Table 3.2: Business Registrations by Borough or District, 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surrey Borough or District</th>
<th>Registrations per 10,000 adults in descending order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elmbridge</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waverley</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mole Valley</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woking</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey Heath</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guildford</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelthorne</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runnymede</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tandridge</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reigate and Banstead</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epsom &amp; Ewell</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data produced by the Department for Business, Enterprise and Regulatory Reform, Enterprise Directorate (BERR)

3.3.3 Small and Medium Enterprises

Surrey has one of the highest rates of micro-businesses in the South East (Annex 3a). Buckinghamshire is the only LEA comparator county that has a greater proportion (89.4%) of micro-businesses than Surrey.

Of Surrey businesses:
- 99.5% are small and medium enterprises (SMEs – under 250 employees)
- 97% employ under 50 people
- 88.2% are micro-businesses under 10 employees
- 81% employ fewer than five staff.

Conversely, Surrey has a relatively low level of medium-sized businesses (2.3% of all businesses fall into the 50-199 employees category). Surrey therefore has the second lowest level of medium sized businesses of all its LEA comparators (except Buckinghamshire – 2.1%).

Comparing boroughs and districts within the county (Annex 3a), using ABI data, it can be seen that:
- Elmbridge has the highest proportion of micro-businesses (i.e. one to 10 employees)
- Guildford has the highest proportion of larger small businesses (i.e. 10-49 employees)
- Spelthorne has the highest proportion of medium-sized businesses (50-199 employees)
- Runnymede has the highest proportion of large enterprises (200+ employees).

---

36 The term ‘micro–business’ is used to describe an enterprise with up to 10 employees.
37 The revised European Union definition, used for EU statistical comparisons, defines a small enterprise as one with employment less than 50, and a medium enterprise as one with employment of at least 50 but less than 250. Large enterprises have 250 or more staff. The term ‘micro’ is often used to describe an enterprise with up to 10 employees.
It is not possible to use official data sources to examine the reasons for the predominance of micro-businesses in Surrey (and lack of medium-sized businesses), but Surrey’s economic stakeholders and local research provide a number of likely reasons:

- Surrey has an economy that supports innovation and business start-ups, spin-outs and entrepreneurship.
- Surrey has a high level of home-based businesses. According to data from the Insights Research Programme (2008)\(^{38}\), Surrey has a higher proportion of home-based SMEs (44%) than the South East (42%) – Annex 3b.
- The economy is predominantly a knowledge-based economy, which will frequently buy in niche professional and business services and utilise micro-business suppliers.
- Surrey has few manufacturing firms, which tend to have larger numbers of employees.
- Towns in Surrey are relatively small in size and therefore less likely to be able to accommodate larger firms.
- The natural environment and planning restrictions associated with it (e.g. the green belt and AONB) restrict expansion of businesses.

### 3.4 BUSINESS DENSITY

Given the predominance of micro-businesses in the county, it is not surprising to find that Surrey has the second highest level of business density (58 businesses per 1,000 adult resident population); Buckinghamshire having the highest business density of the comparators with 66 businesses per 1,000 (see Figure 3.1).

![Figure 3.1: Business Density: LEA Comparators, 2008](image)

Source: BERR; ONS 2008 mid-year population estimates used

---

\(^{38}\) Insights Research Programme undertaken by Business Link. Source: South East Business Monitor, combined dataset waves 8, 9, 10 & 11, un-weighted base: All respondents: Surrey = 780 (reported in Enterprise in Surrey: Key Statistics 2008).
Table 3.3 shows that Waverley and Mole Valley have the highest business densities in Surrey with 72 and 71 businesses per 1,000 respectively. Epsom & Ewell has the lowest business density at 45 per 1,000.

### Table 3.3: Business Stock (Surrey Boroughs and Districts), 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surrey borough or district</th>
<th>Businesses per 1,000 adults (aged 16+) in descending order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waverley</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mole Valley</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmbridge</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tandridge</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey Heath</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guildford</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woking</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runnymede</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reigate and Banstead</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelthorne</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epsom &amp; Ewell</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: BERR; ONS 2008 mid-year population estimates used*

### 3.5 BUSINESS SECTORS

Figure 3.2 below shows the importance to Surrey’s economy of the ‘banking, finance and insurance’ sector, which accounts for 44% of all businesses in the county. Surrey has attracted many large (and small) financial sector businesses from their traditional base in London, by being able to offer good quality but cheaper accommodation, a supply of highly qualified people and good access into London by road and rail.

*Source: Annual Business Inquiry 2008 (ONS)*
Between 2007 and 2008, Surrey saw an above average (i.e. South East and Great Britain average) increase in the number of firms in all major sectors apart from ‘other services’ and ‘distribution, hotels and catering’. Most noticeable is the almost 4% rise in numbers of ‘public administration’ businesses. This has important implications in light of the contraction of public funding under the current government (see Figure 3.3).

**Figure 3.3: Percentage Change in Number of Firms by Sector (2007-2008)**

![Bar chart showing percentage change in numbers of firms by sector](source: Annual Business Inquiry, 2008 (ONS))

**SEEDA Sector Analysis**

A number of key sectors have been identified by SEEDA as being critical to the future growth of the South East economy – i.e. ‘priority sectors’:

- Advanced Engineering & Marine
- ICT, Software & Digital Media
- Pharmaceuticals, Life Sciences & Healthcare
- Environment & Energy
- Aerospace & Defence
- Financial & Professional Services.

These sectors are worth £66 billion (42%) to the South East economy and employ 1.5m (35%) people. SEEDA’s sector profiling work has mapped the clusters of the biggest companies in Surrey by priority sector. The following map (Figure 3.4) shows the location of the top 100 most strategic businesses in Surrey (by turnover). The biggest clusters of such companies are to be found in the north of the county, especially around Chertsey, Addlestone and Weybridge. There are also clusters around Esher and Epsom, Woking, Dorking and Horley. These represent the head office locations of some of the largest companies in Europe and the world.

---

39 Time series comparison to years before 2007 is not reliable due to data discontinuities.
40 GVA (2005 constant prices).
41 Source: SEEDA, Presentation on Priority Sectors given by the Head of Economic Research.
3.6 BUSINESS SURVIVAL AND BUSINESS GROWTH

Surrey has a high business survival rate. After one year (based on businesses ‘born’ in 2003), 94.3% were still in business (a higher rate than all the other county LEA comparators)\(^{42}\) (Annex 3d). After five years, the survival rate is 50.2%, which is the joint second highest rate among the LEA comparators.

Table 3.4 shows that, Surrey’s small businesses grew more slowly (between 2007 and 2008) than businesses across the South East and Great Britain as a whole (using the National Indicator NI172\(^{43}\)). Relative to its LEA comparators, Surrey businesses grew more slowly than those in Cambridgeshire and Oxfordshire.

---


\(^{43}\) Percentage of small businesses showing employment growth.
Table 3.4: Percentage of Small Businesses Showing Employment Growth (National Indicator NI172)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2007 Employment &lt;50</th>
<th>2008 Employment increase</th>
<th>NI172&lt;sup&gt;46&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great Britain</td>
<td>1,937,410</td>
<td>278,020</td>
<td>14.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>322,375</td>
<td>43,870</td>
<td>13.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>51,145</td>
<td>6,820</td>
<td>13.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmbridge</td>
<td>6,850</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>12.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epsom &amp; Ewell</td>
<td>2,675</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>12.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guildford</td>
<td>6,295</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>14.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mole Valley</td>
<td>4,600</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>13.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reigate and Banstead</td>
<td>5,465</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>12.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runnymede</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>14.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelthorne</td>
<td>3,375</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>12.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey Heath</td>
<td>3,870</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>12.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tandridge</td>
<td>4,005</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>14.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waverley</td>
<td>6,625</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>13.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woking</td>
<td>3,885</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkshire</td>
<td>Not available&lt;sup&gt;47&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>Not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckinghamshire</td>
<td>24,870</td>
<td>3,115</td>
<td>12.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxfordshire</td>
<td>25,205</td>
<td>3,520</td>
<td>13.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridgeshire</td>
<td>22,765</td>
<td>3,180</td>
<td>13.97%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Department for Work and Pensions (DWP)

3.7 BUSINESS CHALLENGES

3.7.1 Access to skills
The National Employer Skills Survey, 2009 (NESS) reveals that Surrey has a low percentage of skill shortage vacancies, relative to its economic comparators. Figure 3.5 shows that 12% of vacancies in Surrey were skill shortage vacancies, a rate less than all comparator economies, the South East and Great Britain.

<sup>44</sup> The number of registered enterprises with employment of less than 50 in their first year and that still exist in the second year.
<sup>45</sup> The number of enterprises with an increase in employment by the second year.
<sup>46</sup> Percentage of small businesses in an area showing employment growth. This is calculated by dividing the number of enterprises with employment growth by the number of registered enterprises with employment <50.
<sup>47</sup> Data not available at an aggregated level.
Figure 3.5: Percentage of Skills Shortage Vacancies


Figure 3.6 shows the percentage of occupations that are suffering from skill shortage vacancies in Surrey. It indicates that ‘professionals’, ‘personal service staff’ and ‘customer service staff’ are the occupations that have the most skills shortage vacancies. The occupational categories of ‘managers’ and ‘administrative/ clerical staff’ have the least skills shortage vacancies.

Figure 3.6: Percentage of Skills Shortage Vacancies by Occupation


Further evidence from the 2009 NESS suggests that, where there are skill shortage vacancies, the most commonly lacking skills are: technical/ practical skills, oral communication, customer handling, and written communication skills. Over one fifth of Surrey employers noted that general IT, numeracy and literacy skills were an issue.

48 Up to and including 2007 data only.
3.7.2 Impact of the recession on business in Surrey

It is the case that much of the published data on the economy predates the recession and current economic downturn. It has therefore been necessary to turn to alternative sources to get an idea of the effect of the recession on businesses in Surrey. The National Business Survey\(^{49}\) provides information on business performance and confidence.

The scale of the downturn was highly apparent, with almost two thirds (64%) of businesses in Surrey reporting that their business performance has deteriorated since mid-2008, and slightly under three quarters (72%) stating that their level of output was below capacity. Two thirds of firms reported that their profit margins had decreased since mid-2008.

In Surrey 43% of businesses had made redundancies in the 12 months between mid-2008 and mid-2009, the highest proportion of all counties in the South East.

Investment since mid-2008 was low in Surrey, and seemed set to stay low, with more firms expecting to reduce spending on investment between mid-2009 and mid-2010 (33%) than those expecting to increase spending (19%). However, there was some evidence to suggest that the tough business climate might be helping to foster innovation with more firms in Surrey than in previous surveys (i.e. December and August 2008) reporting new product or process developments.

The results of the Winter/Spring 2010 South East Business Snapshot Survey, undertaken for SEEDA, revealed that Surrey businesses are starting to see improved business performance. Surrey had the highest share of businesses reporting improved performance (41%) in the South East, the same rate as Kent.

The Surrey Chambers of Commerce Quarterly Economic Survey (March 2010) also found there to be a general feeling that business would improve in the coming months and that, despite the days of trade lost through the very bad weather at the beginning of the year, the prospects for companies in Surrey would be a lot better than they were a year ago.

Business growth (Jan-Mar 2010) remained steady, with a very slight increase in the numbers recording growth to 37.5%, compared with the previous 3 months. It was a similar picture with exports with a 10.5% increase. Advance orders had also improved on the past quarter, with a 12.5% increase.

Staffing levels had remained constant and the majority (83%) of new staff were recruited into full-time, professional positions.

Cash flow had remained the same for 48% of the respondents with 30% showing a decrease and only 23% an increase, and 81% were still operating below their full capacity.

\(^{49}\) The National Business Survey (NBS) 2009 was conducted by Ipsos MORI on behalf of the Regional Development Agency Network and Invest Northern Ireland. Over 5,300 companies responded from all sectors of the economy. In the July 2009 survey, 125 businesses from Surrey were interviewed (source: SEEDA, Profile of Surrey, draft dated July 2009, unpublished).
Concerns existed within 25% of those polled regarding business and interest rates, but competition was still the biggest perceived threat to improved profitability at 20%, with worries about corporation tax high at 13% and inflation at 19%. Finding and retaining new customers was the biggest worry (39%).

3.7.3 Economic Recovery
In November 2009, Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners produced an Economic Outlook report – *The Geography of Recovery*. In it, they combined a number of past trends and forward-looking indicators to create a composite measure of the prospects for recovery – a ‘recovery index’ – that included:

- The immediate impact of the recession (i.e. rise in unemployment over the past two years)
- Scaled of house price slump
- Skills levels and entrepreneurialism
- Exposure to ‘at risk’ public sector activities.

The recovery index found that Elmbridge had the highest potential for recovery in Surrey (ranking third in the UK after Kensington and Chelsea and Chiltern). Mole Valley ranked fifth.

**Strategic implications**

- The public and financial services sectors are both expected to contract. Public sector jobs cuts will have a knock on effect for the private sector. Decreasing levels of economic activity will have a direct impact on the productivity of the county over time and have an impact on procurement and local supply chains.

- There is a danger in only focussing on the ‘big players’ in terms of understanding Surrey’s sectors and clusters. It is also important to understand the distribution of smaller, innovative businesses that have the potential to generate future high growth.

- There is need for ongoing investment in national business surveys with robust sample sizes for the sub-regions.
4: LABOUR MARKET

4.1 INTRODUCTION
One of the key ingredients of any successful economy is the availability of an appropriately skilled labour market. This chapter considers economic activity and employment by sector, earnings, occupation, and travel to work flows.

4.2 HEADLINES
- 79.3% of the working age population in Surrey is economically active (i.e. employed or seeking work).
- 75.4% of the Surrey working age population is in employment. Of its working age population, 12.1% are self-employed.
- The average weekly earnings of Surrey residents in 2009 were £623.40 (compared to workplace-based earnings of £561.90).
- One in five of Surrey residents in employment are managers or senior officials.
- 30% of employees in Surrey are in the ‘banking, finance and insurance’ sector and 24% are in the ‘public administration, education and health’ sector.
- 64% of Surrey residents work within the county. Of those that work outside the county, London is the most common destination. About 9% travel to work in Outer London boroughs, and 10% in Inner London boroughs.
- In the year to March 2010, there were 27,800 unemployed people in Surrey (i.e. 4.8% of the working age population).
- In August 2010, there were 12,263 people claiming Jobseeker’s Allowance in Surrey (1.7% of the resident working age population). This compares favourably to the South East (2.4%) and Great Britain (3.6%).
- The number of people aged 20-24 claiming Jobseeker’s Allowance has more than doubled, from 815 in February 2008 to a peak of 2,660 in August 2009 (2,210 in August 2010).

4.3 ECONOMIC ACTIVITY
A person is defined as being economically active if they are either employed or are unemployed but want to supply their labour to produce goods and services. Therefore, economic activity is on the supply side of the labour market.

79.3% of the working age population (using the new definition\(^{50}\)) in Surrey are economically active (Table 4.1).

\(^{50}\) Working age population definition changed in August 2010 to include all people aged 16-64.
Table 4.1: Employment/ Economic Activity Rates (April 2009 – March 2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Activity</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>% aged 16-64</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economically active</td>
<td>584,000</td>
<td>79.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In employment</td>
<td>556,200</td>
<td>75.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>461,600</td>
<td>62.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td>91,000</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>27,800</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Annual Population Survey, April 2009 – March 2010 (ONS)

Although its economic activity rate is higher than that of the UK as a whole (see Table 4.2), Surrey has the second lowest economic activity rate of all its LEA comparators (except Oxfordshire, which has the lowest rate).

Table 4.2: Comparator Economic Activity Rates (April 2009 - March 2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>% aged 16-64</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>30,399,900</td>
<td>76.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>4,265,600</td>
<td>79.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>565,100</td>
<td>79.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkshire</td>
<td>452,800</td>
<td>81.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckinghamshire</td>
<td>252,200</td>
<td>80.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxfordshire</td>
<td>326,800</td>
<td>78.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridgeshire</td>
<td>315,900</td>
<td>79.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Annual Population Survey, April 2009 – March 2010 (ONS)

Surrey’s economic activity rate has been falling in recent years. It was 81.7% in April 2005/ March 2006. A diminishing level of economic activity can be caused by a number of factors including:

- an ageing population
- high levels of early retirement
- a growing number of people choosing not to work.

The latter two categories are often associated with a wealthy resident population.

A comparison of boroughs and districts (Annex 4a) within Surrey shows that Runnymede has the highest level of economic activity (81.9% of the working age population); while Surrey Heath has the lowest level (76.5%).

4.4 EMPLOYMENT AND SELF-EMPLOYMENT

Employment and self-employment are key factors in the overall economic productivity of a locality.

Surrey benefits from relatively high levels of employment. Of the working age population, 75.4% are in employment (see Table 4.3). Surrey is on a par with its LEA comparators, Berkshire having the highest employment rate.
Table 4.3: Employment Rates (April 2009 - Mar 2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Employment rate - aged 16-64 %</th>
<th>% aged 16-64 (employees)</th>
<th>% aged 16-64 (self employed) %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>70.2</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surrey</strong></td>
<td><strong>75.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>62.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>12.1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkshire</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckinghamshire</td>
<td>75.4</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxfordshire</td>
<td>75.2</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridgeshire</td>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Annual Population Survey, April 2009 – March 2010 (ONS)

Surrey also has a high level of self-employment – 12.1% of its working age population are self-employed, which is the second highest self-employment rate among its LEA comparators (Buckinghamshire having the highest rate at 13.0%).

Figure 4.1 plots the change in employment rates since 2004 and highlights the implications of the recent recession. Between April 2007/ March 2008 and April 2009/ March 2010, the percentage of economically active people in employment in Surrey fell from 78.4% to 75.4%; this reflects national and regional trends, but the relative fall has been greater in Surrey than in the South East and Great Britain.

Figure 4.1: Percentage Working Age Resident Economically Active Population in Employment (January 2004 – March 2010)

Source: Annual Population Survey, January 2004 – March 2010 (ONS)

Of those Surrey residents in employment, 73.4% work full-time (90.7% of men and 56.7% of women)\(^52\). These figures mirror regional and national working patterns (Figure 4.2).

---

\(^51\) Working Age defined as aged 16-64.  
Figure 4.2: Full-time and Part-time Employment, 2009/10 (Percentage Working Age in Employment)

Source: Annual Population Survey, April 2009 – March 2010 (ONS)

4.5 EARNINGS
Table 4.4 shows that the average earnings of Surrey residents in 2009 were £623.40 (median\(^{53}\) gross weekly pay for full-time workers). This is the highest of all the ‘shire’ counties in Surrey’s LEA comparator group and higher than the national and regional average. Within Surrey, Elmbridge residents earn the highest amount (£707.60 per week) and Tandridge residents earn the least (£556.80 per week).

The earnings of those people working in Surrey are lower (at £561.90 per week) although they are still higher than the earnings of its LEA comparator areas. The difference between residence-based and workplace-based earnings can be explained by the influence of commuting patterns (i.e. the fact that many Surrey residents travel out of Surrey to highly-paid jobs in London and elsewhere). It also suggests that jobs in Surrey-based businesses are less well paid.

\(^{53}\) These statistics are based on the median rather than the mean. The median is the value below which 50% of employees fall. It is preferred over the mean for earnings data as it is influenced less by extreme values and because of the skewed distribution of earnings data.
## Table 4.4: Median Gross Weekly Pay for Full-time Workers, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Residence-based</th>
<th>Workplace-based</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>£488.70</td>
<td>£488.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>£536.60</td>
<td>£513.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td><strong>£623.40</strong></td>
<td><strong>£561.90</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmbridge</td>
<td>£707.60</td>
<td>£554.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epsom &amp; Ewell</td>
<td>£621.90</td>
<td>£549.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guildford</td>
<td>£668.20</td>
<td>£570.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mole Valley</td>
<td>£574.90</td>
<td>£698.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reigate and Banstead</td>
<td>£621.70</td>
<td>£564.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runnymede</td>
<td>£618.40</td>
<td>£640.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelthorne</td>
<td>£608.20</td>
<td>£568.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey Heath</td>
<td>£643.10</td>
<td>£574.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tandridge</td>
<td>£556.80</td>
<td>£429.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waverley</td>
<td>£603.60</td>
<td>£524.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woking</td>
<td>£589.60</td>
<td>£482.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckinghamshire</td>
<td>£597.60</td>
<td>£556.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkshire</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>Not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxfordshire</td>
<td>£541.40</td>
<td>£517.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridgeshire</td>
<td>£525.90</td>
<td>£510.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings, 2009 (ONS)*

It must also be remembered that median pay levels hide large differences between different occupations. The lowest paid fifth of the people working full-time in Surrey earn less than £395.10 per week. Many contributors to the *Hidden Surrey* report (Bowcock, 2009) said that it is harder, in qualitative terms, to be poor amidst wealth. The spiralling costs of living in Surrey mean that it is very hard for people working in lower paid jobs in Surrey to afford to live in the county.

### 4.6 EMPLOYMENT BY OCCUPATION

Surrey’s residents are predominantly employed in high-level senior and professional occupations (see Annex 4b). Together, the three high-level occupational categories account for 55.1% of Surrey’s economically active residents (the highest rate of all its LEA comparators). One in five of Surrey residents in employment are managers or senior officials.

In contrast, Surrey has the lowest level of resident employees in the elementary occupations (6.6%). Among this group are occupations such as elementary personal service occupations, cleaners, security guards, postal workers, catering staff, etc. While a high-growth economy needs and creates the ‘high-end’ jobs, it cannot function without the supporting services. Anecdotal evidence collected from the Surrey LEA consultation events suggests that Surrey has to ‘import’ workers from outside the county (adding to congestion on its roads etc.). Some business sectors are facing serious labour shortages, which impact on the delivery of key services. For instance, feedback from the care sector (Surrey Care Association members)

---

54 Full-time workers are defined as those who work more than 30 paid hours per week or those in teaching professions working 25 paid hours or more per week.

55 Berkshire data not available at a NUTS 3 ‘county’ level.
suggests that many care environments are struggling to fill basic care worker vacancies.

### 4.7 EMPLOYMENT BY SECTOR

An analysis of the Annual Business Inquiry 2008 data (see Figure 4.3) shows that the ‘banking, finance, insurance’ sector is largest sector accounting for 30.4% of employees in Surrey businesses, followed by ‘public administration, education and health’ (24.4% of employees).

**Figure 4.3: Share of Employment by Sector, 2008**

![Graph showing percentage share of employment by sector](image)

*Source: Annual Business Inquiry 2008 (ONS)*

Figure 4.4 shows that, in terms of sector trends, between 1998 and 2008, employee growth in the ‘public administration’ sector was above both the national and the South East average, whilst growth in banking, finance and insurance was below both the national and South East figure.
The sector with the biggest losses of employment in Surrey 1998 – 2008 was manufacturing, transport and communications. While the loss of manufacturing was being felt across the whole of the country, the loss of jobs in transport and communications was particularly marked in Surrey. It is likely that this reflects the closure of Dunsfold Aerodrome at the end of the 1990s with a loss of more than 900 jobs.

4.8 TRAVEL TO WORK FLOWS
The most rigorous information about travel to work patterns comes from the 2001 Census. Additional information is available from the 2008 Annual Population Survey (APS), although the sample size used by the APS is notably smaller and comparisons of changes over time need to be treated with caution.

Both the APS and 2001 Census indicate that around 64% of Surrey residents work within the county. For those that commute out of the county, 2001 Census data shows that London is the most common destination (Table 4.5) with 128,000 people (19% of the Surrey population) commuting to the capital. The data shows that nine per cent of Surrey workers commute to Outer London boroughs – Hillingdon, Hounslow and Croydon being the most common. These commuting patterns reflect the importance of Heathrow Airport (in Hillingdon) as an employer as well as proximity.
Table 4.5: Place of Work for Surrey Residents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Destination</th>
<th>2001 flow (%)</th>
<th>2008 flow (%)</th>
<th>Significant change?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampshire</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston upon Thames</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillingdon</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hounslow</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croydon</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of London</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Sussex</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond upon Thames</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Annual Population Survey 2008 (ONS); Census, 2001 (ONS)

A further 10% commute to Inner London boroughs – principally Westminster, the City of London and Richmond. For commuting to central London, rail transport links are important and the most significant flows include:

- to the City of London from Tandridge and Woking
- to Westminster from Tandridge, Woking, Elmbridge and Reigate.

Outside of London, Hampshire is the most frequent destination.

Heathrow Airport – Employment Survey

A full Heathrow Airport Employment Survey is carried out every five years, supplemented by annual or biennial surveys that provide an overview of the size of the Heathrow workforce. The last full survey was carried out in 2004. In total, almost 9,000 Surrey residents work at Heathrow Airport in the London Borough of Hillingdon (which equates to 12% of the total Heathrow workforce). Spelthorne accounts for the largest share (5.3%) of all Heathrow employees. Runnymede and Surrey Heath boroughs together provide a further 3.8% of the airport’s employees. 61.4% of Heathrow employees commute by car.

Gatwick Airport – Employment Survey

A Gatwick Airport Employment Survey has similarly been undertaken with all companies whose employees report for work (in 2008) within the boundary of Gatwick Airport in West Sussex. This followed a similar survey in 2003. The survey reported that 53.7% of Gatwick Airport employees were resident in West Sussex with 13.9% residing in Surrey and 11.3% resident in both East Sussex and Greater London. The report also noted that 5.6% of the Surrey residents who worked at Gatwick Airport resided in Horley with a further 1.9% from Redhill and 1.3% from Reigate. 64.5% of Gatwick Airport employees commuted by car.

Commuting patterns are a good indicator of whether a location is stronger as a ‘workplace’ (i.e. labour demanding) or as a residential source of labour supply. ‘Self containment’ is a measure of the number of people who live and work in the same local authority area. As shown in Table 4.6, Surrey (like Buckinghamshire) has a

---

56 Changes that are statistically significant at the 5% level.
much higher level of out-commuting compared to Berkshire, Oxfordshire and Cambridgeshire and is therefore less ‘self-contained’.

Table 4.6: Residence-based Self-containment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Destination</th>
<th>2001 flow (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>64.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkshire</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckinghamshire</td>
<td>64.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxfordshire</td>
<td>83.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridgeshire</td>
<td>82.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Census, 2001 (ONS)

The 2001 Census data (Annex 4c) shows that Guildford, Mole Valley, Runnymede and Surrey Heath are all net ‘importers’ of commuters, which probably reflects the presence of the large employers in each borough or district. Tandridge is the largest exporter of commuters, which reflects the fact that there are fewer large companies based in the district and its good links into London.

It is not known whether these commuting patterns are unusual to Surrey, or whether they are to be expected given Surrey’s relative position to the capital. Participants in a workshop on the Surrey LEA said:

“The magnet that is pulling people away is stronger – but does it matter? As technology and society changes, living this close to a conurbation we would expect to see net outward commuting.”

Within Surrey, some 45%\(^{57}\) of Surrey residents work within their home borough or district. The proportion is highest for Guildford (55%) and Mole Valley (53%) and lowest for Tandridge (33%) and Runnymede (36%). Figure 4.5 shows the main intra-Surrey commuting flows.

---

\(^{57}\) Based on 2001 Census data.
4.9 WORKLESSNESS
This section draws from Surrey County Council’s *Worklessness Assessment, 2010*. Worklessness includes everyone who is without a job - both the unemployed\(^{58}\) and the economically inactive\(^{59}\). Some people have voluntarily left the labour market; reasons for this might include early retirement or care responsibilities. However, some of the economically inactive population would like to work, but might need support to do so, including lone parents and/ or those with disabilities. These people might be claiming benefits such as incapacity benefits.

The ‘workless’ population also includes those who are available for work, but not claiming benefits. This might include those ‘Not in Education, Employment or Training’ (NEET), and the ‘hidden’ unemployed; for example, those young people subsidised by parents/ guardians, or people who are not eligible to claim benefits. These groups are difficult to ‘capture’ statistically.

*Note on data: In August 2010, the definition of working age used by the ONS changed; from 16-59 years old for females and 16-64 years old for males, to 16-64 years old for both males and females. This is reflected in the data presented below.*

\(^{58}\) Defined as those without a job, want a job, have actively sought work in the last four weeks and are available to start in the next two weeks.

\(^{59}\) The economically inactive are those without a job, who have not actively sought work in the last four weeks and/ or are not available to start work in the next two weeks.
4.9.1 Unemployment

Figure 4.6 highlights the percentage of the economically active population defined as unemployed. In the year to March 2010, there were 27,800 unemployed people in Surrey (i.e. 4.8% of the working age population); a rate below that of the South East (6.3%) and Great Britain (7.9%). The effects of the recession can be seen from approximately mid 2008 onwards, with an increase in unemployment - from 2.8% in the year beginning April 2008 to 4.2% in the year beginning April 2009.

Figure 4.6: Percentage Working Age\(^{60}\) Resident Economically Active Population Unemployed (January 2004 – March 2010)

[Diagram showing percentage unemployed from January 2004 to March 2010 for Surrey, South East, and Great Britain]

Source: Annual Population Survey, January 2004 – March 2010 (ONS)

A higher percentage of men are unemployed compared to women; 4.9% of the economically active male population is unemployed (15,400 men), according to April 2009/ March 2010 figures. This compares to 4.6% of the economically active female population (12,400 women).

4.9.2 Economic Inactivity

Economic inactivity refers to those people not participating in the labour market. They are not classed as unemployed because they have either not sought work in the last four weeks or are not available to start work. The latest data (Table 4.7) reveals that 147,400 people were economically inactive in Surrey in the year beginning April 2009 (20.7% of the resident working age population): 31,500 of those people wanted a job (4.4%); and 115,900 (16.3%) did not want a job.

---

\(^{60}\) Working Age defined as aged 16-64.
Table 4.7: Economic Inactivity in Surrey (April 2009/ March 2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Status</th>
<th>Surrey (Number)</th>
<th>Surrey (%)</th>
<th>South East (%)</th>
<th>Great Britain (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economically inactive</td>
<td>147,400</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanting a job</td>
<td>31,500</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not wanting a job</td>
<td>115,900</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Annual Population Survey, April 2009 – March 2010 (ONS)

There are many reasons why working age people may wish to remain economically inactive. Given the ageing population, and the fact that Surrey is home to high-income earning individuals who can afford to take early retirement, it is expected that a large number of these may be people who have taken early retirement. 2001 Census data bears this out, identifying that 26% of retired men in Surrey retired before the age of 65 (Source: Census, 2001 (ONS)).

More than twice as many working age women are registered as economically inactive in Surrey (27.8% - 100,500 women) as men (13.4% - 47,000 men). This reflects national and regional trends. A higher proportion of women tend to leave the labour market than men.

The total workless population of Surrey can be measured by adding together those who are economically active but currently unemployed (27,800), and those who are economically inactive but who would like a job (31,500). As of April 2009/ March 2010 (the latest data available), the workless population of Surrey totalled 59,300.

4.9.3 Out of Work Benefit Claimants

Many of the economically inactive claim benefits (Annex 4d). In February 2010, there were 56,360 people claiming benefits (7.9% of the resident working age population). Across all benefit types (except bereavement-related benefits), Surrey has a lower claimant rate than that of the South East and Great Britain as a whole. The majority of Surrey claimants are in receipt of Employment Support Allowance (ESA) and incapacity benefits (i.e. 3.2% of the resident working age population).

4.9.4 Jobseeker's Allowance (JSA) Claimants

JSA claimant data is a good barometer of how the current labour market is functioning. In August 2010, there were 12,263 people claiming JSA in Surrey, 1.7% of the resident working age population (see Table 4.8). This is below the rate for the South East (2.4%) and Great Britain (3.6%). Over twice as many claimants were men (8,111 compared to 4,152 women).

Table 4.8: JSA Claimant Count, Totals and Rates (August 2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JSA Claimants</th>
<th>Surrey (Number)</th>
<th>Surrey (%)</th>
<th>South East (%)</th>
<th>Great Britain (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All people</td>
<td>12,263</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>8,111</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>4,152</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DWP Benefit Claimants, August 2010
Between May 2008 and May 2009, the JSA claimant rate in Surrey increased from 0.7% to 2.1%, before falling to 1.7% in August 2010; in line with the national trends associated with the economic downturn. Annex 4e plots changes in JSA claimant rates for Surrey from February 2006 to August 2010, relative to Buckinghamshire (1.9%), Cambridgeshire (2.1%), Oxfordshire (1.8%), London (4.0%), the South East (2.4%) and Great Britain (3.6%). Relative to our LEA comparator counties, Surrey (1.7%) still has, consistently, one of the lowest JSA claimant rates.

The recession has had a disproportionate impact on some age groups; most notably those aged under 24 years old. Figure 4.7 below highlights changes in JSA claimants over the last 10 years. It shows how younger cohorts, particularly those aged between 20 and 24 years old, have been disproportionately affected by the recession. The number of people aged 20-24 claiming JSA has increased from 815 in February 2008 to a peak of 2,660 in August 2009 (2,210 in August 2010).

**Figure 4.7: JSA Claimants by Age Range (August 2000 – August 2010)**

![Graph showing JSA claimants by age range from August 2000 to August 2010](source: DWP Benefit Claimants, August 2010)

Delivery of Surrey’s Future Jobs Fund focuses on the young long-term unemployed. The Future Jobs Fund (FJF) is a programme (initiated by the previous Labour Government) intended to find new jobs for 350 long-term young people.

The vast majority of people claiming JSA do so for less than six months. However, since approximately February 2009, there has been a fall in the percentage claiming for less than six months – from 86.4% in February 2009 to 65.7% in August 2010 and an increase in those claiming for 6-12 months (17.3% in August 2010), and over 12 months (17% in August 2010).
4.9.5 Workless Households
A ‘workless household’ is one that includes at least one person of working age and that has nobody aged 16 or over who is in employment. These households are significantly more likely to experience poverty than households in which at least one adult is in work and children in these households are more likely to grow up to be workless than children who grow up in ‘working’ households. According to 2008 data, there were 29,000 ‘workless households’ in Surrey, i.e. 8.4% of all households. This compares to 11.3% in the South East and 15.9% in Great Britain. The rate is below that of all the LEA county comparators: Berkshire (8.7%), Buckinghamshire (9.9%), Cambridgeshire (13.3%) and Oxfordshire (8.9%).

4.9.6 ‘Hidden’ Worklessness
The ‘hidden’ workless is a term that is often used to describe those people who are unemployed, and who wish to be in employment, but who are not claiming benefits. These might include unemployed young people subsidised by parents, individuals who do not meet the criteria for claiming benefits, or those taking early retirement to avoid redundancy. These groups are difficult to capture statistically and so remain largely ‘hidden’ in terms of economic policy decision-making.

4.9.7 Young People Not in Education, Employment or Training (NEET)
The adjusted NEET figure for August 2010 was 4.1% (861 individuals). The actual known number of NEETs in Surrey was 772 (source: Connexions Surrey, monthly statistics, August 2010).

Those areas with the highest concentration of NEETs broadly align with Surrey Strategic Partnership’s Priority Places. Westborough (Guildford) and Maybury and Sheerwater (Woking) have consistently had the highest concentrations of NEETs.

4.9.8 The Geography of Worklessness
Averages can mask concentrations of worklessness in local areas. Comparing the percentage of the working age population claiming JSA in Surrey’s boroughs and districts relative to Surrey, the South East and Great Britain, reveals that, while all Surrey boroughs and districts have JSA claimant rates below the South East and Great Britain, there is quite a high level of divergence from 1.4% (in Mole Valley) to 2.1% in Spelthorne.

Table 4.9 shows the JSA claimant totals in the ‘Priority Places’ relative to Surrey, South East and Great Britain averages. All these localities have JSA claimant rates above the Surrey and South East rate. In Old Dean the rate is three percentage points higher than that of Surrey as a whole.

---

61 ‘Workless households’ is a measure derived from the Labour Force Survey and Annual Population Survey.
63 Aged 16-18.
64 Adjusted NEET figure = total 16-18 year olds who are NEET plus 58% ‘currency expired’ NEET (i.e. those who were previously known to be NEET) plus 8% ‘currency expired’ EET (i.e. those previously known to be in Education, Employment or Training).
Table 4.9: Percentage Working Age Population Claiming JSA (August 2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great Britain</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surrey</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Dean (Surrey Heath)</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybury and Sheerwater (Woking)</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanwell North (Spelthorne)</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoke (Guildford)</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preston (Reigate and Banstead)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westborough (Guildford)</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merstham (Reigate and Banstead)</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DWP Benefit Claimants, August 2010

Strategic implications

- Disparities in income levels create problems when considering factors such as cost of housing in the county. It also has implications for deprivation and exclusion.

- Influence and dependency on the capital for employment, and the necessity for joint working on infrastructure provision.

- Decreasing levels of economic activity will have a direct impact on the productivity of the county over time.
5: TRANSPORT AND INFRASTRUCTURE

5.1 INTRODUCTION
Economic infrastructure, such as transport, housing, employment land, schools, utilities and broadband, is crucial to the performance of local, regional and national economies. It is vital for the transfer of goods and services and is an essential tool for the labour market to function effectively. It is also an important attractor for inward investment. Further, economic infrastructure is inextricably linked to the socio-economic well-being of an area.


The Surrey Infrastructure Capacity Project
In 2008, Surrey local authorities and other partners began work on a three-year project assessing infrastructure capacity in Surrey, examining the likely effects of the housing, employment, economic and population growth patterns on the current public infrastructure provision. The outcomes of this work, under the auspices of the Surrey Infrastructure Capacity Project, will help determine what and where investments in infrastructure will be needed to manage future growth levels.

5.2 HEADLINES
- Surrey’s transport infrastructure is heavily influenced by the county’s proximity to London, Heathrow and Gatwick airports and the radial transport routes running through it (e.g. M25, M3 and M23, A25 and A3).
- Surrey relies heavily on car-based transport and 86% of all households have one or more cars. Both people living in Surrey and working in Surrey are more likely to use a car for their journey to work than any other mode of transport. Of all trips to schools in Surrey 38% are made by car.
- According to the 2007/08 Transport Statistics for Surrey Report, the motorway system in Surrey is currently operating close to or above operational capacity, where flow breakdown is increasingly occurring, and resulting in congestion.
- Average house prices in Surrey in 2008 were £370,000. In 2009, the average lower quartile house (i.e. valued in the bottom 25% of all houses) was valued at nine times as much as the average yearly lower quartile earnings.
- The provision of broadband is inconsistent, particularly in rural Surrey.
- The county’s employment land reviews have identified as key needs:
  - more small unit space, particularly freehold premises
  - redevelopment and upgrading of existing employment premises to meet the needs of modern, high quality occupiers
  - sufficient and healthy stock of premises to meet local needs sustainably.

65 Consultation draft, September 2010.
5.3 TRANSPORT

The transport network of the South East serves the region in a local capacity, as well as being a gateway to mainland Europe and the global economy. Surrey is at the heart of this network. Proximity to London, Heathrow and Gatwick airports heavily influences the county’s transport patterns and the radial transport routes running through it. Surrey has three major national trunk roads passing through the county: the M25, the M3 and the M23, and regional trunk roads including the A3, A25 and parts of the A30 and A23.

In terms of public transport, there is a well-developed network of local bus routes within Surrey, although many of these are low frequency (one per hour) between principal towns. Within the main urban areas, services are more frequent (Transport Statistics for Surrey, 2007/08).

Surrey also has an extensive rail network, which serves 84 stations. Movements to and from central London are well catered for and include the main London to Brighton, Portsmouth and Dorset lines. However, there is very little provision for movement in all other directions, apart from the North Downs Line, which connects Gatwick and Reading via Redhill and Guildford. Although there is good provision into and out of London, the results of the South West Main Line Route Utilisation Strategy (RUS) (March 2006) found that on services running into London (many of which originate in Surrey), there were often times when there were 20% more passengers than capacity.

5.3.1 Road Traffic Flows

According to the Transport Statistics for Surrey Report (2007/08), the motorway system in Surrey is currently operating close to or above operational capacity, where flow breakdown is increasingly occurring, and resulting in congestion. Congestion is also experienced on many A and B Roads within the county, especially on the approach to, or within, the urban areas.

Although the comparisons between traffic flows in Surrey and Great Britain, on motorways and A Roads do not take account of differences in road capacity, they do indicate that the road network in Surrey is very heavily loaded:

- Average flows along Surrey’s motorways in 2007 were 139,300 vehicles per day (Annual Average Daily Traffic - AADT), which is 80% more than the national motorway average of 77,400 vehicles per day, and 46% more than the South East average of 95,000 vehicles per day.
- Traffic flows on A-roads in Surrey are far higher than the national average, averaging 21,800 vehicles per day (AADT); 66% greater than the national average of 13,176 vehicles per day.

According to the draft Surrey Freight Strategy, Surrey’s relative affluence creates a demand for goods, most of which are brought in by road. 3.2% of total traffic on Surrey’s A-roads is Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs). Because Surrey’s roads carry above the national average traffic flows, any additional large vehicles can be very conspicuous on an already congested network. And, while efficient and effective freight deliveries play an important role in the success of Surrey’s economy, the transportation of goods by HGVs can impact adversely on the environment and residents, both in urban and rural areas.
5.3.2 Surrey’s reliance on the car

Surrey is an economy that relies heavily on car-based transport. The 2001 Census shows that 86% of all households have one or more cars, compared to 81% for the South East and 73% for England (Table 5.1).

Table 5.1: Availability Of Cars/ Vans (by Number of Households), 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of cars or vans per household</th>
<th>Surrey No.</th>
<th>Surrey %</th>
<th>South East No.</th>
<th>South East %</th>
<th>England No.</th>
<th>England %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>60,594</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>638,772</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>5,488,386</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>175,800</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>1,400,989</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>8,935,718</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>149,976</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>971,698</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>4,818,581</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>34,440</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>206,914</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>924,289</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 or more</td>
<td>12,366</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>69,116</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>284,453</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total households</td>
<td>433,176</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>3,287,489</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>20,451,427</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Census, 2001 (ONS)

By 2007, car ownership in Surrey was 0.586 cars per person (9% higher than the South East and 23% higher than the national average). Car availability levels were 52% higher than the national average with 0.7 cars per person. Surrey has, proportionally, more than twice the number of households with four or more cars than the national figure (source: Census, 2001 (ONS)).

5.3.3 Travel to Work

Surrey residents are more likely to use a car for their journey to work than any other mode of transport. Of Surrey’s residents who work in Surrey, 57% drive to work by car/ van (Annex 5a). This proportion increases for those who travel into neighbouring counties for work (86%) and further afield (74%). Even though 34% of residents use the train to travel to London, there are still 56% that drive.

The 2001 Census also found that 11% of Surrey residents work mainly from home. While home-based and flexible working may take people off the roads for the purpose of work, they still need to make other types of essential journeys – school runs (see below), shopping and hospitals/ GP appointments and so forth.

In terms of Surrey’s workforce, again, the majority of people working in Surrey drive to work, particularly when they are coming from neighbouring counties (Annex 5b). 85% of Surrey’s non-resident workforce uses the car to travel into Surrey from neighbouring counties; and 80% of those travelling from further afield (80%).

5.3.4 Journeys to school

As well as journeys to work, the Surrey Infrastructure Capacity Project looked at journeys to school by mode of transport, and found that 38% of all trips to schools in Surrey were made by car with a further 3% made by ‘car sharing’ (Figure 5.1) and

---

66 Source: Transport Statistics for Surrey report. ‘Car ownership’ is derived from dividing the number of cars registered in the area by the population of the area. ‘Car availability’ is derived from the numbers of cars based in an area divided by the population of the area, and therefore reflects the actual number of vehicles based in the county. This is particularly important for Surrey because car availability takes into account vehicles such as company cars, which may be registered.
38% of school journeys in Surrey (i.e. fewer than all car journeys) were made on foot. This is lower than the South East as a whole (where approximately 50% of school journeys made on foot).

It is likely that, as pressure on school places increases there will be an increase in the number of car journeys made in taking children to school over ever longer distances (often multiple different car trips for families with a number of children).

**Figure 5.1: Mode of Transport (School Trips), 2007**

![Graph showing mode of transport for school trips in 2007 with percentages for walking, cycling, car, car share, public bus, school bus, and other modes.]


### 5.3.5 Future projections

The Surrey Infrastructure Capacity Project has looked at future projections and suggests that an increase of 19% in the number of car trips between 2005 and 2026 is likely (Table 5.2). In terms of the boroughs and districts in Surrey, Reigate and Banstead shows the greatest forecast increase (+29%).
The **Surrey Rural Strategy 2010-2015** quotes government and local forecasts\(^67\), which indicate that traffic in rural areas is likely to increase by up to 50% by 2031. The main causes are drivers switching to rural routes to avoid heavily congested urban routes, and an increase in car dependence as services move from rural communities and public transport services decline. The knock-on effects include congestion, erosion, noise pollution, light pollution and endangering recreational users of the Surrey countryside. All of which will have detrimental impact on the attractiveness of Surrey to both residents and visitors.

### 5.4 HOUSING

The provision of appropriate housing stock underpins the economic development of any sub-region. Affordability of housing is also crucial, as it has an important influence on labour market and commuting patterns, as well as having other important socio-economic impacts. The link between housing, skills levels and the knowledge economy cannot be overplayed. It is critical that the appropriate housing offer is in place for both skilled knowledge workers as well as lower paid key workers.

#### 5.4.1 Housing Stock

The total number of households\(^68\) in Surrey as a proportion of the housing stock is well above the average for the rest of the South East and England, indicating relatively greater underlying demand pressure on the existing housing supply (Figure 5.2) (source: *Draft Surrey Local Investment Plan*, 2010).

---

\(^67\) *The South East Plan*, 2009 (GOSE).

\(^68\) In the 2001 Census, for the household projections and mid-year estimates a ‘household’ is defined as one person living alone, or a group of people living at the same address who share common housekeeping or a living room.
Surrey has many constraints on development, which dramatically reduce the land that has development potential. The major constraints are as follows:

- Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty
- Green belt
- Special Protection Areas
- Major highways – creating noise constraints
- International airports – Heathrow and Gatwick
- Operational Ministry of Defence land
- Floodplains
- Reservoirs
- Historic parks and gardens
- Ancient woodland.

The traditional pattern of development in Surrey has therefore been small-scale, urban infill and windfall sites. This type of incremental, small-scale development places a cumulative burden on existing infrastructure, which is very difficult to measure and plan for.

The South East Plan, 2009 (GOSE), identified the need for Surrey to accommodate a minimum of 57,920 additional dwellings over the period 2006-2026. This equates to more than a 22% increase over the numbers proposed in the original draft Plan (2006). Typically, over the last 10 years, Surrey has exceeded its targets due to high demand for housing.

Within Surrey, Reigate and Banstead borough has been a centre for construction of new homes, accounting for 23% of new construction in Surrey in 2007/08, while Woking borough accounted for another 19%.
Whilst activity in the housing market has been muted as a consequence of the recession and the delivery of new housing continues to be challenging, Surrey Strategic Partnership is on track to meet Local Area Agreement (LAA) targets. The 2010/11 target for National Indicator NI154 (net additional homes provided) is 8,499 new homes. The 2009/10 target was 5,666 with 5,752 new homes being delivered.

The number of affordable housing units delivered is measured by National Indicator NI155, which shows that:

- during 2009/10, 725 affordable housing units were built in Surrey, a decrease on the 1,058 completed in 2008/09 (the decrease being largely due to the recession);
- as of quarter one 2010/11, 1,879 affordable homes had been delivered (out of the cumulative target of 2,375).

It is interesting to consider the extent to which the recession has affected the rate of homebuilding in Surrey. Unfortunately, at this point in time, the most recent sub-regional data available is for the financial year 2007/08, i.e. before the recession began. In 2007/08, construction started on around 31,000 new homes in the South East, 13% of which were in Surrey. This is equivalent to 3.6 new homes per 1,000 residents, similar to the average for the South East (3.7).

Looking at trends for the South East 2008/09, provisional figures indicate a 38% fall in the number of new permanent housing units started, from around 31,000 in 2007/08 to 19,000 in 2008/09 - slightly less than the (provisional) national average of 42%. It seems likely that this fall will be reflected in the figures for Surrey.

### Rural Housing

As identified in Surrey Rural Partnership’s *Surrey Rural Strategy 2010-2015*, access to housing in rural areas is restricted by high costs and limited availability, with a very small number of properties coming onto the market. The new supply of homes is constrained by planning and green belt policies, the Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Special Protection Areas. New land supply for development is largely reliant on ‘windfall’ and affordable housing ‘rural exception’ sites. The demand for homes is high with a significant demand from commuters to London and other areas with some villages becoming increasingly exclusive communities of the retired and wealthy commuters. These factors combined have created high house prices and a lack of new housing options including affordable housing. This has led to the departure of young people from rural areas.

#### 5.4.2 House prices and affordability

In 2008, Surrey had the highest average (mean) house prices of its LEA comparators at £370,000 (more than double the average £154,000 in 1998) (Table 5.3). Despite the economic downturn, house prices have continued to increase with a mean house price of £395,000 in the second quarter of 2010.

---

69 All types of homes.
Affordability is therefore a particular issue in Surrey, particularly for low earners and first-time buyers. The measure of affordability (i.e. the ratio of lower quartile house prices to lower quartile earnings) is highest in Surrey meaning that Surrey has the least affordable housing of all its LEA comparators (Annex 5c). In 2009, the average lower quartile house (i.e. valued in the bottom 25% of all houses) was valued at nine times as much as the average yearly lower quartile earnings.

House prices and affordability vary within the county. Elmbridge has the highest mean house price in Surrey, at over half a million pounds (see Table 5.4) and, unsurprisingly, has the least affordable houses (Annex 5d). This contrasts with Spelthorne, where the average house price is just £266,000. Nevertheless, the average lower quartile house in Spelthorne is still valued at nearly eight times as much as the average yearly lower quartile earnings. Runnymede saw the biggest increase in house prices between 2004 and 2008 (38%).

Affordability of housing is directly linked to recruitment and retention issues, particular for key workers, and other workers in the public sector, where many salary scales are determined nationally and there is little scope for salary enhancement, relocation packages or other assistance to compensate for the higher cost of living in Surrey. Problems are not limited solely to the public sector. Significant difficulties are also experienced in the voluntary sector within the county. Feedback from Surrey Community Action suggests the sector is finding it increasingly difficult to recruit and retain staff, because it is unable to offer the same quality of life as similar organisations in lower cost areas of the country.
Surrey’s above average number of global company headquarters require a local workforce, but also bring with them staff from around the world, with a requirement for high quality housing, putting further pressure on the housing market. An area between Oxshott, Weybridge, and Virginia Water for example, known to estate agents as the ‘Golden Triangle’, sees a housing market heavily dominated by rentals and leases by multinational companies for their relocating staff, and as demand grows, so do house prices. Furthermore, as London grows, so does the pressure for housing in the Home Counties (like Surrey). To achieve a better quality of life, there is a growing trend for families to locate out of London and Surrey is highly desirable for its schools, natural environment and proximity to London.

5.4.3 Housing Tenure
Surrey has a high level of owner occupation with 78% of households owning their home compared with 69% nationally (source: Draft Surrey Local Investment Plan, 2010). The social housing stock (both council and registered providers) was estimated at 54,908 units in 2009. This represents approximately 12.5% of the total housing stock and is significantly less than the national average of 19.9%.

5.4.4 Housing Need/ Demand
All Surrey boroughs and districts exhibit similar trends with peaks of unmet housing need in those areas where house prices are least affordable. The following graph is based on the findings of the Comprehensive Housing Needs Surveys/ Strategic Housing Market Assessments, correct at October 2010 in each borough and district, and demonstrates an annual net shortfall of affordable homes across the whole county of around 7,000 dwellings (Figure 5.3).
Figure 5.3: Residual Need\textsuperscript{70} for Affordable Housing

![Residual Need Graph]

Source: Prepared by Surrey Enabling Officers Group, using Housing Needs Surveys/ Strategic Market Assessments, as quoted in Draft Surrey Local Investment Plan, October 2010. Left hand axis shows numbers of affordable homes

Evidence of need is also demonstrated by the high number of applicants on the Housing Registers in each of the Surrey borough and district authorities. There are over 25,000 people seeking help with housing and this need is evident in all boroughs and districts.

Many households still aspire to own their own home and a recent report by Catalyst, the Surrey HomeBuy Zone Agent, indicates that there are currently 2,558 households registered for the HomeBuy scheme.

In April 2008, it was reported that in Surrey there were an estimated 5,154 properties that had been vacant for more than 6 months\textsuperscript{71}.

5.5 EMPLOYMENT LAND

Borough and district authorities are required to gather evidence to inform their Local Development Frameworks, which will guide planning policy and land allocations in the future. This includes studies of the provision of, and demand for, land for employment uses (such as office, high-tech, industrial and warehouse space). The Surrey local authorities are at different stages in the production of their Employment Land Reviews (ELRs). Surrey is a varied county, so issues and approaches differ across the area.

\textsuperscript{70} Residual Need = Need for Affordable Housing minus Annual Re-Let Supply.

\textsuperscript{71} CLG Housing Strategy Statistical Appendix (HSSA) returns for April 2008.
Key common threads include:

- Recognising the need for more, small unit space in most boroughs and districts, and particularly freehold premises.
- Common policies to support and encourage the redevelopment and upgrading of existing employment premises to meet the needs of modern, high quality occupiers.
- Recognition that out-commuting is an established characteristic for many Surrey locations, but that alongside this, there needs to be a sufficient, and healthy, stock of premises to meet local needs in a sustainable manner.

The key area differences are:

- Redhill/ Reigate, Guildford and Woking are identified in *The South East Plan*, 2009 (GOSE) as regional hubs for growth and land allocations and policies need to support this role.
- Redhill/ Reigate is identified in *The South East Plan*, 2009 (GOSE) as Surrey’s only new growth point.
- Waverley is the only other Surrey borough or district to identify a need for additional employment land to cater for local growth, over and above the current level of allocation.
- Runnymede, Surrey Heath, Reigate and Banstead ELRs identify a sufficiency of allocated employment land for future needs, and recommend retaining allocations to allow for a flexible range of employment options.
- Planning policy for Mole Valley, Tandridge, Epsom & Ewell and Spelthorne allows for some controlled release of less-favoured employment land for housing.

### 5.6 DIGITAL CONNECTIVITY

It is critical that appropriate levels of digital infrastructure are in place for an economy to thrive. Access to broadband is particularly important for knowledge-based businesses but it is increasingly the case that all businesses and organisations need to be able to access reliable, high-speed broadband services. High-speed broadband connectivity is now seen by many as an important ‘utility’ as electricity or running water. The Surrey Strategic Partnership Plan 2010-2020, identifies the fact that improved Internet connectivity is vital for Surrey if it is to remain globally competitive and economically vibrant, particularly as 30% of Surrey’s businesses are knowledge-based.

It is not just business that needs access to broadband. Increasingly, public services and sources of information are being delivered via the Internet. Children are expected to use the Internet as a research tool and many information sources are only available online. Those without access to the Internet and to broadband are increasingly disadvantaged.

Data collected for SEEDA suggests that, in Surrey, 15% of households and 12% of businesses are receiving 1.5 Mbps or less in connection speed (source: *Optical Fibre Infrastructure Survey and ADSL Broadband Speeds in South East England, Final Report delivered to SEEDA, 2008*).
Digital connectivity also has the potential to contribute to green and low carbon economic growth in a number of ways, notably by encouraging home working and reducing traffic movements.

However, while urban areas of Surrey generally have access to fast broadband, there are still swathes of the county (often in the more rural areas) where broadband is not available at a minimum level. Areas such as Ockham and Ewhurst have limited or no connectivity. A parish broadband survey, undertaken for the Surrey Rural Partnership, revealed that 64% of Surrey parishes have areas with poor or nonexistent connectivity. The Surrey Hills AONB, for example, is home to 150,000 people but nearly 40% of premises are receiving an Internet connection of less than two Mbps\(^3\). Many of these communities suffer from pockets of relative deprivation, which investment in broadband might help to address.

Going forward, Next Generation Access (NGA)\(^4\) will be vitally important. In Surrey, we are faced with a situation where certain areas (predominantly rural areas) are unlikely to benefit from the roll-out of super-fast broadband and NGA before 2015. Large areas to the south of the county are less than 25% likely to benefit according to work undertaken by Communities and Local Government. The Surrey Strategic Partnership has therefore made broadband connectivity one of its five key priorities.

### Strategic implications

- Less attractive location for business – potential quality of life reduction for all.
- As road usage increases and pressures on public transport options grow, so do the problems for Surrey in terms of congestion, pollution and road casualties and access to services. Surrey is not alone in facing such problems but its position relative to two international airports certainly exacerbates those problems.
- In an area of very high car ownership and usage, those without access to a car are particularly vulnerable to poor access to services.
- Failure to invest in education for the planned population growth will have adverse effects on both the pupil population and economy.

---

\(^3\) Data comes from the Surrey bid to Broadband Delivery UK for Next Generation Access pilot project funding (Surrey Economic Partnership, September 2010).

\(^4\) Next Generation Access (NGA) is term describing a significant upgrade to the existing telecommunication access network by replacing some or all of the copper cable with optical fibre. Since fibre is capable of sustaining higher data transmission rates over longer distances than twisted-pair or coaxial cable, NGA is an important enabler for faster broadband Internet access.
6: SURREY’S PEOPLE AND COMMUNITIES

6.1 INTRODUCTION
The age and structure of an area’s population can have a direct and important influence on the economy, in particular on economic growth. In this chapter, the focus is on Surrey’s population now, population trends and projections, and the implications that these factors have for the future of the Surrey economy. This chapter also examines Surrey’s communities and the socio-economic characteristics of the population, including an analysis of deprivation in the county.

6.2 HEADLINES
• Surrey is the most densely populated county in the South East with 661 people per km².
• Surrey has a relatively low proportion of its population from minority ethnic groups – just 5% of its population are from black and minority ethnic groups in comparison to 8.7% for England and Wales.
• The Gypsy, Roma and Traveller community in Surrey is the fourth largest in Britain, numbering at least 10,000 people.
• Surrey has a very similar population age profile to that of the South East as a whole with 18% aged 0-14 years, 64.2% of working age and 16.5% of pensionable age or older (65+).
• Surrey’s total population grew by 4.1% between 2000 and 2008 with the highest rate of growth in the 65+ age category.
• Net internal migration is the biggest driver of population increase in Surrey.
• The population of Surrey is projected to grow by 19.5% or around 215,000 people, between 2008 and 2033 with over half of this increase accounted for by people of pensionable age (i.e. 65+).
• The health of people in Surrey is generally better than the England average.
• There are four Super Output Areas in Surrey that are among England’s most deprived 25%: Maybury and Sheerwater, Stanwell North, Merstham and Westborough wards.
• Approximately 23,330 children and young people in Surrey live in poverty, roughly 10% of the 0-19 population.

6.3 POPULATION

6.3.1 Population Totals and Density
Surrey is the third most populated county in the South East (after Kent and Hampshire) with 1.1m³⁷ five resident population (source: ONS mid-2008 estimate) and accounts for 13.2% of the overall South East population (Annex 6a). Over a quarter of a million people live in rural Surrey (24% of the total population). The borough or district with the largest population is Guildford (12.2% of Surrey’s population), closely followed by Reigate and Banstead (12.1%), Elmbridge (11.9%) and Waverley (10.7%).

³⁷ Since the time of writing, the ONS has released 2009 mid-year population estimates, which show that the Surrey population has increased to 1.113m.
While Surrey is the third largest county in the South East in terms of population size, it is the second smallest in terms of its physical size (1,663km²) and therefore it is the most densely populated county in the South East with 661 people per km² in 2007 (Annex 6b). Within Surrey, it is the boroughs and districts that border London, which have the highest population densities, the highest being Epsom & Ewell with 2,082 people per km², followed by Spelthorne (2,024 per km²) and Woking (1,437 per km²). The least densely populated district is Mole Valley (at 314 people per km²).

6.3.2 Socio-Economic Groups
According to the Mosaic classification, one third of Surrey households are described as “career professionals living in sought after locations” (Figure 6.1). The next biggest group are “older families living in suburbia”.

Figure 6.1: Distribution of Surrey Households by Mosaic Group

Source: Experian (extract from Surrey County Council Surrey, State of Economy 2008)

6.3.3 Ethnicity
Surrey has a relatively low proportion of population from minority ethnic groups. The 2001 Census noted that the percentage of the population from black and minority ethnic groups in Surrey was just 5% compared to 8.7% for England and Wales. This figure excludes refugees, Gypsies and Travellers, asylum seekers and migrant workers (Figure 6.2). The largest single minority ethnic group in 2001 was Indian (1.0% of the total population).

76 Experian’s Mosaic products classify a billion people worldwide.
77 Data is from Experian’s ‘Mosaic Public Sector’, a UK classification designed specifically for use by the public sector focusing on the needs of citizens. It provides a detailed and accurate understanding of each citizen’s location, their demographics, lifestyles and behaviours.
Figure 6.2: 2001 Census: Surrey population by Ethnic Origin

Source: 2001 Census (extract from the State of the County, 2008 (Surrey County Council))

Updated data on ethnicity is included in the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment 2009/10, and the headlines are presented below:

- The Gypsy, Roma and Traveller community in Surrey is the fourth largest in Britain, numbering at least 10,000 people. It is also the largest ethnic minority within the county.
- The category ‘White British’ makes up the largest percentage of the resident population in Surrey (83.6%).
- Epsom & Ewell and Woking have the highest percentages (12.6% and 11.5% respectively) of non-white ethnic groups.
- Asians are the largest minority from the non-white ethnic groups. Surrey’s Asian population accounts for 3.4% of total population, which is comparable to the South East of England (3.4%) but lower than England as a whole (5.7%). Woking has the largest Asian population (6.7% of total population).

The Asian Business Forum
The Woking Asian Business Forum (WABF) was formed to promote, encourage and support the development of Asian businesses in the Borough of Woking and surrounding areas. The WABF is a not-for-profit organisation managed by a team of volunteers. Business networking, professional promotion of the members’ services, and training are all encouraged and supported.
6.3.4 Population Age Profile
Surrey has a very similar population age profile to that of the South East as a whole, with 18.0% aged 0-14 years, 64.2% of working age\(^{78}\) and 16.5% of pensionable age or older (65+) (Table 6.1).

Table 6.1: Surrey’s Population (Age Composition), 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>0-14 years</th>
<th>Working age</th>
<th>Aged 65+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkshire</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckinghamshire</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxfordshire</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridgeshire</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ONS Mid-year estimates, 2008 (NOMIS, November 2010)

With reference to its LEA county comparators, Surrey has the third largest percentage of children (0-14 year olds), the second lowest percentage of working age population and the highest percentage of pensionable age and older.

Across Surrey boroughs and districts, Runnymede has the largest percentage working age population (67.6%) and Waverley has the lowest (61.1%) (Table 6.2). In Mole Valley, almost one in five (19.8%) of the resident population are of pension age (65+) or greater. Woking has the lowest pension-aged (14.7%). Elmbridge has the highest percentage (19.4%) of children (i.e. 0-14 year olds).

Table 6.2 Surrey Boroughs and Districts: Population Age Composition, 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surrey Borough or District</th>
<th>0-14 years</th>
<th>Working age</th>
<th>Aged 65+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elmbridge</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epsom &amp; Ewell</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guildford</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mole Valley</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reigate and Banstead</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runnymede</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelthorne</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey Heath</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tandridge</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waverley</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woking</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ONS mid-year estimates, 2008 (NOMIS, November 2010)

\(^{78}\) Aged 16-64.