

## SERVICE DELIVERY EXECUTIVE ADVISORY BOARD

13 January 2022

- \* Councillor Angela Goodwin (Chairman)
- \* Councillor Ramsey Nagaty (Vice-Chairman)

- |                           |                             |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|
| * Councillor Paul Abbey   | * Councillor George Potter  |
| * Councillor Dennis Booth | * Councillor Jo Randall     |
| * Councillor Andrew Gomm  | * Councillor Tony Rooth     |
| * Councillor Ann McShee   | * Councillor Pauline Searle |
| * Councillor Bob McShee   | Councillor Fiona White      |

\* Present

Councillors Tim Anderson, Julia McShane, Maddy Redpath, John Rigg and Deborah Seabrook were also in attendance.

### **SD47 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Fiona White. There was no notification of a substitute.

### **SD48 LOCAL CODE OF CONDUCT AND DECLARATION OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS**

There were no declarations of disclosable pecuniary or non-pecuniary interests.

### **SD49 MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting of the Service Delivery Executive Advisory Board (EAB) held on 4 November 2021 were confirmed as a correct record, and would be signed by the Chairman at the earliest opportunity.

### **SD50 DAY CARE PROVISION FOR THE ELDERLY**

The Executive Advisory Board (EAB) was invited to consider a report which informed it of the outcome of a public consultation in respect of proposals for the future delivery of day care services for the elderly and sought comments regarding the recommended consolidation of provision at The Hive, Guildford. The report also recommended that a mandate be developed concerning options for the future use of the Shawfield Centre, Ash, following the proposed consolidation of provision at The Hive. The reason for the recommendations was to maintain or improve the quality of provision for day centre clients, whilst reducing costs as part of the Council's Savings Strategy.

Following the Head of Community Services' introduction and presentation of the report, the ensuing points arose from related questions, comments and discussion for forwarding to the Executive:

1. Whilst the EAB acknowledged that any closure of, or decrease in, services was regrettable and could evoke a sense of loss amongst service users, the Council's financial situation necessitated the review of discretionary services with a view to identifying budget reductions as part of its Savings Strategy.
2. The Shawfield Centre had been closed since the COVID-19 outbreak and displaced service users had been transported to The Hive since that time, when Government

## SERVICE DELIVERY EXECUTIVE ADVISORY BOARD

13 JANUARY 2022

- guidance allowed. Robust risk assessments and temperature testing had been undertaken and there had not been any Coronavirus issues at The Hive.
3. Virtually all people who had received day care services from the Shawfield Centre prior to the pandemic now attended The Hive, if they were able to do so, and there was no knowledge of anyone previously in receipt of care now being without. Although the Shawfield Centre had offered day care facilities and was not merely a lunch facility, the majority of users attended for the lunch club only when the facility had been open prior to the pandemic. It was felt that this group, the majority of who resided in the neighbouring Japonica Court, were reluctant for the Centre to close. Therefore, consideration could be given to identifying an alternative lunch provision in the sheltered setting, possibly utilising the kitchen area and the Benson Room, within available resources.
  4. Discrepancy As the number of consultation responders selecting Option 1 (to continue to operate two centres for older people's provision) outweighed the number of total service users, it was suggested that the findings should be considered with an element of caution. Consultation responses from the NHS and Surrey County Council Adult Social Care (ASC) advised that neither organisation referred people to the Shawfield Centre and would refer them to The Hive irrespective of their address in the Borough.
  5. The reference in the report to the residents of Japonica Court benefiting from increased activities being offered within the sheltered housing scheme were being pursued by the Council's Sheltered Housing and Community Services Teams. This involved liaison with community leaders to assist with the provision of some activities such as quizzes, lunches, a social club and the Memory Lane initiative for people with dementia. Although there was limited staffing capacity to support increased activities, this matter had been prioritised and preparations, based on an activity plan, were at an advanced stage, COVID-19 allowing.
  6. Some councillors had visited The Hive and were impressed with the services on offer and achievements realised in recent years. The premises included a quiet sanctuary area and an under-utilised store would be converted to form a further break out provision.
  7. The capacity of The Hive was 100 clients per day and whilst it was difficult to predict future service demand in the Ash area owing to potential new residential developments, it was confirmed that The Hive had adequate capacity to serve the Borough in the foreseeable future.
  8. In terms of people living with dementia, levels of severity varied and the NHS and ASC had requested the Council to provide an integrated model of care. The service sought to maintain a ratio of people with severe dementia representing under half of service users in order to maintain a manageable situation. As people's dementia level deteriorated, alternative suitable care provision was sought. Reference was made to Surrey County Council's draft Dementia Strategy and associated survey, to which anyone affected by dementia as a sufferer or carer could respond.
  9. The Council operated its own community transport fleet which consisted of 11 vehicles which were being replaced with electric versions as they became due for renewal to improve the Council's carbon footprint. The fleet served the whole Borough and had sufficient capacity to transport all users of The Hive, where the vehicles were based. There was also the option of utilising a car to transport individuals who preferred to travel alone in a smaller vehicle with a regular driver. Although there was a possibility of adding a further car to the fleet for this purpose at some point in the future, this would be dependent upon the review of the overall fleet in terms of need and capacity, which were currently being met. The community transport service was well publicised with links to relevant community groups and services. The vehicles were available for community transport bookings whilst service users were visiting The Hive. The drivers were paid Council employees.
  10. The identification of a direct transport route between Ash and The Hive avoiding pick up / drop off points and delays would be beneficial in the event that the Shawfield

## SERVICE DELIVERY EXECUTIVE ADVISORY BOARD

13 JANUARY 2022

Centre remained closed. Although service users were currently collected from their place of residence in logical groupings to minimise delays, it was possible for the Council to organise pick up / drop off points as an alternative for those who were able to access them.

11. Although many service users attended day care provision from 9:00 am to 4:00 pm including travelling time, there were more flexible options for those who preferred a shorter day and there was vehicle scheduling capacity to facilitate this. Visits tended to focus on lunchtime to enable people to have a hot meal. Carers were welcome to accompany their cared for to The Hive and engage fully with the variety of activities on offer, also receiving some respite time if wished. There was a special area tailored to the needs of dementia sufferers where alternative activities could be pursued.
12. The Shawfield Centre was currently designated as a rest centre in case of emergency, leaving remaining rest centres at The Hive, the Spectrum and Surrey Sports Park in the event of its permanent closure. However, Applied Resilience was undertaking some work to identify assets owned by other organisations, such as parish councils and churches, outside the town centre which could be utilised as rest centres with supplies being provided by the Council. It was requested that further information be provided to the EAB when officers were in receipt.
13. In terms of the financial implications associated with the closure of the Shawfield Centre, officers were confident that the projected savings identified in the report would be achieved. However, some councillors felt that a breakdown of the savings would be informative. The EAB was advised that the building running costs were the most significant financial factors for the Council in this scenario whilst additional clientele attending The Hive could be absorbed into the existing services. There were also some savings opportunities relating to staffing and service contracts relating to meal provision. It was noted that, in the event that the Shawfield Centre re-opened, it would require refurbishing at an estimated cost of £100,000 to render it fit for purpose as a day care service facility.
14. The future use of the Shawfield site, following consolidation of provision at The Hive, would be subject to a separate mandate. There was a covenant in respect of the land which could create legal complexities. If the building was to be retained as a community facility such as a community hall, this would need to be outside the Council's ownership for financial reasons. It was felt that the future use of the building should be addressed as rapidly as possible to avoid a community facility falling into disuse for any length of time.
15. A recent visit by a councillor to Dray Court, Guildford, had revealed that residents were content with the services being provided at The Hive. However, there was an issue at the premises whereby some residents went out and pursued activities such as visiting The Hive, whereas other occupants generally remained confined to their personal accommodation and did not visit the communal area. A further issue was the closure of kitchenettes in sheltered accommodation. These factors highlighted the need for an overall review of Older People's Services in the wake of COVID-19. Officer discussions were taking place in this regard and could lead to the establishment of a working group, including the Older People's Champion, to secure improvements to the communal areas and activities in sheltered housing units within available resources.

The Lead Councillor for Community and Housing thanked the EAB for its varied and thoughtful questions and comments arising from the report. She advised that attention would be given to working more closely with the Older People's Champion in respect of future reviews and consultations of this nature. The Champion's views were included in the EAB's submission to the Executive.

Having indicated its general support for the proposals in the report, the EAB agreed the following recommendations to the Executive:

13 JANUARY 2022

- (a) The provision of day care services for the elderly be consolidated at The Hive to maintain high quality service delivery for all residents in the Borough.
- (b) The possibility of introducing a lunch provision at Japonica Court be explored to support those residents who previously accessed the lunch club at the Shawfield Centre.
- (c) A mandate be developed in respect of the options for the future use of the Shawfield Centre site without delay to prevent a community facility falling into disuse for a length of time. One of the options should consider the operation of the property by an external organisation such as a parish council, charity or local enterprise.
- (d) A breakdown of the projected revenue savings of £170,000 be provided to clarify the amount of funding expected to be saved from the Shawfield Centre closure, balanced against any rise in costs associated with an increase in the use of The Hive and community transport and any ongoing up keep of the building including utility payments.

#### **SD51 OFF-STREET PARKING BUSINESS PLAN 2022-23**

At its meeting held on 13 January 2022, the Service Delivery Executive Advisory Board (EAB) was invited to consider a report reviewing the off-street parking pricing structure proposals which formed part of the Off-Street Parking Business Plan 2022-23.

The Programme Manager (Car Parks) introduced the report for the EAB's consideration. The following points arose from related questions, comments and discussion for forwarding to the Executive:

1. With regard to integration of on and off-street parking, the latter had charged for parking in the evenings and on Sundays for many years whilst there had been no similar parking controls for on-street parking resulting in visitors parking on residential streets around the town centre to avoid charges at these times. This had caused issues for residents and was one of the key drivers for the recent introduction of on-street charges.
2. A move to more sustainable transport was sought and one of the few mechanisms available to the Council to influence behaviours was through its off-street car park pricing policy.
3. A reduction in demand for parking following the pandemic had not been witnessed other than in the long stay York Road and Farnham Road Car Parks which were not currently utilised to full capacity. A parking study undertaken by the Systra Group in 2020 had indicated that there was an increased demand for visitor parking and attention needed to be given to how best accommodate that within car parks or by encouraging alternative transport modes. It was acknowledged that future residential developments in the Borough were likely to generate increased demand for parking and close working with Corporate Programmes colleagues was taking place regarding the timing of the redevelopment of car parks such as Bright Hill as this would have an impact on parking capacity and demand. Possibly, the car parks with spare capacity could absorb some of the displaced parking demand.
4. The Park and Ride service had been significantly impacted by the pandemic due to factors including a shortage of drivers and a significant reduction in use by commuters, one of largest user groups, owing to an increase in working from home. Identified weaknesses with the Onslow site were the need to travel through a congested area to access the site and high operating expenses as the site was outside Council ownership. Land on the approach to Shalford was suggested as a possible Park and Ride site which could cater for new developments planned in the Cranleigh area.

13 JANUARY 2022

There was a possibility that the Artington site may be utilised as a bus depot enabling the parking of buses overnight when customer parking had ceased for the day. It was felt that improvements to the Park and Ride sites would render them more attractive and increase their use alleviating congestion and pollution in the town centre.

Therefore officers were seeking to improve and develop the service which included identifying options and opportunities to secure more economical and better placed sites. However, this was hampered by the cessation of related Government funding in the near future and the uncertainties around the future demand for the service due to changing work and behavioural patterns following COVID-19.

5. In response to a query as to whether the former Arriva garage site in Mary Road could be utilised as a Park and Ride depot or a car park, the EAB was advised that this was unlikely as the site was privately owned, at risk of flooding and possibly earmarked for redevelopment.
6. In terms of parking season tickets, it was suggested that permit holders' workplace destination should be taken into account in addition to the source of their car journey when allocating permit controlled parking bays in order to minimise congestion and pollution. Officers confirmed that, for this reason, customers and corporate clients were directed towards the York Road and Farnham Road Car Parks which acted as interceptors located in the outer areas of the town and had spare capacity.
7. An effective communications campaign would be required to explain the reasons for the proposed parking tariff increases to the public and businesses and the Parking Team were working with the Communications Team to achieve this. Some resistance to the increases was anticipated and some negative comments had been made via social media, although these may equally apply to the recent changes to on-street parking agreed by the Guildford Joint Committee concerning the introduction of controls in the evenings and on Sundays.
8. There was some support for implementing Option A to minimise the increase in the shopper tariff and encourage people to visit the town centre. However, Guildford was a regional draw with much to offer visitors and its parking charges compared favourably with other regional centres.
9. Discussions would be held with Experience Guildford and local businesses regarding the proposed parking tariff increases to address any fear of a resulting reduced footfall in the town. Past experience had shown that shoppers valued parking convenience over the level of parking charges and increased tariffs did not reduce footfall or negatively impact on businesses. Charges varied between different car parks giving drivers some options.
10. Consideration should be given to the possible introduction of reduced off-street parking tariffs on Thursday afternoons and evenings to coincide with and support the late night shopping initiative in Guildford. Such reductions could also be applied to other events such as the Queen's Platinum Jubilee celebrations.
11. This Council should continue discussions with Surrey County Council with a view to securing provision of 'end to end active travel' amenities in the form of secure cycle parking facilities as electric bikes and cycling were encouraged and becoming more popular as a sustainable mode of transport.

In conclusion, the EAB indicated its general support for the proposed increases in the off-street parking tariffs recommended in the report. The Board recognised the challenges that the Council faced in relation to encouraging different behaviours with a view to tackling climate change and improving air quality. As factors such as public transport were largely outside the Council's control, it was felt that further work should be undertaken in this area to secure improvements and encourage greater use where possible.

## **SD52 EXECUTIVE FORWARD PLAN**

The Executive Forward Plan was noted without comment.

13 JANUARY 2022

**SD53 EAB WORK PROGRAMME**

Potential future agenda items would be discussed at the EAB / Overview and Scrutiny Committee Work Programming meeting organised for 19 January 2022 with a view to allocating unscheduled items to future meeting dates. The Art Collection was highlighted as a topic that should be programmed for future consideration, particularly as its future storage arrangements would be changing.

The meeting finished at 9.40 pm

Signed .....

Date .....

Chairman