



South East Plan
Issue 8H London Fringe
8Hiii Infrastructure and Implementation

8Hiii.1 Have the water supply and waste water treatment, flood risk, and transport implications of the growth proposals been adequately considered (Policy LF5)?

1 Demand for water and transport infrastructure is a product of both population and the local economy. At this stage whilst overall infrastructure costs at the regional level¹ and at the sub-regional level² have been generated specific transport and other infrastructure requirements arising from the housing and economic provision are not quantified. For example, transport infrastructure for the regional hubs is simply identified as “improved public transport in Guildford, Woking and Redhill/Reigate” with no indication of the nature or scale of required investment.

2 Further work to identify the required investment in infrastructure at the sub-regional level is essential in order to conform to the key principle in the South East Plan that development will only be accommodated where infrastructure is adequate or will be brought forward in time.

3 The Council has serious concerns regarding the provisions for water supply and the inadequacy of the surface water drainage system, particularly in light of the implications of climate change, to cope with the level of development envisaged in the submitted South East Plan. The Council has included within its submitted Core Strategy³ the overall objective of “a Borough which leads the way on high quality sustainable development and addresses climate change”; and has employed the approach of requiring all new development to incorporate a sustainable water management system.

4 Implications for transport in Woking are addressed through the Guildford and Woking Integrated Transport Study (GWITS). A key issue is traffic congestion in the peak hour. GWITS has forecast a potential increase in peak hour traffic in Guildford and Woking of around 15% over the next ten years. However, the submitted Woking Core Strategy adopts the principle that for this target to be achieved a significant shift to public transport use, walking or cycling is required, together with other changes in travel behaviour such as more working from home or making journeys outside the

¹ See Fig 3 Infrastructure Costs for South East England, “Delivering the South East Plan – a revised South East Plan Implementation Plan”; SEERA, 30 October 2006.

² See Annex 3.5: London Fringe, “Delivering the South East Plan – a revised South East Plan Implementation Plan”; SEERA, 30 October 2006.

³ Core Strategy Submission Document Woking LDF October 2006

peak hour. The Council's strategy is to manage travel, while investing in transport infrastructure improvements, particularly serving Woking town centre; this accompanies the intention to focus higher density development in the town centre thus maximising the opportunity for use of public transport, walking and cycling. This approach is consistent with the submitted South East Plan.

5 Woking BC would prefer the implementation plan to be part of the published RSS document. If this is not feasible the Council supports the prospect of using it as part of a Multi-Area Agreement. Furthermore, the Council supports the statement from GOSE, made at the Examination on the status of the implementation plan, to the effect that, although it is not a statutory requirement, it would be a material consideration if:

- a. It is in a form consistent with PPS11 and other Government policy;
- b. It does not itself contain policies and proposals (though it is possible to put in implementation mechanisms for policies/proposals that are set out elsewhere in the plan); and
- c. It is set out in a way that gives it the same status as supporting text (which forms part of the statutory document).

8Hiii.2 Are the proposals in the Implementation Plan⁴ (including for social and green infrastructure) clear, justified and well related to the spatial strategy? What are the priorities?

6 Demand for education, health, social, green and public service infrastructure is largely a product of the size of the local population. The assessment undertaken for SEERA by Roger Tym and Partners⁵ suggests the order of cost for provision of this type of infrastructure in the London Fringe sub-region is some 4.1% of that required for the region as a whole⁶. Given that the order of housing proposed for the sub-region is some 6.5% of the total regional provision this suggests that there is an apparent mismatch between housing provision and infrastructure expectations.

7 Forecasts from Surrey County Council suggest that the population of Woking might rise by around 7,000 to 97,000 by 2026. The single biggest increase would be in the population over retirement age. The population of school age might not rise at all. This implies that demand for health care for the elderly could be a major issue, as it is likely to be throughout the country, but extra school provision for children may not be required locally. Thus inevitably there will be local variations from the sub-regional estimates.

8 The revised Implementation Plan states that it provides a framework within which detailed implementation plans can be prepared at the sub-regional and local levels. As such it is a general framework for delivery rather than providing the actual means of delivery. Thus, whilst it is based on generally sound data and intelligence and makes a good case for the level of overall investment required at the regional level it is not a detailed investment programme with commitment by providers. Priorities are not clearly stated and it would benefit from a clearer explanation of how providers will be required to bring their forward budgets in line with and comply with the indicated infrastructure requirements.

⁴ Updated by SEERA prior to EiP and available online at <http://www.southeast-ra.gov.uk/southeastplan/key/infrastructure.html>

⁵ See Annex 4: Local Infrastructure Costs, "Delivering the South East Plan – a revised South East Plan Implementation Plan"; SEERA, 30 October 2006.

⁶ See annex 1.

8Hiii.3 *Would it be appropriate to include a requirement for a tariff-based approach to be applied to all new development in the sub-region (Policy LF5)?*

9 The introduction of the Planning Gain Supplement is by no means certain. A tariff system is the fairest and most straightforward method of delivering social and physical infrastructure. To enable a region-wide approach would need a co-ordinated effort to put such a tariff in place.

10 The work by the Surrey authorities⁷ in preparing a code of practice in relation to the use of planning obligations in delivering infrastructure improvements builds on the pioneering work of Milton Keynes, Ashford and other authorities. The Surrey code aims to require contributions towards essential infrastructure from all scales of development, thus overcoming the long-standing issue of how to cope with the cumulative impact of small scale development. The Surrey approach has been informed by Counsel's opinion and by a supportive letter from GOSE. The Surrey authorities currently intend to adopt the Code as interim guidance pending preparation of formal SPDs.

11 This demonstrates that authorities are willing and able to secure increased funding from developments for essential infrastructure improvements. There is no reason why such an approach could not be replicated by other authorities throughout the region.

SEE ALSO THE COUNCIL'S RESPONSE TO ISSUE 8Hii.4 "Is the proposed link between development and infrastructure provision reasonable and capable of being implemented?" Doc Ref WokBC 8Hii

⁷ As part of the PAS/I&DeA funded Surrey Planning Collaboration Project.

Annex 1 Education, health, social, green and public service infrastructure costs in the London Fringe sub-region 2006 - 2026⁸

affordable housing	735,269,996
primary schools	102,650,692
secondary schools	204,204,084
local health	2,824,495
social & community	34,334,887
sports	2,795,051
swimming pools	1,476,383
play areas	10,743,909
open space	15,798,250
libraries	1,460,319
archives	292,064
cemetaries	23,845
total	1,111,873,975

Total for region £27,289,000,000

⁸ Derived from Annex 4: Local Infrastructure Costs, "Delivering the South East Plan – a revised South East Plan Implementation Plan"; SEERA, 30 October 2006.