

Vita Meadow  
Limited  
HR BB- (G)  
Stable Outlook

£146.1m TL  
HR BB- (G)  
Stable Outlook  
G9397\*AA3



**Elizabeth Martínez**

Corporates Manager  
Lead Analyst

[elizabeth.martinez@hrratings.com](mailto:elizabeth.martinez@hrratings.com)



**Diego Santa Gadea**

Senior Analyst

[diego.santagadea@hrratings.com](mailto:diego.santagadea@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
Vita Meadow Limited	Assigned	Long Term Rating	HR BB- (G) / Stable Outlook
£146.1m Term Loan	Assigned	Long Term Rating	HR BB- (G) / Stable Outlook

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 and its associated debt is based in accordance with the following methodologies established by the rating agency:



@HRRATINGS



HR RATINGS



WWW.HRRATINGS.COM



HR RATINGS

- 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)
- 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**

- Based on the Corporate Debt Credit Risk Evaluation:

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.



@HRRATINGS



HR RATINGS



WWW.HRRATINGS.COM



HR RATINGS

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 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.

The rating incorporates one negative notch adjustment related to the Project risk due to the construction process of the Project.

- Based on the General Methodological Criteria:

#### 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).



@HRRATINGS



HR RATINGS



WWW.HRRATINGS.COM



HR RATINGS

**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.
- 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 or historical financial information due to the Project is still under construction and therefore is not generating income yet. This was not considered as 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:

- Meadow Senior Facility Agreement, provided by a third party.
- Meadow Intercreditor Agreement, provided by a third party.
- Meadow Mezzanine Facility Agreement, provided by a third.
- Meadow Margin Letter, provided by a third party.
- Investment Memo, provided by a third party.
- Valuation Report by Cushman & Wakefield, provided by a third party.



@HRRATINGS



HR RATINGS



WWW.HRRATINGS.COM



HR RATINGS

- Progress Report 3.0, 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 17q-7**

The financial information was solely projected due to the Project is still in construction and will not be fully operational until late 2028. 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 17q-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 Rule 17q-7**

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

- **United Kingdom Sovereign rating.** If UK's equivalent sovereign rating is modified, this would have a direct impact on the Project's and its associated debt rating having a positive or negative minimum to strong impact.
- **Higher FCF levels.** If the Project stabilizes faster than expected, FCF levels could benefit. If total FCF generation from 2029-2035 is £104.4m, in comparison to £94.0m, the rating could have a minimum positive impact.
- **Delay in Dates.** A delay in both the expected completion date and stabilization of the Project could deteriorate the estimated FCF for the rating period. If the total FCF amount from 2029 to 2035 is £77.1m (compared to £94.0m baseline scenario), the rating could have a minimum negative impact.
- **Refinancing conditions.** If the refinancing loan does not have more favorable conditions compared to the building loan in terms of maturity and interest rate, the rating could have a minimum negative impact.

2. The magnitude of the change that could occur under different market conditions determined by HR Ratings to be relevant to the rating:



@HRRATINGS



HR RATINGS



WWW.HRRATINGS.COM



HR RATINGS

- **SONIA levels.** In the scenario where SONIA levels are higher than expected and this increases the cost of debt of the Company, leading to a pressure in DSCR and DSCR with cash metrics, the rating could have a minimum negative impact.
- **Competitive environment.** If the Project performs its operations in a more competitive environment, this could affect the expected occupation rate, leading to a minimum negative 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 17q-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)



@HRRATINGS



HR RATINGS



WWW.HRRATINGS.COM



HR RATINGS

### **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:

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.

- Under the base scenario, total revenue is projected at £16.0m in 2029F, which is considered to be the first full operating year of the Project. Thereafter, revenue is expected to grow steadily to £19.1m by 2035F, driven by the 3.0% annual rental growth assumption. Revenue is primarily derived from rental income across a diversified mix of studio units, with mid-sized units representing the core revenue contributors.
  - NOI is projected at £12.3m in 2029F and increases to £14.8m by 2035F, supported by stable operating margins. NOI margins are expected to improve gradually from approximately 77.1% in 2029F to around 77.5% by the end of the projection period, reflecting operating leverage.
  - Free Cash Flow is expected to increase from £12.0m in 2029F to £14.7m in 2035F, closely tracking NOI given limited recurring capital expenditures and stable working capital requirements.
  - The financing structure consists of senior and junior debt drawn during construction and structured as bullet facilities with no scheduled amortization prior to maturity. A full refinancing is assumed in 4Q29 at a cost of debt 100 basis points lower than the original contractual spread, reflecting the removal of construction risk and transition to stabilized operations. From 2030F onward, the cost of debt stabilizes at approximately 5.9%, with annual cash interest payments of approximately £10.7m. Considering the rating period, another refinancing has been assumed for 2034 (based on a five-year duration period).
  - Based on the debt profile, as well as the expected FCF generation, under the base scenario DSCR, DSCR with Cash, and Years of Payment would reach 1.3x, 3.3x , and 10.3 years by the end of the forecast period.
2. Analysis, using specific examples, of how each of the assumptions identified in the preceding paragraph impacts the credit rating:

- The rating could be negatively impacted under a scenario where the weighted difference between reported and expected revenue is -11.6% or greater for the 2029-2035 period.
- If the anticipated weighted average NOI and NOI margin are £11.5m and 75.7% or lower, respectively, over the 2029–2035 period, the rating could be revised downward.
- A downgrade on the rating could occur if the Project records a weighted cumulative difference of 13.6% in FCF generation between the baseline and stress scenarios. This would be driven by a decline in NOI and increased working capital requirements.



@HRRATINGS



HR RATINGS



WWW.HRRATINGS.COM



HR RATINGS

- The rating could be revised downwards if the Company presents an increase in the Investment Properties account due the need of a higher budget for the construction of the Project
- In a scenario where the Company reports a weighted average DSCR and DSCR with cash of 0.6x and 0.8x, respectively, during 2029–2035, and Years of Payment metric of 16.3 years, driven by lower operating performance and weakened FCF generation, the rating could be negatively affected.

**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, Elizabeth Martínez, 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, February 27, 2026

/s/ Elizabeth Martínez  
Corporates Manager  
HR Ratings de México, S.A. de C.V.



@HRRATINGS



HR RATINGS



WWW.HRRATINGS.COM



HR RATINGS

\*HR Ratings, LLC (HR Ratings), is a Credit Rating Agency 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.

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