



---

**HEALTH IMPACT  
ASSESSMENT**

---

**1-9 SANDYCOMBE ROAD,  
RICHMOND**

**GOLDCREST**

**DECEMBER 2016**

Planning • Heritage

Specialist & Independent Advisors to the Property Industry

**Author:  
Kevin Goodwin**

**Report Status:  
Final**

**Issue Date:  
December 2016**

**CgMs Ref:  
KG/BC/19794**

**© CgMs Limited**

No part of this report is to be copied in any way without prior written consent.

Every effort is made to provide detailed and accurate information, however, CgMs Limited cannot be held responsible for errors or inaccuracies within this report.

**© ORDNANCE SURVEY MAPS REPRODUCED WITH  
THE SANCTION OF THE CONTROLLER OF HM  
STATIONERY OFFICE.  
Licence No: AL 100014723**

<b>CONTENTS</b>	<b>PAGE(S)</b>
1.0 INTRODUCTION .....	4
2.0 ASSESSMENT .....	5
3.0 CONCLUSION .....	9

## **APPENDICES**

Appendix 1 – Health Impact Assessment

Appendix 2 – Infrastructure Delivery Plan Summary (Extract) (April 2012)

Appendix 3 - School Place Planning Strategy 2015-2024

Appendix 4 – Review of GP availability NHS Choices

Appendix 5 – Child Yield

## **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 Goldcrest are proposing the redevelopment of the above site to provide 20 residential units along with 534.8m<sup>2</sup> of office floorspace.
- 1.2 The application proposes 20 residential units which will comprise 2 x studios, 7 x one bed, 7 x two bed and 4 x three bedroom flats. Of the residential accommodation, two units will be wheelchair accessible.
- 1.3 This document assesses the health impacts of the proposed development. The HUDI Rapid Health Impact Assessment (HIA) Tool is used in this case. This tool has been used by CgMs in the past for submissions to Richmond Council and has been recommended again in this case by the Council.

## 2.0 ASSESSMENT

2.1 Health Impact Assessments (HIA) are referred to in the NPPG where it states that they are a useful tool to assess and address the impacts of development proposals. The London Plan also refers to the use of HIAs. The London Plan states: *'The impacts of major development proposals on the health and wellbeing of communities should be considered, for example through the use of Health Impact Assessments (HIA).'*

2.2 At a local level, a HIA is required by London Borough of Richmond upon Thames for major developments within the borough. The local validation list refers to Core Strategy Policy CP17 which states:

*CP17 Health and Well-being*

*17. A Health and well-being in the Borough is important and all new development should encourage and promote healthier communities and places.*

*17. B The provision of new or improved facilities for health and social care and other facilities will be supported. Such facilities should be in sustainable locations and accessible to all and priority will be given to those in areas of relative deprivation which are identified in Core Policy 13, an immediate need for primary health care facilities (especially doctor's surgeries) has been identified in Kew, Richmond, Whitton and Ham. Sites for larger facilities may be identified in the Site Allocations DPD.*

*17. C A pattern of land use and facilities will be promoted to encourage walking, cycling and leisure and recreation and play facilities to provide for a healthy lifestyle for all, including provisions for open and play space within new development as appropriate.*

*17. D Existing health, social care, leisure and recreation provision will be retained where these continue to meet or can be adapted to meet residents' needs. Land will be safeguarded for such uses where available, and the potential of re-using or redeveloping existing sites will be maximised.*

2.3 The proposals have been assessed using the NHS London Healthy Urban Development Unit's - HUDU Planning for Health - Rapid Health Impact Assessment Tool (Second Edition, June 2015). The key aim of this tool is to ensure that proposals have a positive rather than a negative impact on health.

2.4 A full review is included within **Appendix 1** using the form provided.

2.5 Additional assessment on some points is outlined below. This assessment and research were carried out to inform our answers in the Appendix but space restrictions within the form did not allow for the inclusion of the information.

### **Education**

2.6 The Final LBRUT Infrastructure Delivery Plan (April 2012) outlines the requirements for education. Relevant extracts are enclosed at **Appendix 2**.

2.7 With regard to nursery and early years provision, there is an expressed need. However, this need is not quantified although demand is expected to remain high with high birth rate.

2.8 For primary education, there was a 'medium to long term possible need to consider additional provision in the East Sheen, Ham/Petersham, Hampton/Hampton Hill, Heathfield/Whitton and Richmond areas. It is noted that the delivery partner will be LBRuT, Academies and Free Schools'.

2.9 The Infrastructure Delivery Plan 2012 notes no secondary shortfall stating: '*None identified considerable capacity in secondary school provision*'.

2.10 A School Place Planning Strategy was approved by Cabined on 15 October 2015 **Appendix 3**. This decision primarily noted the change in need generated by the Stag Brewery Site.

2.11 For primary phase, the areas are split into 10 school place planning areas, coterminous with the electoral ward boundaries. The application site is located within Area 7: Kew. The assessment of this area notes Darell Primary, Kew Riverside Primary, and The Queen's Church of England Primary. The report notes with regard to likely demand: '*There is no short to medium term need for places within this area*'. It notes, in the '*longer-term it would be advisable to*

*identify sites for potential new schools within the area*'. The report recommends that there is no urgent need for providing additional places within this area.

- 2.12 For secondary places, the report notes that there are 1,690 places available within year 7 in Richmond. Of the nine schools, seven are at capacity but two of the three sponsored academies have 60 spare places between them. A site is being sought for Turning House, a five form entry free school and it is noted that if a site is not found, demand will almost match supply.
- 2.13 With regard to Early Years, the report does identify a shortfall in provision with all facilities in the borough oversubscribed.
- 2.14 No short or medium term concerns are raised with regard to the primary or secondary provision in the School Place Strategy Provision. A shortfall in early years provision is identified.
- 2.15 The proposal provides for 100% market housing and so would generate two children, one under 5 and 1 between 5 and 11 (**Appendix 5**).
- 2.16 The only shortfall identified in the area is in early years care. The proposal will not have a significant impact on the shortfall.

### **Healthcare**

- 2.17 With regard to healthcare, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (2012) notes that there may be interest in new GP facilities in Twickenham and East Sheen.
- 2.18 In order to assess the current provision of GP capacity in the borough, we have carried out a search for capacity in the immediate area. **Appendix 4** demonstrates that there are 10 GP practices with capacity and accepting new patients within 2km (1.25 miles). It is considered that due to the available capacity shown, there is no shortfall in provision.

### **Open space and play space**

- 2.19 The site is excellently served by nearby parks and open space. The nearest park to the site is located at Raleigh Road, less than 200m to the east of the site. This small neighbourhood recreation ground has a grass area for informal ball

games and a children's playground for children of all ages. Specific facilities for under sevens and seven to 13 year olds are provided.

2.20 North Sheen Recreation Ground is located within 500m walking distance of the site, to the north east. Changing rooms, full football pitches, play for under 7s, play for 7-13 year olds, and play for over 13s are all provided. There is a café located within the park too.

2.21 It is considered that the provision of open space and children's play space in this location is excellent.

### **CIL**

2.22 The proposals will generate CIL for the LPA to spend as required to provide infrastructure. A full list of the proposals are outlined in the Council's Regulation 123 list. These include significant strategic transport improvements which will improve the site such as a new rail transport signalling scheme to reduce level crossing downtime, a new footbridge between Kew and Brentford and works to complete the London Borough Cycle Network with associated infrastructure and signage. Improvements to community facilities and strategic parks and open space projects are also proposed. Improvements to waste facilities and sports and leisure facilities are also proposed.

2.23 With specific regard to education, the Regulation 123 List states:

- *Provision of additional primary school capacity, probably within Twickenham, Teddington, Richmond, East Sheen and Barnes, plus possible need for new primary school(s) / free schools*
- *Provision of additional secondary school capacity within the borough, including creation of a new secondary school through the redevelopment of Richmond upon Thames College site.*
- *Re-provision of Clarendon School Special Needs Education at Richmond upon Thames College site*
- *Relocate and improve Strathmore School Special Needs Education*
- *Additional capacity or assistance to colleges for post-16 Special Needs Education Provision*
- *Provision of additional capacity in new units or by conversion of private, voluntary and independent nurseries into community nurseries.*



### **3.0 CONCLUSION**

- 3.1 It has been demonstrated above, and in the appendices attached, that the proposed development will not have a positive rather than a negative impact on the health of the occupants, employees and local residents.
- 3.2 The scheme has been designed in accordance with the highest standards and will have no negative impact on the provision of healthcare or educational facilities.

## **Appendix 1**

### **Health Impact Assessment**



London Healthy Urban Development Unit

**HUDU Planning for Health**

# Rapid Health Impact Assessment Matrix

Self-completion Form

June 2015

# Contents

Introduction .....	3
1 Housing quality and design.....	4
2 Access to healthcare services and other social infrastructure .....	5
3 Access to open space and nature .....	7
4 Air quality, noise and neighbourhood amenity .....	8
5 Accessibility and active travel.....	9
6 Crime reduction and community safety .....	11
7 Access to healthy food.....	12
8 Access to work and training.....	13
9 Social cohesion and lifetime neighbourhoods .....	14
10 Minimising the use of resources .....	15
11 Climate change .....	16

NHS London Healthy Urban Development Unit

[www.healthyurbandevelopment.nhs.uk](http://www.healthyurbandevelopment.nhs.uk)

© 2015 All rights reserved

# HUDU Planning for Health

## Rapid Health Impact Assessment Matrix – Self-completion Form

---

### Introduction

The assessment matrix is designed to rapidly assess the likely health impacts of development plans and proposals, including planning frameworks and masterplans for large areas, regeneration and estate renewal programmes and outline and detailed planning applications. It should be used prospectively at the earliest possible stage during plan preparation, or prior to the submission of a planning application to inform the design, layout and composition of a development proposal.

The matrix does not identify all issues related to health and wellbeing, but focuses on the built environment and issues directly or indirectly influenced by planning decisions. It is generic and should be localised for specific use. Not all the issues or assessment criteria may be relevant and the user is encouraged to prioritise specific actions which focus on key impacts.

The assessment matrix identifies eleven topics or broad determinants. Under each topic, Section 2 of the tool identifies examples of planning issues which are likely to influence health and wellbeing and the section also provides supporting information and references.

Health impacts may be short-term or temporary, related to construction or longer-term, related to the operation and maintenance of a development and may particularly affect vulnerable or priority groups of the population. Where an impact is identified, actions should be recommended to mitigate a negative impact or enhance or secure a positive impact.

Name of assessor / organisation:

Name of project (plan or proposal):

Planning reference (if applicable):

Location of project:

Date of assessment:

## 1 Housing quality and design

Assessment criteria	Relevant?	Details/evidence	Potential health impact?	Recommended mitigation or enhancement actions
Does the proposal seek to meet all 16 design criteria of the Lifetime Homes Standard or meet Building Regulation requirement M4 (2)?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A		<input type="checkbox"/> Positive <input type="checkbox"/> Negative <input type="checkbox"/> Neutral <input type="checkbox"/> Uncertain	
Does the proposal address the housing needs of older people, ie extra care housing, sheltered housing, lifetime homes and wheelchair accessible homes?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A		<input type="checkbox"/> Positive <input type="checkbox"/> Negative <input type="checkbox"/> Neutral <input type="checkbox"/> Uncertain	
Does the proposal include homes that can be adapted to support independent living for older and disabled people?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A		<input type="checkbox"/> Positive <input type="checkbox"/> Negative <input type="checkbox"/> Neutral <input type="checkbox"/> Uncertain	
Does the proposal promote good design through layout and orientation, meeting internal space standards?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A		<input type="checkbox"/> Positive <input type="checkbox"/> Negative <input type="checkbox"/> Neutral <input type="checkbox"/> Uncertain	
Does the proposal include a range of housing types and sizes, including affordable housing responding to local housing needs?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A		<input type="checkbox"/> Positive <input type="checkbox"/> Negative <input type="checkbox"/> Neutral <input type="checkbox"/> Uncertain	
Does the proposal contain homes that are highly energy efficient (eg a high SAP rating)?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A		<input type="checkbox"/> Positive <input type="checkbox"/> Negative <input type="checkbox"/> Neutral <input type="checkbox"/> Uncertain	

## 2 Access to healthcare services and other social infrastructure

Assessment criteria	Relevant?	Details/evidence	Potential health impact?	Recommended mitigation or enhancement actions
Does the proposal retain or re-provide existing social infrastructure?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A		<input type="checkbox"/> Positive <input type="checkbox"/> Negative <input type="checkbox"/> Neutral <input type="checkbox"/> Uncertain	
Does the proposal assess the impact on healthcare services?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A		<input type="checkbox"/> Positive <input type="checkbox"/> Negative <input type="checkbox"/> Neutral <input type="checkbox"/> Uncertain	
Does the proposal include the provision, or replacement of a healthcare facility and does the facility meet NHS requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A		<input type="checkbox"/> Positive <input type="checkbox"/> Negative <input type="checkbox"/> Neutral <input type="checkbox"/> Uncertain	
Does the proposal assess the capacity, location and accessibility of other social infrastructure, eg schools, social care and community facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A		<input type="checkbox"/> Positive <input type="checkbox"/> Negative <input type="checkbox"/> Neutral <input type="checkbox"/> Uncertain	
Does the proposal explore opportunities for shared community use and co-location of services?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A		<input type="checkbox"/> Positive <input type="checkbox"/> Negative <input type="checkbox"/> Neutral <input type="checkbox"/> Uncertain	

Assessment criteria	Relevant?	Details/evidence	Potential health impact?	Recommended mitigation or enhancement actions
Does the proposal contribute to meeting primary, secondary and post 19 education needs?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A		<input type="checkbox"/> Positive <input type="checkbox"/> Negative <input type="checkbox"/> Neutral <input type="checkbox"/> Uncertain	



### 3 Access to open space and nature

Assessment criteria	Relevant?	Details/evidence	Potential health impact?	Recommended mitigation or enhancement actions
Does the proposal retain and enhance existing open and natural spaces?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A		<input type="checkbox"/> Positive <input type="checkbox"/> Negative <input type="checkbox"/> Neutral <input type="checkbox"/> Uncertain	
In areas of deficiency, does the proposal provide new open or natural space, or improve access to existing spaces?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A		<input type="checkbox"/> Positive <input type="checkbox"/> Negative <input type="checkbox"/> Neutral <input type="checkbox"/> Uncertain	
Does the proposal provide a range of play spaces for children and young people?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A		<input type="checkbox"/> Positive <input type="checkbox"/> Negative <input type="checkbox"/> Neutral <input type="checkbox"/> Uncertain	
Does the proposal provide links between open and natural spaces and the public realm?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A		<input type="checkbox"/> Positive <input type="checkbox"/> Negative <input type="checkbox"/> Neutral <input type="checkbox"/> Uncertain	
Are the open and natural spaces welcoming and safe and accessible for all?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A		<input type="checkbox"/> Positive <input type="checkbox"/> Negative <input type="checkbox"/> Neutral <input type="checkbox"/> Uncertain	
Does the proposal set out how new open space will be managed and maintained?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A		<input type="checkbox"/> Positive <input type="checkbox"/> Negative <input type="checkbox"/> Neutral <input type="checkbox"/> Uncertain	

#### 4 Air quality, noise and neighbourhood amenity

Assessment criteria	Relevant?	Details/evidence	Potential health impact?	Recommended mitigation or enhancement actions
Does the proposal minimise construction impacts such as dust, noise, vibration and odours?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A		<input type="checkbox"/> Positive <input type="checkbox"/> Negative <input type="checkbox"/> Neutral <input type="checkbox"/> Uncertain	
Does the proposal minimise air pollution caused by traffic and energy facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A		<input type="checkbox"/> Positive <input type="checkbox"/> Negative <input type="checkbox"/> Neutral <input type="checkbox"/> Uncertain	
Does the proposal minimise noise pollution caused by traffic and commercial uses?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A		<input type="checkbox"/> Positive <input type="checkbox"/> Negative <input type="checkbox"/> Neutral <input type="checkbox"/> Uncertain	

## 5 Accessibility and active travel

Assessment criteria	Relevant?	Details/evidence	Potential health impact?	Recommended mitigation or enhancement actions
Does the proposal prioritise and encourage walking (such as through shared spaces?)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A		<input type="checkbox"/> Positive <input type="checkbox"/> Negative <input type="checkbox"/> Neutral <input type="checkbox"/> Uncertain	
Does the proposal prioritise and encourage cycling (for example by providing secure cycle parking, showers and cycle lanes)?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A		<input type="checkbox"/> Positive <input type="checkbox"/> Negative <input type="checkbox"/> Neutral <input type="checkbox"/> Uncertain	
Does the proposal connect public realm and internal routes to local and strategic cycle and walking networks?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A		<input type="checkbox"/> Positive <input type="checkbox"/> Negative <input type="checkbox"/> Neutral <input type="checkbox"/> Uncertain	
Does the proposal include traffic management and calming measures to help reduce and minimise road injuries?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A		<input type="checkbox"/> Positive <input type="checkbox"/> Negative <input type="checkbox"/> Neutral <input type="checkbox"/> Uncertain	
Is the proposal well connected to public transport, local services and facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A		<input type="checkbox"/> Positive <input type="checkbox"/> Negative <input type="checkbox"/> Neutral <input type="checkbox"/> Uncertain	

Assessment criteria	Relevant?	Details/evidence	Potential health impact?	Recommended mitigation or enhancement actions
Does the proposal seek to reduce car use by reducing car parking provision, supported by the controlled parking zones, car clubs and travel plans measures?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A		<input type="checkbox"/> Positive <input type="checkbox"/> Negative <input type="checkbox"/> Neutral <input type="checkbox"/> Uncertain	
Does the proposal allow people with mobility problems or a disability to access buildings and places?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A		<input type="checkbox"/> Positive <input type="checkbox"/> Negative <input type="checkbox"/> Neutral <input type="checkbox"/> Uncertain	

## 6 Crime reduction and community safety

Assessment criteria	Relevant?	Details/evidence	Potential health impact?	Recommended mitigation or enhancement actions
Does the proposal incorporate elements to help design out crime?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A		<input type="checkbox"/> Positive <input type="checkbox"/> Negative <input type="checkbox"/> Neutral <input type="checkbox"/> Uncertain	
Does the proposal incorporate design techniques to help people feel secure and avoid creating 'gated communities'?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A		<input type="checkbox"/> Positive <input type="checkbox"/> Negative <input type="checkbox"/> Neutral <input type="checkbox"/> Uncertain	
Does the proposal include attractive, multi-use public spaces and buildings?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A		<input type="checkbox"/> Positive <input type="checkbox"/> Negative <input type="checkbox"/> Neutral <input type="checkbox"/> Uncertain	
Has engagement and consultation been carried out with the local community?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A		<input type="checkbox"/> Positive <input type="checkbox"/> Negative <input type="checkbox"/> Neutral <input type="checkbox"/> Uncertain	

## 7 Access to healthy food

Assessment criteria	Relevant?	Details/evidence	Potential health impact?	Recommended mitigation or enhancement actions
Does the proposal facilitate the supply of local food, ie allotments, community farms and farmers' markets?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A		<input type="checkbox"/> Positive <input type="checkbox"/> Negative <input type="checkbox"/> Neutral <input type="checkbox"/> Uncertain	
Is there a range of retail uses, including food stores and smaller affordable shops for social enterprises?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A		<input type="checkbox"/> Positive <input type="checkbox"/> Negative <input type="checkbox"/> Neutral <input type="checkbox"/> Uncertain	
Does the proposal avoid contributing towards an over-concentration of hot food takeaways in the local area?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A		<input type="checkbox"/> Positive <input type="checkbox"/> Negative <input type="checkbox"/> Neutral <input type="checkbox"/> Uncertain	

## 8 Access to work and training

Assessment criteria	Relevant?	Details/evidence	Potential health impact?	Recommended mitigation or enhancement actions
Does the proposal provide access to local employment and training opportunities, including temporary construction and permanent 'end-use' jobs?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A		<input type="checkbox"/> Positive <input type="checkbox"/> Negative <input type="checkbox"/> Neutral <input type="checkbox"/> Uncertain	
Does the proposal provide childcare facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A		<input type="checkbox"/> Positive <input type="checkbox"/> Negative <input type="checkbox"/> Neutral <input type="checkbox"/> Uncertain	
Does the proposal include managed and affordable workspace for local businesses?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A		<input type="checkbox"/> Positive <input type="checkbox"/> Negative <input type="checkbox"/> Neutral <input type="checkbox"/> Uncertain	
Does the proposal include opportunities for work for local people via local procurement arrangements?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A		<input type="checkbox"/> Positive <input type="checkbox"/> Negative <input type="checkbox"/> Neutral <input type="checkbox"/> Uncertain	

## 9 Social cohesion and lifetime neighbourhoods

Assessment criteria	Relevant?	Details/evidence	Potential health impact?	Recommended mitigation or enhancement actions
Does the proposal connect with existing communities, ie layout and movement which avoids physical barriers and severance and land uses and spaces which encourage social interaction?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A		<input type="checkbox"/> Positive <input type="checkbox"/> Negative <input type="checkbox"/> Neutral <input type="checkbox"/> Uncertain	
Does the proposal include a mix of uses and a range of community facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A		<input type="checkbox"/> Positive <input type="checkbox"/> Negative <input type="checkbox"/> Neutral <input type="checkbox"/> Uncertain	
Does the proposal provide opportunities for the voluntary and community sectors?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A		<input type="checkbox"/> Positive <input type="checkbox"/> Negative <input type="checkbox"/> Neutral <input type="checkbox"/> Uncertain	
Does the proposal address the six key components of Lifetime Neighbourhoods?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A		<input type="checkbox"/> Positive <input type="checkbox"/> Negative <input type="checkbox"/> Neutral <input type="checkbox"/> Uncertain	



## 10 Minimising the use of resources

Assessment criteria	Relevant?	Details/evidence	Potential health impact?	Recommended mitigation or enhancement actions
Does the proposal make best use of existing land?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A		<input type="checkbox"/> Positive <input type="checkbox"/> Negative <input type="checkbox"/> Neutral <input type="checkbox"/> Uncertain	
Does the proposal encourage recycling (including building materials)?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A		<input type="checkbox"/> Positive <input type="checkbox"/> Negative <input type="checkbox"/> Neutral <input type="checkbox"/> Uncertain	
Does the proposal incorporate sustainable design and construction techniques?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A		<input type="checkbox"/> Positive <input type="checkbox"/> Negative <input type="checkbox"/> Neutral <input type="checkbox"/> Uncertain	

## 11 Climate change

Assessment criteria	Relevant?	Details/evidence	Potential health impact?	Recommended mitigation or enhancement actions
Does the proposal incorporate renewable energy?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A		<input type="checkbox"/> Positive <input type="checkbox"/> Negative <input type="checkbox"/> Neutral <input type="checkbox"/> Uncertain	
Does the proposal ensure that buildings and public spaces are designed to respond to winter and summer temperatures, ie ventilation, shading and landscaping.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A		<input type="checkbox"/> Positive <input type="checkbox"/> Negative <input type="checkbox"/> Neutral <input type="checkbox"/> Uncertain	
Does the proposal maintain or enhance biodiversity?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A		<input type="checkbox"/> Positive <input type="checkbox"/> Negative <input type="checkbox"/> Neutral <input type="checkbox"/> Uncertain	
Does the proposal incorporate sustainable urban drainage techniques?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A		<input type="checkbox"/> Positive <input type="checkbox"/> Negative <input type="checkbox"/> Neutral <input type="checkbox"/> Uncertain	

## **Appendix 2**

### **Infrastructure Delivery Plan Summary (Extract) (April 2012)**



## **Local Development Framework**

**FINAL**

# **INFRASTRUCTURE DELIVERY PLAN SUMMARY REPORT**

**April 2012**

### Summary of infrastructure assessment

The table below summarises the assessment of existing infrastructure, and outlines, where known, the overall requirements for new community infrastructure facilities. It also reflects the certainty and any uncertainties in future needs and demands. For a detailed analysis of the assessment of the individual infrastructure types and categories, please refer to the detailed assessment that accompanies this summary report. Note that the Infrastructure Delivery Schedule, which will be a separate document from the IDP, will include more details about the costs, phasing, delivery partners, funding sources etc for certain infrastructure types and projects, including their location, where a demand/need for future provision has been identified.

INFRASTRUCTURE TYPES	Existing provision	Current shortfall	Future need	Costs / funding (where known)	Phasing (where known)	Delivery Partners	Certainty / reliability of information	Section in Detailed Assessment
<b>Local and community infrastructure</b>								
Nursery and Early Years	1 nursery school and 16 primary schools with nursery units.	No standards to measure against and difficult to fully assess existing provision from a myriad of public and private sources.	Not quantified, although demand expected to remain high with high birth rate.	Unknown	Unknown	LBRuT, Private providers	Certain and reliable based on Council Strategy, but some uncertainty with provision from private and public and sectors.	4.1.1 (assessment last updated January 2012)
	6 Children's Centres. Provision by nurseries and childminders.							
Primary education	40 primary phase schools.	Expansion in recent years/underway to address significant increase in applications.	Medium- to long-term possible need to consider additional provision in the East Sheen, Ham/Petersham, Hampton/Hampton Hill, Heathfield/Whitton	Council Primary School Expansion Capital Programme for short-term.	Ongoing programme	LBRuT, Academies, Free Schools	Certain and reliable based on Council Strategy. Uncertain around impact of move to academies and free schools,	4.1.2 (assessment last updated February 2012)
				Unknown for				

INFRASTRUCTURE TYPES	Existing provision	Current shortfall	Future need	Costs / funding (where known)	Phasing (where known)	Delivery Partners	Certainty / reliability of information	Section in Detailed Assessment
<b>Secondary education</b>	8 secondary schools	None identified, considerable spare capacity in secondary school provision	and Richmond areas. Demand is expected to increase towards capacity by 2016. Undertaking feasibility for one, possibly two, additional secondary schools (including one Roman Catholic)	medium-long term. Council Capital Programme for 2016/17 includes up to 750 secondary school places. Unknown in relation to other long-term costs.	Ongoing programme	LBRuT, Academies, Free Schools	but kept under review. Certain and reliable based on Council Strategy. Uncertain around impact of move to academies and free schools, but kept under review.	4.1.3 (assessment last updated February 2012)
	Within mainstream schools and specialist support in 2 special schools	None identified	None identified	Council Capital Programme for 2016/17 includes SEN places.	Ongoing programme	LBRuT, Academies, Free Schools	Certain and reliable based on Council Strategy. Uncertain around impact of move to academies and free schools, but kept under review.	4.1.4 (assessment last updated February 2012)
<b>Special education needs</b>	No post-16 provision in secondary schools/academies.	Council committed to establishing sixth forms in borough's	Council committed to establishing sixth forms in borough's secondary schools	Council Capital Programme for 2016/17 includes	Short-term	LBRuT, Academies, Free Schools, RACC, RuTC, St Mary's	Certain and reliable based on Council Strategy and plans of	4.1.5 (assessment last updated February 2012)

RASTRUCTURE IES	Existing provision	Current shortfall	Future need	Costs / funding (where known)	Phasing (where known)	Delivery Partners	Certainty / reliability of information	Section in Detailed Assessment
	Further/higher/adult education opportunities at Richmond Adult Community College, Richmond upon Thames College and St Mary's University College	secondary schools in 2013. College improvement plans for redevelopments.	in 2013. College improvement plans for redevelopments.	approximately 1,000 sixth form places.		University College	Colleges.	
with care uding Hospitals (GPs)	Community-based services from network including Teddington Memorial Hospital, 5 clinics and over 30 GP practices.  Networks for mental health services, dentistry, optometry, pharmacies.	New clinic in Whitton opening Spring 2012.  Interest in new GP facilities in Twickenham and East Sheen.	Possible requirements to respond to changes in premises and operational legislation.  Potential for mental health services consolidation.	Unknown	Unknown	NHS South West London, Hounslow and Richmond Community Healthcare, South West London and St George's NHS Mental Health Trust	Certain and reliable based on NHS and MHT plans and strategies, although uncertainty around changes in healthcare commissioning.	4.1.6 (assessment last updated December 2011)
it social care	Housing related support, including extra care housing, residential homes and nursing homes.  Services for adults	Need for redevelopment of existing sheltered and residential care schemes into extra care	Supported living options.  No other needs quantified, but may be maintenance issues with existing	Unknown	Unknown	Housing: LBRuT, Registered Providers, private and not-for-profit organisations.	Certain and reliable based on Council Strategy, but move towards commissioning will use	4.1.7 (assessment last updated January 2012)

## **Appendix 3**

### **School Place Planning Strategy 2015-2024**



# London Borough of Richmond upon Thames

## School Place Planning Strategy 2015-2024

### Background

1. In March 2014, a report<sup>1</sup> to the Council's Cabinet updated the Council's strategy for providing additional school places, which includes:
  - Considering the few remaining existing single-site school expansion options;
  - Considering the expansion of existing schools onto additional sites;
  - Assisting the establishment of free schools; and
  - Agreeing the downward expansion in age-range of existing secondary schools.
2. Since March 2014, three free schools, as detailed at paragraphs 3 and 4 below, have been approved for opening within the borough, and one primary school, Sheen Mount, has been approved for permanent expansion.
3. Two two-form entry primary schools have been approved, subject to sites, to open in September 2015: [Richmond Bridge Primary](#), proposed by Bellevue Place Education Trust, and [Twickenham Primary](#), proposed by GEMS Learning Trust.
4. A five-form entry 11-16 secondary school [Richmond upon Thames College free school](#), proposed by Richmond upon Thames College, Richmond Council and Harlequins Rugby Club has been approved to open in September 2017 on the Richmond upon Thames College site in Egerton Road, Twickenham.
5. Whilst these new schools will meet some of the basic need for school places and will be very welcome within the local family of schools, more places will be required to meet longer-term forecast demand, particularly in the primary phase. This report therefore: analyses demand for additional primary places within each of the 10 school place planning areas that the Council uses for its pupil forecasts; considers how that demand could be met; and considers whether and when further secondary phase places will be required.

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://cabnet.richmond.gov.uk/documents/s49735/Primary%20school%20expansions%20strategy.pdf>.

6. For the purposes of this report, short-term demand is defined as the period from 2015 to 2017, medium-term covers 2018 to 2020, and long-term covers 2021 and beyond. Assumptions regarding long-term demand are based upon London Councils' and the Office of National Statistics' pupil and general population projections respectively, but are, of course, more speculative than the short- to medium-term demand. It is anticipated that this document will be subject to annual review and that its detail and recommendations will be amended in accordance with local and national developments.
7. The Mayor's London Infrastructure Plan<sup>2</sup> estimates that, as London's population rises to 11million and beyond, 600 new schools and colleges will be needed in the Capital by 2050. London Councils' 'Do the Maths 2014' report<sup>3</sup>, on the number of school places that will be required across London, predicts that between 2012/2013 and 2017/2018 there will have been a 23% increase in the state-funded school population within the borough, the fifth highest in London as a whole, 15-17% in the primary phase and 24.5%+ in the secondary phase. The Office of National Statistics is predicting<sup>4</sup> that the overall population within the borough will by 2024 increase by 15%, from the current 189,000 to 218,000, with the school age population increasing from 46,000 to 55,000 during that period.
8. The Council's Core Strategy<sup>5</sup>, adopted in 2009, set a target for an additional 2,700 net new homes to be provided over a 10 year period between April 2007 and March 2017, equating to 270 per year, and a further 150-330 homes per year over the 10 years from March 2017. Since the adoption of the Core Strategy, the London Plan 2011 reduced the borough's housing target to 2,450 net new homes for the 2011-2021 period, equating to 245 per year. However, the population projections outlined in paragraph 7 above suggest that London's population is growing faster than was previously forecast, and the borough's new target will therefore be 3,150 homes for the 2015-2025 period, equating to 315 per year. There are few comparatively large-scale housing developments, i.e. with more than 100 units, planned or likely to happen within the borough in that period, so it is probable that the target would primarily be achieved through more disparately distributed small-scale developments, the pupil yield from which will be more difficult to plan for in terms of additional school places.
9. This report outlines the Council's Executive Board's preferred options for providing the additional requisite primary, secondary and early years places within the borough and gives the best possible estimates of cost. As will be evident, most 'easy' expansion options in the areas of highest need have already been undertaken, others may not be able to satisfy Section 77 guidance requirements regarding outdoor play space, and sites for new schools are both scarce and expensive. All proposals for expansions of existing schools would require statutory consultation before the formal decision-making process(es).

---

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/London%20Infrastructure%20Plan%202050%20-%20presentation.pdf>.

<sup>3</sup> London Councils, July 2014.

<sup>4</sup> See: <http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/publications/re-reference-tables.html?edition=tcms%3A77-335242>.

<sup>5</sup> See: [http://www.richmond.gov.uk/core\\_strategy-3.pdf](http://www.richmond.gov.uk/core_strategy-3.pdf).

## Primary phase

10. The 10 school place planning areas, co-terminous with electoral ward boundaries, are as follows:

### Middlesex side of the Thames

- Area 1: Hampton / Hampton North
- Area 2: Teddington / Hampton Wick
- Area 3: South Twickenham / West Twickenham / Fulwell and Hampton Hill
- Area 4: Heathfield / Whitton
- Area 5: St Margarets and North Twickenham / Twickenham Riverside

### Surrey side of the Thames

- Area 6: North Richmond / South Richmond
- Area 7: Kew
- Area 8: East Sheen
- Area 9: Barnes / Mortlake and Barnes Common
- Area 10: Ham, Petersham and Richmond Riverside

Paragraphs 11 to 20 analyse likely demand and possible options within each of these areas. Where the possibility of expanding individual schools is discussed, the detail relates to each school's existing site(s) except in cases where expansion onto an additional site is specifically considered. A recommended option is given within each planning area.

Current capacity per school and planning area is given in multiples of forms of entry (FE); and one form of entry equates to 30 places per year.

11. **Area 1: Hampton / Hampton North**

School(s)	Current capacity	Comments and scope for expansion
Buckingham Primary	3FE	Expanded from 2FE in 2011; no room for further expansion.
Carlisle Infant and Hampton Hill Junior	3FE	Could be converted into all-through 2FE primary schools, in the same way that Orleans and St Stephen's were in 2012.
Hampton Infant and Hampton Junior	3FE	Could be converted into all-through 2FE primary schools, in the same way that Orleans and St Stephen's were in 2012.
St Mary's Church of England Primary (Hampton)	1FE	Free school, opened in 2013; could be expanded to 2FE if MOL issue can be overcome. Cost might be met from the Academies' Capital Maintenance Fund, but to date that funding has only been allocated for secondary phase projects.
Total capacity	10FE	

Likely demand

From 2016 onwards, there is a forecast shortfall of at least half a form of entry, but that could be absorbed if, as seems probable, fewer Hounslow resident children attend Buckingham due to the increased popularity of the two closest Hounslow schools: Forge Lane Primary is proposed for conversion to a Diocese of London Church of England primary; and Oriel Primary became Oriel Academy, within the Aspirations Academy Trust, in September 2013, and is now rated by Ofsted as 'good'.

Options

There is a good range of options in this area.

Recommendation

Expanding St Mary's in time for 2017 is the preferred option as it would provide a better balance of faith and community school provision in the area than if either of the pairs of infant and junior schools were converted into primaries. The relatively healthy range of options within this area do not necessitate an urgent requirement for more potential sites for new schools.

12. **Area 2: Teddington / Hampton Wick**

School(s)	Current capacity	Comments and scope for expansion
Collis Primary	3FE	Expanded from 2FE in 2006; has room for expansion to 4FE, but is a comparatively expensive option. Nevertheless, a bid has been submitted to the Education Funding Agency for the school to be included within the Priority Schools Building Programme (PSBP) – if the bid is approved, the costs of expansion would be reduced, but the outcome will not be known until late 2014.
Hampton Wick Infant and St John the Baptist Church of England Junior	3FE	Expanded from 2FE in 2012 and 2014 respectively; could be converted into all-through 2FE primary schools, in the way that Orleans and St Stephen's were, but, given the recent/ongoing building projects at the two schools, that should only be considered as a long-term option.
Sacred Heart Primary (Catholic)	1FE	Has room for expansion to 2FE, but the school gives priority admission to baptised Catholic children from practising families so expansion could draw children from a much wider area than Teddington / Hampton Wick and therefore might not meet the immediate localised need for additional places.
St Mary's and St Peter's Church of England Primary	3FE	Expanded from 2FE in 2011 and from 1FE in 2000; no room for further expansion.
Total capacity	10FE	

Likely demand

There is a forecast shortfall of 1FE up to 2017. From 2018 onwards, that forecast would be considerably exacerbated now that the planning application to redevelop Haymarket's Teddington Lock offices for large-scale residential use (220 units) has been approved. There is also a large forecast shortfall from 2015 onwards within the adjacent Area 3 (see paragraph 13 below), where options for providing further places are limited, and so pursuing options within Teddington and Hampton Wick might therefore meet short- to medium-term demand in both areas.

### Options

Although Collis and Sacred Heart could both be expanded, the development of a free school within the area could be encouraged and assisted, to be accommodated within Livingston House, if the EFA can purchase or long-lease the building.

### Recommendation

The establishment of a 2FE free school in Livingston House is the preferred option in the short-term, as it would be at no cost to the Council; with expansion of Collis as a second option for the medium- to long-term, depending on the success of the PSBP bid to narrow the funding gap. Discussions will need to take place with potential free school providers for a school in Livingston House.

### 13. **Area 3: South Twickenham / West Twickenham / Fulwell and Hampton Hill**

School(s)	Current capacity	Comments and scope for expansion
Archdeacon Cambridge's Church of England Primary	2FE	No room for expansion.
St James's Catholic Primary	3FE	Expanded from 2FE in 2000; PFI school so would be difficult and costly to expand, if it were physically possible.
Stanley Primary	4FE	Expanded from 3FE in 2010; no room for further expansion.
Trafalgar Infant and Trafalgar Junior	3FE	Expanded from 2FE in 2000; PFI schools and no room for expansion. The possibility of expanding the schools onto a third site, at Mereway, has been considered, but that would be difficult from a planning perspective and Mereway would be better used for extra-care housing.
Total capacity	12FE	

### Likely demand

From 2015 onwards, there is a forecast short- to medium-term shortfall of 1-2FE. The establishment of the 2FE Twickenham Primary free school, proposed by GEMS Learning Trust, in Heathgate House, Heath Road, in 2015 will meet that demand. Longer-term, demand in the area is forecast to grow further.

### Options

There are no realistic options to provide further places at existing primary schools within this area at present.

### Recommendation

Twickenham Primary will meet the short- to medium-term need here. It would be advisable to identify sites for potential new schools within the area.

## 14. **Area 4: Heathfield / Whitton**

School(s)	Current capacity	Comments and scope for expansion
Bishop Perrin Church of England Primary	1FE	No room for expansion.
Chase Bridge Primary	3FE	Expanded from 2FE in 2011; no room for further expansion.
Heathfield Infant and Heathfield Junior	4FE	Expanded from 3FE in 2013; no room for further expansion.
Nelson Primary	3FE	Expanded from 2FE in 2014; no room for expansion.
St Edmund's Catholic Primary	2FE	No room for expansion.
Total capacity	13FE	

### Likely demand

The expansions of the Heathfield schools and Nelson have met forecast short- to medium-term demand within this area.

### Options

There are no expansion options within this area.

### Recommendation

There is no urgent need to provide additional places within this area, and its adjacency to the Hounslow boundary means that further expansions would need to be considered within a cross-boundary context. It is essential to identify another new site within this area to meet possible longer-term need.

15. **Area 5: St Margarets and North Twickenham / Twickenham Riverside**

School(s)	Current capacity	Comments and scope for expansion
Orleans Primary	2FE	Converted from 3FE infant school in 2012; no room for expansion.
St Mary's Church of England Primary (Twickenham)	3FE	Expanded from 2FE in 2012 and from 1FE in 2000; no room for further expansion.
St Richard Reynolds Catholic Primary	1FE	New VA school in 2013; might have room for expansion but would be difficult, expensive and wouldn't necessarily provide any non-faith places.
St Stephen's Church of England Primary	2FE	Expanded from 3FE in 2013; no room for further expansion.
Total capacity	8FE	

Likely demand

This is the most difficult school place planning area in the borough: there is a need for up to three forms of entry in this area. Despite the addition of three forms of entry across the area since 2012, it has recently been difficult to meet demand from East Twickenham and North St Margarets, where residents are living too far from any of the three schools, or from The Vineyard just over the Thames in Richmond, to gain immediately local places for their children. (Despite the close proximity of two Hounslow primary schools to North St Margarets, very few Richmond Borough residents apply for places at either school.) A 2FE free school, Richmond Bridge Primary has been targeted at East Twickenham and been approved for opening in September 2015, but it is possible that a site for it will instead be secured on the Surrey side of the bridge, within Area 6. The approved/planned housing developments at the Royal Mail site (110 units), Twickenham station (115 units) and as part of the Richmond upon Thames College site re-development (200 units) will add to the birth-driven demand.

Options

There are no obvious current options for providing additional places at the existing schools. However, the establishment of Richmond Bridge Primary, the 2FE free school, within this area would meet the short- to medium-term need. Possible sites for new schools are currently being assessed.

Recommendation

Even if Richmond Bridge Primary is established in this area, it is essential to identify another new site within this area to meet possible longer-term need.



16. **Area 6: North Richmond / South Richmond**

School(s)	Current capacity	Comments and scope for expansion
Holy Trinity Church of England Primary	2FE	Expanded from 1FE in 2010; no room for further expansion.
Marshgate Primary	2FE	New school in 2002; has been part of a 'shared form of entry' with Sheen Mount and The Vineyard since 2010 but both the latter two schools are being permanently expanded from 2014; no room for full expansion.
St Elizabeth's Catholic Primary	1FE	Has been part of a 'shared form of entry' with St Mary Magdalen's and St Osmund's since 2009; no room for full expansion.
The Vineyard Primary	3FE	Expanded from 2FE in 2014; no room for further expansion.
Total capacity	8FE	

Likely demand

There is a need for two forms of entry within this area.

Options

The establishment of Richmond Bridge Primary within this area, rather than Area 5, would meet the short-to medium-term need. There are no options for providing additional places at the existing schools except at St Elizabeth's if the adjacent land could be acquired.

Recommendation

We are reliant on a site for a new school being identified here. Longer-term, it is advisable to identify a site for a new school, possibly an all-through primary and secondary.

17. **Area 7: Kew**

School(s)	Current capacity	Comments and scope for expansion
Darell Primary	2FE	Expanded from 1.5FE in 2014; no room for further expansion.
Kew Riverside Primary	1FE	New school in 2002; has room for expansion but is a PFI

		school so would be difficult and costly to achieve.
The Queen's Church of England Primary	2FE	Has room for expansion, and is being rebuilt through the Priority Schools Building Programme, but is not located in an area where there is unmet demand for places.
Total capacity	5FE	

#### Likely demand

There is no short- to medium-term need for places within this area.

#### Options

Longer-term, it would be advisable to identify sites for potential new schools within the area.

#### Recommendation

There is no urgent need for providing additional places within this area.

### 18. **Area 8: East Sheen**

School(s)	Current capacity	Comments and scope for expansion
East Sheen Primary	2FE	Has room for expansion.
Sheen Mount Primary	3FE	Expanded from 2FE in 2014; no room for further expansion.
Total capacity	5FE	

#### Likely demand

There is a need for at least one more form of entry within this area, but demand here overlaps with that within Area 9.

#### Options

Notwithstanding its proximity to the Wandsworth boundary, permanent expansion of East Sheen Primary would be possible.

### Recommendation

It is essential to expand East Sheen Primary.

## 19. **Area 9: Barnes / Mortlake and Barnes Common**

### Current provision

School(s)	Current capacity	Comments and scope for expansion
Barnes Primary	2FE	Expanded from 1FE in 2000; no room for expansion unless a third site can be provided at Barnes Hospital.
Lowther Primary	2FE	Expanded from 1FE in 2011; no room for further expansion.
St Mary Magdalen's Catholic Primary	1FE	Has been part of a 'shared form of entry' with St Elizabeth's and St Osmund's since 2009; no room for full expansion.
St Osmund's Catholic Primary	1FE	Has been part of a 'shared form of entry' with St Elizabeth's and St Mary Magdalen's since 2009; no room for full expansion.
Thomson House Primary	2FE (52 places)	Free school, opened in 2013; has two sites but no room for expansion.
Total capacity	8FE	

### Likely demand

There is a need for at least one more form of entry within this area.

### Options

Expansion of Barnes Primary must be considered if a third site, ideally 0.5ha of the (1.3ha) Barnes Hospital site, can be secured. Longer-term, if Stag Brewery is re-developed the planning brief for the site includes space for a 2FE primary school.

### Recommendation

Either expanding Barnes Primary onto or creating a new free school on the Barnes Hospital site is essential in the short- to medium term.

## 20. **Area 10: Ham, Petersham and Richmond Riverside**

### Current provision

School(s)	Current capacity	Comments and scope for expansion
Meadlands Primary	1FE	Has room for expansion.
St Richard's Church of England Primary	1FE	Has room for expansion.
The Russell Primary	1FE	Has room for expansion.
Total capacity	3FE	

### Likely demand

There is a need for two more forms of entry within this area by 2017 or 2018, due to birth-rate increases and approved, planned and probable medium- to large-scale housing developments at the Star and Garter (80 units), Latchmere House (115 units), Cassel Hospital and Ham Close.

### Options

As all three existing schools appear to have the room for expansion, subject to satisfying the Section 77 guidance regarding outdoor play space, there is a good range of possibilities within this area.

### Recommendation

Expanding two schools in this area will be essential: The Russell (in 2017) and then Meadlands as and when required.

## 21. The need and preferred options for more places, plus actions arising, are tabulated below:

Area	Need (FE) by term			Options	Actions	Timescales	Estimated cost to the Council
	Short	Medium	Long				
1	1	1	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expansion of St Mary's, Hampton</li> </ul>	1. Speak to school, Diocese of London and EFA and commission a feasibility study.	Autumn 2014 – spring 2015, for September 2017 opening	Up to £3m
2	1	2	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New free school at Livingston House site</li> <li>Expansion of Collis</li> </ul>	2. Work with EFA and free school proposer re new school at Livingston House site 3. If PSBP bid is approved, consider expansion of Collis	Ongoing, for September 2016 opening  PSBP bid outcome – December 2014; consider expansion – spring 2015	None  £4m (would be £7m if PSBP bid were unsuccessful)
3	1	2	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opening of Twickenham Primary free school at Heathgate House</li> </ul>	4. Work with EFA and free school proposer to enable Twickenham Primary	Spring/summer 2015	None
4	0	0	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None needed</li> </ul>	None		None
5	1	2	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opening of Richmond Bridge Primary free school, if a site can be secured</li> </ul>	5. EFA to secure a site for Richmond Bridge Primary	Ongoing, in time for September 2015 opening	None

<b>6</b>	2	2	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New school on an additional site in Richmond</li> </ul>	6. Identify a site and commission a feasibility study.	Spring/summer 2015, for September 2016 or 2017 entry	None
<b>7</b>	0	0	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None needed</li> </ul>	None		None
<b>8</b>	1	1	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expansion of East Sheen</li> </ul>	7. Undertake feasibility study for expansion of East Sheen	Spring/summer 2015, in time for September 2016	£4.5m
<b>9</b>	1	1	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expansion of Barnes or new free school, using Barnes Hospital site</li> </ul>	8. Work with SWLStGMHT to secure part of Barnes Hospital site for school use, undertake feasibility study and work with EFA	Spring/summer 2015, for September 2016 opening	None
<b>10</b>	1	2	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expansion of The Russell</li> <li>Expansion of Meadlands</li> </ul>	9. Undertake feasibility study and consult  10. Undertake feasibility study and consult	Spring/summer 2015, for September 2017 opening  Autumn 2015 – spring 2016	£2.5m  £4m
<b>Total need</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>21</b>				£18.0m

## Secondary phase

22. At present (i.e. for 2014 entry), there are 1,690 places available in Year 7 within the borough, as follows:

School	Published admission number
Christ's (Church of England)	150
Grey Court	210
Hampton Academy	180
Orleans Park	200
Richmond Park Academy	180
St Richard Reynolds Catholic High	150
Teddington	240
Twickenham Academy	180
Waldegrave School for Girls	200

23. In September 2014, seven of the schools are at capacity in Year 7, but two of the three sponsored academies between them have 60 spare places.
24. In order to ensure a wider diversity of secondary places, it is imperative that a site is found to enable Turing House, the five-form entry free school, to open, following the deferral of its original planned opening in 2014. To that end, work is ongoing with the school's proposers and the Education Funding Agency to secure both an appropriate long-term site and a temporary site.
25. If a site cannot be found for Turing House, it is possible that demand for places from Richmond Borough residents would almost match supply. For 2015 entry, there has been an increase against 2014 of 72 first preferences for the nine existing schools. However, it is likely that the most immediate result of increased demand from Richmond Borough residents will be that fewer Hounslow resident children will be able to obtain places at Hampton Academy and Twickenham Academy, fewer Wandsworth residents will be able to obtain places at Richmond Park Academy and fewer Kingston residents will be admitted to Grey Court, Christ's and Teddington (see paragraph 26). Contingency plans will therefore be needed to provide 'bulge classes' at two schools, to cover the period until Richmond upon Thames College free school opens in 2017. Nevertheless, contingency plans may be needed to provide 'bulge classes' at two schools, to cover the period until Richmond upon Thames College free school opens in 2017. Waldegrave has agreed to accommodate 16 additional girls in 2015.

26. The opening in 2015 of The Kingston Academy, the six-form entry free school in North Kingston which has received over 700 applications for its first intake, is expected to free up more places for Richmond Borough residents at Grey Court and Christ's and thereby ease pressure on secondary places on the Surrey side of the Thames. It may also free up a (smaller) number of places at Teddington. The precise numbers of places which will be released are difficult to estimate, but, since more than 50% of Grey Court's intake have in recent years been North Kingston residents, it is reasonable to expect that within a year or two of Kingston Academy's opening, around 100 places, or more, will be released for Richmond Borough children.
27. The approval, in May 2014, of the Richmond upon Thames College Free School, to provide five forms of entry from 2017, will meet medium- to long-term forecast demand on the Middlesex side of the Thames.
28. To meet long-term increased demand, which at present is very difficult to quantify, it is essential that sites be identified where new secondary schools could be provided within the borough. In assessing the forecast demand, though, it is vital that account be taken of new or planned secondary school provision in neighbouring local authority areas, most particularly Hounslow.

## Early Years

29. As with Reception class places, demand for free Early Years places in the borough is very high. 18 of the 38 infant and primary schools in the borough have attached maintained nurseries, and there is one stand-alone nursery school, Windham. 11 of those 19 are on the Middlesex side of the Thames and eight are on the Surrey side. Between them, those schools provide a total of 1,070 places, as detailed in the table below. Each of the maintained nurseries is oversubscribed with applications and, as can be seen from the table, demand far exceeds supply:

School	Places	Applications in 2014
Archdeacon Cambridge's C of E Primary	52	92
Barnes Primary	78	136
Buckingham Primary	52	77
Chase Bridge Primary	52	105
Collis Primary	52	112
Darell Primary	52	91
Hampton Infant	52	119
Hampton Wick Infant	52	87
Heathfield Infant	104	125
Holy Trinity C of E Primary	52	82



Lowther Primary	52	130
Meadlands Primary	26	48
Orleans Primary	52	109
The Russell Primary	52	42
St Edmund's Catholic Primary	52	85
St James's Catholic Primary	52	76
Stanley Primary	78	164
St Richard's C of E Primary	30	33
Windham Nursery	78	129

Except at Meadlands and St Richard's which both have a morning session only, each school runs a morning and afternoon session, with half its total places in each session. The nurseries at Chase Bridge and St Edmund's are recent additions to the maintained sector, having both been private nurseries that were managed on their sites.

30. Each school allocates its own places in accordance with published oversubscription criteria. For the community schools, the nursery criteria are the same as for Reception class places, i.e. most places are allocated to siblings and on the basis of home-to-school distance. (However, it should be noted that attendance at the nursery or having a younger sibling at the nursery does not form part of the criteria for Reception entry.) Unlike for entry to Reception and Year 7, the Council does not coordinate applications for the maintained nursery schools.
31. Almost three-quarters – 3,015 – of the 4,085 nursery places for three- and four-year-olds within the borough are within the private, voluntary and independent (PVI) sector, i.e. the majority are not free of charge. The Council has a duty to secure the early education entitlement completely free of charge and the very large majority of private and voluntary providers charge additional charges due to the significant cost of running childcare business in the borough. Therefore, providing sufficient places that are entirely free is a significant challenge and they are mostly available in the maintained nursery classes. This places families with a low income at a further disadvantage.
32. Some of the PVI nurseries also offer free places for two-year-olds. Provision for two year olds to access early education places is increasing with 40% of the population eligible from 1<sup>st</sup> September 2014. The Council must secure sufficient free places for two year olds who will then be able to move seamlessly into a nursery place which is entirely free.
33. All Early Years providers who offer the early education entitlement must adhere to the provisions of the Department for Education's Early Years Foundation Stage Framework.

34. For three- and four-year-olds, the Council has a statutory duty, which it fulfils, to secure early education places offering 570 hours a year over no fewer than 38 weeks of the year for every child in their area.
  35. For two-year-olds, the Council has a statutory duty to secure free early education places offering 570 hours a year over no fewer than 38 weeks of the year for every child in their area who is either looked-after or who falls within the eligibility criteria for free school meals. For September 2014, the Council has a statutory target of ensuring the provision of 377 free places for two-year-olds but has so far arranged 213 places, across 60 settings, due largely to difficulties with the fees charged by providers.
  36. It is difficult to estimate the amount of unmet demand for maintained nursery places within the borough, but the level of applications for the 19 nurseries is such that there can be no doubt that if there were more places they would be in high demand and therefore very easily filled. Evidence shows that parents are challenged to find places which are entirely free of charge.
  37. There are three possible methods for providing additional maintained nursery places:
    - A. Open new nurseries at other state-funded infant and primary schools within the borough. There is no direct funding available for nursery expansion, but some additional capacity could be created as part of a school expansion. If this option is pursued, the selection criteria must be based on current unmet need, The Early Years Service is currently completing its Childcare Sufficiency Assessment which will provide local data and indicate where additional places need to be established.
    - B. Bring private nurseries on state-funded school sites into the maintained sector, as happened at Chase Bridge and St Edmund's. Some schools are already considering this option and are in discussion with the Early Years Service.
    - C. Expand the number of places at some of the existing maintained nurseries.
- All options to increase nursery places could also offer some additional new provision within the nursery class for disadvantaged two year olds. This will also help the borough to meet this unmet demand.
38. The geographical distribution of the current maintained nurseries within the borough is good, but could be improved, as there are some areas – most notably St Margarets/central and east Twickenham and Teddington – where the number of places has not kept pace with the number of Reception class places that have been provided in recent years.

39. Five schools have submitted expressions of interest to create or increase maintained nursery provision: Carlisle Infant, Collis Primary, St Elizabeth's Catholic Primary, St Mary's Church of England Primary (Twickenham) and St Stephen's Church of England Primary.
40. With very limited capital funding it is essential that additional maintained nursery capacity is created where it is needed most. The expressions of interest which have been received are being considered and a priority list will be agreed should any funding be available. All proposals regarding maintained nursery provision will be subject to a further report to Cabinet.

### **Financial implications**

41. The Council has committed its 2014-2017 'Basic Need' allocation (from the Education Funding Agency) of £8,990,851. That amount, supplemented by Section 106 Education contributions and capital borrowing, has funded the permanent expansions of Darell, Nelson, Sheen Mount (partly) and The Vineyard, and the temporary expansions of Collis, East Sheen, St Mary's (Twickenham) and The Russell.
42. The average cost of permanently expanding a primary school within the borough is now approximately £3.5-4m. The total cost of the expansions that are identified as the preferred options in the table at paragraph 21 is estimated at £20m, but that is subject to the outcome of feasibility studies which would need to be undertaken.
43. The capital costs of free school proposals which are approved for opening are / would be incurred by the Education Funding Agency. However, if the Council wishes to long-lease sites within its ownership for free school use, then it would need to balance the financial saving of school places being provided without it having to spend any capital against the loss of potential income from such sites.
44. Temporary expansions within existing spaces should each cost less than £50,000, but would depend on the individual school's situation. Alternatively, a single demountable would cost c.£175,000, and a double demountable would cost c.£315,000. Bulge classes are, though, considered to represent poor value for money compared with permanent expansions and do not attract the same levels of capital investment. They are also less helpful to parents and to the schools concerned, as they are sometimes announced only after the initial offers of application, due primarily to the variable and therefore unpredictable amount and distribution of children whose parents ultimately plump for the private sector. In any case, as the report indicates in paragraphs 11-20, there are few schools within the areas of highest demand which still have sufficient space to accommodate temporary expansions.
45. Adding bulge classes in secondary schools could cost more than in primary schools since there would be pressure on specialised spaces, such as science labs, but it is possible that in 2015 additional places could be provided by utilising temporarily empty spaces created by the provision of sixth-form blocks.

46. In addition to the capital costs, each expansion, whether permanent or temporary, would require revenue, to pay for seven-twelfths of the costs of a teacher, teaching assistant and other resources for the period from September to April, of c.£54,000. These costs would be paid from the Dedicated Schools Grant.
47. The building and associated costs of providing new maintained nurseries would be borne from the overall Schools Capital Budget. An update to the Capital Programme was reported to Cabinet in February 2014.
48. Nursery provision for three and four year olds is funded through our Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) - Early Years Block allocation. This is calculated by multiplying the number of full time equivalent children participating at the time of the early years census by £3,601 (the Guaranteed Unit of Funding or GUF). For the 2014/15 financial year, this allocation amounted to £7.919m and includes funding for central management activity and other early years costs.
49. For two year olds, there is a supplementary adjustment to the DSG allocation to reflect the anticipated take up. For the 2014/15 financial year, this adjustment included additional provision for an increased take up in September 2014 following the introduction of wider qualifying criteria which is expected to raise participation levels to approx. 40% of the two year old population. The adjustment (£1.151m) also includes some 'Trajectory Funding' (£0.123m) for outreach and pump priming initiatives to encourage two year old take up. This latter funding is expected to be discontinued in 2015/2016.
50. The total DSG Early Years Block allocation for 2014/2015 is £9.070m. This allocation is not ring-fenced but the Schools Forum has been advised that the early year's budget for 2014/2015, as reported in the Authority's Section 251 Budget Statement, will be £9.050m – a difference of £20,000.
51. The allocation for three and four year olds is subject to termly adjustment based on actual levels of participation in each term. Therefore any real increase in child participation levels would attract an additional £3,601 per full time equivalent child, pro-rata for each term in the financial year. For the 2013/2014 financial year, this adjustment was £0.294m and will be paid as a one-off supplement to the 2014/2015 DSG allocation. This supplement will be available for early years activity during the current financial year.
52. Because of the way in which the DfE funds early years through the DSG, any increase in child participation levels arising from the creation of additional places in the maintained sector will attract additional DSG funding. Most of this would be passed on to the school through the Early Years Single Funding Formula (EYSFF) in the term during which the increase occurs. However, if the places are taken by children who would otherwise attend a PVI setting, there would be an equivalent reduction in DSG funding, and EYSFF funding to the setting would also reduce. Therefore any increase in DSG funding will only arise if there is a real increase in child numbers.

53. The borough's Schools Forum has recently reviewed the EYSFF and agreed to increase the hourly rate by 10 pence, to £3.60. This increase will be met from within the overall DSG allocation. The Forum also agreed to target the deprivation element of the EYSFF at settings with the highest proportions of disadvantaged children.

### **Risk assessment**

54. The borough has a statutory duty under Section 14 of the Education Act to ensure the provision of school places for its residents. Failure to meet that duty would result in significant adverse publicity for the borough and could result in legal action being taken against it for failure to provide education.
55. If the borough and its partners were unable to implement the proposed expansions and/or secure new schools, it would continue to be reliant upon temporary additional classes, which do not represent good value for money and can be more disruptive for schools' organisation than strategically planned permanent expansions. The borough could also run out of viable options for temporary additional classes in due course, so its long-term ability to provide sufficient places for its residents would be compromised.

### **Contacts**

Matthew Paul, Head of School Place Commissioning, Achieving for Children; 020 8891 7588,  
[matthew.paul@achievingforchildren.org.uk](mailto:matthew.paul@achievingforchildren.org.uk).

Charis Penfold, Associate Director for Early Years, Achieving for Children; 020 8547 5250  
email: [charis.penfold@achievingforchildren.org.uk](mailto:charis.penfold@achievingforchildren.org.uk).

## **Appendix 4**

### **Review of GP availability NHS Choices**

## Results for GP in TW9 2EP

Showing 1-10 of 2085 results

Distances given are in a straight line but travel routes may be longer. Please check before starting your journey

Topics Key Facts Sort by Nearest	NHS Choices users rating	Registered patients	Would recommend the surgery	Electronic prescription service	Accepting patients	Online appointment booking	Order or view repeat prescriptions online
<b>Crowley &amp; Partners</b>							
Tel: 020 88764442 North Road Surgery 77 North Road Kew Richmond TW9 4HQ 0.3 miles 	 6 ratings - <a href="#">Rate it yourself</a>	6856 patients	 88.4% - Among the best		 Currently accepting new patients	 Online appointment booking is available	 Viewing or ordering prescriptions online is available
<b>Kew Medical Practice</b>							
Tel: 020 84878292 Kew Medical Practice 14 High Park Road Kew Richmond TW9 4BH 0.5 miles	 8 ratings - <a href="#">Rate it yourself</a>	4130 patients	 79.5% - In the middle range		 Currently accepting new patients	 Online appointment booking is available	 Viewing or ordering prescriptions online is available
<b>Blake-James &amp; Partners</b>							
Tel: 020 8940 2802 Seymour House Surgery 154 Sheen Road Richmond Surrey TW9 1UU 0.6 miles 	 11 ratings - <a href="#">Rate it yourself</a>	13789 patients	 76.5% - In the middle range		 Currently accepting new patients	No image available Data not available	No image available Data not available
<b>Parkshot Medical Practice</b>							
Tel: 020 8948 4217 18 Parkshot Richmond Richmond TW9 2RG 0.7 miles 	 31 ratings - <a href="#">Rate it yourself</a>	11016 patients	 76.0% - In the middle range		 Currently accepting new patients	 Online appointment booking is available	 Viewing or ordering prescriptions online is available
<b>Lee C</b>							
Tel: 020 89402423 Paradise Road Surgery 37 Paradise Road Richmond Surrey TW9 1SA 0.9 miles 	 8 ratings - <a href="#">Rate it yourself</a>	2982 patients	 77.2% - In the middle range		 Currently accepting new patients	 Online appointment booking is available	 Viewing or ordering prescriptions online is available
<b>Jeziarski &amp; Partners</b>							
Tel: 020 88763901 Sheen Lane Health Centre Sheen Lane East Sheen London SW14 8LP 0.9 miles 	 10 ratings - <a href="#">Rate it yourself</a>	9433 patients	 94.7% - Among the best		 Currently accepting new patients	 Online appointment booking is available	 Viewing or ordering prescriptions online is available
<b>Johnson &amp; Partners</b>							
Tel: 020 88764086 Sheen Lane Health Centre							

<p>Sheen Lane East Sheen London SW14 8LP 0.9 miles <b>P</b></p>	<p>★★★★★ 13 ratings - <a href="#">Rate it yourself</a></p>	<p>10929 patients</p>	<p> 94.8% - Among the best</p>	<p></p>	<p> Currently accepting new patients</p>	<p> Online appointment booking is available</p>	<p> Viewing or ordering prescriptions online is available</p>
<p><b>The Vineyard Surgery</b></p>							
<p>Tel: 020 89480404 35 The Vineyard Richmond Surrey TW10 6PP 1.0 miles </p>	<p>★★★★☆ 12 ratings - <a href="#">Rate it yourself</a></p>	<p>3774 patients</p>	<p> 74.3% - In the middle range</p>	<p></p>	<p> Currently accepting new patients</p>	<p> Online appointment booking is available</p>	<p> Viewing or ordering prescriptions online is available</p>
<p><b>Sayer A</b></p>							
<p>Tel: 020 83327515 The Richmond Green Medical Cen 19 The Green Richmond Surrey TW9 1PX 1.0 miles <b>P</b></p>	<p>★★★★★ 8 ratings - <a href="#">Rate it yourself</a></p>	<p>2071 patients</p>	<p> 72.1% - In the middle range</p>	<p></p>	<p> Currently accepting new patients</p>	<p> Online appointment booking is available</p>	<p> Viewing or ordering prescriptions online is available</p>
<p><b>Grove Park Terrace Surgery</b></p>							
<p>Tel: 020 8630 1680 25 Grove Park Terrace Chiswick London W4 3JL 1.2 miles <b>P</b></p>	<p>★★★★★ 11 ratings - <a href="#">Rate it yourself</a></p>	<p>3411 patients</p>	<p> 83.2% - In the middle range</p>	<p></p>	<p> Currently accepting new patients</p>	<p> Online appointment booking is available</p>	<p> Viewing or ordering prescriptions online is available</p>



## **Appendix 5**

### **Child Yield**

## Assessing child occupancy and play space requirements

### Size of your development:

#### Number of FLATS

	Studio	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4 bed	5 bed	Total
Social rented/affordable	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Intermediate	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Market	2	7	7	4	0	0	20
<b>Total</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>20</b>

#### Number of HOUSES

	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4 bed	5 bed	Total
Social rented/affordable	0	0	0	0	0	0
Intermediate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Market	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

#### Proportion of children

	Number of children	%
Under 5	1	57%
5 to 11	1	29%
12+	0	14%
<b>Total</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100%</b>

#### Play space requirements

GLA benchmark (sqm)*	Alternative local benchmark (sqm)**	Total (sq m play space) required
10		21.1
	5	10.6

\* GLA benchmark standard=minimum of 10sqm of dedicated play space per child

\*\* Borough's local benchmark

Cgms

**Cgms**  
[www.cgms.co.uk](http://www.cgms.co.uk)