

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL
CABINET**



SURREY
COUNTY COUNCIL

DATE: 27 FEBRUARY 2024

REPORT OF CABINET MEMBER: CLARE CURRAN, CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN, FAMILIES AND LIFELONG LEARNING

LEAD OFFICER: RACHAEL WARDELL, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR FOR CHILDREN, FAMILIES AND LIFELONG LEARNING

SUBJECT: PROVISION OF PRIMARY SCHOOL PLACES IN THE PLANNING AREA OF REIGATE

ORGANISATION STRATEGY PRIORITY AREA: NO ONE LEFT BEHIND, TACKLING HEALTH INEQUALITY, EMPOWERING AND THRIVING COMMUNITIES, ENABLING A GREENER FUTURE

Purpose of the report:

Under section 14 of the Education Act 1996, Local Authorities have a statutory duty to ensure that there are sufficient school places for primary and secondary education in their areas.

Surrey County Council's guiding mission is [no one is left behind](#). It is important that there is equity in inclusive accessible school places for all, across Surrey. An important criterion in evaluating options is that the outcome supports Surrey County Council to achieve ambitions set out in Surrey's Community Vision for 2030; that children and young people are safe and feel safe and confident and that everyone benefits from education, skills and employment opportunities that help them succeed in life.

Surrey Council consulted on two options for the future of primary school provision in Reigate between 27 November 2023 and 21 January 2024. These were:

Option 1: Relocate Reigate Priory Junior School to a new site at Woodhatch Place

The school would move out of the current building and transfer to a new site at Woodhatch Place. The site is less than 1 mile from the current site. This option is subject to the necessary planning permission. Since the move would be to a site less than 2 miles from the current site, there would be no obligation for further consultation on this option, if approved. We currently estimate that if this option is adopted and the necessary permissions are obtained, the new site should be open in September 2026.

Option 2: Set up an education working group to explore re-organisation options for schools in the primary planning area of Reigate.

Surrey County Council would bring together decision makers and representatives across all schools in the primary planning area of Reigate to consider whether school places in Reigate could be re-organised. The five schools in the primary planning area of Reigate are Reigate Priory Junior School, Dovers Green Infant School, Holmesdale Infant School, Sandcross Primary School and Reigate Parish Primary School. The working group would need to identify changes that could be made as Reigate Priory Junior School cannot stay in its current form on the current site. This could include expansions, schools amalgamating and/or changing age ranges to become primary schools, changes in admission arrangements and other reorganisation ideas. We currently estimate that if this option is adopted and the necessary permissions are obtained, the changes could be in place by September 2028. If option 2 is pursued, this could be done in tandem with pursuing the determination of the live planning application at Woodhatch Place to establish if option 1 is viable. This is because of the uncertainties in making all the changes which may be necessary under option 2 and doing so within a reasonable time frame.

Cabinet is asked to review the two options and agree the educational rationale for moving forward with either option 1 or option 2.

- a) Agree option 1. This will start with the submission of additional planning documentation to the live planning application for option 1 (ref: RE22/01796CON) to address the concerns raised by the Planning and Regulatory Committee when it referred the application back to the applicant, then, subject to planning permission being granted, implementing the proposal to transfer Reigate Priory Junior School onto a new site at Woodhatch Place, or
- b) Agree option 2 thereby bringing into effect activities to seek a solution by setting up a working group and exploring re-organisation options in the primary planning area of Reigate. (Further decisions and permissions will be needed dependent on the proposals formed through the working group).

Cabinet may:

Agree either option 1 or option 2.

Agree option 1 or option 2, in either case with modifications. Note that option 2 involves the potential to progress option 1 as well as investigating the possibility of wider re-organisation.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that Cabinet:

1. Pursue option 2, establishing a working group to explore reorganisation for the Reigate Primary Planning Area.
2. Agree the timescales and scope for the working group as outlined in **Annex 1**.
3. Agree to delegate authority to the Director of Land & Property in conjunction with the Executive Director of Children Families and Lifelong Learning to commission initial desk-based viability studies up to £0.6m.
4. Pursue the determination of the live planning application (Reference RE22/01796CON) for option 1, to establish if this is a viable option.

Reason for recommendations:

As the majority of respondents to the consultation selected option 2, the recommendations are to continue to look for alternative solutions and pursue option 2 by establishing a working group to explore re-organisation options as set out in recommendation 1.

It has not been possible to identify any potentially viable sites other than Woodhatch Place, or to identify a solution for Reigate Priory Junior School (RPJS) to remain a 600-place junior school on the current site for the reasons set out in **Annex 2 of this report**. The working group will look at re-organisation options to provide sufficient school places in the area. Possibilities could include the Woodhatch site and the existing school sites, including the potential for a smaller school at Priority Park and other potential sites. The evaluation criteria are set out at Annex 1, this includes the need for any solution under Option 2 to be comparable in cost to Option 1. Cabinet Agreement for the timescales and scope of the working Group is sought under recommendation 2. More information about the role, functions and scope of the working group and timescales is available in **Annex 1: Working Group Terms of Reference**.

Surrey County Council would not ordinarily recommend a closure of a school that provides quality education and continues to meet the needs of local pupils, however, school closure or school closure as part of an amalgamation may be considered by the working group, if an alternative cannot be found, or if a school no longer meets the needs of children.

Recommendation 3 ensures relevant delegated authority to ensure sufficient feasibility is completed for any solution identified by the working group. There may be feasibility studies across multiple schools as part of the agreed option. The original site search for a 5FE (5 Form Entry) Junior school may be refreshed alongside any additional site search as part of option 2.

There is no guarantee of finding viable options and this process will further delay a secure future for RPJS. To ensure a continuity of sufficient school places for children and young people in Reigate, it would be sensible and reasonable that, as set out in Recommendation 4, Surrey County Council pursues determination of the live planning application to relocate Reigate Priory Junior School to Woodhatch Place, (Ref RE22/01796CON), by submitting additional information to address the issues identified by the Planning and Regulatory Committee when referring it back to the applicants. This is in order to fully understand if this option is a viable solution.

Recommendation 4 relates only to proceeding to determination of the planning permission. This is to keep all possible options open for consideration at this time and as a back-up if an alternative cannot be identified or if a more urgent need arises to re-locate RPJS from the current site. This is because of the uncertainties in making all the changes which may be necessary under option 2 and doing so within a reasonable time frame.

A further decision will be required by Cabinet later in 2024 to determine how to proceed, taking into consideration the recommendations of the working group and the outcome of the planning application.

Executive Summary:

Background Information

1. Surrey County Council has a statutory duty to ensure children have access to education that is safe, accessible, and fit for the future. There is a significant impact on the day to day running of the school due to several areas where the current building does not meet modern education standards set by the Department for Education (DfE). The Department for Education agrees that the current RPJS building is not in line with modern learning requirements and restricts any re-provision or redevelopment of a like-for-like school on the same site. Further clarification is set out in **Annex 2**.
2. In August 2023, Surrey County Council submitted a planning application to move the 600 place RPJS to Woodhatch Place (ref RE22/01796CON). The planning application was not approved at the time by the Planning and Regulatory Committee and was referred back to the applicant with reasons why it was not considered acceptable. That application remains 'live'.
3. As concerns were raised during the planning application Surrey County Council re-explored alternative options and published an education consultation with 2 available options, explained above. The consultation took place between 27 November 2023 and 21 January 2024.

Why did the education consultation not include any sites other than Woodhatch Place?

4. Vail Williams, property consultants, were instructed in July 2023 by Surrey County Council to carry out an updated search of the local Reigate market for sites suitable for the development of a school and report all findings together with an assessment of deliverability. The search is an update to one undertaken in February 2022. Woodhatch Place was the only site identified that met all the criteria required to deliver a 600- place junior school building as well as outdoor school spaces.
5. These criteria were:
 - A site of approximately 8 acres and no smaller than 5 acres. Larger sites were included, to ensure maximum coverage and that the development can accommodate a school which accords with the Department of Education standards for new schools.
 - Within 2 miles of the existing school. Sites both off and on market with a range of ownership types, uses, access/location arrangements and sizes, have been considered.
6. The site search carried out in August 2023, identified there were no alternative sites other than Woodhatch Place. This site search included, amongst others, the site west of St Albans Road in existing use as a Playing Field by Micklefield School and Surrey Fire & Rescue Site, Wray Park Road, required by SCC for operational use.
7. The [alternative site assessment in Reigate for Reigate Priory Junior School](#) was made available with the consultation documents and is included as Annex 7 with this report.

Why did the education consultation not include an option to refurbish or re-build Reigate Priory Junior School on the current site?

8. **Annex 2** outlines the reasons that an option for the school to be refurbished or re-built on the current site, it was not included in the consultation.

Needs Analysis

9. An [Education Needs Analysis](#) was published with the consultation documents. The needs analysis has been updated based on latest forecast information produced at the end of December 2023. The updated Education Needs Analysis is available as **Annex 3**.
10. The [School Organisation Plan 2022-2032 and Sustainability Strategy](#) set out Surrey County Council's aims for providing education close to home by local providers, who can successfully support all children and young people to live, learn and grow up locally to achieve their full potential.

11. Surrey County Council has a legal duty to ensure there are sufficient school places across an area. There is a mix of five infant, junior and primary schools in the Reigate area. As of October 2023, there were 2,137 pupils on roll at these schools compared to the capacity of 2,310 places. There were 554 pupils on roll at RPJS as of the school census in October 2023. A 5 Form of Entry (FE) provision means there is capacity of 5 classes of 30 pupils per year group totalling 600.
12. Due to a decline in birth rates Holmesdale Community Infant School reduced from 4 forms of entry (Published Admission Number (PAN) of 120) to 3 forms of entry (Published Admission Number (PAN) of 90). Therefore, the number of places in Year R (Reception) reduced from 330 to 300 in the primary planning area of Reigate in September 2023.

Table 1: Number of places projected in Year R and Year 3 from Sept 2023 to Sept 2030 (Edge forecasts published December 2023)

Reigate							School name		
School year	Year R places	Year R Forecast	Surplus / Deficit	Year 3 places	Year 3 Forecast	Surplus / Deficit	Year R Places	Year 3 Places	
2024-25	300	267	33	330	296	34	Dovers Green School	90	
2025-26	300	302	-2	330	303	27	Holmesdale Community Infant School	90	
2026-27	300	292	8	330	286	44	Reigate Parish Church School	60	
2027-28	300	293	7	330	263	67	Reigate Priory School	150	
2028-29	300	294	6	330	298	32	Sandcross School	60	
2029-30	300	294	6	330	290	40	Total places in planning area	300	
2030-31	300	293	7	330	292	38		330	
2031-32	300	293	7	330	292	38			
2032-33	300	291	7	330	290	40			

13. The forecasts above show that there is expected to be some surplus in the area in Year 3. It is being considered whether there should a reduction of Junior places in Sept 2026 to match the reduced number of Infant places from Sept 2023. Any reduction in PAN would be subject to consultation in line with the [School Admissions Code](#).
14. Although the current projections for Year 3 show a growing surplus of places, there is less accuracy in the later years of the forecasts and numbers of pupils in the area may rise again based on additional housing in the area or an increase in birth rates. Therefore, while admission authorities may choose to consult to reduce PAN, it would be beneficial to Surrey County Council to maintain current capacity for school places in the area to provide sustainability of places in the future.

Options Appraisal

15. The options appraisal is available as **Annex 4**. The two options have been assessed under agreed evaluation criteria:
- a) Does the option support Surrey County Council to achieve ambitions set out in the Community Vision that children and young people are safe and feel safe and confident and that everyone benefits from education, skills and employment opportunities that help them succeed in life.

- b) Affordability
- c) Achievability
- d) Sustainable for the future
- e) Legally compliant
- f) Value for money

Key outcomes and benefits for children, young people and families:

- Sufficient places for pupils attending school in the pupil planning area of Reigate, that are fit for purpose and sustainable in the long term.
- Children, young people, and families have access to high quality education wherever they live in Surrey.
- An improved accessible and inclusive learning environment for pupils who attend RPJS, or another configuration of schools in the area in the future.

Consultation:

16. The education consultation was published from 27 November 2023 to 21 January 2024. **Annex 5** Consultation Analysis is an analysis of all responses to the consultation. The consultation methodology and activities are included in the report. The consultation documents are available at [Surrey Says](#). A dedicated [webpage](#) will also continue to be updated throughout the work with primary schools in Reigate.
17. Public engagement exercises and consultations are designed to help inform council decision making. While all contributions are considered, and detailed feedback recorded and reported, the outcome of that public engagement will not solely dictate the final decision. Public opinion, both quantitative and qualitative, is one of several important considerations when deciding how to progress, alongside things like viability, equality impact assessments, cost to the public purse, and wider implications for residents and stakeholders. Although an important part in policy making and decision making, and one way to gauge the level of public support, engagement exercises and consultations do not constitute a binding vote, referendum, or representative polling.

Key points from the consultation:

18. 975 people responded to the consultation. 265 (27%) respondents selected option 1, 665 (68%) respondents selected option 2 and 45 (5%) selected don't know/no opinion.
19. There were three free text questions to allow respondents to share their views on each option. The comments were manually thematically coded by officers.

20. The theme with the highest prevalence for option 1 was negative impact on traffic in the area (391 comments). This was followed by concerns regarding safety of travel to school (329 comments) and negative impact due to increased distance from Holmesdale Community Infant School (203 comments).
21. The theme with the highest prevalence for option 2 was a desire for solutions on the current site (298 comments), followed by positive comments in re-organising to primary schools (rather than infant and junior) (158 comments) and a need to consider other sites (91 comments). This shows the three main themes respondents wanted to see followed up by the working group in option 2. Further ideas are captured in a table at the end of **Annex 5**.
22. Respondents were asked if they had any further comments. The theme with the highest prevalence was distrust in Surrey County Council (118 comments). Respondents mentioned thinking that Surrey County Council had an agenda for RPJS to move to Woodhatch Place and not trusting that there is not a solution on the current site, or another site available. **Annex 2** aims to address the potential on the current site at Priory Park and paragraphs 4 - 7 of this document outline the most recent site search.

Understanding parents' views

23. A table showing all respondents and the option selected is available in **Annex 5** Consultation Analysis.
24. There were 216 responses from parent/carers of a child at RPJS (this includes those who also have a child at one of the infant schools or another school). The majority (77%) selected option 2 as a preferred option. Of the 216 almost half (100) left comments under option 2 that they wanted a solution on site with a small number of the 102 also mentioning another site (10) or to re-organise from infant and junior to primary (16). 31 of the 216 respondents left positive comments on re-organising from infant and junior to primary and 20 wanted to consider sites other than Woodhatch Place for the school. The 19% (40) who selected option 1 commented on a positive future for RPJS, positive impacts if travel and transport could be improved, benefits of a new bespoke building and positive impacts for children.
25. Holmesdale Community Infant School and Dovers Green Infant School are both feeder schools to Reigate Priory Junior School and therefore pupils at these schools are directly impacted by any change to Reigate Priory Junior School.
26. There were 98 responses from parent/carers of child at Holmesdale Infant School (not including those who also have a child at RPJS). The majority (96%) selected option 2 as a preferred option. Of the 98, almost half (46) left comments under option 2 that they wanted a solution on site with a small number of the 46 also mentioning another

site (6) or to re-organise from infant and junior to primary (12). 23 of the 98 respondents left positive comments on re-organising to primary and 12 wanted to consider sites other than Woodhatch Place for RPJS.

27. There were 67 responses from parent/carers of a child at Dovers Green Infant (not including those who also have a child at RPJS). The majority (96%) selected option 1 and left positive comments about re-locating RPJS to Woodhatch Place.

Understanding staff and their views on the current condition of the building

28. There were 35 responses from staff across the schools in Reigate. 71% of all staff selected option 1 and all staff at RPJS School who completed the survey, selected option 1. Staff mentioned difficulties faced in the current building and constraints of the site and positive impacts of re-locating.

Risk Management and Implications:

29. The Local Authority needs to be satisfied that the appropriate fair and open local consultation and or representation has been conducted and that the proposer has given full consideration to all responses received. To ensure that this is the case the consultation and decision-making processes are quality assured.
30. Surrey County Council has worked closely with the schools to ensure that parents, carers and young people know about the consultation proposals and have had sufficient opportunity to share their views through a number of channels including public and stakeholder meetings, written responses, email correspondence and online response forms. Social media, a leaflet drop and public engagement events in the area took place to ensure residents and other interested parties were aware of the consultation.
31. There are risks associated with the current site of RPJS at Priory Park. The school leadership team have risk management plans in place to mitigate the two key areas of safeguarding concern in the public right of way and the use of Priory Park.
32. The school cannot remain in its current form on the current site. Due to the nature of the buildings and related heritage designations the running cost of the school is far higher than for a modern educational establishment whilst the school remains at the current site. If a solution cannot be identified within a suitable timeframe there is a risk of the school becoming financially unviable due to the burden of the maintenance costs. This would result in a pressure on school places in the area with children displaced and educated outside of their community.

33. There is a risk that temporary accommodation could be needed for part or all of the school at any point whilst decisions are being made. Therefore, any delay in moving from the current site increases this risk. Temporary arrangements are already in place for 3 classrooms while work is undertaken to ensure safety of classrooms in the year 6 block.
34. There are risks identified for both options. Risks and issues are identified in **Annex 5** Options Appraisal. A risk register will continue throughout the next steps to ensure risks and issues are captured and mitigations implemented.

Financial and value for money implications:

Financial Reasons to move from the current site.

35. Surrey County Council has a capital maintenance budget for maintained schools where the council is obliged to fund and deliver lifecycle works. Finance figures for the last 5 years demonstrate works delivered at Reigate Priority Junior School (RPJS) cost approximately £181k, which is 1,108% more than an equivalent sized Primary School (The Greville Primary School, numbers on roll 665, which cost approximately £15k). In addition to this a dedicated team has been working with/ at the school to ensure that significant facilities issues continue to be addressed whilst the school remains at its current site. The ongoing premises issues are disproportionate as the school building is not fit for purpose and costs will continue to increase.
36. The school budget is impacted by additional staff time in planning and assessing risk to ensure safety of pupils. There are also higher utility bills without the options to reduce energy usage that would be available in a more modern school. The impacts are greater each year putting pressure on the school budget.
37. There is £10.7m of Priority Schools Building Programme 2 (PSBP2) funding currently committed from the DfE to relocate Reigate Priory Junior School, this funding could be at risk as the programme dates slip further. There is also an increased risk of withdrawal of this DfE funding, should the current funding priorities of the DfE change, which would create a huge and potentially unaffordable pressure on the School Basic Need capital grant fund.
38. The £10.7m of DfE funding from PSBP2 is conditional on direct replacement of a 5 form Entry RPJS and such funding may not be available for other options for future school provision identified via the working group. It may be possible to submit a business case for an alternative re-provision of Reigate Priory School however it is not known at what point the funding would be allocated elsewhere as the PSBP2 has closed.

39. Revenue funding would be needed to fund initial appraisals for option 2. This is estimated at approximately £0.6m. Costs associated with proceeding to feasibility would need to be agreed by the Director of Land & Property in conjunction with the Director for Education and Learning at the point that studies or assessment are needed. Any feasibility costs not directly leading to capital expenditure, will result in an unbudgeted revenue cost.
40. If option 1 or 2 lead to a new school at Woodhatch Place, the development costs will be met from the project budget included in the Capital Programme. If a school is not progressed on the Woodhatch site development costs relating to the site will need to be charged to revenue, resulting in an un-budgeted additional pressure on the Council's revenue budget. The development costs are estimated to be £2.6m (£2.4m incurred to date plus a further £0.2m).

Section 151 Officer commentary:

41. Significant progress has been made in recent years to improve the Council's financial resilience and the financial management capabilities across the organisation. Whilst this has built a stronger financial base from which to deliver our services, the increased cost of living, global financial uncertainty, high inflation and government policy changes mean we continue to face challenges to our financial position. This requires an increased focus on financial management to protect service delivery, a continuation of the need to be forward looking in the medium term, as well as the delivery of the efficiencies to achieve a balanced budget position each year.
42. In addition to these immediate challenges, the medium-term financial outlook beyond 2023/24 remains uncertain. With no clarity on central government funding in the medium term, our working assumption is that financial resources will continue to be constrained, as they have been for the majority of the past decade. This places an onus on the Council to continue to consider issues of financial sustainability as a priority, in order to ensure the stable provision of services in the medium term.
43. The recommendation to pursue option 2 requires consideration of the potential additional revenue costs of up to £3.2m, which would add pressure to the Council's budget, if it results in the school being located elsewhere and option 2 feasibilities do not lead to capital expenditure. This amount consists of £2.6m of development costs relating specifically to the Woodhatch Place site and £0.6m of feasibility costs relating to option 2. In addition, this option puts the £10.7m capital grant at risk.

Legal implications – Monitoring Officer:

44. When considering changes to schools, regard must be had to the January 2023 statutory guidance “Making significant changes (‘prescribed alterations’) to maintained schools”. Local authorities must also adhere to the usual principles of public law when making decisions. Local authorities must act rationally and within their powers, take into account all relevant and no irrelevant considerations and follow a fair procedure.
45. Option 1 contained in the report does not fall within the prescribed alterations contained in Reg 5 of the School Organisation (Prescribed Alterations to Maintained Schools) (England) Regulations 2013 as the proposal is to move the School to a site less than two miles from the current main entrance. The statutory consultation procedure does not apply. However, the statutory guidance provides although there is no statutory ‘pre-publication’ consultation period for prescribed alteration changes, there is a strong expectation that local authorities will consult interested parties in developing their proposal prior to publication, to take into account all relevant considerations.
46. The consultation process set out in the report describes the responses from interested persons for members consideration. The general principles for a lawful consultation process must be adhered to:
- It must take place when proposals are still at a formative stage. A final decision has not yet been made, or predetermined, by the decision makers.
 - there is sufficient information to allow consultees to give ‘intelligent consideration.’ The information provided must relate to the consultation and must be available, accessible, and easily interpretable for consultees to provide an informed response.
 - there is adequate time for consideration and response. There must be sufficient opportunity for consultees to participate in the consultation. There is no set timeframe for consultation.
 - ‘Conscientious consideration’ must be given to the consultation responses before a decision is made. Decision-makers should be able to provide evidence that they took consultation responses into account.
47. As well as consultation responses. The other relevant matters to take into account include, but are not limited to: -
- Whether, and if so why, there is need to move in educational terms i.e., educational advantages vs disadvantages
 - why the proposed site has been identified and why it is considered appropriate in physical terms
 - accessibility for pupils and staff. The latter will involve considering transport patterns, the Council’s transport policies, and the availability of transport

- cost/savings and affordability
- plans for effecting the move, and minimising disruption
- equalities implications and in particular the “public sector equality duty” under the Equalities Act 2010 to have due regard to eliminate discrimination, and to advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it. In this regard in particular any move to new premises is likely to involve consideration of the impact (beneficial or otherwise) on people with disabilities (physical and other), both through layout of the site and through the availability of transport. This, and other equalities implications, is a matter considered in the Equality Impact Assessment at **Annex 6**.
- the Council’s duty under the Children Act 2004 to make arrangements for ensuring that its functions are discharged having regard to the need to safeguard and promote the welfare of children.
- possible community impact of closure and opening.

Equalities and diversity:

48. The Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) for the proposal is attached to this report as **Annex 6**.

Other implications:

49. The potential implications for the following Council priorities and policy areas have been considered.

Area assessed:	Direct Implications:
Corporate Parenting/Looked After Children	<p>Improving and sustaining availability and accessibility of primary school provision in Reigate supports the Surrey Corporate Parenting Strategy 2020 in ensuring consistent education for children “looked after” by Surrey County Council.</p> <p>Any impacts for looked after children and their carers will continue to be assessed throughout as further decisions are made.</p>
Safeguarding responsibilities for vulnerable children and adults	Safeguarding vulnerable children is a high priority in all Surrey schools. Schools have considerable expertise in safeguarding vulnerable children and adhere to robust procedures. The schools will continue to apply good practise around safeguarding as they

	<p>do currently. In addition, safeguarding is a key area for monitoring when Ofsted conducts inspections.</p> <p>The Council has a duty to promote and improve safeguarding in education as well as educational outcomes for all children and young people who are vulnerable or disadvantaged.</p>
Environmental sustainability	<p>Exploring options further to identify school places that are closer to home and/or improving travel and transport will reduce journey times and impacts on traffic in the area.</p> <p>For any project, as part of option 2, requiring planning permission the County Planning Authority will advise the Council (as applicant) on the need for the project to be subject to statutory Environmental Impact Assessment.</p> <p>In regard to the planning application for Woodhatch Place, County Planning Authority issued a formal Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Screening Opinion on 8 April 2022 (SCC ref. 2022/0035) concluding that the proposed school development was not 'EIA development'. The County Council as applicant was therefore not required to undertake an EIA prior to the submission of the planning application.</p> <p>Any major refurbishments and new builds design will be guided by the LETI energy standards. The standards promote high standards for energy efficient, maximising onsite renewable energy, and low carbon heating including heat pumps.</p>
Compliance against net-zero emissions target and future climate compatibility/resilience	<p>Design philosophy that has been adopted to create new or refurbish and extend existing buildings will support low energy consumption, reduce solar gain, and promote natural ventilation. Any proposals will be in line with this policy and any new building will be to the standards in the local planning authority's adopted core planning strategy. Commitment to drive forward the transition to a zero-carbon built</p>

	environment, through the pursuit of lower operational energy use, increased supply of renewable energy to Surrey's buildings and reduced embodied carbon – the GHG emissions associated with non-operational phases like construction.
Public Health	<p>The health of people in Reigate and Banstead is generally better than the England average. Reigate and Banstead is one of the 20% least deprived districts/unitary authorities in England, however about 9.3% (2,470) children live in low-income families. Life expectancy for both men and women is higher than the England average.</p> <p>Provision of sufficient, sustainable, accessible and inclusive primary school places in Reigate, so that all children and young people benefit from an education that helps them succeed in life, is linked to average GCSE attainment which is reported as a "wider determinant of health" in Public Health England Local Area Health Profile. In 2018/19 47.2% of 15-16 year olds in Reigate & Banstead gained average GCSE attainment slightly higher than the national average (46.9%) and slightly lower than the average in Surrey (47.9%).</p>

WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:

50. If Cabinet agree the recommendations the following activities will commence:

Provisional date	Activity
March 2024	Working group described in Annex 1 commences.
March 2024	The planning application for option 1 is re-submitted with amendments to address the reasons for refusal.
April/May 2024	Initial viability for an option or options identified by the working group.

A further report will be submitted to Cabinet following the activities above.

Contact Officer:

Jane Keenan, Commissioning Manager, jane.keenan@surreycc.gov.uk

Consulted:

- Tim Oliver, Surrey County Council, Leader of the Council
- Clare Curran, Surrey County Council, Cabinet Children and Families Lifelong Learning
- Rachael Wardell, Surrey County Council, Executive Director Children Families and Learning
- Liz Mills, Surrey County Council, Strategic Director for Customer Transformation
- Julia Katherine, Surrey County Council, Director of Education and Learning
- Simon Crowther, Surrey County Council, Director of Land & Property
- Carrie Traill, Surrey County Council, Head of Education
- James Painter, Surrey County Council, Programme Director
- Pasqualina Puglisi, Surrey County Council, Contracts Manager
- Mike Singleton, Surrey County Council, Service Manager, Education Place Planning
- Jane Keenan, Surrey County Council, Commissioning Manager, Education Place Planning
- Oliver Moses, Reigate Priory Junior School, Headteacher
- Pamela Hutchinson, Chair of Governors, Reigate Priory Junior School
- Leadership of all schools in the primary planning area of Reigate
- Greensand Trust
- Everychild Partnership Trust
- Public consultation with all members of the community and stakeholders

Annexes:

Annex 1 Working group terms of reference

Annex 2 Why Reigate Priory Junior School cannot remain in its current form at Priory Park

Annex 3 Updated Education needs analysis

Annex 4 Options Appraisal

Annex 5 Consultation analysis report

Annex 6 Equality Impact Assessment

Annex 7 The alternative site assessment in Reigate for Reigate Priory Junior School