CONCLUSIONS

As identified at the outset of this document, this draft of the Surrey Infrastructure Study presents an overarching baseline of growth patterns, infrastructure projects and cost requirements and gaps. It has been produced drawing upon information obtained through Surrey County Council officers and following a period of engagement with the Local Authorities and other infrastructure providers.

The study provides a "snap-shot" in time, reflecting the position during July 2015. It must be remembered that the growth and development context is in a constant state of flux and with all LPAs in Surrey at varying stages in developing and implementing their local plans, and negotiating planning consents, the position will change over time.

The preparation of the study has demonstrated strong collaborative working between the county and local authorities. It has however shown that shortfalls exist in terms of a standardised agreed approach towards a study of this kind including the collection of data on housing and employment sites, population forecasting, modelling infrastructure requirements and the costs and funding assumptions for that infrastructure.

The following key findings have been established:

- Surrey authorities are planning to accommodate housing and economic growth over the 15 year period to 2030 delivering on average **3,137 dwellings per year.** This compares to completions of 2,495 dwellings per year across Surrey from 2010 to 2014.
- **47,053 dwellings** are expected between 2015 and 2030 with an associated population **increase of 60,991 people** (an increase of 5%).
- Delivering the necessary infrastructure to support that growth from now to 2030 is estimated to **cost at least £5.37 billion.**
- The study has estimated a combination of secured funding (over £993 million) and potential funding from the public sector, private sector and developer contributions (£1.23 billion). It is important to note that a full review of the funding position for each project included in the study is required to refine this estimation. This has been outside the scope of this project.
- Taking into consideration the potential funding identified, a **minimum gap in infrastructure funding of 3.2 billion** still remains between now and 2030.
- The study demonstrates that current anticipated developer contributions, Central Government grants and other sources of income are not sufficient to support the scale of growth anticipated in Surrey in the period to 2030. This is without consideration of further potential changes to current funding sources which may reduce finances further, such as reduction

in grants or additional exemptions from the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

- CIL is at varying stages of adoption across the county reflecting variations in land value and the amount of money that will be collected. The identified funding gap should be considered and taken into account when setting CIL rates.
- The infrastructure requirements and associated costs presented represent a **minimum scenario** as these are based on a population forecast constrained by planned housing sites as opposed to ONS population forecasts.
- **ONS population forecasts for Surrey over the same 15 year period are 132% higher than the study forecasts.** The estimated costs associated with the infrastructure to support the population growth could therefore be increased considerably if a growth level nearer the ONS forecast was realised.

The following key steps have been identified for Surrey and its partners to take the study findings forward:

- Revisit the evidence base behind this study on a regular basis in collaboration with partners to maintain a rolling understanding of the infrastructure landscape and funding priorities.
- Consider the implications of infrastructure providers decisions both now and in the future. This study has used standard metrics to determine requirements for some infrastructure elements (such as healthcare, libraries, community and leisure, youth services, social care accommodation etc), but the actual requirements will be heavily dependent on service decisions on new delivery models which are affected by regulatory, financial and technological changes.
- Use the study as a tool for engagement with Central Government in demonstrating the challenges faced in supporting growth within the county.
- Continue to work with local authorities and other infrastructure providers to maintain an up-to-date understanding of growth distribution and supporting infrastructure.
- Use the study as a basis for identifying local level shortfalls to support bids for future funding, including potential means outlined in Section 6.
- Undertake further work to review funding sources and cost assumptions to verify the study assumptions to assist in making representations to Central Government on infrastructure and funding issues.
- Conduct an in-depth review of potential funding mechanisms and their ability to fund infrastructure in the county.
- Develop a wider linkage to asset management reviews to best utilise county council estate.
- Continue dialogue with the GLA and CLG on wider growth issues including London overspill.
- Continue to work with the Local Enterprise Partnerships and other county councils in the South East on strategic issues and priorities - in particular transport - to support growth. This may include linkages to London and radial routes to better connect the wider South East. In addition, considering the impacts of major infrastructure proposals such as airport expansion and the Crossrail extension.
- The study also provides an opportunity with regards to Green Infrastructure for Surrey to lead the way by embracing a “natural capital approach” to its future decision making in the widest sense and not just as a Green Infrastructure initiative.
- Improve understanding and dialogue with evolving infrastructure delivery and management regimes, i.e. NHS services, adult education, library services etc.
- Develop a long-term strategy for infrastructure investment and how it relates to planned growth, phasing, and the relationships (i.e potential synergies and conflicts) between different types of investment .