

31 OCTOBER 2016

**BOROUGH, ECONOMY AND INFRASTRUCTURE EXECUTIVE
ADVISORY BOARD**

31 October 2016

- * Councillor Jenny Wicks (Chairman)
- * Councillor Liz Hogger (Vice-Chairman)

- | | |
|--------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Councillor Philip Brooker | Councillor Julia McShane |
| * Councillor Nils Christiansen | Councillor Bob McShee |
| Councillor Andrew Gomm | * Councillor Mike Parsons |
| Councillor Angela Goodwin | * Councillor Mike Piper |
| * Councillor Nigel Kearse | * Councillor Matthew Sarti |

*Present

Councillors were also in attendance.

BEI34 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

Councillors Philip Brooker, Andrew Gomm, Angela Goodwin, Julia McShane and Bob McShee submitted apologies for absence.

In accordance with procedure rule 23(j) Councillor Jennifer Jordan attended on behalf of Councillor Philip Brooker and Councillor David Goodwin attended on behalf of Councillor Angela Goodwin.

Councillor Matt Furniss, Deputy Leader and Lead Councillor for Infrastructure and Governance and Councillor Tony Rooth, Lead Councillor for Housing and Social Welfare were in attendance.

**BEI35 LOCAL CODE OF CONDUCT AND DECLARATION OF DISCLOSABLE
PECUNIARY INTERESTS**

There were no declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests.

BEI36 MINUTES

The minutes of the Executive Advisory Board meeting held on 12 September 2016 were confirmed as a true record and signed by the Chairman.

BEI37 INTEGRATING COMMUNITY CARE SERVICES

It was explained that this agenda item had been brought before the Board in order to update members on current work streams and to receive their views on the ways in which the Council was working with other organisations and the levels of service it was providing within those partnerships.

The Head of Community Care Services delivered a presentation that set out the ways in which the Council was working in partnership with other organisations to deliver the health and social care model 'My care, my choice'. The aim of the model was to support older and frail people in the community with the aim of reducing the numbers of acute hospital admissions through integrated partnership working. In this aspect, it was explained, the Borough Council had a key role.

It was explained greater integration of health and care services was intended to address overlapping of service areas (duplication), streamline provision and provide best use of public funds as budgets reduced across the health and care sectors. It was noted that the

31 OCTOBER 2016

numbers of those likely to require such services would increase by 21% in Guildford and Waverley in the coming 10-year period.

There were a range of partners with whom the Council was working in partnership. These ranged from small voluntary sector support groups and General Practice surgeries to the largest statutory providers. Of these, Guildford and Waverley Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG), the NHS Foundation Trusts and Surrey County Council held the greatest influence in terms of budget.

Sustainability and Transformation Plans (STP) had been a statutory requirement from every health and care system in England. This planning framework was place-based, service integrative, built around the needs of local populations and would run from 2016 to 2021. The borough of Guildford fell within the "Surrey Heartlands" STP that was the area of Surrey covered by Surrey Downs, North West Surrey and the Guildford and Waverley CCG. The plan would be governed by a Transformation Board working upon a strategy of shared commissioning. The Surrey Heartlands STP was large scale planning to cover the full range of healthcare services and had a budget of several billion pounds.

The remainder of the presentation was a refresh of the Councils care services provision e.g. meals on wheels, community transport, day centres and sheltered housing etc. The Council provide a number of services for those in later life. Whilst most district and borough councils outside of Surrey do not provide these services, as they are essentially a duty on the Social Services Authority. Boroughs and districts in Surrey have a long-standing arrangement whereby they provide such services on behalf of Surrey County Council and there are a small number of other areas in the U.K. where this is also the case.

Other Council local partnership initiatives were set out such as membership of the Guildford and Waverley Better Care Fund Board and the Guildford and Waverley Integrated Care Board, the Elderly Mentally Infirm (EMI) assessment work with privately funded parties and Surrey County Council. It was also noted that in addition to its own service delivery programmes the Council funded posts and initiatives in other local voluntary organisations such as the Guildford Diocese Community Coordinator and Community Angels.

The Lead Councillor for Housing and Social Welfare reminded the Board that the growing need for care services alongside reducing budgets would require local communities to further nurture relationships amongst friends, neighbours and families to support older and frailer residents and relatives.

He went on to remind the Board that Guildford would host a week of activities to increase awareness of what services are provided by different agencies. 'Aging Well' would run from 7-11th November.

In the light of the shift towards greater integration and joint commissioning the Board were asked to comment if the current levels of care services delivery were appropriate and sustainable for the Council, and also if further integration was felt to be the right direction.

The Board made the following comments:

- The concept of working with privately funded partner initiatives was of interest although it was noted that some projects were more attractive to the private sector than others and this may not be a 'cross the board' solution.
- There was concern over the prospect of future devolution and the impact this could have on budgets should Surrey be integrated with other areas with high social care need.

31 OCTOBER 2016

- There was a mix of opinion regarding the Council increasing service levels in the future to meet increasing demand. It was argued that there was a moral responsibility for the Council to provide for communities and individuals in need, albeit not always a statutory one. However, the need to retain the quality of services was also felt to be important.
- Concern was further raised over loss of control over quality of services if budgets became integrated. In addition, it was questioned how much is the Borough Council's contribution valued by the larger service providers.
- It was noted that Central Government funding reduction to Surrey County Council would mean a further shortfall in budgets for next year and there would be an expectation on partners to do more. It was announced that funding to Carers Support had been entirely withdrawn from next April. It was observed from applications to the Voluntary Grants Scheme that providers were seeking different means to access funding.
- It was mentioned that the Council could look overseas for ideas. Communities in other countries appeared to have stronger family and neighbour networks that acted to support older and frailer people.
- It was noted that the Council should seek to dovetail and integrate strategic approaches to services. In this case particularly the care service model, leisure, health and wellbeing and planning for sheltered housing were mentioned.

In conclusion the Lead Member for Housing and Social Welfare told the Board that although this item was not scheduled to go before the Executive in the short term, members should be aware of the pressures on services when considering the budget for next year.

BEI38 MULTI-USE SPORTS AND ENTERTAINMENT FACILITY

This agenda item was before the Board in order to obtain some initial feedback on a proposal to replace the Spectrum Leisure Centre over an estimated period of up to the next ten years.

The Leisure Services Manager delivered a presentation that set out the ways in which the existing facility had delivered as an outstanding and popular venue since it opened in 1993 and generated significant income. However, it had become clear that the design of the centre had its shortcomings in respect to modern sports and leisure demands and expectations. Added to this was an ongoing issue of the repair of the roof, which had leaked since the venue had opened twenty-three years earlier. The direct costs for remedial repair of the roof would be in the region of £12 Million and specialist contractors had been reluctant to tender as the centre was to remain open to the public for the duration with short-term loss of access to individual facilities.

Within the Corporate Plan was an existing objective to consider the opportunity for replacing Guildford Spectrum with a new sport and entertainment venue. With the costs of the remedial works in mind, it had been proposed that this process should be accelerated to achieve better value for money in the longer term. The first stage of this process would be a feasibility study to consider if the existing leisure centre would be better replaced with a new venue that would be designed to accommodate the anticipated future demand. This new build would be at a likely cost of £80-£100 Million subject to the range of facilities in the replacement venue. Amongst the advantages of opting for a new build, it was explained that a significant cost of the existing building was energy usage. It was anticipated that any new

31 OCTOBER 2016

build would take advantage of modern technology to ensure the most efficient use of energy and resources..

The key to deciding the next steps would depend upon a wide ranging and thorough consultation with residents and users. Meeting with the Board was the first step in this consultation process. The Board were asked to consider the viability of a replacement venue, what factors were important, what opportunities could be created and what restrictions may apply.

The Board made the following comments:

- Generally, the Board agreed that to replace the Spectrum would be a better use of public funds than to continue a plan of remedial works. It was suggested that some part of the existing building should be considered for reuse given demolition could be a waste of resources. The suggestion was that a hybrid option should also be considered with a combination of reused and extending the existing building. It was also recognised that extending was potentially more expensive than building new. However, it was explained that the new centre could be built whilst the Spectrum remained open and this way there would be no loss of provision for residents and users. In addition, the plant inside of the Spectrum was over twenty-three years old and probably little could be utilised for the new building
- It was suggested that once the new centre opened the site of the Spectrum could be returned to parkland for the recreational use of residents or used for additional facilities.
- It was suggested that a new site would need to have good access to the A3 and the proximity of the Surrey Sports Park needs to be taken into consideration, however it was generally felt that the existing site offered the best location.
- Various possible additional facilities, such as a conference centre or retail provision, were suggested, although the costs and provision of local accommodation were noted.
- It was suggested that the new build might have a 'campus' design by spreading the various uses across the site or alternatively have separate individual facility access so that secondary spend opportunities could still be realised.

BEI39 EAB WORK PROGRAMME

The Board work programme was noted.

BEI40 UPDATE/PROGRESS WITH MATTERS PREVIOUSLY CONSIDERED BY THE BOROUGH, ECONOMY AND INFRASTRUCTURE - EXECUTIVE ADVISORY BOARD

The Chairman consulted with the Board about convening a working group to support the production of the Urban Design Guide. It was noted that the designated officer for this project was not yet in post and so the matter would be revisited in two months. The Board was disappointed at the lack of progress and the delays affecting the appointment.

It was queried if the Town Centre Regeneration Strategy had been before the Executive as scheduled. The Committee Manager would provide an update to the members of the Board by email following the meeting.

BOROUGH, ECONOMY AND INFRASTRUCTURE EXECUTIVE ADVISORY BOARD

31 OCTOBER 2016

The Board members queried when the scheduled review of the Executive Advisory Board process would begin. The process had been in place since January 2016 and a review was due after twelve months. The Committee Manager would consult further with the Chairmen of both boards and there would be an update in the New Year.

**BEI41 ITEM 04 INTEGRATING COMMUNITY CARE SERVICES PRESENTATION
[COMPATIBILITY MODE]**

BEI42 MULTI USE SPORTS AND ENTERTAINMENT FACILITY PRESENTATION

The meeting finished at 9.26 pm

Signed

Date

Chairman