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1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 This document relates to the proposed allocation of Heath Clark, Stafford Road for

‘Secondary School and residential development subject to access from Stafford Road’

1.2 This is known as Site 16 in the Submission Version of the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals.

1.3 This statement identifies the areas of dispute between Croydon College and the London Borough of Croydon (LBC).

1.4 The key issue for the Statement of Common Ground is as follows:

‘The need for secondary school provision in the borough up to 2035/36 and the role the Heath Clark site can play in meeting this need.’

1.5 This document should be read in conjunction with the June 2017 Statement of Common Ground. The Common Ground between the two parties is that Heath Clark is not required to meet the current level of project demand for secondary school places up to 2036. It is also agreed that the site could not be delivered before 2025 due to the highways constraints of the remodelling of the Fiveways junction.

1.6 LBC’s position is that the site is needed because there is too much uncertainty that the projections and the Heath Clark site is needed in case of a significant increase in demand for secondary school places over the period 2025 to 2036. In our view there are three likely scenarios that could lead to the projections being significantly exceeded, these are as follows:

- The fertility rates could greatly increase;
- The level of proposed development for Croydon could significantly exceed the housing target; and
- There is insufficient certainty over what type of housing mix will be delivered in the Borough and this could affect the number of families that move to Croydon.

1.7 We consider that significant increases above the current projections are highly unlikely for the following reasons:
• Fertility rates have already increased significantly and are unlikely to increase further again in the future.

• The area most likely to deliver increased levels of development is the Croydon Opportunity Area and this will not deliver significant secondary school child yields due to the high density flatted nature of development with a lower quantum of affordable housing.

• A very significant over delivery on the current housing target is unlikely given economic uncertainties and the historic delivery rates in Central Croydon.

• The proposed housing mix targets (in relation to three bedroom units) are extremely ambitious and are unlikely to be delivered.

1.8 In addition, the Statement of Common Ground establishes that the Council has assumed that not one of the 25 secondary schools in the Borough could be expanded. We have sought to provide evidence that such an assumption is unfounded and there is significant potential for permanent or temporary expansion of these schools.

1.9 Finally, we have also highlighted that the Council had not considered it was necessary to plan for the projected need for secondary school places for the period 2024 onwards until two weeks before the examination when presented with evidence by Iceni and The Learning Crowd. At this point a U-turn took place and the Council considered that all of sudden they needed to plan for this period despite previously rejecting such an approach.

1.10 Given, in our view, the chances of the projections being significantly exceeded is remote and thus Heath Clark is highly unlikely to be required for education purposes, we have made recommendations to remedy the soundness of the plan in our conclusions.
2. **THE COUNCIL’S POSITION**

2.1 It is common ground that there is sufficient capacity to meet the current projections for secondary school places up until 2036. In order for the need for additional secondary school accommodation to be triggered, it would require a significant divergence from the current projections. We consider that this is unlikely because the three main factors that could lead to a deviation from the current projections are more likely to lead to a reduction rather than an increase in current levels of projected secondary school places. The three main factors are as follows:

- Changes to fertility rates;
- Significant divergence from the housing target; and
- Higher than expected levels of families living in flatted development in Central Croydon.

2.2 In the following sections, we explore each potential scenario for significant additional secondary school place demand above the projections in the following sections and set out why we consider the chances of a significant increase in the projections are remote.

2.3 It is also important to note that the Council’s position on the level of need for secondary school places has changed significantly in the past month. In the space of two weeks the Council went from not considering delivering any schools were required to meet the need for the period 2024 to 2036 to it forming the main justification for allocating the site. We have set out below the timeline of changes to the Council’s evidence:


  This identifies a need for 24 additional secondary school Forms of Entry by 2023/24.


  This identifies 8 potential options to deliver new schools for the Borough up to 2024. Heath Clark is identified for residential and education development (dependent on need).


  The Council continues to rely on 2015 Education Evidence Base document to support the proposed allocation of five new secondary schools to meet need for the period up to 2023/24.
Heath Clark is allocated for education and residential development. The Technical Paper - Proposal Sites published alongside the Local Plan also refers to the same figures in the 2015 Evidence Base document to support these allocations.

- **October 2016** – Iceni objects to the allocation of Heath Clark allocation for education purposes due to (inter alia) that recent free school proposals have met the level of unmet need required by up to 2022/23 and the level of need had reduced from the 2015 report.

- **January 2017** – The Council publishes their summary of responses to all consultation comments – no comment or modifications based on Iceni’s representations on educational need is made.

- **February 2017** – Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies and Proposals is submitted with no changes to the secondary school allocations.

- **21 April 2017** – Iceni and Croydon College meet with Croydon Council to discuss the upcoming examination. Iceni highlight our intention to continue to challenge the level of need identified in the Council’s evidence base for secondary school plans, the Council acknowledges this point, but makes no further comments. It is agreed there is potential for a Statement of Common Ground to be produced.

- **8 May 2017** – Iceni submits Hearing Statement which includes detailed of assessment of the need for secondary school places.

- **18 May 2017** – Council accepts that there is no need for a secondary school before 2024/25, but state that they will not provide new position and evidence until the day of the hearing.

- **31 May 2017** – Hearing Session 19 for Other Sites (including Heath Clark) takes places.

The Council produce new evidence on the day of the examination. This states that they agree there is no need for additional secondary school places up until 2025, but based on current projections and the potential housing mix (arising from new development) between 2 and 7 new secondary schools could be required. The Inspector asks parties to go away and agree a Statement of Common Ground and Areas of Dispute for the new evidence.

- **9 June 2017** – Iceni requests information underpinning the assumptions set out in the information submitted on the day of the hearing.

- **23 June 2017** – Croydon provide underlying evidence on previous assumptions. It is agreed that there is sufficient capacity for secondary school places **up until 2036** and the Council wants to allocate sites in case the projections are exceeded.

2.4 As set out above the Council has been planning to meet projected secondary school need only up until 2024 for the period right up until 18 May. A significant U-turn was then performed and the Council
stated their justification for the retaining the school was potential for the exceeding the current projections for the period 2025 onwards.

2.5 The Council has always been in possession of the projections for the period beyond 2025; however it was only decided that it is necessary to allocate sites for secondary schools to meet any potential need for this period once they reluctantly accepted that there was sufficient capacity up to 2025. In short, they had previously considered that it was not appropriate to plan for any potential need for secondary school places for this period.

2.6 The Council has been unable to explain this inconsistency in approach. In our view, when submitting the Local Plan Part 2 to the Secretary of State without considering the period 2024 to 2036 this was an implicit admission that they considered this approach to be sound. We consider that this original view remains correct and that it would not be sound to make provision for secondary school places based on the projections for the period beyond 2024.

2.7 It is also notable that the Council is no longer claiming that between 2 and 7 new Secondary Schools could be required for the period 2025 to 2036 (as they did at the hearing session). This has been dropped from more recent evidence provided and represents a further climb down.
3. FERTILITY RATES

3.1 In the following sections we identify why the chances of a significant oversupply of secondary school places on top of current projections are remote.

3.2 One potential way in which there could be a significant variation from the projection is a change to the fertility rates. We consider that a significant increase is unlikely because fertility rates in Croydon built into the population projections are already higher than the national picture although comparable with surrounding boroughs. In London terms, only Newham and Barking and Dagenham have higher rates and arguably these cannot be regarded as statistical neighbours. A chart showing the general fertility rates for women age 15-44 is shown at Appendix A5 below.

3.3 Projections produced later and provided directly to local authorities (including those underpinning school roll projection work) have included trends taken from the 2012-based National Population Projections (NPP). These assume that fertility will remain near-constant for the duration of the projection. Projections produced with the 2012-based NPP assumptions have annual birth rates approximately ten per cent higher than those produced using the 2010- NPP data. GLA School Roll Projections assume this higher fertility rate than the ONS population projections which are based on SHLAA but this is constant throughout the period to 2031. The fertility projections contained in the Croydon projections at least to 2031 include this higher rate.

3.4 After 2031 the picture is more difficult to determine but the GLA provide long term projections of 11 year olds to 2050 which are shown at Appendix 4 of the document submitted by The Learning Crowd. These are based on the housing led SHLAA data and show that after the significant growth in the 2017-20 period the population of 11 year old grows more slowly in common with neighbouring boroughs, where the extent of cross boundary movement has been demonstrated.

3.5 Fertility rates have seen substantial variation across London over the period of the most rapid growth in school populations from 2000 to 2015. This is evidenced in the chart shown at Appendix A5 (2) below where it can be seen that whereas the growth in fertility was constant in the outer London Boroughs, the inner Boroughs varied substantially with some rising and others falling.

The most recent rise in school rolls started in Inner London and is already starting to fall back. The comparable change in outer London came later and it is therefore likely that it will in time follow the same pattern as inner London. For this reason we would not expect current rates of fertility to be sustained. We would therefore be more confident that the long term projection of 11 year olds to 2050 as shown can be used as evidence that demand will broadly stabilise after 2031.
4. OVERDELIVERY OF HOUSING

4.1 The Council consider that the over delivery of housing above the London Plan target could also increase the demand for secondary school places. We consider this is unlikely as the largest driver of housing growth comes from Croydon Opportunity Area where:

1. Past delivery rates within Croydon do not indicate significant over provision is likely.
2. The majority of development will be high density flatted development where limited numbers of secondary school children are likely to live.

Predicting housing delivery in Croydon

4.2 The housing target for Croydon is 31,850 dwellings to be delivered over the period 2016-2036 (1,593 dwellings per annum) in the Croydon Local Plan Review. Of these 10,360 dwellings are proposed for Croydon Opportunity Area (518 dpa).

4.3 The Council has never delivered more than 1,435 dwellings in a year before (according to Council’s 2016 Housing Trajectory in Appendix A1). This is an average of 1,141 dwellings over the period 2004-2016, despite there being significant development and delivery in the Croydon Opportunity Area. The projected levels of delivery for the next five years are also well below the 1,593 dpa target (the Trajectory can be found in Appendix A1).

4.4 In addition, we have concerns about the likely build out rates rising significantly above current levels (or projected levels). Croydon’s strategy of delivering a third of all dwellings in the Croydon Opportunity Area, means that developers would need to consistently flood the market with new flats in the same location year after year for there to be any significant impact.

4.5 We consider this is unlikely when the short-term outlook is cautious and the economic cycle over the longer-term will lead to peaks and troughs of delivery. Overall it is considered unlikely that developers would take such significant risks with boosting housing delivery to the levels the Council consider is within the realms of possibility.

4.6 We consider that the current housing targets are already very ambitious and they are unlikely to be significantly exceeded. Even if these targets were to be significantly exceeded, then as we shall set out in the following section it most likely to happen in the Croydon Opportunity Area which is a location unattractive to families in terms of setting and the types of accommodation that will be produced – increased growth in this location is therefore unlikely to lead to the creation of significant Secondary School places.
5. HOUSING MIX AND THE ATTRACTIVENESS OF CENTRAL CROYDON TO FAMILIES

5.1 The Council has stated that they consider Heath Clark needs to be reserved for a Secondary in case the Council over delivers on its housing target. In the previous section we set out why we considered this was unlikely. In this section, we explain why even if the already ambitious target was significantly exceeded it would not lead to proportionate increases in demand for secondary school places.

5.2 In addition, the Council consider that there are significant uncertainties over the mix of housing that could come forward over the plan period and thus they need to take a cautious approach to reserving new school sites. We consider the chances of either of these variables leading to significant levels of additional secondary school places is remote for the following area:

- The emerging target for housing mix is 50% of all units to be three bedrooms or more. This target is undeliverable given the dependence on Croydon Opportunity to deliver the most significant levels of housing.

- The affordable housing target for the Borough is 50%, again delivering this figure is highly unlikely and a significant under delivery (as per historic rates) on this figure is expected – particularly as the affordable housing target for Croydon Opportunity Area (which will deliver the largest quantum of units) is much lower than 50%.

- Families are much less likely to locate within the Croydon Opportunity Area due to the environment and types of units delivered here.

Strategic Housing Mix

5.3 The Council state that the emerging target for the Borough for three bedroom units is 50% of all additional units. This is an extremely ambitious target, with few London Boroughs (even the most suburban) ever consistently hitting this target. In the past two monitoring years Croydon has only delivered 9% and 13% of all its units as three bedrooms or more (Appendix A1). We consider it unlikely that even with an emerging policy seeking to increase the number of three bedroom units that it will be impossible to hit this ambitious objective.

5.4 The historic trends reflect the demand for three bedroom units in terms of the appetite from developers and the local market. Such low levels are unsurprising (despite existing policy encouraging significant levels of three bed units) due the majority of units in the Borough being delivered in the Croydon Opportunity Area which is characterised by high density flatted units. If the
Council is serious about exceeding its housing target then they will be forced to relax their housing mix policy as its inconceivable that developers will swamp the market with three bedroom flatted units which traditionally there has been little demand for.

5.5 To put this in perspective the Croydon Opportunity Area housing target is 518 dpa and or this to be significantly exceeded it while meeting emerging housing policy it would mean delivering around 300-400 three bedroom flats per year. We consider it highly unlikely that there is even close to this kind of demand from families to live in a City Centre location with limited amounts of amenity space.

**Affordable housing**

5.6 We consider that affordable housing units in Central Croydon are more likely to accommodate families, but the Council’s soon-to-be adopted policy only states that 15%-30% of units in Central Croydon will delivered as affordable. A significant number of these will be an intermediate tenure which are less likely to accommodate families. When considering both of the Council’s policy levers in this context it is considered highly unlikely that the significant number of secondary school places will be created by development within the Croydon Opportunity Area, even if the Council exceed there ambitious housing targets. We consider that the focus on Central Croydon is more likely to lead to less Secondary School demand than currently expected.

**Croydon Opportunity Area Unattractive to Families**

5.7 The other driver on the creation of demand for secondary school places is the attractiveness of Croydon Opportunity Areas as a location for families.

5.8 The GLA has recently identified an increase in domestic migration out of London which in Croydon’s case shows an increase from 624 in 2013 to 2,802 in 2016. This is a reassertion of the historic trend which had been interrupted by the recession and the restrictions on mortgage finance, and was held to have prevented many families who would historically have moved out of London as their children became older. This is relevant for the Opportunity Area where families might be expected to move out of small flats as their families grow up and as such reducing the potential demand for secondary school places. Demand for secondary school places does not follow as a direct consequence of growth in primary school rolls not least because of this factor.

5.9 The GLA says in its commentary on the latest 2016 mid year estimates, ‘Net domestic migration is chiefly driven by the large domestic outflows from London to other parts of the UK. These outflows have been slowly recovering since a drop below 600,000 after the financial crisis. This latest data (a rise in outflows from 665,200 to 672,900) indicates a further step back towards the patterns of migration seen before the crisis.’
5.10 We therefore consider that there is a strong likelihood that when the children of families living in the Croydon Opportunity Area reach secondary age they are likely to move to larger housing in many cases out of London. Assuming the price disparity between London and surrounding areas remains then the case for additional demand in this area for secondary places would fall away. Whilst over the long term there is no certainty that the circumstances of the period 2008-2016 will not reassert themselves, it is clear from the evidence above that the strategic underlying trend remains and that it is likely that the occupants of the flats in the Croydon Opportunity Area would be replaced by other, younger families who might be seeking places in primary schools but not in secondary. Furthermore this is a trend to leave London, not to move to a more suburban location although for many that will clearly be an option. The numbers moving elsewhere within the Borough would be largely constrained by the existing housing stock and therefore represent turnover rather than growth.
6. ALTERNATIVE SUPPLY OF ADDITIONAL SECONDARY SCHOOL PLACES

6.1 The Statement of Common Ground sets out that there is currently an oversupply of secondary school places of 8% to 2031 and beyond. We have set out why we consider that the level of demand for secondary school places is unlikely to rise significantly, in the following sections we explain why we consider that the level of proposed supply is likely to be an underestimate.

Funding for Expansion

6.2 This level of supply set out in this document is only likely to increase over time. The Council has not identified any potential expansion of any existing secondary schools. They argue that there is no funding to do this. This is incorrect, the Council has been given £6.8 million to spend on additional school places by 2019.

6.3 In addition, both CIL and Section 106 agreements could be used to deliver expansions to secondary schools if required. This is how local authorities have traditionally dealt with increases in demand for secondary school brought about by increases in development in specific areas.

6.4 In addition, should an existing local authority school convert to an academy then it would have the potential to take advantage of EFA funding for expansion as per 2016 Archbishop Lanfranc expansion.

Why Expansion Makes Sense

6.5 As the Council has previously stated they want to avoid opening schools that would be undersubscribed as this has significant finance implications. With projections showing sufficient capacity up until 2036 it would take a major departure from these figures to require expansions of existing schools let alone a whole new school.

6.6 We have therefore considered the potential for expansion in the Borough. Many occupy larger sites than comparable schools in Inner London and may have the potential for permanent expansion. Enlargement of existing successful schools, whether by bulge classes or permanent enlargement, carries forward an existing ethos and is also an efficient use of resources. With the average size of school less in Croydon less than 7FE there would be some scope to explore enlargement without creating large schools.

6.7 Bulge classes, as with primary schools can either utilise spare accommodation which would revert to its former use once past, or can be provided with temporary accommodation at lower cost than
permanent buildings. Bulge classes are easier to provide, although permanent enlargement can be costly where existing fabric has to be remodelled as part of the extension process although generally it offers a lower cost per place than new build.

**Establishing the potential for expansion of Secondary Schools in Croydon**

6.8 We have reviewed the planning history of a number of secondary schools in the Borough to understand the potential for the following:

1. Bulge classrooms that can be provided in the event of the need to accommodate temporary increases in need; and
2. The potential for expansion of existing secondary schools.

6.9 In our view the use of temporary classrooms indicates the potential for redevelopment and expansion of a school. Temporary classrooms are usually sited on underutilised space which could be redeveloped permanently in the future. In addition, they are usually an inefficient use of space that could be redeveloped to provide a more significant quantum of teaching accommodation.

6.10 The full Planning History and relevant Decision Notices can be found in Appendix A2, but, in summary, the search uncovered 9 planning permissions for temporary classrooms at seven different secondary schools. While it is acknowledged that there may be individual circumstances whereby the redevelopment of temporary classroom sites might not be appropriate in every instance, it is considered that the range of permissions here indicates potential for expansion or the use of temporary accommodation of a significant number of schools.

6.11 Other secondary schools we reviewed did not have any temporary permissions on the Council’s online application portal, but did appear to have potential for expansion or to accommodate temporary classrooms (further details in Appendix A3). In addition, we have included a letter in Appendix A4 from the Principal of Edenham High School (in relation to a planning application on the site) which states their objective of redeveloping the school to provide further capacity of the site.

6.12 Furthermore, our review of schools has not considered the potential for further expansion of recently redeveloped schools which could have potential for upwards extension.

6.13 This high level research is not intended to act as a capacity study of existing schools, but does demonstrate that there should be significant capacity to expand existing schools on a temporary and a permanent basis. It contradicts the Council’s assertion that expansion of existing schools is unlikely and as a result the Heath Clark site must be retained for education purposes. It also indicates that the current assessment of capacity in secondary schools is an absolute minimum and highly likely to
increase. This would further increase the sufficiency of secondary school places in the Borough beyond the 8% over the plan period already identified.
7. **COMPARISONS WITH OTHER LOCAL AUTHORITIES**

7.1 Local Authorities have a duty to provide sufficient school places to meet the demand in their area. They are therefore required to secure additional capacity to meet the forecast requirement in conjunction with all state providers of education in their areas, including voluntary aided schools and academies.

7.2 The scope to enlarge existing schools has been recognised by other London authorities and they have approached the need for additional places by a combination of major expansions and bulge classes. This has the potential to allow for greater sustainability through investment in the existing estate, whereby schools gain new or refurbished facilities which provide for betterment as well as additional numbers. Larger schools can command higher budgets which enable curriculum enrichment and provision of new facilities often not possible in smaller schools. In outer London secondary schools often sit on large sites with scope for enlargement.

7.3 Sutton is a case in point, the immediate neighbour of Croydon where over the period 2015 -16 the Borough has provided for some 1,485 additional secondary places at 10 schools. These have in each case been expansions of 0.5, 1 and 2 forms of entry although this has also been accompanied by a new school.

7.4 In Wandsworth’s case the Council has taken a similar approach where it plans to enlarge four of its secondary schools to provide for growth between 2020 and 2023, after which demand is expected to level. The Borough has agreed with its schools to meet any additional demand over permanent capacity with bulge classes as in primary schools. These would be provided either in temporary accommodation or in extensions which could revert to enhanced curriculum delivery after the peak of demand had passed.

7.5 Local Authorities are resourced by the DfE through the annual capital bidding and assessment process (SCAP) which measures capacity and forecast demand. Local Authorities with a forecast deficit over a five year period in secondary are provided with a capital allocation which can be spent on new provision both maintained schools and academies.

7.6 Whilst it is recognised that Croydon has carried out some expansions of existing provision, such as Archbishop Lanfranc (where the PAN has been increased from 200 to 270), St. Mary’s RC (150 to 180), and the new school at Coombe Wood expected to expand from 180 to 240, there would remain scope for further enlargement across the estate of some 26 secondary schools.
7.7 We consider that the use of expansion of existing schools is a far more sensible way of meeting any unexpected and unlikely increases in the demand for secondary school places, rather than seek to allocate sites which could help deliver housing to meet the Council's OAN.

7.8 In order to be considered justified and positively prepared, the requirement for a secondary school on the site must be based on robust evidence. The Council does not have evidence which states that a Secondary School on Heath Clark (Site 16) is required, to the contrary the evidence states that there sufficient capacity. For a school to be required, there would need to be a significant divergence from the current projections. We have set out that the chances of this occurring are remote. In the unlikely event that this did occur, we have set out it did there are more effective ways of delivering additional capacity.
8. CONCLUSIONS

8.1 Both parties agree that the Council has scope within its existing pattern of schools to meet its statutory duty to provide secondary school places for its residents to 2036 and beyond.

8.2 Although there is more uncertainty in pupil place forecasting after 2028 as the children have not yet been born, we consider that with the 26 secondary schools now open or approved to open there will be sufficiently resilience in the system to meet requirements.

8.3 The Council consider that they need to reserve the Heath Clark site for education purposes in case of an unexpected demand for secondary school places over the latter half of the plan period. We have demonstrated that the potential main drivers for this; fertility, migration and new housing show that significant increases are unlikely the chances of the site being required for a Secondary School are remote.

8.4 Whilst there are forecast changes in the housing stock, mainly in the Croydon Opportunity Area, these are in the main small flats with limited amenity space and whilst they will have a child yield this is unlikely to generate secondary demand, particularly as there is a long standing trend for families to move out of London as their children get older. We have seen from the GLA evidence that this long term trend is beginning to reassert itself after the 2008 recession limited the availability of mortgage finance and this restricted the ability of families to move.

8.5 With a margin of some 8% of capacity by 2036 and potentially beyond Croydon is likely to have a sufficiency of place to sustain some growth in the secondary age population. With 26 schools there remains scope to make selective enlargements to meet needs as they arise without the need for additional new schools beyond those which are currently planned.

8.6 We therefore conclude that the Council’s approach is not justified based on available evidence or positively prepared. In order to remedy this unsoundness the site should be allocated solely for housing and we recommend the following amendments to the policy text:

‘Description of Option

‘Secondary School and Residential development subject to delivering a suitable access from Stafford Road Duppas Hill Road’

Justification for option
8.7 The site is of a suitable size for a secondary school, is in an area that has a high demand for school places and can make a significant contribution to meeting this demand. The site is also large enough to accommodate a residential development new homes as well as a secondary school. Residential development Access to this site is currently an issue and development is dependent upon the reconfiguration of the Fiveways junction as currently. Access to the site could be achieved from Duppas Hill Road subject to appropriate transport modelling, or Duppas Hill Road because of the volume of traffic on these roads. The Sustainability Appraisal recommends the loss of open space is mitigated by the development. School buildings and residential development should be located away from areas at risk from surface water ponding.
A1. CROYDON HOUSING TRAJECTORY
### A2. PLANNING HISTORY AND DECISION NOTICES – BULGE CLASSROOMS

#### A2.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>App ref</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Description of Development</th>
<th>Date approved</th>
<th>Date of removal in planning permission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/00989</td>
<td>Archbishop Tenison C E High School</td>
<td>Installation of two storey mobile classroom block [7 classrooms], and single storey classroom, relocation of single classroom and removal of 3 classroom mobile block</td>
<td>11 June 2010</td>
<td>18 June 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/01718/P</td>
<td>Norbury Manor Business And Enterprise College For Girls</td>
<td>Retention of three temporary classroom buildings</td>
<td>19 August 2010</td>
<td>19 August 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/01404/P</td>
<td>Riddlesdown Collegiate</td>
<td>Retention of a temporary single storey detached classroom building</td>
<td>13 July 2012</td>
<td>11 July 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/00955/P</td>
<td>St Andrews Church Of England High School</td>
<td>Removal of existing dilapidated temporary classrooms; siting of replacement temporary classrooms.</td>
<td>28 July 2015</td>
<td>28 July 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/02381/P</td>
<td>St Andrews Church Of England High School</td>
<td>Retention of two buildings to provide an additional 6 classrooms</td>
<td>13 April 2017</td>
<td>13 April 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Date Initiated</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/02679</td>
<td>Shirley High School</td>
<td>Siting of single storey classroom building with associated hardstanding and AC units</td>
<td>24 August 2016</td>
<td>24 August 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/03160/P</td>
<td>Virgo Fidelis Convent School</td>
<td>Retention of St Mary's centre temporary building</td>
<td>20 October 2016</td>
<td>20 October 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/02682/P</td>
<td>Woodcote High School</td>
<td>Siting of two temporary classroom buildings</td>
<td>17 November 2009</td>
<td>17th May 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/02825/P</td>
<td>Woodcote High School</td>
<td>Erection of 1 two storey and 2 single storey modular classroom buildings</td>
<td>30 November 2009</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A3. SCHOOLS WITH POTENTIAL FOR EXPANSION

Meridian High School
The school is set within very generous playing fields and many of the buildings are one or two storeys, given the physical separation from surrounding residential properties there is considered to be significant potential for extension both upwards and outwards as well as new individual buildings.
Coloma Convent Girls School

The school has ample playing fields, but the main potential for expansion is considered to be the single storey dilapidated buildings to the south of the main buildings (circled in red) and the single storey building set amongst larger buildings circled in yellow.
St Mary’s Catholic High School/Thomas More Catholic School
The school consists of one, two and three storey buildings in an area surrounded by larger buildings. It is considered that the use of the site inefficient and could be redeveloped (in part) to provide a more intensive use of the site.
A4. LETTER FROM THE PRINCIPAL OF EDENHAM HIGH SCHOOL
A5. FERTILITY RATES IN LONDON (GLA 7/16, ONS BASED DATA)

General Fertility Rate 2011-2015 (live births/1000)

% Change in Fertility women aged 15-44 2000-2015 (GLA)