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1.0 Introduction

“Cabinet notes that in view of the further increased forecast demand and inherent complexities in providing sufficient local places in the Wimbledon area a specific options appraisal is to be commissioned which will report by the end of September on the most appropriate way forward for the Wimbledon area.”

1.01

Capita Symonds were appointed by the London Borough of Merton to assist the Council in developing option appraisals to support the programme for the provision of additional school places in the Borough by carrying out the following activities described in the brief as follows:

1. Following discussion with Council managers of school organisation, Property Review and Strategic Planning Policy, to review all the sites in the 2010 site search, the council’s Sites and Policies DPD and consider whether there are any further possible sites, especially those in the ownership of LB Merton.
2. List all these sites and provide evidence for those that should be in a short list, of approximately five to ten sites.
3. To undertake a more detailed viability assessment of the short-listed sites for the council to build a two-form entry primary school including likely timescales and the risks to these.
4. To conclude how LB Merton would most effectively be able to provide for at least an additional 4 forms of entry in the Wimbledon area, with a broad strategy for more if demand increases further.

1.02

The need for additional school places in the Wimbledon area
School expansions agreed to date

As detailed in the paragraphs below the council has firm plans to provide for 22 permanent additional forms of entry (FE – classes of 30 pupils per year i.e. 210 pupil places across the 7 years of primary school).

In September 2012 the council provided an additional 21 forms of entry in reception year, compared to a baseline of 2008 when the requirement for significant primary school expansion commenced. The following schools provided extra classes:

1. Wimbledon Chase
2. Holy Trinity CE
3. St Thomas of Canterbury RC
4. Benedict
5. Hollymount
6. Joseph Hood
7. Aragon
8. Cranmer *
9. All Saints CE (incorporating former South Wimbledon Community & Youth Centre Building, Haydons as a split site school)
10. Gorringe Park
11. Liberty
12. St. Mary’s RC
13. Wimbledon Park
14. Singlegate *
15. William Morris
16. Hillcross *
17. Merton Abbey *
18. Poplar *
19. Pelham *
20. Beecholme *
21. Garfield **

All of the above except those with an * have now completed the legal process for permanent expansion, and are at varying stages of building being completed. Those with a * are considered feasible for permanent expansion and all but one have capital funding in place and are following the legal process to this end. Only Garfield Primary School above, listed with ** is not considered suitable for permanent expansion. It is taking a bulge class to be 3FE in each of 2011/12 and 2012/13, having only recently expanded to 2FE from reception year in 2006. No further expansion is considered feasible.
Therefore the council expects to expand the 20 schools above, and if this does not occur for any of those marked * alternatives would need to be found.

In addition to the 20 schools above, the council has firm plans with funding in place for the following expansions:

1. Dundonald Primary School – the school provided an additional class in September 2011 but did not so do in 2012 due to delays in legally implementing the scheme, which involves building on the neighbouring recreation ground utilising the footprint of an existing pavilion. Planning permission and the modification of a covenant are the current barriers to the school permanently expanding to 2FE.

2. Singlegate/Jamia - the purchase in summer 2012 of the adjacent Jamia Study Centre means that Singlegate Primary School can move to 3FE rather than the 2FE presently planned.

The council therefore has firm plans to provide for 22 additional forms of entry.

1.03 The council’s pupil projections for future demand

The table Fig.01 opposite is based on the council’s pupil forecasts from the GLA (Greater London Authority) and its pupil places submission to the DfE in August 2012.

Using the same 2008 baseline as above, growth to 29 forms of entry is forecast to be required by 2017-18 i.e. a further 7FE than the council has plans for. There is then a plateau for several years and from 2022-23 the forecast is for the level to drop slightly, suggesting that only about 3FE extra needs to be planned for permanently at this stage.
However, the council needs to have outline plans that could be implemented if necessary for the following reasons:

- The growth is based on a 1.5% surplus, which is lower than the sum traditionally recommended to ensure a reasonable element of contingency and parental preference. The typical recommended surplus from the Audit Commission to balance parental choice and value for money is a minimum of 5%.
- The GLA forecasts do not allow for substantial housing growth which is a high possibility, with housing targets increasing and evidence that, even with the current downturn in the economy, a substantial number of small to medium size sites may be developed over the next 10-20 years.

Therefore, it would be prudent for the council to ensure there are outline plans that could provide for at least 30 forms of entry i.e. 8 further forms of entry, plus further if any of the 22 school expansions listed above cannot be delivered.

The council is also forecasting substantial growth in the secondary sector – the February 2012 outline forecasts an increase required of 25 forms of entry. It could be that a larger primary school site could provide for an all-through school, or provide for pupils aged 11 and above, which would then require a replacement site for the primary school unless demand reduces.

Therefore firm plans are required for at least 4 additional forms of entry in the Wimbledon/Raynes Park area, and 4 additional forms of entry in planning areas 4, 5 and 6 (Mitcham and Morden)

This report considers the council’s planning areas 1, 2, and 3, and particularly planning area 3 around Wimbledon. This is the area that LB Merton officers have identified as being of most concern, since, as recorded in the 20 February 2012 council Cabinet paper, an analysis of potential schools for expansion surrounding Wimbledon town centre shows that there a few options to expand schools. Despite the substantial school expansion in recent years outlined above, admissions preference and allocation information shows that schools have very small distance based catchments and it is therefore particularly challenging to be allocated a local school place.
## 2.0 Education Capacity Assessment

The table below contains all LB Merton Primary Schools in Places Planning areas 1 to 3 (all “West of the borough” wards - see appendix 2 for map). It considers all schools that could be re-considered for expansion based on their site only.

### Areas 1, 2, 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>name of school</th>
<th>plan area</th>
<th>denom.</th>
<th>existing FE</th>
<th>B899 min site area for exg FE (sqm)</th>
<th>site area (sqm)</th>
<th>address</th>
<th>expansion in progress</th>
<th>additional potential expansion deliverable by sept 2014</th>
<th>suggested further actions to release potential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bishop Gilpin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C of E</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4600</td>
<td>8,480</td>
<td>Lake Road London SW19 7EP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Feasibility study demonstrated this was possible through timetabled play space on Ricards Lodge land though concerns raised from school community regarding the school size and play area size. Could be re-visited but a VA school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollymount</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4600</td>
<td>6,623</td>
<td>Cambridge Road Wimbledon SW20 0SQ</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No site capability for further expansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Matthew’s</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C of E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3550</td>
<td>6,379</td>
<td>Cottenham Park Road London SW20 0SX</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Site appears to have capacity for expansion; it is understood this has not been progressed since expansion of Hollymount and Joseph Hood have to date met demand to far west of the borough. May wish to review if future shortfall in this area. A CofE VA school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Wimbledon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4600</td>
<td>12,627</td>
<td>Bodnant Gardens West Barnes Lane Raynes Park London SW20 0BZ</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Site appears to have capacity for expansion; it is understood this has not been progressed since expansion of Hollymount and Joseph Hood have to date met demand to far west of the borough. May wish to review if future shortfall in this area. Use of part of industrial site to rear of school could further facilitate school expansion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aragon</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5650</td>
<td>9,819</td>
<td>Aragon Road Morden Surrey SM4 4QU</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No site capability for 4FE unless the adjacent green space is utilised</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Areas 1,2,3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>name of school</th>
<th>plan area</th>
<th>denom.</th>
<th>existing FE</th>
<th>B899 min site area for exg FE (sqm)</th>
<th>site area (sqm)</th>
<th>address</th>
<th>expansion in progress</th>
<th>additional potential expansion deliverable by sept 2014</th>
<th>suggested further actions to release potential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hatfield</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4600</td>
<td>15,812</td>
<td>Lower Morden Lane Morden Surrey SM4 4SJ</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Site area appears large enough for expansion but flood plain constraints - other neighbouring schools easier to expand e.g. Hillcross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillcross</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4600</td>
<td>25,086</td>
<td>Ashridge Way Morden Surrey SM4 4EE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Site is large enough to be 4FE but would be planning issues in losing a designated playing field space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Hood</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4600</td>
<td>6,783</td>
<td>Whately Avenue London SW20 9NS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No site capability for further expansion unless adjacent Adult Education Centre utilised (see site report)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacred Heart</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4600</td>
<td>7,798</td>
<td>Burlington Road New Malden Surrey KT3 4ND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>none- No site capability for expansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St John Fisher</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4600</td>
<td>17,539</td>
<td>Grand Drive London SW20 9NA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Site of sufficient size for expansion but in a flood plain and to review whether a further RC school needs to expand to meet the balance of RC places, following expansion of St. Thomas of Canterbury and St Mary's Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Saints</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>C of E</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4600</td>
<td>7,454</td>
<td>East Road London SW19 1AR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Due to single storey building, difficult to expand without demolition or use of space not part of school site look at additional site for expansion- M08 Leyton Road centre and backland green area as could be linked to further expansion of this school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dundonald</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3550</td>
<td>2,094</td>
<td>Dundonald Road Wimbledon SW19 3QH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Council awaits planning application decision to expand this school. Based on site search this appears to be the only option to provide further additional places in central Wimbledon in the short to medium term</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Areas 1,2,3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Garfield</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4600</td>
<td>8,303</td>
<td>Garfield Road Wimbledon SW19 8SB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No site capability for permanent 3FE unless adjacent recreation ground utilised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holy Trinity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>C of E</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4600</td>
<td>6,666</td>
<td>Effra Road London SW19 8PW</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>none - No site capability for further expansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merton Abbey</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3550</td>
<td>10,251</td>
<td>High Path Merton London SW19 2JY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Considering addition of adjacent sites for primary or secondary expansion - sites CS14, M46 and High Path Day Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merton Park</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3550</td>
<td>3,430</td>
<td>Church Lane Merton Park London SW19 3HQ</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>none - No site capability for expansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelham</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3550</td>
<td>5,914</td>
<td>Southeby Road London SW19 1NU</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Statutory consultation underway - expansion essential to provide places in central Wimbledon and included in planning assumptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poplar</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4600</td>
<td>12,207</td>
<td>Poplar Road South London SW19 3JZ</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Statutory consultation underway - expansion essential to provide places now in short and long term in Merton Park and included in planning assumptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Priory</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>C of E</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4600</td>
<td>9,503</td>
<td>Queens Road Wimbledon SW19 8LX</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Governors of VA school would not support an extra reception class in Sep 12 but site is larger than other 3FE schools. In view of location identified as being in key area of demand, may be worth reconsidering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Mary's</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4600</td>
<td>3,708</td>
<td>Russell Road London SW19 1QL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>none - No site capacity for further expansion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Areas 1,2,3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wimbledon Chase</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5650</td>
<td>35,713</td>
<td>Merton Hall Road, London SW19 3Q8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The land area suggests further expansion is possible and could be considered as a potential secondary or all-through site. However would mean losing a playing pitch space. Also access and transport issues from previous recent expansion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wimbledon Park</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4600</td>
<td>8,061</td>
<td>Havana Road, London SW19 8EJ</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No site capability for further expansion unless adjacent recreation ground built on</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**                                                       | 41 | 6 | 6 |
3.0 Activity 1: Site Review and Search

3.01
The Capita Symonds (CS) team met with London Borough of Merton (LBM) Education and Planning officers on 15 August. At this first meeting the team were provided with large scale plans of the area that officers marked up with an approximate search area for the instruction.

Additionally we were provided with the following documents to assist in our considerations:

- London Borough of Merton, Asset Management Planning CSF - Potential Acquisitions Schedule - Draft Short List
- London Borough of Merton, Asset Management Planning Potential acquisitions schedule
- Education Sites in Merton and associated open space (Map)
- LDF 2012 Draft Proposal Sites - As at May 2012 (Map, with marked boundary)
- Sites and Policies DPD - Part II: Potential sites for new uses – January 2012

At this initial meeting it was conveyed to the team that the priority was to explore all and any brownfield opportunities in the Borough and to consider their potential to meet the pressing primary education requirements.

In order to identify appropriate sites in the borough, the key criteria that CS set for itself were that the sites should be:

- previously developed, and
- not in residential use
- not green space or Metropolitan open land (MoL)

All other options were considered open for consideration. It should be noted that green space was considered where it was essential for the potential success of the site proposal.

3.02
A process was devised to identify potentially suitable properties and to then ‘sift’ for suitability. This process can be broken down in to the following stages:

1. “Top-down” review of market availability
2. “Bottom-up” detailed search for non-residential, brownfield, property
3. Compilation of a ‘long list’
4. Site visits of all property on the long list
5. First sift for suitability
6. Planning policy and Tree Preservation Order (TPO) review of properties
7. Second sift for suitability and production of a short-list
8. Title review, market assessment and capacity assessments
9. Prioritise sites for discussion and potential purchase.

3.03
1, 2 and 3– Top-down and bottom-up property searches, long list.

In conducting this research CS sought to identify all the non-residential property in the search area. Two key processes were deployed to achieve this:

- a top-down review of market availability, and
- a bottom-up property search.

The top-down approach involved the carrying out of searches through property market portals such as Costar and EGi and the issuing of an anonymous requirement to the property agency community.

The bottom-up approach sought to identify all buildings in a non-residential use in the search area.

3.04
A long list of properties was initially produced by dividing the search area into smaller areas which were then ‘scoured’ for buildings and properties that appeared to be in non-residential use. This first search was undertaken using online aerial and street level photography provided by Google and Bing. All properties were allocated a unique reference number and placed in to a long list. Postcodes were obtained from
the Royal Mail website. To this list were added any properties that had been identified by the top-down market research and any sites that had previously been identified by Merton or that had been submitted by land owners as part of the Sites & Policies DPD process. The product of this first stage of work was a ‘long list’ of 105 sites.

4.0 Activity 2: Site shortlist

4.01
To narrow down this long list and generate an evidence based shortlist a number of steps were taken:

4.02
4 and 5 – Site visits and first sift

Over the course of four days each of these sites was visited and photographed by the CS team. These site visits allowed the team to verify the current status of the sites and to identify if anything had changed since the aerial and street photography had been taken. It also checked the settings for any significant obstacles to potential primary school use.

A number of sites were discounted at this stage due to:

- industrial character or potential contaminated land
- proximity to railway lines or other sources of significant noise
- poor vehicle and pedestrian access
- poor relationship with the highway for pick up and drop off
- size of site
- lack of potential for external space

This review was undertaken by both the Property and Education teams at Capita Symonds. This process reduced the number of sites by approximately half.

4.03
6 and 7 – Planning policy review and search for Tree Preservation Orders, second sift

The reduced list of sites was issued to the CS town planning team who conducted desk-top reviews of the key planning policies for each of the sites.

Key issues for consideration were:

- any site specific designations
- extant planning consents
- conservation area status
- statutory listing
- existing use and class, the
- neighbouring uses
- Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL).

4.04
An internal workshop involving Property, Planning and Education reduced the long list to those sites the team believed had the best chance of being suitable for development. Sites that were put aside included those:

- obviously multi-let by a number of businesses
- part of a wider masterplan/larger development scheme
- owned and operated as a church or religious meeting place
- adjacent or very close to a school already being expanded
- with very restrictive covenants

These sites have not been completely discounted but it is considered that other sites have a better chance of being delivered within Merton’s pressing time constraints. These sites may be revisited in the future, subject to the outcome of further work on the emerging shortlist.
5.0 Activity 3: Site Viability Assessment

5.01

8 and 9 – Title, market assessment and capacity review, priority sites

A shortlist of 11 sites were identified that potentially meet Merton’s requirement. These sites were investigated in greater detail by the team, including the obtaining of title documents and high level market assessments, which informed our outline capacity studies and viability assessments.

5.02

These shortlisted sites were discussed with officers from both Children, Schools and Families and Planning Departments on 13th September to inform the final shortlist.

The remaining sites have been prioritised in the following order:

- sites in the ownership of LBM
- sites on the open market
- sites not on the open market but judged to be potentially available
- sites in multiple ownership or in area with low demand for additional places

5.03

Sites not in the ownership of LBM, or not on the open market, have been assessed on a high level basis by the Capita Symonds Real Estate Valuation team who have provided indicative potential site values. Further discussion with the landowners will be required for potential acquisition. It is anticipated that sites currently on the market could be secured in a minimum of 8 weeks. Sites not on the market already could also be secured in that timescale if the owner is willing to sell, however additional complications, such as finding new sites for existing activities may delay this timescale significantly.

5.04

The use of Compulsory Purchase Powers is an accepted means by which local authorities can facilitate the delivery of planned social and economic outcomes and outputs. However, the use of these Powers should be able to demonstrate that the land is genuinely required in order to secure the development, redevelopment or improvement of the land, or to achieve the stated purpose required in the interests of the proper planning of the area. There is a need to demonstrate that a compelling case in the public interest is served by the use of these powers and that this will outweigh any private loss. This will need careful consideration and justification, particularly in a scenario whereby alternative sites are being considered for a specific form of development and a selection process identifies a preferred site for the acquiring authority.

An acquiring authority should demonstrate that there is a realistic prospect that the proposed use(s) are deliverable, and within a reasonable time-scale. It is therefore extremely beneficial to have in place, prior to any Order being made, the delivery mechanism; means of funding; and a clear and robust Planning strategy (perhaps even Planning Consent for the proposed development if the proposals do not fully accord with Policy). Furthermore, the Authority should be able to clearly demonstrate that it has sought to acquire the land interest(s) via negotiation, and be able to adequately explain its reasoning for not being able to conclude such negotiations, such that compulsory acquisition is deemed the only realistic option in meeting the public interest.

Compulsory acquisition should not be the first means by which a local authority seeks to gain control of property interests and thereby over-ride an individual’s human rights. The decision to embark upon acquiring land through the use of compulsory powers should only be taken following detailed consideration. The timescale for completing a compulsory purchase is a minimum of 12 months and could potentially take many years, and will require purchasing and legal advice on a site by site basis.
### 6.0 Activity 4: Conclusion and recommendations

#### 6.01 The following sites have been identified as having the best potential to deliver the additional FE- as new schools or extensions to existing schools- by September 2014:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site ref</th>
<th>zone</th>
<th>description</th>
<th>ownership</th>
<th>Potential FE</th>
<th>Next steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CS9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Kingston Road (former Manuplastics factory site)</td>
<td>private</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>£4 million was paid for this site in 2008. Large cleared site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS34</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Trinitarian Bible Society (TBS), City Court and Army Cadet Force sites, Merton Road, SW19 3NN</td>
<td>TBS and MOD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Consider contacting owners of Bible Society property to explore intentions and whether they might consider moving. Subject to response to then contact adjacent owner (MoD). Existing building could potential be re-used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS46</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Dairy Crest site + no. 59 Gap Road</td>
<td>private</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>The owners have made it clear it is a key location and requirement for their operation so they would want a replacement extensive external area and a refrigerated building, and financial incentive to move. However, given its location it is suggested the council ensures the site is kept open as a future option for a school in the medium to long-term.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS65</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Whatley Centre, Whatley Avenue, SW20 9NS adjacent to Joseph Hood Primary</td>
<td>LBM</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Council's Community &amp; Housing department to review requirement of existing use including whether this service could be run from alternative premesis. Review impact of extra primary places on this site given Joseph Hood has just expanded to 2 forms of entry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M08</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21 Leyton Road, South Wimbledon, SW19 1DJ Youth Centre linked to All Saints Primary by backland green space</td>
<td>LBM tbc</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>Children’s Services to investigate the potential alternative locations for the existing users and on what terms they occupy the current premises.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M12 + CS30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Queens Road car park + Wimbledon New Baptist Church, 30 Queens Road SW19 8LR</td>
<td>LBM + Baptist church</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Shared site approach involving church and carpark could be explored with subsequent further feasibility study needed. Significant concerns re potential use of Queens Road car park site on its own due to immediate proximity to railway and narrow thin site which severely restricts a layout or economically efficient design solution. Restrictive covenants in favour of the British Railways Board need further investigation. Possible Crossrail implications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS65</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Car Park, Kenley Road, Merton Park, SW19 3HZ</td>
<td>LBM</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Obtain legal advice on existing/required rights of way and on the nature and any implications of restrictions on title.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 6.02

In addition a series of sites have been identified adjacent or close to **Merton Abbey School** that could provide 1-2 FE places, as a further extension to Merton Abbey School, to that currently progressing on their own, but are considered to offer a strong possibility for a future secondary school or all through school site, and are therefore identified separately here:

See map in Appendix 4 identifying locations of these 4 sites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site ref</th>
<th>zone</th>
<th>description</th>
<th>ownership</th>
<th>Next steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M46</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Old Lamp Works, 25 High Path, South Wimbledon, SW19 2LQ</td>
<td>Merton Priory Homes</td>
<td>Adjacent to CS44. Contact owner to explore intentions and expectation on value. Obtain valuation in existing use and highest and best use (less planning risk).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>61 High Path SW19 2JY</td>
<td>private</td>
<td>Site for sale £1.7M. Would add 1000sqm to existing LBM ownership adjacent in day centre and school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No ref</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>High Path Day Centre</td>
<td>LBM</td>
<td>Located between CS14 and Merton Abbey School- at minimum would provide physical connection but combination of two sites would significantly improve potential of site for future education provision in good strategic location. Explore current usage and potential for relocation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS44</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Garages adjacent to Marsh Court, High Path, SW19 2LQ</td>
<td>Merton Priory Homes</td>
<td>Adjacent to M46.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.03 The site capacity assessment (appendix 2) indicates that existing school sites in school planning zones 1, 2 and 3 have adequate area to provide a potential 6 FE in addition to expansions already underway, however many have previously faced barriers due to planning or playing field issues, the nature of the site or buildings, or concerns of the governors. LB Merton may wish to compare these barriers with some of the risks and challenges of the best new site options above, which include sites already owned by the borough. Apart from the initial hurdle of the purchase price, sites not already owned by the borough may risk a open-ended purchase timescale, even if they are already on the market, and change of use issues. It should also be noted that a school building on a new site could either become part of an existing school governance, or the legal entity of a new school. If the latter, the current government presumption is that it should be a free school or an academy.

6.04

We recommend that the council undertake further work on the sites identified above to analyse the specific financial, political, and other implications of progressing the provision of primary places on any of these new sites against the implications of expanding existing schools. This work might include:

- Progressing discussions with site owners with regards to site valuation and potential timescale for availability
- Review of immediate local issues including potential local catchment area and impact on other local schools
- Carry out a risk analysis of all identified sites
- Assessing the overall financial cost and affordability against value for money
- Reviewing the potential for all-through schools within the secondary strategy to meet some primary need.