

# House of Social

## House of Social One Limited



Credit  
Rating  
Agency

Corporates  
October 28, 2025  
A NRSRO Rating\*

House of Social  
HR B+ (G)  
Stable Outlook  
GBP£76.5m TL  
HR B+ (G)  
Stable Outlook  
G4639#AA8



**Mirthala Alarcon**

Associate  
Lead Analyst

[mirthala.alarcon@hrratings.com](mailto:mirthala.alarcon@hrratings.com)



**Guillermo Casavecchia**

Analyst

[guillermo.casavecchia@hrratings.com](mailto:guillermo.casavecchia@hrratings.com)



**Jesus Pineda**

Corporates Manager

[jesus.pineda@hrratings.com](mailto:jesus.pineda@hrratings.com)



**Heinz Cederborg**

Corporates / ABS Sr. Executive Director

[heinz.cederborg@hrratings.com](mailto:heinz.cederborg@hrratings.com)

### Information Disclosure Form

#### Rule 17g-7

*The Rating Action Commentary (RAC) associated with this disclosure form is an integral part of the form.*

1. **Symbol, Number, or Score in the Rating Scale used by HR Ratings as required by Paragraph (a)(1)(ii)(A) of Rule 17g-7:**

Entity/Instrument	Rating Action	Rating Type	Rating Code
House of Social	Upgraded	Long Term Rating	<a href="#">HR B+ (G) / Stable Outlook</a>
GBP£76.5m Term Loan	Upgraded	Long Term Rating	<a href="#">HR B+ (G) / Stable Outlook</a>

2. **Version of the Procedure or Methodology used to determine the credit rating as required by Paragraph (a)(1)(ii)(B) of Rule 17g-7:**

The rating assigned by HR Ratings to the entity is based in accordance with the following methodologies established by the rating agency:

- Corporate Debt Credit Risk Evaluation, February 2024.  
[https://www.hrratings.com/docs/metodologia/Corporates\\_2024.pdf](https://www.hrratings.com/docs/metodologia/Corporates_2024.pdf)



@HRRATINGS



HR RATINGS



WWW.HRRATINGS.COM



HR RATINGS

- General Methodological Criteria, October 2024.

[https://www.hrratings.com/docs/metodologia/General\\_Methodological\\_Criteria\\_2024.pdf](https://www.hrratings.com/docs/metodologia/General_Methodological_Criteria_2024.pdf)

**3. Main assumptions and principles used in constructing the procedures and methodologies to determine the credit rating as required by Paragraph (a)(1)(ii)(C) of Rule 17g-7**

The methodology describes the process used to assess the ability and willingness to meet corporate debt payment obligations in a timely manner and as originally agreed, including dependent structured debt and real estate investment trusts. The process consists of a quantitative analysis based on four financial metrics (three for structured debt) and an analysis allowing for qualitative adjustments, including adjustments related to ESG factors.

The corporate methodology involves the creation of financial models based on HR Ratings projections and when relevant historical performance data. The projections are made under a Base and Stress scenario, both incorporating the relevant historical data. The formal rating period generally incorporates five years of information. The four metrics used in this analysis are: (i) debt service coverage; (ii) debt service coverage including end of previous period cash (iii) years to payment, which measures the ratio between annual free cash flow and net debt; and (iv) the ratio between a market value estimate of corporate assets and its total liabilities. For real estate companies, the fourth metric is replaced by the loan to value ratio.

For both the Base and Stress scenarios the annual weighted average of each metric value is calculated. These annual averages are converted into a numerical rating scale, which is the same for each metric. Subsequently, and for each scenario, the weighted average of the metric numerical ratings is calculated. The final quantitative score is the weighted average of the two scenarios. If historical information is available, this process generally considers two reported and three projected years. However, the methodology considers the possibility of using different rating or time periods, with fewer reported years, and in the case of real estate leasing companies with seven instead of five years.

The rating obtained through this quantitative analysis can be adjusted positively or negatively by applying qualitative notches, which are divided into two categories: general and ESG. General adjustments refer to factors that could over time affect the quantitative rating especially when HR Ratings concludes that these factors cannot be adequately incorporated into the quantitative models. This includes ESG factors that are analyzed to determine their significance for and potential influence on credit risk. The environmental factor analyzes the corporate's environmental approach and policies, considering its lines of business and daily operations, as well as exposure to natural phenomena and environmental regulations. For the social factor, the business approach is evaluated first then the corporate policies regarding all levels of employee benefits, career plans and ability to retain talent and inclusion are evaluated.

Finally, the corporate governance analysis considers five aspects: (i) internal regulations of the corporation, considering their scope, formality and mechanisms for continuous adaptation, (ii) quality of senior management and administration, considering their financial strategies and history of crisis management, (iii) transparency and quality of the information provided, as well as history of non-compliance, (iv) risk associated with the regulatory framework to which each corporation is susceptible and the



@HRRATINGS



HR RATINGS



WWW.HRRATINGS.COM



HR RATINGS

risk associated with the macroeconomic environment, and (v) management and mitigation strategies associated with the entity's operational risk, as well as the technological tools available for performing daily operations.

- Based on the General Methodological Criteria Methodology:

#### Local and Global Scales

Any credit rating for a borrower or debt instrument is initially assigned on a Local Scale. HR Ratings Local Scale represents the different rating levels in which the results of a rating process can be categorized as set out in the appropriate methodology. This rating on the scale reflects the results of standardized processes, which are applicable in any political jurisdiction. The global scale considers the risks associated with the sovereign in question and faced by the borrower or debt instrument. This includes the convertibility, degradation and transferability risks for each country in a global scenario.

HR Ratings will use the global rating of the applicable sovereign, as an indicator for country risk, to convert the local credit ratings for borrowers and/or debt instruments into global credit ratings. The applicable sovereign rating may refer to one particular sovereign or a group of sovereigns depending on the case. In general terms, the downgrade will be equal to the difference, in terms of notches, between HR AAA (G) and the applicable sovereign's global rating. However, in some cases it may be appropriate not to take as a basis for the downgrade only the difference in the applicable sovereign's global rating from HR AAA (G). For example, when HR Ratings judges that the global credit rating of an applicable sovereign, or sovereigns, implies a greater or lesser degree of country risk for purposes of the conversion of local rated entities and debt. Also, when the analysis for a specific debtor or debt instrument suggests that its characteristics are such that its rating on the global scale should receive a modified rating differential.

A set of factors is used to determine the applicable jurisdiction or sovereign for assigning a global scale rating. The simplest case is that of a borrower operating in only one country and using only that country's currency. In such cases the global rating of sovereign of the country in which the borrower operates will be used as the basis for conversion. In other cases, an entity may have substantial operations in several jurisdictions, it would be appropriate to determine a weighted average of relevant sovereigns and apply a weighted sovereign differential notch to make the local to global conversion.

To include the sovereign risk of the United Kingdom (UK) into the global scale rating, the rating incorporates a two-notch adjustment as UK has an average rating equivalent to HR AA (G), based on the average influential ratings of other authorized rating agencies.

#### 4. **Potential limitations of the credit rating as required by Paragraph (a)(1)(ii)(D) of Rule 17g-7**

- HR Ratings does not validate, guarantee, or certify the accuracy, correctness or completeness of any information and is not responsible for any errors or omissions or for results obtained from the use of such information.



@HRRATINGS



HR RATINGS



WWW.HRRATINGS.COM



HR RATINGS

- Ratings and/or opinions assigned by HR Ratings are based on an analysis of the creditworthiness of an entity, issue, or issuer, and do not necessarily imply a statistical likelihood of default.
- The credit ratings do not opine on the liquidity of the issuer's securities or stock.
- The credit ratings do not consider the possible loss severity on an obligation default.
- The credit ratings are not an opinion of the market value of any issuer's securities or stock, or the possibility that this value suffer a deterioration.

**5. Information on the uncertainty of the credit rating as required by Paragraph (a)(1)(ii)(E) of Rule 17g-7**

The Analysis Committee noted no material limitations on the reliability, accuracy and quality on the data relied on in determining the credit rating.

The third party did not provide HR Ratings with audited financial information, however, due to the project being in the early stages we did not consider this a lack of information.

**6. Use of third-party due diligence services as required by Paragraph (a)(1)(ii)(F) of Rule 17g-7**

HR Ratings did not use third party due diligence services for the rating.

**7. Use of servicer or remittance reports to conduct surveillance of the credit rating as required by Paragraph (a)(1)(ii)(G) of Rule 17g-7**

HR Ratings did not use Servicer or remittance reports for the rating.

**8. Description of types of data about any obligor, issue, security or money market instrument relied upon for determining credit rating as required by Paragraph (a)(1)(ii)(H) of Rule 17g-7**

Among the main information used for the rating is:

- Updated Appraisal (January 27, 2025) for the project issued by Cushman & Wakefield, provided by a third party.
- Construction Reports Progress (No. 17) issued by Dalbergia Group, provided by a third party.
- GBP£76.5m Facility Agreement, provided by a third party.
- GBP£13.0m Facility Agreement, provided by a third party.
- GBP£2.0m Facility Agreement, provided by a third party.
- Compliance Certificate for the Senior Facility, provided by a third party.
- Mezzanine 1 and 2 Compliance Certificate, provided by a third party.
- Commitment Fee Letter, provided by a third party.
- Agency Fee Letter, provided by a third party.
- Common Security Agreement, provided by a third party.



@HRRATINGS



HR RATINGS



WWW.HRRATINGS.COM



HR RATINGS

- Sponsor Guarantee, provided by a third party.
- Credit Investment Memo, provided by a third party.
- Senior Loan Cash Flow Model, provided by a third party.
- Mezzanine Upsize Legal Opinion, provided by a third party.

**9. Overall assessment of quality of information available and considered in determining credit rating as required by Paragraph (a)(1)(ii)(I) of Rule 17g-7**

The financial information was purely projected due to the Project being in its early stages and will not fully stabilize until 2026. Nevertheless, the quality of the information provided by the entity is considered to be consistent with the quality observed in ratings that use a similar methodology.

**10. Information relating to conflicts of interest as required by Paragraph (a)(1)(ii)(J) of Rule 17g-7**

The aforementioned rating was not requested by the entity or issuer, or on its behalf. However, the rating was requested by an investor whose identity is kept confidential to the general public, therefore, HR Ratings has received from the investor the corresponding fees for the provision of its rating services. The following information can be found on our website <https://www.hrratings.com/>: (i) The internal procedures for the monitoring and surveillance of our ratings and the periodicity with which they are formally updated, (ii) the criteria used by HR Ratings for the withdrawal or suspension of the maintenance of a rating, (iii) the procedure and process of voting on our Analysis Committee, and (iv) the rating scales and their definitions.

HR Ratings was paid for services other than determining credit ratings during the most recently ended fiscal year by the person that paid to determine this credit rating.

**11. Explanation or measure of potential volatility to the credit rating as required by Paragraph (a)(1)(ii)(K) of Rule17g-7**

1. Factors that are reasonably likely to lead to a change in the credit rating:

- **Higher FCF.** If the Project stabilizes faster than expected, leading to an accumulated FCF of GBP£49.9m (compared to GBP£49.6) and this leads to a weighted average Years of Payment for 2025-2031 is 17.0 years compared to 17.4 years in the baseline scenario, the rating could have a minimum positive impact.
- **Lower Occupancy Rate.** In the event that the Project is not able to achieve the expected occupancy rate throughout the projected period, which leads to lower revenue generation and tighter margins, FCF would contract to average levels of GBP£5.6m compared to GBP£7.1m in our base scenario. Due to this the Company would present a weighted average DSCR of 0.7x (compared to 1.0x in our base), this could result in a moderate negative impact on the rating.
- **Refinancing Conditions.** If the refinancing loan does not have better conditions compared to the building loan in terms of maturity and interest rate, the rating could have a minimum to moderate negative impact.
- **United Kingdom Sovereign rating.** If United Kingdom's sovereign rating, or its outlook, is modified, this would have a direct impact on the Company's rating and could have a positive or negative minimum to strong impact.



@HRRATINGS



HR RATINGS



WWW.HRRATINGS.COM



HR RATINGS

2. The magnitude of the change that could occur under different market conditions determined by HR Ratings to be relevant to the rating:
  - **Interest rate increases.** Since the debt has a variable interest rate tied to the SONIA, any change in the interest rate may directly impact on the DSCR and DSCR with Cash metrics, resulting in a minimal negative impact on the rating.
  - **Higher Competition.** If the Project performs its operations in a more competitive environment, this could reduce the expected occupation rate affecting the FCF generation, resulting in a negative minimum to moderate impact on the rating.

NOTE: The Credit Analysis Committee must convene to review and discuss the changes that could occur under different market conditions. All the ratings issued by HR Ratings must be approved by the Credit Analysis Committee in accordance with the applicable methodology and the information available at the time. However, the magnitude of a potential change in the rating that could reasonably occur as a result of the impact of the factors listed above are characterized by the following summary chart:

Rating change impact	Number of notches
Minimum	(0-1)
Moderate	(2 - 3)
Strong	>3

## **12. Historical performance and expected probability of default and expected loss in event of default as required by Paragraph (a)(1)(ii)(L) of Rule 17g-7**

For historical performance of each rating listed in the disclosure form, click on the link in the ratings table presented on the first page.

Our credit ratings need to be understood as rankings of the relative creditworthiness of different entities or credits. Creditworthiness takes into consideration both the ability and willingness to meet debt obligations in the manner prescribed in the relevant documentation. Default refers to the noncompliance of previously agreed obligations.

As our ratings measure relative creditworthiness, they do not necessarily reflect any specific statistical probability of default. However, HR Ratings provides the market participants with the default rate for historical default and loss statistics for the class or subclass of the credit rating. Although the default rate is not the expected probability of default or loss given default, we consider it the ratio that could be interpreted by market participants as such. The default rate for each of the asset classes in which HR Ratings provides ratings and for each rating category is publicly available for each calendar year at: [https://www.hrratings.com/regulatory\\_disclosure/transition\\_matrix.xhtml](https://www.hrratings.com/regulatory_disclosure/transition_matrix.xhtml)

## **13. Assumptions made by HR Ratings in determining announced credit ratings and examples of how assumptions impact the rating as required by Paragraph (a)(1)(ii)(M) of Rule 17g-7**

1. Assumptions made in the ratings process that, without accounting for any other factor, would have the greatest impact on the credit rating if proven false or inaccurate:



@HRRATINGS



HR RATINGS



WWW.HRRATINGS.COM



HR RATINGS

HR Ratings bases its ratings and/or opinions on information obtained from sources that are believed to be accurate and reliable. The assumption is that the information provided is reliable and credible, however, does not validate, guarantee or certify the accuracy, correctness or completeness of any information and is not responsible for any errors or omissions or for results obtained from the use of such information.

- Revenue. We the Project will reach a total revenue of GBP£10.8m in 2031, compared to GBP£2.8m in 2025. This growth estimation is reliant on the fact that the Project will achieve an average occupancy rate of 95.9% during the projected period.
- NOI Levels. We are anticipating that the Company will reach GBP£8.6m for 2031 with a stabilized NOI margin of 80.0%. We expect an average growth rate of 3.0% in operating expenses for 2025-2031.
- FCF Growth. We expect our FCF estimate to reach GBP£8.6m in 2031. This is driven entirely by the NOI levels and minimal working capital requirements.
- Debt Structure. Under a baseline scenario, we expect the Company to reach GBP£104.0m of gross debt and GBP£97.3m of net debt in 2031. We anticipate refinancing of the Senior Loan, Mezzanine Loan 1 and Mezzanine Loan 2 in February 2027 at their initial maturity date. For this refinancing loan, we consider a five-year maturity and a lower pricing given a lower construction risk.
- Metrics. Under our base scenario we expect the metrics to present a weighted average DSCR and DSCR with Cash of 1.0x and 1.3x respectively, and Years to Payment metric of 17.4 years.

2. Analysis, using specific examples, of how each of the assumptions identified in the preceding paragraph impacts the credit rating:

- Under a scenario where the weighted difference between the reported and the expected revenue is -10.5% or more due to a fall in the occupancy rate throughout the projected period, the rating could be negatively impacted.
- If the anticipated weighted NOI margin is 71.0% or less for 2025-2031, it may result in a negative effect on the Company's rating.
- The rating could be revised downward if the Project reports a weighted average FCF of GBP£5.7m or less from 2025 to 2031 due to a contraction in margins under a stress scenario.
- The rating could be negatively impacted if the Company takes on additional debt reaching GBP£114.0 (compared to GBP£104.6m in our base), to finance its operations due to the contractions in revenue and Net Operating Margin.
- Under a stress scenario we expect the metrics to present a weighted average DSCR and DSCR with Cash of 0.7x and 1.0x respectively, and Years to Payment metric of 24.8 years. If this were to happen the rating could be negatively impacted.



@HRRATINGS



HR RATINGS



WWW.HRRATINGS.COM



HR RATINGS

**14. Representations, warranties and enforcement mechanisms available to investors as required by Paragraph (a)(1)(ii)(N) of Rule 17g-7**

The reporting of representations, warranties, and enforcement mechanisms does not apply to any of the credit ratings listed in this disclosure form.



@HRRATINGS



HR RATINGS



WWW.HRRATINGS.COM



HR RATINGS

## Credit Rating Attestation

I, Jesus Pineda, Corporates Manager have the responsibility for this rating action and, to the best of my knowledge:

- No part of the credit rating was influenced by any other business activities.
- The credit rating was based solely upon the merits of the obligor, security, or money market instrument being rated; and
- The credit rating was an independent evaluation of the credit risk of the obligor, security, or money market instrument

Mexico City, October 28, 2025

/s/ Jesus Pineda  
Corporates Manager  
HR Ratings de México, S.A. de C.V.



@HRRATINGS



HR RATINGS



WWW.HRRATINGS.COM



HR RATINGS

\*HR Ratings LLC, is an credit rating agency authorized by the National Banking and Securities Commission(CNBV) and registered by the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) as a Nationally Recognized Statistical Rating Organization (NRSRO) for the assets of public finance, corporates and financial institutions as described in section 3 (a) (62) (A) and (B) subsection (i), (iii) and (v) of the US Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and certified as a Credit Rating Agency (CRA) by the European Securities and Markets Authority (ESMA) and the Financial Conduct Authority (FCA).

The aforementioned rating was not requested by the entity or issuer, or on its behalf. However, the rating was requested by an investor whose identity is kept confidential to the general public, therefore, HR Ratings has received from the investor the corresponding fees for the provision of its rating services. The following information can be found on our website <https://www.hrratings.com/>: (i) The internal procedures for the monitoring and surveillance of our ratings and the periodicity with which they are formally updated, (ii) the criteria used by HR Ratings for the withdrawal or suspension of the maintenance of a rating, (iii) the procedure and process of voting on our Analysis Committee, and (iv) the rating scales and their definitions.

The ratings and/or opinions of HR Ratings de México S.A. de C.V. (HR Ratings) are opinions regarding the credit quality and/or the asset management capacity, or relative to the performance of the tasks aimed at the fulfillment of the corporate purpose, by issuing companies and other entities or sectors, and are based on exclusively in the characteristics of the entity, issue and/or operation, regardless of any business activity between HR Ratings and the entity or issuer. The ratings and/or opinions granted are issued on behalf of HR Ratings and not of its management or technical personnel and do not constitute recommendations to buy, sell or maintain any instrument, or to carry out any type of business, investment or operation, and may be subject to updates at any time, in accordance with the rating methodologies of HR Ratings.

HR Ratings bases its ratings and/or opinions on information obtained from sources that are believed to be accurate and reliable. HR Ratings, however, does not validate, guarantee or certify the accuracy, correctness or completeness of any information and is not responsible for any errors or omissions or for results obtained from the use of such information. Most issuers of debt securities rated by HR Ratings have paid a fee for the credit rating based on the amount and type of debt issued. The degree of creditworthiness of an issue or issuer, opinions regarding asset manager quality or ratings related to an entity's performance of its business purpose are subject to change, which can produce a rating upgrade or downgrade, without implying any responsibility for HR Ratings. The ratings issued by HR Ratings are assigned in an ethical manner, in accordance with healthy market practices and in compliance with applicable regulations found on the [www.hrratings.com](http://www.hrratings.com) rating agency webpage. HR Ratings' Code of Conduct, rating methodologies, rating criteria and current ratings can also be found on the website.

Ratings and/or opinions assigned by HR Ratings are based on an analysis of the creditworthiness of an entity, issue or issuer, and do not necessarily imply a statistical likelihood of default, HR Ratings defines as the inability or unwillingness to satisfy the contractually stipulated payment terms of an obligation, such that creditors and/or bondholders are forced to take action in order to recover their investment or to restructure the debt due to a situation of stress faced by the debtor. Without disregard to the aforementioned point, in order to validate our ratings, our methodologies consider stress scenarios as a complement to the analysis derived from a base case scenario. The fees HR Ratings receives from issuers generally range from US\$1,000 to \$1,000,000 (one million dollars, legal tender in the United States of America) (or the equivalent in another currency) per offering. In some cases, HR Ratings will rate all or some of a particular issuer's offerings for an annual fee. Annual fees are estimated to vary between \$5,000 and US\$2,000,000 (five thousand to two million dollars, legal tender in the United States of America) (or the equivalent in another currency).

## Media Contact

[comunicaciones@hrratings.com](mailto:comunicaciones@hrratings.com)



@HRRATINGS



HR RATINGS



WWW.HRRATINGS.COM



HR RATINGS