Mill Farm Close	2	2	17	3		24
62 Rickmansworth Road			3			3
Miller Close				8	7	15
	2	2	20	11	7	42

1.2.2 A number of the leasehold and freehold dwellings do not have resident landlords and are let out. Of these a few have been acquired by housing associations and are let out at social rents.

1.2.3 There are also a number of garages on the estate of which a significant proportion were void at the time of the analysis. Of the garages that are let it is understood that around 25% are let by tenants and leaseholders on the estate.

1.2.4 The stock option review identified option for carrying out decent homes work on the estate but did not provide for any additional resources to address some of the key issues on the estate and in particular effecting Mill Farm Close itself.

1.2.5 As part of Tribal's brief we were asked to commission an assessment of the structural condition and sub contracted that work to Curtins. Alongside that we were asked to look at the options for funding the extra works within the council

and other more radical options to redevelop the estate. Tribal worked with JCMT architects to come up with a number of different design options which were initially discussed with officers, planners and the tenants' adviser (First Call) and were then presented at the Community Day along with the advantages and disadvantages of each option. These are summarised in this report along with some outline costings for each option.

1.2.6 The report sets out each of those options in the each section as follows:

- Section 2 – the existing decent homes programme and results of Curtins Survey & funding through limited development
- Section 3 - redevelopment options of part or all of the estate, costing assumptions and possible delivery vehicles
- Section 4 – summary of analysis, feedback from the community day on 8/9/2007 and conclusions

2 Refurbishment & part development options

2.1 Funding of Decent Homes Programme

2.1.1 As highlighted in the Introduction the Council identified that it would be able to meet its interpretation of the decent homes standard by using prudential borrowing to support other existing resources.

2.1.2 The Council's decent homes programme for Mill Farm Close has been drawn from its Codeman database the data for which was originally drawn from the Savills survey and subject to internal house updating since then.

2.1.3 This identified a works programme of around £1.032m at 2007 prices and excluding fees and VAT. This is based on a programme over the next 3 years comprising of various works including kitchens, bathrooms and windows.

2.1.4 Under the current housing financial regime the Council's (notional) rent surpluses are clawed back by the government through the housing subsidy regime. Consequently the main source of funds available to support stock investment are:

- (i) The Major Repairs Allowance (MRA) – this is a specially ring fenced resource within the HRA regime which the Council is required to spend on major repairs
- (ii) Supported Capital Expenditure (SCE) - this is borrowing which is supported by the government through the subsidy system
- (iii) Prudential Borrowing – this is additional borrowing which the Council is able to support through the HRA by making savings in its spending budgets or through generating other income (ie aside from dwelling rents).
- (iv) Capital Receipts – these are additional resources which the Council is able to secure from its proportion of sales receipts. However these can be used on any capital investment and as the interest on the capital receipts goes to the General Fund this is effectively support from the General Fund.

2.1.5 Over the next 3 years the Council estimates that it will need around £35.3m for its decent homes programme and other essential works funded by £11.0m from MRA, £18.8m from SCE and prudential borrowing £4.0m revenue contributions and £1.5m in capital receipts. Of this sum the only amount currently allocated to Mill Farm is the £1.03m for its immediate decent homes programme.

2.2 Other Investment At Mill Farm Close

2.2.1 In addition to the decent homes programme the Council requested a separate analysis of the structural condition of the properties and a separate report was commissioned from Curtins. This is attached at Appendix A. The report identified a further £1.97m (excluding fees and VAT) on the 7 blocks at Mill Farm Close.

2.2.2 In addition to this there a number of enhancements that the Council would ideally like to make to the estate in line with higher resident expectations and in order to improve its long term sustainability. Overall this is estimated to cost around

£1.09m (excluding fees and VAT) and comprises around £425,000 to improved soundproofing plus various other external works including improved lighting, fencing play areas and door entry systems. Under this option the Council would also want to explore the idea of converting 18 of the bedsits to 9 x 2 bed units (at an estimated cost of £90,000). A full schedule of the works is attached including the decent homes costs at Appendix B. The total additional costs are estimated at around £3.4m including fees.

2.3 Funding Additional Investment via 'infill development'

2.3.1 As highlighted above the Council estimates that it only has sufficient resources to carry out the decent homes programme over the next 3 years. There is no certainty about future funding and the availability of resources beyond that period. The total costs of the additional works highlighted above after adjusting for fees is around £3.4m – this assumes the council as landlord can recover the VAT.

2.3.2 In order to secure funds for the structural works identified by Curtins and the other estate enhancements one option would be to build additional units on any available land on the estate.

2.3.3 Following discussion with officers, planners and the tenant advisers it was agreed to explore the potential additional resource which might be secured by developing on existing underutilised land on the estate including 2 of the garage sites. Appendix C shows an outline plan of the possible ways of developing on the estate without demolishing existing dwellings. This has been described as Option 1.

2.3.4 These plans show that it might be possible to build an additional 30 dwellings on the estate (comprising 12 x 1b2p flats, 8 x 2b4p flats, 6 x 3b5p houses and 4 x 4b7p houses). If these were made available for sale on the private market it is estimated (prudently) that this would generate around £2.3m net of building costs (or possibly as open market land sale). Details of the assumptions for this are included at Appendix D. In order to ensure that none of this receipt is subject to clawback by the CLG it would be necessary to show that the receipt was being recycled into eligible regeneration investment.

2.4 Summary Of Refurbishment / Part Development option

2.4.1 The Council estimates that it only has sufficient resources to carry out the decent homes programme over the next 3 years and it estimates that it would require a further £3.4m to carry out the structural works identified by Curtins and the other enhancements that would make the estate more sustainable in the medium term (although there is not guarantee of funding in the longer term).

2.4.2 In order to fund this additional investment it would either have to make savings elsewhere in its HRA or capital budgets or fund resources elsewhere. One option explored in this section is to develop a number of infill sites as laid out in the accompanying plans. However based on our admittedly prudent estimates this is unlikely to meet all the cost of all the additional investment being sought for the estate.

2.4.3 In summary the main advantages with this option (Option 1), as laid out at the Community Day are:

- This option would involve least upheaval and would provide some new housing and would pay for some extra works to the estate.
- It could be taken forward quite quickly if the funding gap can be closed.

2.4.4 The main disadvantages with this option (Option 1), also as laid out at the Community Day are:

- This is a fairly minimalist approach to the estate and may not meet residents expectations for the estate.
- This option is unlikely to provide sufficient resources for the entire works programme.
- It provides fewest additional dwellings on the estate and none of them are for additional affordable housing.
- No improvement to space and layout of the existing dwellings.

3 Redevelopment options for part / all of the estate

3.1 Different Alternatives

3.1.1 Three broad alternative redevelopment options were discussed with officers, planners and the tenants' advisers prior to the Community Open Day. There were also sub-options for two of the alternatives. Each option assumes an increase in density on the estate. The broad alternatives highlighted were:

- (i) Option 2 – This would involve the demolition of 3 existing blocks in Mill Farm Close (consisting of 24 x 2b flats and 6 x 3b flats) and most of the garage sites. These would be replaced with 110 new homes (consisting of 34 x 1b2p flats, 38 x 2b3p flats, 20 x 2b4p flats, 6 x 3b5p houses and 12 x 4b7p houses). It is proposed that 6 bedsits would also be converted to 3 x 2b flats. The designs for this option and further details on other aspects of it are included at Appendix E.
- (ii) Option 3a – This would involve the demolition of all existing blocks in Mill Farm Close (110 units) and all garage sites and replacing them with 197 new homes (consisting of 61 x 1b2p flats, 23 x 2b3p flats, 67 x 2b4p flats, 10 x 3b5p houses and 36 x 4b7p houses). A variant of this (sub-option 3b) was also explored with a different design producing 201 new homes (consisting of 69 x 1b2p flats, 15 x 2b3p flats, 75 x 2b4p flats, 6 x 3b5p houses and 36 x 4b7p houses). These designs can be found at Appendix F and G.
- (iii) Option 4a – This would involve the demolition of all existing properties including Miller Close and 62 Rickmansworth Road (145 units) and replacing them with 267 new homes consisting of (consisting of 88 x 1b2p flats, 23 x 2b3p flats, 87 x 2b4p flats, 10 x 3b5p houses and 59 x 4b7p houses). A variant of this (sub-option 4b) was also explored with a different design producing 271 new homes (consisting of 96 x 1b2p flats, 15 x 2b3p flats, 95 x 2b4p flats, 6 x 3b5p houses and 59 x 4b7p houses). These designs can be found at Appendix H and I.

3.1.2 Each of these options was then costed along with an analysis of the potential vehicles which the council might use for delivering the redevelopment and the impact on the HRA. These are considered in the sections which follow along with a summary of the advantages and disadvantages of each option.

3.1.3 A further option (Option 5) was also considered at the request of a resident at an earlier meeting of the local residents group. It assumes that existing tenants are relocated elsewhere and existing leaseholders and freeholders are bought out by a developer. It is difficult to put a value on the estate taking into account the cost of moving people. The Council would not be able to rehouse residents and market the site with vacant possession. A developer would therefore need to make part payment for the land before acquiring ownership to enable the first tenants to move. This would devalue the land considerably and it is unlikely the eventual receipt would be sufficient to meet the cost of buying out existing owners and the costs of finding replacing social rented dwellings elsewhere in the borough. As a result this option is not considered viable and has not been explored further.

3.2 Costing Assumptions

3.2.1 There are a number of core assumptions behind each of the options. The main assumptions on tenure profile and capital costs and income for each option are highlighted below:

- (i) Balance between social / private housing – it has been assumed that the same number of demolished social rented units would be replaced on the estate, broadly in line with the existing dwelling size profile. The balance would be sold on the open market or provided as shared ownership to replace existing leasehold / freehold buyouts. Home loss for tenants is based on £4,400 per unit.
- (ii) Leaseholder / freeholder buyouts – it has been assumed that leaseholders (under options 2 and 3) plus freeholders (under option 4) would be bought out at existing market value + a 10% home loss payment. The model assumes that leaseholders / freeholders would be given an option of shared ownership (representing around 70% of value on average) with any balancing equity being held by the landlord and let at a pro rate social rent. Staircasing (purchase of remaining equity) has been assumed evenly over the next 30 years.
- (iii) Build costs have been based on £1,150 psm for houses and £1,450 for flats plus £5,000 per unit for sustainable development / renewable energy plus 12% fees. The core space standards are 48sqm for 1 bed, 70sqm for 2 beds, 95 sqm for 3 beds and 115 sqm for 4 bed units. Costs have been inflated by 7% to 2009/10 prices along with VAT on fees and 2.5% contingency. Demolition costs have been based on £4,000 per unit. A figure of £250,000 has been assumed for S106 costs. This will be for discussion with planners which suggests this is very much for negotiation on individual schemes, but initial discussion suggests this may prove adequate.
- (iv) Sales values have been based on £207,000 for a 1b2p flat, £226,000 for a 2b3p flat, £233,000 for a 2b4p flat, £304,000 for a 3b5p house and £336,000 for a 4b7p house. These were based on an assessment of local market prices. An average cost of £2,000 has been assumed for each sale. No inflation has been assumed in prices.
- (v) Phasing – it will be necessary to carry out a more detailed phasing analysis as part of the next stage. At this stage we have assumed that demolition and newbuild takes place in year 1 and sales and lettings take place in year 2. The more detailed analysis will also have to consider the need for decanting where necessary and any additional costs related to this.

3.2.2 The revenue assumptions for the social housing will be dependent to some extent on the selection of the delivery vehicle. This is discussed in further detail below but for the purposes of costing the model we have assumed that the new landlord will be an established registered social landlord (RSL) or housing association. The core revenue assumptions are as follows:

- (i) Rents – target rents have been set for each of the new properties based on the government formula. This currently works out to around £81.91 for a 1 bed flat, £91.48 for 2 bed flat, £108.42 for a 3 bed house and £119.04 for a 4 bed house. It has been assumed that tenants would move straight to the new target rent. These are higher than existing rents and may therefore need to be the subject of further discussion depending on the process followed. It is assumed that target rents grow at 0.5% above inflation.
- (ii) Management costs have been based on £500 per unit (increasing by 0.5% per annum) and maintenance costs at £400 per unit (increasing by 2.5% per annum as the property ages). Major repairs costs have prudently been assumed at £295 per unit in years 1-5, £590 per unit in years 6-10, £885 per unit in years 11-15 and £1,180 per unit thereafter. Voids and bad debts have been based on a prudent rate of 3%.
- (iii) The revenue income and costs have been discounted in the model at a prudent rate of 7% (real) and valued over 30 years.

3.2.3 The resulting discounted cashflows showed the position as follows for each of options 2 – 4 (all figures in £m):

	2	3a	3b	4a	4b
Capital Costs of newbuild	18.1	31.4	31.9	45.3	45.8
Sales Income	17.3	22.7	23.0	32.4	32.8
Present Value of Rent Income	1.2	4.0	3.9	5.1	5.1
Net Cost / (Surplus)	(0.4)	4.7	5.0	7.8	7.9

3.2.4 The figures above exclude the extra capital cost to the HRA of maintaining the remaining dwellings on the estate. These are discussed in section 3.4 below. As highlighted in the preceding analysis this is based on a set of prudent assumptions and we would expect a new landlord to out-perform many of these assumptions and / or provide additional capital / revenue support towards the scheme from its own resources, as happened at Rayners Lane.

3.3 Options for delivery vehicle - RSLs

3.3.1 As highlighted above we have assumed for the purposes of the costings that the new landlord for the redevelopment would be a housing association or RSL. This would be in line with the Rayners Lane redevelopment (developed by Warden Housing Association, part of the Home Group) and many other estate based redevelopments which have taken place in London and elsewhere in recent years.

3.3.2 One approach for such a redevelopment would be to transfer the properties tenanted to the RSL and for the RSL to manage the decanting and sales process itself. This was the approach adopted at Rayners Lane and on some other redevelopments. Tenants would need to be consulted as set out in Section 106 and schedule 3A of the Housing Act 1985. In accordance with CLG guidance this

would require tenants to be balloted on the proposals. A positive ballot would be required in order to proceed.

- 3.3.3 An alternative would be to transfer the properties or sites vacant to the new landlord. This would not require a ballot in quite the same format as when the properties are transferred tenanted but still requires tenants to be consulted on the suitable alternative accommodation to be provided under Ground 10a of schedule 2 of the Housing Act 1985.
- 3.3.4 In each case it would also be necessary to consult leaseholders (and freeholders if they are being bought out). Although there is not the same expectation to ballot leaseholders this is the general norm on redevelopments.
- 3.3.5 The arrangements for the dwelling sales in either case would depend on the deal struck with the developer and the risk being borne by the relevant parties. The recycling of sales receipts (either of vacant land or completed properties) would be necessary in order to make the scheme viable.
- 3.3.6 The communications with residents to date has mainly assumed that there would be a tenanted transfer. This has also been the basis of material provided by the residents' adviser, First Call, including at the Community Open Day events.
- 3.3.7 If the Council decides on working with an existing RSL it will be necessary to arrange some form of competition to select the partner as was done at Rayners Lane. CLG guidance is that residents should be involved in this process.

3.4 Options for delivery vehicle – Council owned

- 3.4.1 As an alternative the authority could consider setting up its own vehicle to do the redevelopment. As part of the government's green paper and in line with new proposals appearing in the new Housing & Regeneration Bill, authorities have the option of carrying out such redevelopments themselves. A number of local authorities, mainly those with established ALMOs are currently considering similar schemes. Some of these new linked vehicles have been controlled by the local authority and others are looking to set up a body outside the public sector, in much the same way as a housing association, thereby freeing it from direct public sector borrowing controls
- 3.4.2 In Harrow's case, however, it is debatable whether the Mill Farm scheme would be sufficiently large to justify setting up a separate redevelopment vehicle. There is also a significant area of risk involved in this process particularly around the build costs and sales assumptions. Whilst it may be possible to improve upon some of the assumptions, it is likely in our view that the Council would need to bear some of this cost. If the vehicle was controlled by the Council it would also need to account for any borrowing within its prudential borrowing targets.
- 3.4.3 The government is also considering ways in which it can enable newbuild and redevelopment through the HRA. At present authorities are constrained from adopting such an approach because rent surpluses generated from the new dwellings are recycled back to government rather than used to support borrowing in the same way that a housing association operates. Under proposals contained in the Bill, the Secretary of State would be able to exclude certain properties from the subsidy regime thereby avoiding the clawback rules. This could eliminate the

need to set up a separate vehicle outside the HRA although at present there are no plans to provide separate grant funding for such developments. Consequently the Council would need to consider the net cost of the scheme and whether it was able to meet that from its own capital resources and / or revenue resources within the HRA.

3.5 Private Finance Initiative

3.5.1 Another option would be to look at doing the redevelopment through the Private Finance Initiative (PFI). The PFI has had limited success to date as a mechanism for delivering social housing programmes, due in part to the lengthy process involved and the accompanying set up costs. However it has been used for a number of newbuild and redevelopment projects and the CLG has recently sought to streamline the process with a new set of guidance. The main advantage with the PFI option is that there would be the opportunity to apply for government funding (PFI credits) which would help to meet any net costs of the scheme.

3.5.2 A PFI would involve a private contractor (normally a consortium working with a RSL) bidding to redevelop and manage the estate through a long term contract (normally 30 years). This could be done as a HRA or a non-HRA redevelopment. The HRA option would generally mean the Council retaining long term ownership although because of the way the current subsidy system works it would need the Council to secure higher PFI credits than under the non-HRA option to counter the loss of the rent surpluses on the scheme.

3.5.3 It is also questionable whether Mill Farm would be a large enough project to qualify for PFI status. Generally the CLG is looking for bids which require a minimum of £10m from PFI credits, so it is likely that Mill Farm would need to be supplemented with another scheme in order to get through the initial qualification stages. The CLG also expects the authority to provide some of its own resources to schemes so Harrow may find it difficult to secure the entire funding gap anyway, depending on how it is presented.

3.6 Impact on the HRA from a RSL transfer

3.6.1 If the Council chooses to transfer the stock to a RSL or demolish the dwelling and hand over the vacant sites, it will need to take account of the loss of dwellings within its HRA, in much the same way as happens when it disposes of a property under the Right to Buy.

3.6.2 Option 4 (a and b) assumes a loss of 103 social rented units compared with 86 units in Option 3 (a and b) and 36 units (Option 2). The biggest potential loss (103 units) represents around 2% of the stock currently in the HRA and is considerably less than the Rayners Lane transfer (around 450 homes).

3.6.3 When a property is disposed of from the HRA the Council loses the rent income on the property but saves on operating costs and future repairs costs. Under the current subsidy regime the CLG reimburses the HRA (broadly) for the loss of rent income but makes a deduction for the assumed savings in management, maintenance and major repairs. The main issue facing an authority following a disposal is how it makes savings in its management costs as there are certain fixed costs which are difficult to reduce in the short term. The subsidy adjustment

also does not take place until 2 years after the disposal unless the authority disposes of more than 10% of its stock over that period.

3.6.4 We have examined the impact on the HRA in line with the work done on the HRA Business Plan and have summarised the estimated costs in year 1 and from year 3 for each of the options. These are shown at Appendix J. As might be expected the most significant impact arises from the largest disposal (£340,000 in year 1 and £109,000 in year 3).

3.6.5 Against this the Council would no longer be required to invest large sums of money in the stock transferred / demolished and would therefore make savings against the capital investment required. As highlighted in section 2.1 requires around £1.0m for the decent homes programme on Mill Farm. As also highlighted in Section 2.2 it requires a further £3.4m to carry out the structural and other estate enhancements giving a total of around £4.4m. We have assumed that around £2.55m would still be required under Option 2 (the part redevelopment) and £0.24m under Option 3. We have factored these figures into our summary analysis considered in Section 4.

3.7 Advantages & Disadvantages of Options 2 - 4

3.7.1 The main advantages and disadvantages were summarised in the information presented at the Community Open Day. These are considered in the paragraphs below.

3.7.2 The main advantages with Option 2, as laid out at the Community Day are:

- This option makes better use of the available space on the estate and provides more homes including additional rented housing than option 1.
- Not all of the existing tenants and leaseholders would need to move.
- It could be taken forward quite quickly if the funding gap can be closed.
- Considerable improvements to the space and layout of the new houses and flats built
- Better energy efficiency performance for all the new properties resulting in cheaper energy bills for some residents.

3.7.3 The main disadvantages with Option 2, as laid out at the Community Day are:

- This may not meet the aspirations of many residents for the estate.
- It results in piecemeal development of the estate.
- This option does not provide sufficient funds to meet all the investment needs on the estate.
- A housing association may not be prepared to meet the investment gap based on this design option.

3.7.4 The main advantages with Option 3, as laid out at the Community Day are:

- This option provides the most comprehensive option for tenants and leaseholders in Mill Farm Close and provides some new houses for tenants.
- The housing association may be prepared to invest its own resources based on this option and / or may be able to access additional public subsidy.
- Considerable improvements to the space and layout of the new houses and flats built on the estate
- Better energy efficiency performance for all the new properties resulting in cheaper energy bills for residents.
- In general complete demolition and rebuild will allow for improved usage and planning of public open spaces.
- This would help by creating better access to properties and make management of the communal areas and green spaces better.

3.7.5 The main disadvantages with Option 3, as laid out at the Community Day are:

- The density on the estate is more than under options 1 and 2 and may not be considered desirable by some residents.
- It would take longer to progress this option as no work could start until a housing association has been selected and the majority of residents would have to be in favour of it

3.7.6 The main advantages with Option 4, as laid out at the Community Day are:

- This provides the most comprehensive redevelopment solution for the whole estate and provides more new houses for tenants than under option 3.
- The housing association may be prepared to invest its own resources based on this option and / or may be able to access additional public subsidy.
- Access to parking via Rickmansworth Road for tenants in those blocks.
- Considerable improvements to the space and layout of the new houses and flats built on the estate
- Better energy efficiency performance for all the dwellings resulting in cheaper energy bills for residents.
- In general complete demolition and rebuild will allow for improved usage and planning of public open spaces.
- This would help by creating better access to properties and make management of the communal areas and green spaces better.

3.7.7 The main disadvantages with Option 4, as laid out at the Community Day are:

- The density on the estate is more than under the other options and may not be considered desirable by some residents.

- This option may not be considered desirable for some tenants and freeholders on Miller Close or Rickmansworth Road.
- It would take longer to progress this option as no work could start until a housing association has been selected and the majority of tenants would have to be in favour of it

4 Summary Analysis, Feedback & Conclusions

4.1 Summary Analysis

4.1.1 The foregoing analysis has examined the options available for the Mill Farm estate. The overall financial position based on the assumptions discussed above is as follows:

Mill Farm Options - Summary of Financial Analysis

	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3a	Option 3b	Option 4a	Option 4b
Transfer & Redevelopment						
Number of Units						
New dwellings - tenanted	0	36	86	86	103	103
New dwellings - shared o/s	0	0	24	24	42	42
New dwellings - l/h & f/h sales	30	65	87	91	122	126
	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
Total Build Costs	4.1	18.1	31.4	31.9	45.3	45.8
Borrowing supported by rent income	0.0	1.2	4.0	3.9	5.1	5.1
Income from Sales	4.1	17.3	22.7	23.0	32.4	32.8
Total Income	6.4	18.5	26.7	26.9	37.5	37.9
Funding Gap (to be met by new RSL)	2.3	0.4	-4.7	-5.0	-7.8	-7.9
Retained for Refurbishment						
Number of Units						
Retained dwellings - tenanted	103	81	17	17	0	0
Retained dwellings - l/h & f/h	42	31	18	18	0	0
	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
Net Cost of refurbishment	4.4	2.5	0.2	0.2	0.0	0.0
Resources available	1.0	0.8	0.2	0.2	0.0	0.0
Funding Gap (to be met by Council)	-3.4	-1.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Units	175	213	232	236	267	271
Total Funding Gap	-1.1	-1.3	-4.7	-5.0	-7.8	-7.9

4.1.2 This shows a capital cost to the Council (net of any receipts) of around £1.1m for Option 1 and £1.3m for Option 2.

4.1.3 Options 3 and 4 provide the most radical solutions to the estate. For option 3 some funds would still need to be found to meet the residual capital costs for 17 units on the tenanted estate (in Miller Close and 66 Rickmansworth Road) but it should be possible to resource this from the remaining earmarked MRA funds.

4.1.4 One of the main issues is in connection with the net capital cost of the redevelopment. At this stage we have taken a fairly prudent view on many of the key assumptions. With this in mind it is our view that this level of subsidy broadly fits within the sort of additional support that a RSL would be prepared to meet on a scheme such as this, especially when compared with the level of funding required to cross subsidise current SHG funded development. The capital cost of option 3a (£4.7m) represents a cross subsidy of around £50,000 per unit (based on 86 tenanted and 24 shared ownership units), whilst the capital cost of option 4a represents around £67,000 per unit (based on 103 tenanted and 42 shared ownership units).

4.1.5 The other main issue is around the revenue cost to the HRA from the loss of stock. However this does only represent 2% of the stock at the most. In our view the costs of £101,000 for option 3 and £109,000 for option 4 are residual costs which most authorities would be able to find over time through stepped reductions in staffing and other overheads as stock numbers reduce.

4.2 Feedback from Community Open Day

4.2.1 Representatives from Tribal and JCMT attended the Community Open Day and worked with Council officers and First Call to explain to residents what the different options represented. Feedback from that day has been summarised separately by council officers.

4.2.2 Anecdotal evidence suggests that residents were generally most supportive of Options 3a or 3b as most were in favour of some form of redevelopment with the exception of the freeholders in Miller Close. Most residents also appeared to understand what a RSL was and knew something about the redevelopment project at Rayners Lane. Initial indications were that the idea of a transfer to a RSL would not necessarily be considered a problem.

4.3 Conclusions & Next Steps

4.3.1 Based on our analysis and the feedback received to date we consider that Option 3 would appear to offer the best long term solution for the estate if the Council is prepared to meet the residual (but in our view manageable) costs to the HRA. If the Council goes down the transfer route this will also be dependent on finding a RSL partner that is prepared to meet the funding gap, but in our view this is within the range that many RSLs would be prepared to countenance.

4.3.2 The Council does have the option of setting up a redevelopment vehicle itself or even waiting for prospective changes to the HRA regime so that it might do the redevelopment itself. It might also consider going through the PFI route. However we believe that Mill Farm is too small to consider setting up a separate vehicle and is probably too small for a PFI. The Council could wait for changes to the HRA regime to see if redevelopment becomes more attractive. However in our view the Council would probably still need to find the balancing funds to meet the capital costs as it does not have the financial reserves available to many housing associations.

4.3.3 If the Council does decide to proceed with a transfer to a RSL it will need to decide on the form of that transfer (eg tenanted or vacant) and will need to embark on a process to select the RSL, working with residents. The selected

RSL will no doubt have its own views on the best design option so it may be preferable to wait until that partner is selected before doing considerable extra detailed work on this although it would be worth reviewing some of the core assumptions (eg build cost / sales values) on a regular basis.

Appendix A - Curtins Report on Structural Issues



**A Risk Assessment and Structural Survey of
Non-Traditional Housing
At Mill Farm, Harrow**

For

**Tribal Consulting
87-91 Newman Street
London
W1T 3EY**

On Behalf of Harrow Council

by

**Curtins Consulting Engineers plc
3 Cwrt-y-Parc
Earlswood Road
Llanishen
Cardiff
CF14 5GH
Tel: 029 20765444
Fax: 029 20747800
Email: cardiff@curtins.com**

Draft Stage 1 Report

Contents

	Page Number
1.0 Introduction	1
2.0 Composition of the Non-Traditional Housing Stock	2
3.0 Visual Appraisal and Impressionistic Study	3
4.0 Proposals for Detailed Investigations	14
5.0 Conclusions	16
6.0 Budget Repair Costs	17

Appendices

- A Property Address List**
- B Photographs**

1.0 Introduction

Following our appointment to undertake the survey and investigation of non-traditional housing at Mill Farm, Harrow, an initial Stage 1 appraisal of the stock has been undertaken.

This has been based upon:

- The database of address lists and dwelling types provided to us
- A visual inspection and appraisal of the properties in order to familiarise ourselves with the stock and its appearance – part of this was undertaken in the presence of a representative from the Council
- Our experience of the behaviour of similar non-traditional housing stock

The appraisal is in relation to the structural elements only of the dwellings and does not consider items of fabric which have been taken into account by the general stock condition survey.

This interim report has been prepared after the completion of our review of existing data and an initial visual inspection of the stock. It contains our first estimate of probable repair costs based on the initial work done to date.

The final Stage 2 report will follow once the physical tests have been completed and concrete samples analysed. This final report will contain our confirmed budget estimates.

2.0 Composition of the Non-Traditional Housing Stock at Mill Farm, Harrow

The non-traditional housing stock comprises a total of 103 rented dwellings as indicated below;

Non-traditional Type	Accommodation	No. of Units	
		Rented	Leasehold
Laing Easiform	Bedsit Flat	18	24
	Flat	14	
	Maisonette	54	
Timber Frame	House	11	15
Unknown	Flat	6	3
Total		103	42

The above summary has been prepared from the details provided by the Council.

3.0 Visual Appraisal and Impressionistic Study

Following our appointment an external visual appraisal of the stock was made on 19 June 2007 in order to familiarise ourselves with the general condition of the stock and to note any items that we considered would require special attention during the detailed investigations. Our findings, following the visual appraisal are as follows;

3.0 Visual Appraisal and Impressionistic Study (continued)

3.1 Laing Easiform



The Easiform system of building is a cast insitu concrete form of house construction developed by John Laing. The first house was built in 1919 and approximately 5,000 dwellings were completed during the inter-war years, most of which were erected in the mid 1920's. The Easiform system was reintroduced after the war in 1946 and was in production until the early 1970's providing a further 85,000 dwellings.

Since the walls are of cast insitu concrete the system is adaptable giving many different plan configurations and types of accommodation. More than 25 basic types of Easiform houses, flats and maisonettes were produced embracing two, three and four storey buildings incorporating hipped and gabled roofs, porches of different designs, bay windows and brick outer cladding to front and rear or side elevations.

The structural system of the Easiform house is essentially the same as that for a traditional cavity walled brick dwelling. The floor and roof loads are taken directly to the foundations via the loadbearing inner skin of the external walls, which in turn are stabilised and stiffened by wall tie connections to the outer skin.

Such systems are simple and robust and can tolerate considerable damage without affecting the stability of the structure. In addition, cast insitu cross walls provide substantial lateral bracing and, even in the unlikely event of partial failure of an external wall, damage to the rest of the structure would be limited.

Two Storey Construction

Built during 1919 to mid 1920's

The first Easiform houses have 8 inch thick solid concrete walls built with no fines clinker concrete and approximately 2,100 houses of this type were built before 1928.

3.0 Visual Appraisal and Impressionistic Study (continued)

3.1 Laing Easiform (continued)

Built during mid 1920's to 1945

All cavity walled Easiform construction is similar in that it has cast insitu concrete cavity construction for the external walls similar in principle to traditional cavity brick construction. The outer skin of the cavity was cast with normal dense gravel aggregate and the inner skin was cast using clinker aggregate concrete. The two skins are connected with wall ties in the conventional manner.

In the first cavity walled Easiform dwellings the two skins of the outer envelope were 3 inches thick and separated by a 2 inch cavity. The outer dense concrete skin was specified with half inch diameter mild steel reinforcing bars placed horizontally at 2 foot vertical centres, whereas the inner clinker concrete skin had no reinforcement specified. The outer skins of the external walls were usually finished with a dense stone dashed render coat.

The party walls were 8 inches thick and cast in clinker aggregate concrete, the partition walls to the ground floor and first floor were 3 inches thick, again cast in clinker aggregate concrete. The suspended floors were usually of traditional timber joist/board construction and the ends of the joists were wrapped in bituminous felt and supported in notches cast in the inner skin of the external walls. The rest of the construction was traditional.

Built after 1945

The majority of Easiform properties in existence are of this later type and differ in a number of respects from the pre-war dwellings.

The thicknesses of the skins of the external cavity walls were increased from 3 inches to 3.5 with the 2 inch cavity retained. Reinforcement was specified both in the inner and outer skins and is grouped in four horizontal bands above and below window openings. Dense concrete strips encasing the reinforcement within the inner skin were also specified.

The ground floor partitions were usually cast with insitu clinker concrete, the first floor partitions being provided in breeze block.

In some later dwellings, limestone quarry waste or Lytag was used instead of clinker aggregate in the inner leaf and loadbearing partitions and tile hanging or brickwork was sometimes substituted for the outer concrete leaf.

The party walls extend the full height of the dwellings and are of cavity construction similar to the external walls, except that both skins were cast using clinker aggregate concrete.

In other respects the construction is the same as that described for the earlier cavity walled Easiform properties.

3.0 Visual Appraisal and Impressionistic Study (continued)

3.1 Laing Easiform (continued)

Three and Four Storey Construction

After 1945, three and four storey blocks of flats and maisonettes were constructed. The form of construction is similar to that described above except that some loadbearing walls may be thicker to accommodate the structural requirements and alternate floors were sometimes constructed in reinforced concrete.

These floors may have been constructed using solid insitu slabs, insitu ribs and hollow blocks or occasionally precast ribs with hollow blocks with a structural topping.

Additional reinforcement was also incorporated in some developments to provide an insitu reinforced concrete frame within the walls.

These are the type of Easiform dwellings owned by the Council. The properties were arranged in seven 4 storey blocks with rendered front and rear elevations and brickwork gables.

3.0 Visual Appraisal and Impressionistic Study (continued)

3.1 Laing Easiform (continued)

Three distinctive variations of flat blocks were noted which contain bedsits, flats and 2 storey maisonettes (to the uppermost floors). The site comprised three larger blocks, two of which had an additional concrete balcony/walkway to the rear at first floor level and window openings to the gable. The four remaining blocks were shorter in length than the others.

Inspection within the roof space of one of the maisonettes revealed the roof to be of timber construction, comprising primary roof trusses along with cut timbers. The condition of the timbers was noted to be reasonable and no signs of deterioration or decay could be detected. The original concrete roof tile covering appeared to be in good condition and free from defects where inspected. Loft insulation was present and was recorded to be approximately 100mm thick.

Closer inspection of the party wall within the roof space revealed that the construction was of Easiform dense concrete, so noted because of the characteristic horizontal shutter marks at approximately 600mm intervals. The condition of the wall was seen to be good and no signs of deterioration, or that it had been breached, could be determined in the area inspected.

The external components to each flat block were identical. The fascia and bargeboards were noted to be of timber and were exhibiting signs of general decay. Soffits were a cement type board and were seen to have become displaced and were generally uneven. Some localised repairs had been carried out to the soffits. Rainwater goods were in the most part PVCu and appeared to be in poor condition.

The external wall coatings comprised spar dash render to the front and rear elevations from first floor level up to top floor level. Generally, the condition of the render was noted to be weathered, although no delamination from the external wall face could be ascertained.

It was noted that the ground floor elevations had a rough cast render finish which seemed to be older and more weathered than the render to the remaining elevations. It was unclear if this was an aesthetic feature, or if a new render coat had been applied to the upper floors. The front and rear elevations to the stairwell sections exhibited a smooth cast render coat which was found to be cracked and crazed.

Some vertical cracking was noted, mainly to the rear elevation of some the blocks; in one instance, this started at the base of the rear wall and progressed up to eaves level. These cracks, however, appeared to be historic and could not be located at the corresponding position internally where inspection was feasible. Vertical expansion joints were noted to the front and rear elevations at intermediate positions along the external walls, and these were seen to be sealed with mastic.

3.0 Visual Appraisal and Impressionistic Study (continued)

3.1 Laing Easiform (continued)

Horizontal cracking/banding was noted to the front and rear elevations at the position of the concrete floor slabs at each floor level. However, the horizontal banding at approximately 600mm intervals, which traditionally tend to be associated with Easiform construction, could not be detected.

The appearance of the masonry gable walls would suggest that they were free from any serious structural inadequacies. No signs of any appreciable frost damage, lateral movement or bulging were noted. Some cracking was evident although very minor in its nature and, accordingly, unlikely to be conducive of any significant structural movement. In addition, the mortar appeared to be generally robust, although isolated areas of powdery mortar were noted. Consequently, it is thought that the brickwork will need to be raked out and re-pointed in places. The damp proof course at the base of the brickwork elevations was seen to be a bitumen product and was noted to be suffering from deterioration in some instances.

Although no inspection within the cavity was feasible during the site inspection, we are of the opinion that the external walls have not received cavity wall insulation due to the lack of pump holes in the render. We were unable to confirm the condition of wall ties although, due to the age of the properties, it is likely that these will require replacement in the near future.

The condition of the balcony walkways to the rear and stub balconies to the front elevations seemed to be generally good. Instances of spalling concrete and exposed reinforcement to these components were limited and they appeared to have been regularly coated with masonry paint (unknown if anti-carbonation paint has been used). Nevertheless, some minor instances of spalling concrete had occurred, particularly within the vicinity of the slab edge, the underside of the slab and around the point of the fixing for the steel guardrails, possibly as a consequence of low cover to the reinforcement.

The condition of the asphalt surface coverings to the balconies etc have deteriorated to such a level that these will soon need to be renewed; these exhibited bubbling especially to the vertical face of the slabs. The steel guardrails appeared free from any appreciable corrosion and as such should require little more than routine maintenance. However, it may be necessary to undertake some repairs to the fixings where they were secured to the slab. It should also be noted that the timber components of the guardrails have suffered decay and should be replaced. Balcony slabs to the ground floor dwellings were seen to have rotated away from the face of the building in many instances, suggesting that they were probably on a separate foundation to the main flat blocks.

3.0 Visual Appraisal and Impressionistic Study (continued)

3.1 Laing Easiform (continued)

Other concrete components included window cills, window surrounds (only present to the gables of the larger blocks and to the front and rear of the stairwell sections) and entrance door canopies. Spalling concrete and exposed reinforcement was generally evident to these components. In many instances the cill or the complete surround had spalled away. Some door canopies have also suffered heavy spalling, especially to the front corners where large areas of reinforcement have been exposed.

The visual evidence indicates that there are currently no major structural matters that need attention and that it is unlikely that any extensive structural remedial measures will be needed during the next 30 years. However, we would recommend that, as a minimum, allowances are included for isolated render/concrete/brickwork repairs, random reinforcement repairs together with wall tie replacement and remedial works to ground floor balcony slabs. Furthermore, we consider that the life of the dwellings will be extended well beyond 30 years if the external envelope is protected with insulation and render. The reinforcement in this type of non-traditional construction is usually in a good condition at present and overcladding the dwellings would ensure that this remained so. We would recommend external insulation which will keep the outer leaf dry in preference to cavity fill as this can cause an acceleration in the deterioration process as the outer leaf is now subject to more extreme temperature and moisture ranges than before. In terms of overall environmental improvements and benefits to residents there is merit in considering the application of external wall insulation. This will enhance and prolong the life of the structural wall components beyond the 30 year time frame considered here and, thus, we have shown this item of work together with an allowance for wall tie replacement and general concrete repairs etc. as the recommended option.

3.0 Visual Appraisal and Impressionistic Study (continued)

3.2 Timber Frame Houses



These were seen to be two storey terraced houses with pitched roofs located in Miller Close.

It is considered that these properties are in original condition and have not received any notable refurbishment/repair works, apart from the provision of PVCu windows and reactive maintenance repairs to the external tile hanging.

Inspections within the roof space revealed a timber trussed roof construction which was seen to be in good condition, although the low pitch of the roof made entering the roof space infeasible. Underfelt was present and the condition of the interlocking concrete roof tile covering was found to be reasonable. Loft insulation was noted to be approximately 100mm thick.

The external walls comprised a brickwork outer skin to the ground floor elevations and artificial slate tile hanging to the first floor. The brickwork was noted to be in good condition and no instances of cracking were evident. Similarly, the mortar joints, where examined, seemed robust and no instances of soft/ powdery mortar could be identified. Much of the tile hanging to the first floor was in poor condition, with many instances of damage having occurred through lack of maintenance and vandalism. Where seen, the sarking felt was noted to be weathered and damaged in the position of broken tiles. The tile hanging to many of the properties appeared to have been completely replaced with new materials.

3.0 Visual Appraisal and Impressionistic Study (continued)

3.2 Timber Frame Houses (continued)

It had been suggested by the Council that these properties were of timber framed construction. Although we did not undertake an intrusive examination of these properties, we consider that we have gathered sufficient information to conclude that they more closely resemble a traditional brick/block construction. Tapping of the party walls and the front and rear external walls at ground and first floor level suggested that the internal walls/inner leaf were solid masonry, rather than plasterboard as would be expected in a timber framed property. The presence of blockwork to the gable apex when viewed within the attic space was also established. Externally, blockwork was visible to the outer leaf wall at first floor level, beneath a damaged section of tile hanging. No investigations within the cavity were carried out and as such the condition of wall ties could not be ascertained. The lack of pump holes suggested that cavity wall insulation had not been introduced.

We were informed by a resident that the first floor construction was timber with chipboard flooring. The ground floor was solid.

Fascias and soffits were not present to the properties and PVCu rainwater goods were noted to be in a generally poor condition.

3.0 Visual Appraisal and Impressionistic Study (continued)

3.3 Unknown



This block of nine flats at 62 Rickmansworth Road was seen to be of three storeys with a flat roof.

Anecdotal information on this block suggested that it was constructed around 15 years ago by a private developer who became insolvent. We are of the understanding that it was subsequently acquired by the Council soon afterwards.

No inspection was feasible to the flat roof covering at the time of the inspection and, therefore, its condition could not be ascertained. However, we were able to identify that the roof covering was felt, visible where it had been lapped over the parapet.

We are uncertain as to the construction of the flat roof, although, an internal inspection revealed that the depth between the roof deck and the top floor ceiling was approximately 500mm. This was determined at the location of skylights within the roof deck.

The external leaf of masonry comprised feature concrete blockwork (395x190x190mm) which was generally free from defects, cracking etc. Some minor vertical cracking was noted to the rear of the property in the vicinity of some recently completed excavations/earthworks. The mortar joints to the blockwork also seemed generally robust with no visible areas of soft/powdery mortar. We were unable to inspect within the cavity at the time of the inspection and, consequently, the condition of any wall ties present could not be ascertained. We suspect that cavity wall insulation has not been introduced as no pump holes could be located on any of the elevations.

PVCu rainwater goods appeared to be in good condition.

3.0 Visual Appraisal and Impressionistic Study (continued)

3.3 Unknown (continued)

The exposed edges to the concrete floor slabs which incorporate lintel details above openings, appeared to be largely free from any potential defects - there was little visible evidence of any concrete having cracked and/or spalled as a consequence of corroded reinforcement. The exposed floor slab was seen to be coated in masonry type paint, which was in good condition with no occurrences of de-bonding visible. The joint between the floor slab and the lintel was noted to be a dry joint with no mastic seal.

Windows were double glazed PVCu and appeared to be original.

4.0 Proposals for Detailed Investigations

4.1 Laing Easiform

Carry out the following investigations on selected properties;

- Take concrete dust samples for chloride ion analysis from the external wall construction and walkways/balconies. Determine the depth of carbonation and cover to the steel and inspect its condition.
- Verify construction of gable walls.
- Establish condition of cavity ties in the external wall.
- Take samples as described above from the party wall (where access permits).
- Visually inspect the internal aspect of the dwellings and examine structure in roof space.
- Take key dimensions.
- Note the general condition of the external fabric, particularly those parts of the external envelope likely to deteriorate to the point of requiring repair/replacement during the next 30 years.

4.2 Timber Frame

Carry out the following investigations on selected properties;

- Verify the construction of the external walls.
- Inspect internally for signs of dampness and mould growth, take Relative Humidity and moisture content readings at appropriate/suspicious locations and note any signs of structural distress/deterioration to overall frame or to timber components.
- Examine condition of dpc and sole plate – probe timber for rot check.
- Examine structure in roof space; wall/roof connections etc.
- Take key dimensions.
- Note the general condition of the external fabric, particularly those parts of the external envelope likely to deteriorate to the point of requiring repair/replacement during the next 30 years.

4.0 Proposals for Detailed Investigations (continued)

4.3 Unknown

Carry out the following investigations on the block of flats;

- Verify the construction of the external walls.
- Visually inspect the internal aspect of the dwellings and examine condition of roof structure.
- Take key dimensions.
- Note the general condition of the external fabric, particularly those parts of the external envelope likely to deteriorate to the point of requiring repair/replacement during the next 30 years.

5.0 Conclusions

The housing stock at Mill Farm has not benefited from any major refurbishment works and appeared to be as originally built with, seemingly, only minimal maintenance works undertaken.

The Laing Easiform dwellings are of an insitu concrete form of construction with little or no reinforcement in them to cause premature deterioration. Subject to our detailed inspection we expect to find that these will provide a safe structural life for another 30 years, albeit there may be a need for some relatively minor concrete/reinforcement repairs. These dwellings may also require wall tie replacement. This is not a problem restricted to non-traditional cavity walled dwellings, but can be widespread in any of the “older” traditionally built dwellings. These dwellings would benefit from external insulation to both protect the concrete and enhance thermal performance.

We are of the opinion that the Timber Frame designated properties are in fact of traditional masonry cavity wall construction although this would need to be confirmed by an intrusive investigation. These properties should be satisfactory for a further 30 years subject to improved maintenance works in order to maintain the external envelope in a weathertight manner.

The ‘Unknown’ designated block of flats also appears to be of traditional construction although, as noted above, detailed investigation would be required to verify this. Again, improved maintenance should ensure that these dwellings achieve a further 30 years life.

6.0 Budget Repair Costs

The following tables indicate our estimated budget repair costs for the various property types based upon our preliminary observations. These costs will be confirmed or modified in the light of the detailed intrusive investigations.

6.1 Laing Easiform

	(£)/unit	No.	Total Cost (£)	Year	
Minimum 30 years	Isolated render/ concrete/brickwork repairs and new mastic sealant to joints.	18,000	4	72,000	
		21,500	3	64,500	
	Random reinforcement repairs.	18,000	4	72,000	
		21,500	3	64,500	
	Remedial wall ties to external walls including brickwork end walls.	42,500	4	170,000	
		50,000	3	150,000	
	Remedial works to ground floor balcony slabs	10,000	4	40,000	
			633,000	1-5, 6-10	

6.0 Budget Repair Costs (continued)

6.1 Laing Easiform (continued)

		(£)/unit	No.	Total Cost (£)	Year
Enhanced 30 years	Isolated concrete repairs.	14,000	4	56,000	
		16,000	3	48,000	
	Remedial wall ties to external walls including brickwork end walls.	42,500	4	170,000	
		50,000	3	150,000	
	Remedial works to ground floor balcony slabs	10,000	4	40,000	
	Insulated render overcladding system.	180,000	4	720,000	
		213,750	3	641,250	
				1,825,250	1-5

6.0 Budget Repair Costs (continued)

6.1 Laing Easiform (continued)

			(£)/unit	No.	Total Cost (£)	Year
Recommended	Isolated concrete repairs.		14,000	4	56,000	
			16,000	3	48,000	
	Remedial wall ties to external walls including brickwork end walls.		42,500	4	170,000	
			50,000	3	150,000	
	Remedial works to ground floor balcony slabs		10,000	4	40,000	
	Insulated render overcladding system.		180,000	4	720,000	
			213,750	3	641,250	
					1,825,250	1-5

6.0 Budget Repair Costs (continued)

6.2 Timber Frame

		(£)/unit	No.	Total Cost (£)	Year
From the initial visual inspection these properties appear to be traditional; therefore, no costs included with regard to non-traditionality.					
Minimum 30 years	N/A	-	-	0	
Enhanced 30 years	N/A	-	-	0	
Recommended	N/A	-	-	0	

6.3 Unknown

From the initial visual inspection these properties appear to be traditional; therefore, no costs included with regard to non-traditionality.

Minimum 30 years	N/A	-	-	0	
Enhanced 30 years	N/A	-	-	0	
Recommended	N/A	-	-	0	

Appendix A
Property Address List

Appendix B

Photographs

(Please see CD for Photographs)

Appendix B - Schedule of Refurbishment Works

	7 Blocks
Conversion of 18 Besits to 2 Beds	270,000
Door entry system renew / upgrade	80,000
External Lighting to Communal areas and footpaths	60,000
Play areas four separate locations, three under 5s equipment and one kick about area	85,000
Fencing around blocks to provide defensible space	75,000
Soundproofing to flats (depends on system)	425,000
Top up insulation in the roof space to 200mm	10,000
Cavity fill & repoint to the brick end elevations	60,000
New bin store areas	50,000
Floor covering to communal areas	45,000
Redecoration of internal communal areas	55,000
Replacement facia, barge boards, soffits and rainwater goods	45,000
Landscaping and new planting around communal areas	60,000
New digital ariel system	35,000
Curtins, incl 8% Fees	1,971,270
Decent Homes Costs	1,032,394
Total	<u>4,358,664</u>

Appendix C - Option 1 – Plan Showing Layout

SCHEDULE OF ACCOMMODATION

EXISTING HOMES (145 total including bedsits)

Mill Farm Close 2 x bedsits (18 bedsits converted to 9 x 2 bed flats)
 16 x 1 bed flats
 69 x 2 bed maisonettes/flats
 14 x 3 bed maisonettes
 Miller Close 14 x 2 bed houses
 12 x 3 bed houses
 62 Rickmansworth Rd 9 x 2 bed flats (assumed)

136 EXISTING HOMES

PROPOSED HOMES

Mill Farm Close 12 x 1 bed /2p flats
 8 x 2 bed/4p flats
 6 x 3 bed/5p houses
 4 x 4 bed/7p houses

30 NEW HOMES

166 TOTAL EXISTING AND NEW HOMES



OPTION 1

- Retain all existing buildings
- Convert bedsits to flats (2 bedsits = 1 x 2 bed flat)
- Upgrade all existing properties
- Demolish most remaining garages on Mill Farm Close (61)
- Introduce traffic calming/landscape - Homezone
- Build 30 new houses and flats in spaces between buildings
- Add a ball court and toddler play facilities
- Enclose areas to rear of flats and landscape
- Build new bin stores and recycling centres to each block

PARKING

73 existing off street parking spaces
 +16 garages (only 16 garages used by residents of Mill Farm Close & Miller Close)
 = **89 Car Parking spaces**

Overall effect on Parking : - 3
Total Car Parking = 86 spaces

 HOUSES
 FLATS

MILL FARM ESTATE, PINNER
 OPTIONS APPRAISAL

OPTION 01

RETENTION OF EXISTING BUILDINGS, PLUS INFILL
 DWG. 839_SK01 / SCALE 1:1250@A3

icmt
 architects

Appendix D - Financial / other assumptions used for options

Transfer ?	Demolition Stock assumed to transfer to RSL in options 2 - 4	
Demolition Date	Assumed to be year 1 for all dwellings (no phasing)	
Rents	As per Council, no uplift on relets (likely to be short life)	
Management & (net) Service Cost per unit	£550, rising at 0.5% pa real	Would need to test by preparing draft TUPE list
Responsive & Cyclical repairs per unit	£600, rising at 2.5% real	
Re-purchase - leaseholders, including 10% homeloss		
Mill Farm Close Bedsit	£160k	Derived from 2 bed value
Mill Farm Close 1 Bed	£185k	Derived from 2 bed value
Mill Farm Close 2 Bed	£205k	Lots of 2 Beds for sale at asking prices in range £180k - £190k
Mill Farm Close 3 Bed	£235k	Derived from 2 bed value
Miller Close 3 Bed	£275k	None on market - assumption
Miller Close 4 Bed	£300k	None on market - assumption
62 Rickmansworth 1 Bed	£185k	Based on Mill Farm Close
Demolition Cost per dwelling	£4k per dwelling	NB: Difficult to estimate, will depend on incidence of hazardous materials etc, but this is the working assumption. VAT and 7% uplift to 2009.10 allowed
Homeloss - Tenants	£4,400	
Bedsits	For option 1, loss of 9 units through conversiojn of 18 bedsits to 2 beds not replaced by scheme. Similarly, assumed for option 2 that demolished blocks are type which contain no bedsits, & Council accepts loss of 9 units.	
	For option 3 & 4, assumed that demolished bedsits are replaced, 50% by 1 bed, 50% by 2 bed.	

Phasing of works	demolition & new build in year 1, sales and lettings year 2 (no phasing)	
Assumed build costs - Flats	£1,450 per Sq M + £5k per unit sustainable development/renewable energy + 12% fees	Assumed to increase by 7% to 2009.10. VAT allowed on fees & 2.5% contingency allowed.
Assumed build costs - Houses	£1,150 per sq m + £5k per unit sustainable development/renewable energy + 12% fees	
Sales Proceeds New Dwellings:		
1B2P Flat	£207k	No Increase assumed to base date 2009.10
2B3P Flat	£226k	
2B4P Flat	£233k	
3B5P House	£304k	
4B7P House	£336k	
Sales Cost per Dwelling	£2k	
Rents New Dwellings (Target Rents from first let)		
1B2P Flat	81.91	New lettings at target. Assumed to increase at RPI + 0.5% (including to 2009.10)
2B3P Flat	91.48	
2B4P Flat	91.48	
3B5P House	108.42	
4B7P House	119.04	
Assumed Management Cost per New Build £	500	Real growth 0.5% pa
Assumed Maintenance Cost per New Build £	400	Real growth 2.5% pa as dwellings age
Assumed Major Repairs Cost per New Build from year 11 £	£295 years 1-5, £590 years 6-10, £885 years 11-15, £1,180 years 16-30	Based on 0.25% of build cost in first 5 years, rising by 0.25% each 5 year band up to & including 16-30, plus 0.5%. Real growth 0.5%
Other costs - s106 / infrastructure etc	£250k as a notional figure for rebuild options	Discussions with planners suggests this is very much for negotiation on individual schemes, but initial discussion suggests this may prove adequate.
Allocation of new dwellings	See detailed schedule, but in general, assumed existing rented units are first call (bedsits replaced 50% by 1 beds, and 50% by 2 beds). Assumed 3 person 2 beds used for rented. Leaseholders assumed to buy 70% share in equivalent size dwelling, where insufficient of that size built, next size up.	
Shared ownership Staircasing	Assumed to start in year 10. For option 3 (a&b) 1 per annum buys remaining 30% until year 33. For option 4 (a&b) 2 per annum years 10-27 and 1 per annum years 28-33. In both cases, this accounts for all dwellings.	

	NB Social Rent	NB for Sale	Shared O'ship	Totals
Option 1				
1b/2p Flats		12		12
2b/3p Flats		-		-
2b/4p Flats		8		8
3b/5p Houses		6		6
4b/7p Houses		4		4
Totals	-	30	-	30
Average Size		2.07		2.07
Option 2				
1b/2p Flats		25		25
2b/3p Flats	30	8		38
2b/4p Flats		20		20
3b/5p Houses	6	-		6
4b/7p Houses		12		12
Totals	36	65	-	101
Average Size	2.17	1.98		2.05
Option 3A				
1b/2p Flats	23	34	4	61
2b/3p Flats	23	-		23
2b/4p Flats	29	21	17	67
3b/5p Houses	6	1	3	10
4b/7p Houses	5	31	-	36
Totals	86	87	24	197
Average Size	1.92	2.33	1.96	2.11
Option 3B				
1b/2p Flats	23	42	4	69
2b/3p Flats	15	-	-	15
2b/4p Flats	37	21	17	75
3b/5p Houses	3	-	3	6
4b/7p Houses	8	28	-	36
Totals	86	91	24	201
Average Size	1.95	2.15	1.96	2.04
Option 4A				
1b/2p Flats	29	55	4	88
2b/3p Flats	23	-	-	23
2b/4p Flats	29	38	20	87
3b/5p Houses	-	-	10	10
4b/7p Houses	22	29	8	59
Totals	103	122	42	267
Average Size	2.15	2.02	2.52	2.15
Option 4B				
1b/2p Flats	29	63	4	96
2b/3p Flats	15	-	-	15
2b/4p Flats	37	38	20	95
3b/5p Houses	-	-	6	6
4b/7p Houses	22	25	12	59
Totals	103	126	42	271
Average Size	2.15	1.90	2.62	2.10

Appendix E - Option 2 – Plan Showing Layout

SCHEDULE OF ACCOMMODATION

EXISTING HOMES

Mill Farm Close 2 x bedsits (6 bedsits converted to 3 x 2 bed flats)
 16 x 1 bed flats
 39 x 2 bed maisonettes/flats
 8 x 3 bed maisonettes
 Miller Close 14 x 2 bed houses
 12 x 3 bed houses
 62 Rickmansworth Rd 9 x 2 bed flats (assumed)

100 EXISTING HOMES

PROPOSED HOMES

Mill Farm Close 34 x 1 bed /2p flats
 38 x 2bed/3p flats
 20 x 2 bed/4p flats
 6 x 3 bed/5p houses
 12 x 4 bed/7p houses

110 NEW HOMES

210 TOTAL EXISTING AND NEW HOMES



OPTION 2

- Demolish 3 existing blocks
- Convert remaining bedsits to flats (2 bedsits = 1 x 2 bed flat)
- Upgrade all existing properties
- Demolish all remaining garages on Mill Farm Close (68)
- Introduce traffic calming/landscape - Homezone
- Build 110 new houses and flats
- Add a ball court and toddler play facilities
- Enclose areas to rear of flats and landscape
- Build new bin stores and recycling centres to each block

PARKING
 73 existing off street parking spaces
 +16 garages (only 16 garages used by residents of Mill Farm Close & Miller Close)
= 89 Car Parking spaces

Overall effect on Parking : +27
Total Car Parking = 116 spaces

 HOUSES
 FLATS

MILL FARM ESTATE, PINNER
 OPTIONS APPRAISAL
OPTION 02
 PARTIAL DEMOLITION & NEW BUILD
 DWG. 839_SK02 / SCALE 1:1250@A3

jcmt
 architects

Appendix F - Option 3a – Plan Showing Layout

SCHEDULE OF ACCOMMODATION

EXISTING HOMES

Miller Close 14 x 2 bed houses
 12 x 3 bed houses
 62 Rickmansworth Rd 9 x 2 bed flats (assumed)

35 EXISTING HOMES

PROPOSED HOMES

Mill Farm Close 61 x 1 bed /2p flats
 23 x 2bed/3p flats
 67 x 2 bed/4p flats
 10 x 3 bed/5p houses
 36 x 4 bed/7p houses

197 NEW HOMES

232 TOTAL EXISTING AND NEW HOMES



OPTION 3a

- Demolish all Mill Farm Close blocks
- Upgrade remaining existing properties
- Demolish all remaining garages on Mill Farm Close (68)
- Introduce traffic calming/landscape - Homezone
- Build 197 new houses and flats
- Add toddler play facilities

PARKING

73 existing off street parking spaces
 +16 garages (only 16 garages used by residents of Mill Farm Close & Miller Close)
 = **89 Car Parking spaces**

Overall effect on Parking : +43
Total Car Parking = 132 spaces

 HOUSES
 FLATS

MILL FARM ESTATE, PINNER
 OPTIONS APPRAISAL
OPTION 03a
 REDEVELOPMENT OF
 MILLFARM CLOSE
 DWG. 839_SK03a / SCALE 1:1250@A3

icmt
 architects

Appendix G - Option 3b – Plan Showing Layout

SCHEDULE OF ACCOMMODATION

EXISTING HOMES

Miller Close 14 x 2 bed houses
 12 x 3 bed houses
 62 Rickmansworth Rd 9 x 2 bed flats (assumed)

35 EXISTING HOMES

PROPOSED HOMES

Mill Farm Close 69 x 1 bed /2p flats
 15 x 2bed/3p flats
 75 x 2 bed/4p flats
 6 x 3 bed/5p houses
 36 x 4 bed/7p houses

201 NEW HOMES

236 TOTAL EXISTING AND NEW HOMES



OPTION 3b

- Demolish all Mill Farm Close blocks
- Upgrade remaining existing properties
- Demolish all remaining garages on Mill Farm Close (68)
- Introduce traffic calming/landscape - Homezone
- Build 201 new houses and flats
- Add toddler play facilities

PARKING

73 existing off street parking spaces
 +16 garages (only 16 garages used by residents of Mill Farm Close & Miller Close)
 = **89 Car Parking spaces**

Overall effect on Parking : +61
Total Car Parking = 150 spaces

 HOUSES
 FLATS

MILL FARM ESTATE, PINNER
 OPTIONS APPRAISAL
OPTION 03b
 ALTERNATIVE REDEVELOPMENT OF
 MILL FARM CLOSE
 DWG. 839_SK03b / SCALE 1:1250@A3



Appendix H - Option 4a – Plan Showing Layout

SCHEDULE OF ACCOMMODATION

PROPOSED HOMES

- 88 x 1 bed /2p flats
- 23 x 2bed/3p flats
- 87 x 2 bed/4p flats
- 10 x 3 bed/5p houses
- 59 x 4 bed/7p houses

267 NEW HOMES



OPTION 4a

- Demolish all Mill Farm Close, Miller Close and 62 Rickmansworth Road blocks
- Build 267 new houses and flats, with car parking, Homezone and toddler play facilities

PARKING

- 73 existing off street parking spaces
- +16 garages (only 16 garages used by residents of Mill Farm Close & Miller Close)
- = **89 Car Parking spaces**

Overall effect on Parking : +53
Total Car Parking = 142 spaces



MILL FARM ESTATE, PINNER
 OPTIONS APPRAISAL

OPTION 04a

AS OPTION 03a: INCLUDING REDEVELOPMENT OF
 MILLER CLOSE & 62 RICKMANSWORTH ROAD
 DWG. 839_SK04a / SCALE 1:1250@A3



Appendix I - Option 4b – Plan Showing Layout

SCHEDULE OF ACCOMMODATION

PROPOSED HOMES

- 96 x 1 bed /2p flats
- 15 x 2bed/3p flats
- 95 x 2 bed/4p flats
- 6 x 3 bed/5p houses
- 59 x 4 bed/7p houses

271 NEW HOMES



OPTION 4b

- Demolish all Mill Farm Close, Miller Close and 62 Rickmansworth Road blocks
- Build 271 new houses and flats, with car parking, Homezone and toddler play facilities

PARKING

- 73 existing off street parking spaces
- +16 garages (only 16 garages used by residents of Mill Farm Close & Miller Close)
- = **89 Car Parking spaces**

Overall effect on Parking : +86
Total Car Parking = 175 spaces

- HOUSES
- FLATS

MILL FARM ESTATE, PINNER
 OPTIONS APPRAISAL

OPTION 04b

AS OPTION 03b: INCLUDING REDEVELOPMENT OF
 MILLER CLOSE & 62 RICKMANSWORTH ROAD
 DWG. 839_SK04b / SCALE 1:1250@A3



Appendix J - Impact on HRA from stock disposals

	7 Blocks
Conversion of 18 Besits to 2 Beds	270,000
Door entry system renew / upgrade	80,000
External Lighting to Communal areas and footpaths	60,000
Play areas four separate locations, three under 5s equipment and one kick about area	85,000
Fencing around blocks to provide defensible space	75,000
Soundproofing to flats (depends on system)	425,000
Top up insulation in the roof space to 200mm	10,000
Cavity fill & repoint to the brick end elevations	60,000
New bin store areas	50,000
Floor covering to communal areas	45,000
Redecoration of internal communal areas	55,000
Replacement facia, barge boards, soffits and rainwater goods	45,000
Landscaping and new planting around communal areas	60,000
New digital ariel system	35,000
Curtins, incl 8% Fees	1,971,270
Decent Homes Costs	1,032,394
Total	<u>4,358,664</u>

Harrow : Mill Farm Estate Regeneration December 2007

	2009.10	2010.11	2011.12	2012.13	2013.14	2014.15	2015.16	2016.17	2017.18	2018.19
Bedsit Rent	61.70	65.20	68.67	72.29	74.60	76.99	79.45	82.00	84.62	87.33
Bedsit SC	3.02	3.12	3.22	3.32	3.43	3.54	3.65	3.76	3.89	4.01
2 Bed Rent	81.51	86.12	90.88	95.79	99.63	102.82	106.11	109.50	113.01	116.62
2 Bed SC	3.45	3.56	3.67	3.79	3.91	4.04	4.17	4.30	4.44	4.58
Loss of 18 Bedsits	- 59,366	- 62,665	- 65,940	- 69,355	- 71,571	- 73,864	- 76,224	- 78,671	- 81,184	- 83,784
Gain of 9 2 Beds		41,131	43,366	45,672	47,489	49,009	50,577	52,195	53,866	55,589
Net	- 59,366	- 21,534	- 22,574	- 23,683	- 24,082	- 24,855	- 25,647	- 26,475	- 27,319	- 28,195
Subsidy (Incl MRA)			17,229	17,877	18,561	19,266	19,989	20,746	21,554	22,405
Maintenance	7,416	7,653	7,898	8,151	8,412	8,681	8,959	9,245	9,541	9,847
Less flat MRA per unit			7,077	7,268	7,464	7,666	7,873	8,085	8,304	8,528
-	10,655	- 51,950	- 13,881	9,630	9,614	10,355	10,757	11,173	11,601	12,585
MRA Element			7,442							
Index	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
2007.8 Prices	- 49,255									9,388
Subsidy Unit Cost from HRA BP (converted to 2.7% RPI)			1,914	1,986	2,062	2,141	2,221	2,305	2,395	2,489

	£
Conversion of 18 Besits to 2 Beds	270,000
Door entry system renew / upgrade	57,143
External Lighting to Communal areas and footpaths	60,000
Play areas four separate locations, three under 5s equipment and one kick about area	85,000
Fencing around blocks to provide defensible space	53,571
Soundproofing to flats (depends on system)	303,571
Top up insulation in the roof space to 200mm	7,143
Cavity fill & repoint to the brick end elevations	42,857
New bin store areas	35,714
Floor covering to communal areas	32,143
Redecoration of internal communal areas	39,286
Replacement facia, barge boards, soffits and rainwater goods	32,143
Landscaping and new planting around communal areas	42,857
New digital ariel system	25,000
Curtins, incl 8% Fees	1,408,050
Decent Homes Costs	711,996
Total	<u>3,206,474</u>

Harrow : Mill Farm Estate Regeneration December 2007

	2009.10	2010.11	2011.12	2012.13	2013.14	2014.15	2015.16	2016.17	2017.18	2018.19	
Bedsit Rent	61.70	65.20	68.67	72.29	74.60	76.99	79.45	82.00	84.62	87.33	
Bedsit SC	3.02	3.12	3.22	3.32	3.43	3.54	3.65	3.76	3.89	4.01	
2 Bed Rent	81.51	86.12	90.88	95.79	99.63	102.82	106.11	109.50	113.01	116.62	
2 Bed SC	3.45	3.56	3.67	3.79	3.91	4.04	4.17	4.30	4.44	4.58	
3 Bed Rent	86.69	91.46	96.39	101.47	106.72	112.14	117.73	121.94	125.84	129.87	
3 Bed SC	3.89	4.01	4.14	4.28	4.41	4.55	4.70	4.85	5.00	5.16	
Loss of 18 Bedsits	- 59,366	- 62,665	- 65,940	- 69,355	- 71,571	- 73,864	- 76,224	- 78,671	- 81,184	- 83,784	
Net Loss of 21 2 Beds	- 90,921	- 95,972	- 101,188	- 106,569	- 110,808	- 114,354	- 118,013	- 121,789	- 125,687	- 129,709	
Loss of 6 3 Bed	- 27,696	- 29,192	- 30,739	- 32,333	- 33,980	- 35,680	- 37,434	- 38,767	- 40,008	- 41,288	
Subsidy (Incl MRA)			86,144	89,386	92,803	96,328	99,945	103,729	107,771	112,025	
Less flat MRA per unit			35,385	36,340	37,321	38,329	39,364	40,427	41,518	42,639	
Maintenance	37,080	38,267	39,491	40,755	42,059	43,405	44,794	46,227	47,706	49,233	
-	453,606	- 140,903	- 149,564	- 36,847	- 41,775	- 44,175	- 45,836	- 47,569	- 48,845	- 49,883	- 50,884
MRA Element			37,211								
Index	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
2007.8 Prices	- 133,592									- 37,958	
Subsidy Unit Cost from HRA BP (converted to 2.7% RPI)			1,914	1,986	2,062	2,141	2,221	2,305	2,395	2,489	

£

Conversion of 18 Besits to 2 Beds	
Door entry system renew / upgrade	
External Lighting to Communal areas and footpaths	
Play areas four separate locations, three under 5s equipment and one kick about area	
Fencing around blocks to provide defensible space	
Soundproofing to flats (depends on system)	
Top up insulation in the roof space to 200mm	
Cavity fill & repoint to the brick end elevations	
New bin store areas	
Floor covering to communal areas	
Redecoration of internal communal areas	
Replacement facia, barge boards, soffits and rainwater goods	
Landscaping and new planting around communal areas	
New digital ariel system	
Curtins, incl 8% Fees	
Decent Homes Costs	234,959
Total	<u>234,959</u>

Harrow : Mill Farm Estate Regeneration December 2007

	2009.10	2010.11	2011.12	2012.13	2013.14	2014.15	2015.16	2016.17	2017.18	2018.19	
Bedsit Rent	61.70	65.20	68.67	72.29	74.60	76.99	79.45	82.00	84.62	87.33	
Bedsit SC	3.02	3.12	3.22	3.32	3.43	3.54	3.65	3.76	3.89	4.01	
1 Bed rent	74.05	78.38	82.89	85.57	88.31	91.13	94.05	97.06	100.17	103.37	
1 bed SC	3.45	3.56	3.67	3.79	3.91	4.04	4.17	4.30	4.44	4.58	
2 Bed Rent	81.51	86.12	90.88	95.79	99.63	102.82	106.11	109.50	113.01	116.62	
2 Bed SC	3.45	3.56	3.67	3.79	3.91	4.04	4.17	4.30	4.44	4.58	
3 Bed Rent	86.69	91.46	96.39	101.47	106.72	112.14	117.73	121.94	125.84	129.87	
3 Bed SC	3.89	4.01	4.14	4.28	4.41	4.55	4.70	4.85	5.00	5.16	
Loss of 18 Bedsits	- 59,366	- 62,665	- 65,940	- 69,355	- 71,571	- 73,864	- 76,224	- 78,671	- 81,184	- 83,784	
Loss of 14 1 Beds	- 55,292	- 58,460	- 61,758	- 63,754	- 65,795	- 67,900	- 70,073	- 72,315	- 74,629	- 77,017	
Net Loss of 43 2 Beds	- 186,171	- 196,515	- 207,195	- 218,212	- 226,892	- 234,153	- 241,646	- 249,378	- 257,358	- 265,594	
Loss of 11 3 Bed	- 50,776	- 53,519	- 56,355	- 59,277	- 62,296	- 65,414	- 68,629	- 71,073	- 73,348	- 75,695	
Subsidy (Incl MRA)			164,631	170,827	177,357	184,094	191,006	198,237	205,962	214,092	
Less flat MRA per unit			67,624	69,450	71,325	73,251	75,229	77,260	79,346	81,488	
Maintenance		70,864	70,864	70,864	70,864	70,864	70,864	70,864	70,864	70,864	
-	1,005,684	- 280,741	- 300,295	- 88,129	- 99,456	- 107,008	- 113,122	- 119,473	- 125,076	- 130,348	- 135,646
MRA Element			71,114								
Index	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
2007.8 Prices	- 266,173									- 101,188	
Subsidy Unit Cost from HRA BP (converted to 2.7% RPI)			1,914	1,986	2,062	2,141	2,221	2,305	2,395	2,489	

**London Borough of Harrow
Business Plan Assumptions
Operating Account**
(expressed in money terms)

YEAR END BALANCE BELOW MINIMUM CASHFLOW SURPLUS/DEFICIT DIFFERS

Year	Year	Income					Expenditure											Net Operating (Expenditure) £,000	Provision for repayment of external loans £,000	Transfer from / (to) MRR £,000	RCCO £,000	Surplus (Deficit) for the Year £,000	Surplus (Deficit) b/fwd £,000	Interest £,000	Surplus (Deficit) c/fwd £,000					
		Net rent Income £,000	Other income £,000	Misc Income £,000	HRA Subsidy Receivable £,000	Total Income £,000	Managt. £,000	Depreciation £,000	Maint. £,000	Cost of Capital £,000	Other Revenue spend £,000	HRA Cost of Rent Rebates £,000	Misc expenses £,000	Surplus to be redistrib. £,000	Total expenses £,000	Adjusting transfer from AMRA £,000														
1	2007.08	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
2	2008.09	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	2009.10	(226)	0	0	0	(226)	0	0	45	0	0	0	0	0	45	0	0	(181)	0	0	0	(181)	0	(4)	(185)	(185)	(4)	(185)	(185)	
4	2010.11	(478)	0	0	0	(478)	0	0	94	0	0	0	0	0	94	0	0	(384)	0	0	0	(384)	(185)	(19)	(587)	(587)	(19)	(587)	(587)	
5	2011.12	(504)	0	0	0	(504)	0	92	97	0	0	0	210	400	0	0	(104)	0	0	159	55	(587)	(28)	(560)	(560)	(28)	(560)	(560)		
6	2012.13	(529)	0	0	0	(529)	0	95	101	0	0	0	219	415	0	0	(114)	0	0	39	(75)	(560)	(29)	(664)	(664)	(29)	(664)	(664)		
7	2013.14	(551)	0	0	0	(551)	0	98	104	0	0	0	228	430	0	0	(121)	0	0	38	(83)	(664)	(35)	(782)	(782)	(35)	(782)	(782)		
8	2014.15	(571)	0	0	0	(571)	0	101	108	0	0	0	237	446	0	0	(124)	0	0	31	(93)	(782)	(41)	(916)	(916)	(41)	(916)	(916)		
9	2015.16	(591)	0	0	0	(591)	0	104	112	0	0	0	247	463	0	0	(128)	0	0	33	(95)	(916)	(48)	(1,059)	(1,059)	(48)	(1,059)	(1,059)		
10	2016.17	(611)	0	0	0	(611)	0	107	116	0	0	0	257	480	0	0	(131)	0	0	552	421	(1,059)	(42)	(680)	(680)	(42)	(680)	(680)		
11	2017.18	(633)	0	0	0	(633)	0	110	120	0	0	(5)	268	493	0	0	(139)	0	0	819	680	(680)	(17)	(17)	(17)	(17)	(17)	(17)	(17)	
12	2018.19	(655)	0	0	0	(655)	0	114	124	0	0	(6)	279	511	0	0	(144)	0	0	161	17	(17)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	
13	2019.20	(678)	0	0	0	(678)	0	117	128	0	0	(12)	291	524	0	0	(154)	0	0	154	0	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	
14	2020.21	(701)	0	0	0	(701)	0	120	133	0	0	(20)	303	536	0	0	(165)	0	0	165	0	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	
15	2021.22	(726)	0	0	0	(726)	0	124	137	0	0	(26)	316	551	0	0	(175)	0	0	175	0	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	
16	2022.23	(751)	0	0	0	(751)	0	128	142	0	0	(28)	329	571	0	0	(181)	0	0	181	0	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	
17	2023.24	(778)	0	0	0	(778)	0	132	147	0	0	(28)	342	593	0	0	(184)	0	0	184	0	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	
18	2024.25	(805)	0	0	0	(805)	0	136	152	0	0	(30)	356	615	0	0	(190)	0	0	190	0	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	
19	2025.26	(833)	0	0	0	(833)	0	140	158	0	0	(31)	371	637	0	0	(196)	0	0	196	0	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	
20	2026.27	(862)	0	0	0	(862)	0	144	163	0	0	(31)	387	662	0	0	(200)	0	0	200	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	
21	2027.28	(892)	0	0	0	(892)	0	148	169	0	0	(31)	402	688	0	0	(204)	0	0	204	0	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	
22	2028.29	(923)	0	0	0	(923)	0	153	175	0	0	(34)	419	712	0	0	(211)	0	0	211	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	
23	2029.30	(956)	0	0	0	(956)	0	157	181	0	0	(36)	436	739	0	0	(217)	0	0	217	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	
24	2030.31	(989)	0	0	0	(989)	0	162	187	0	0	(36)	454	767	0	0	(222)	0	0	222	0	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	
25	2031.32	(1,024)	0	0	0	(1,024)	0	167	194	0	0	(36)	473	797	0	0	(226)	0	0	226	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	
26	2032.33	(1,060)	0	0	0	(1,060)	0	172	201	0	0	(39)	492	825	0	0	(234)	0	0	234	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	
27	2033.34	(1,097)	0	0	0	(1,097)	0	177	208	0	0	(40)	512	856	0	0	(241)	0	0	196	(45)	(0)	(1)	(46)	(46)	(1)	(46)	(46)		
28	2034.35	(1,135)	0	0	0	(1,135)	0	182	215	0	0	(40)	533	889	0	0	(246)	0	0	104	(142)	(46)	(6)	(193)	(193)	(6)	(193)	(193)		
29	2035.36	(1,175)	0	0	0	(1,175)	0	188	223	0	0	(44)	554	921	0	0	(254)	0	0	17	(237)	(193)	(15)	(446)	(446)	(15)	(446)	(446)		
30	2036.37	(1,216)	0	0	0	(1,216)	0	193	230	0	0	(44)	577	957	0	0	(259)	0	0	0	(259)	(446)	(28)	(733)	(733)	(28)	(733)	(733)		

Harrow : Mill Farm Estate Regeneration December 2007

Year	2009.10	2010.11	2011.12	2012.13	2013.14	2014.15	2015.16	2016.17	2017.18	2018.19	
Net rent Income	-452.02	-477.72	-504.40	-528.97	-551.08	-570.68	-590.65	-611.30	-632.69	-654.82	
Maint.	90.97	94.15	97.45	100.86	104.39	108.04	111.82	115.74	119.79	123.98	
Subsidy	0.00	0.00	210.41	218.96	228.00	237.35	246.98	257.08	267.88	279.26	
MRA			81.94	84.40	86.93	89.54	92.23	94.99	97.84	100.78	
-	1,247	-361.05	-383.57	-114.60	-124.75	-131.76	-135.75	-139.62	-143.50	-147.18	-150.79
Index NB - 3% 2007.8 Prices	-	1 340	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1 109	
			£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	
Subsidy Unit Cost			2042.78	2125.86	2213.56	2304.36	2397.86	2495.91	2600.74	2711.30	
Converted to 2007.08 price base			1814.99	1833.78	1853.83	1873.65	1892.89	1912.90	1935.19	1958.70	
Converted to outturn at 2.7% RPI			2019.09	2095.08	2175.16	2257.78	2342.55	2431.24	2525.97	2625.69	
2.7% Index	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	