

**Defra Capacity  
Building and  
Infrastructure Strategy  
Programme**

**Proposals submitted by  
Surrey Community Action on  
behalf of:**

**Surrey Rural  
Infrastructure  
Consortium**

**July 2004**

*Supported by Gardiner and Saunders Consultants*

## Surrey proposals

### Contents

	Page
1. Foreword	2
2. Introduction	2
3. Surrey Context	4
4. Consortium and Accountable Body	5
5. Defra Early Spend Work	7
6. Strategy	10
7. Implementation Plan	12
Component One (Strategy)	12
Component Two (Waverley infrastructure)	16
Component Three (Community Development)	19
8. Financial Breakdown	27
9. Addressing Rural Social Exclusion	28
10. Addressing Diversity	28

Appendix A: Accountable body - Constitution, Accounts and Annual Report

Appendix B: Details of Consortium members

Appendix C: Letters of support

Appendix D: Further details – the Surrey context

## **Section 1. Foreword**

The draft proposals for developing voluntary and community sector infrastructure in Surrey have been developed in accordance with the Defra's 'Rural Preparatory Programme' guidance. The proposals represent a strategic and widely supported programme to help ensure that infrastructure support for rural communities is available to a similar standard to the support available in towns.

Surrey is perceived as an affluent area; therefore the need to take action to address real issues of concern within the county may not always be appropriately understood or recognised. Such affluence can often make access to external funding difficult and this is particularly the case in relation to rural needs.

## **Section 2. Introduction**

In the Defra policy paper '*Community Capacity Building and Voluntary sector Infrastructure in Rural England*' the particular needs of those who live in rural areas are identified. The report highlights factors that have a direct bearing on rural community capacity building:

- Dispersion and accessibility – spatial issues including transport and isolation
- Small communities – lack of critical mass with few potential volunteers
- High costs of physical and service infrastructure per head of population
- Nature of professional service delivery – differing from urban provision due to the more dispersed nature of social exclusion
- Higher levels of self help and community delivery of services required – due to historical reasons and in order to make the services viable

The report concludes that due to these factors the voluntary and community organisations in rural areas have particular needs for:

- Governance, influencing and advocacy – including relationships with parish councils and other partnerships (some who will be distant)
- Networking and support – normally low levels of networking and some resistance to outside support
- Training and ICT – a lack of access to training and low penetration of ICT
- Appropriate methods of delivery – the need for outreach services and micro approaches

Good infrastructure support to rural communities requires a specific approach, which differs from the structure encompassed within the mainstream Infrastructure Strategy, because:

- it must provide a wider range of support, delivered by outreach methods, covering integrated support on a range of specialisms including, for

- instance, community development, increasing ICT availability, community facilities, access to services, affordable housing and transport
- It must connect with an array of specific policies, delivery plans, funding programmes and governance structures unique to rural communities whilst also ensuring a rural perspective on delivery of mainstream policy, delivery and funding.

The need for a specific rural dimension to infrastructure mirrors the work of statutory authorities and government who have all seen the requirement for a separate rural focus on policies, strategies and delivery plans accompanied by separate rural representative activity. The existence of a separate rural sub-sector Defra/ACU programme, which correctly identifies the wider range of support required from infrastructure organisations at local level, is therefore welcomed.

The Defra early spend funded research undertaken in Surrey to support the development of mainspend proposals is in keeping with and supports Defra's findings, recognizing that a wider range of rural support structures are required in rural communities. However in Surrey those experiencing rural social exclusion are further disadvantaged by living in a county widely perceived as affluent. The 'rural sparsity' factor is also important, where those who are excluded or experiencing disadvantage are thinly scattered across the county. Issues such as lack of access to services (transport, shops, health, training, IT, etc.) can be experienced often by just a handful of people within an individual rural community making it extremely difficult to identify, reach and support them. Nevertheless, these 'pockets' of disadvantage and exclusion can, across the county, represent sizeable proportions of the rural community.

Whilst discussing and developing Surrey's Defra mainspend proposals the Steering Group have been influenced by the *ACU's Community Capacity Building report*. In the report it identifies four key components to ensure effective infrastructure at a community level

- At least one representative and inclusive forum or network
- At least one physical hub or base for community activity
- Access to generic community capacity building workers
- Easy access to small grants to stimulate and support grass roots community activity

Whilst these four components are vital, the Steering Group also consider that there is a requirement in each community for a comprehensive, inclusive and well-supported plan, such as the parish plan model used in Surrey.

## **Section 3: Surrey Context**

### **The county voluntary and community sector**

In the county, the voluntary and community sector shows a distinctive pattern of development. At a local level there are infrastructure organisations in all of the districts and boroughs, except for Waverley and Elmbridge. These district-based organisations are often small in size (up to 2 full-time equivalent staff) with a strong role in direct service delivery, usually linked to community transport. There is a further group of medium sized district-based organisations (usually with up to 4 full-time equivalent members of staff, often with a greater focus on infrastructure provision. Organisations working countywide are fewer in number and tend to be more diverse in their make-up. There are some specialist infrastructure organisations working countywide with particular communities or interest groups (for example, younger people) but Surrey Community Action, the Rural Community Council for Surrey, is by some way the largest voluntary sector infrastructure organisation working in the county. Surrey Community Action has strong links to regional organisations, including specialist rural organisations and policy forums as a member of SERCC (South East Rural Community Councils).

The timing of this initiative is highly appropriate for Surrey, with the voluntary and community sector infrastructure at a critical stage of its development. The existing CVS Network is an effective grouping, working to build and sustain the current levels of support to the sector and ready to move forward through the development of a longer-term strategic approach. There are strong and supportive relationships within this Network, reinforced through effective and sustained working relationships with local authorities, and in particular the County Council.

This unified and coherent approach, with support from all sectors, is supported by a genuine desire and clear willingness to work towards a shared vision for the county. Whilst the CVS Network and the participating organisations have been building strong foundations, the research has indicated clear gaps and needs in the current provision of infrastructure support, especially in rural areas and these proposals are targeted on addressing the key priorities for development in the county's infrastructure.

Recent other sources of external funding (particularly through the Home Office Active Community Department's 'Partnership Development Fund') have not been accessed within Surrey resulting in little progress being made in joint strategic planning and delivery of services between the existing infrastructure organisations.

## **Section Four. The details of the consortium and accountable body**

### **Applicant organisation**

Surrey Community Action, the Rural Community Council for Surrey is the lead and accountable body for the rural infrastructure strategy and implementation plan. Surrey Community Action is an independent charity and company limited by guarantee, which resources voluntary and community action through access to advice, training, funding and advocacy. Please see Appendix A for a signed copy of our constitution, accounts and latest annual report.

Our core funder is Surrey County Council who is represented on our board. We receive project funding from a number of partners including the Countryside Agency, Surrey Learning and Skills Council, ESF and Business Link Surrey.

### **The Surrey Consortium**

Surrey Community Action has led in establishing an inclusive Surrey Rural Infrastructure Consortium. An initial meeting took place in March to set up an inclusive Steering Group and the following organisations were invited to participate.

- Central Surrey Council For Voluntary Service
- Tandridge Voluntary Service Council
- Elmbridge Council For Voluntary Service Steering Committee
- Voluntary Action in Spelthorne
- Elmbridge Volunteer Bureau
- Voluntary Services Surrey Heath
- Farnham Voluntary Service Council
- Woking Association of Voluntary Services and Volunteer Bureau
- Godalming Volunteer Bureau
- Surrey County Council (Head of Voluntary Sector Liaison)
- Guildford Association of Voluntary Services and Volunteer Bureau
- Surrey County Council (Head of Countryside and Heritage)
- Haslemere & District Volunteer Bureau
- Surrey Council for Voluntary Youth Services
- Reigate & Banstead Council For Voluntary Service
- Waverley Borough Council
- Runnymede Association of Voluntary Services
- Surrey Access Forum
- Surrey Community Action
- Woking Community Relations Forum
- Age Concern - Surrey

- Surrey County Association of Parish and Town Councils

The regular members of this Steering Group have been:

Abby Thomas	Head of RCC, Surrey Community Action
Julia Grant	Surrey Community Action
Andy Parr	Tandridge Voluntary Service Council (representing the CVS network)
Sally Dubery	Central Surrey Council for Voluntary Service
Sonia Hubbard	CVS Network Manager
David Cox	Surrey Council for Voluntary Youth Services
Mike Dawson	Head of Countryside and Heritage, Surrey County Council
Wendy Varcoe	Waverley Borough Council
Elaine Garfitt	Head of Voluntary Sector Liaison, Surrey County Council
Tony Lee	Age Concern Surrey

However, in addition to the open invitation to attend meetings, all tender briefs, papers and minutes have been circulated to all on the original list of invitees. Please see Appendix B for a full list of names and addresses of consortium members and Appendix C, letters of support for the bid from members.

Further organisations and partners have been involved through the Defra early spend research and consultation including Surrey Hills AONB, Surrey County Association of Town and Parish Councils, rural community groups and Executive Members of Surrey County Council.

## **Section Five: Defra early spend work**

The aim of the early spend funded activity was to provide the Surrey Rural Infrastructure group with the evidence and advice to enable it to develop appropriate proposals for mainspend support from the Defra Capacity Building and Infrastructure Strategy. The research specifically set out to systematically review the scale and scope of the services currently provided to rural communities and the voluntary and community sector organisations by infrastructure organisations in the county, and to:

- identify significant gaps in these services and explanations for them;
- identify any overlaps or duplication of services and the explanations for these;
- collect the views of rural VCS organisations, the infrastructure organisations themselves and key informants in statutory agencies on the priorities for addressing the gaps and overlaps in existing services;
- make recommendations based on this evidence for the future development of services and the ways in which main spend support from the Defra programme can contribute to the implementation of this strategy.

### **Methodology**

All identified infrastructure organisations were invited to participate in the research process, which was undertaken using two key mechanisms. A comprehensive and detailed survey form was circulated to all participating organisations which aimed to collect data on the capacity of each organisation to deliver infrastructure functions, their area of benefit and an assessment of the quality and effectiveness of the services delivered. This covered both specialist and generalist infrastructure functions and aimed to give clear information on the geographical targeting of work, particularly in relation to rural areas. A key element of the work was to consider in detail the delivery mechanisms for infrastructure support and in particular the use of outreach work targeted at rural communities.

The initial survey research was then developed through a number of telephone interviews with representatives of the infrastructure organisations, local authority contacts and representatives from Voluntary and Community Sector organisations working in rural Surrey. These detailed follow up interviews aimed to explore key issues in greater depth and to develop a greater understanding of the concerns and gaps in rural infrastructure provision in the county.

## **Research Results**

Research showed a clear focus on urban infrastructure delivery with the majority of organisations working in this area (82% classified as urban or mainly urban). A number worked only in urban areas, but none of the organisations were classified as rural only.

In terms of infrastructure organisations working in the county, the overall picture of more than half of the participating organisations are very small organisations, usually with the equivalent of 0.5 - 2 full time equivalent members of staff. There is a group of medium sized infrastructure organisations, working with an average of 3 to 4 full time equivalent members of staff and 1 much larger organisation, with staffing of over 23 full time-equivalents.

Income levels vary significantly, with three organisations having had significant growth in their funding over the past three years. Other organisations (usually the smaller ones) have seen smaller but fairly consistent rises in income, although almost one quarter of the participating organisations had experienced significant annual income fluctuations. Only one organisation had experienced a drop in funding and this was at a relatively minor level.

Links with the wider voluntary and community sector were broad and comprehensive, with a total of over 8,000 database contacts in the county. It is likely that this figure will contain a number of duplicated contacts, but nevertheless would seem to show a wide ranging engagement with the wider sector. There were a relatively low number of rural contacts listed on databases, with only 17% in this category.

Although returns were inconsistent, research data did show a clear emphasis on urban infrastructure delivery, with an average of 83% of advice sessions being classed as urban. Only two organisations undertook significant numbers of advice sessions with rural communities, whilst 7 of the 11 participating organisations delivered this work either exclusively or largely on an urban basis.

Involvement in partnerships is a key element of the work undertaken by infrastructure organisations within the county. The organisations participated in over 100 partnerships with the emphasis on those based around the themes of young people, health and local authorities: a key area of work was with Local Strategic Partnerships. Again, most of this work was urban-focused with only one organisation having a clear focus on rural partnership working.

In terms of the generalist infrastructure functions, the research demonstrated a relatively consistent situation across the county. Capacity building work is concentrated in urban areas, with rural work often taking up only 10% of an organisations work. A similar situation can be seen in relation to the provision of information advice and assistance, with 87% of delivery being urban, with very limited outreach capability. This is particularly important as outreach is likely to

be the most effective mechanism for delivering this work in rural areas. Partnership building and brokerage and policy development were identified as less well-developed by a number of participant organisations, with work again being largely urban-based.

The research indicated that specialist infrastructure services were delivered again on a very urban-focused basis, but there were greater levels of concern over some of these particular functions. Volunteering was considered to be a strength within the research, whilst IT support, support for BME communities, social enterprise and community development work were rated at a much weaker level.

### **Key themes from the research**

The importance of identifying and responding to voluntary and community sector needs through the provision of effective functions rather than focusing on organisational structures was an important element of the feedback. There was also a wide acceptance of a largely urban focus, matched by clear agreement over the distinctive needs of rural communities. It was clear from the research that only one organisation (Surrey Community Action) was specialising in the delivery of infrastructure support to rural communities, working using an outreach approach.

There was a strong desire shown for the need to develop a more effective structure of working relationships between district-based organisations and those working countywide to promote and support the most appropriate use of key strengths: a 'hub and spoke' structure was identified as a possible way forward, based on well-developed and planned relationships between local (district) organisations and larger countywide organisations. This was likely also to lead to economies of scale and more effective joint working/best use of strengths, in an inclusive and coherent strategy for voluntary sector infrastructure in the county.

Other key issues identified were the need for investment to increase the effectiveness of rural community capacity building and to strengthen community planning and involvement in service delivery in rural areas. There was also concern over the lack of a local infrastructure organisation in Waverley district.

## Section Six: Strategy

### Vision

The following was identified by the Steering Group as a vision for effective rural infrastructure support in Surrey;

- 1. Community Focus:** Working with whole communities in community planning, supporting individuals and groups
- 2. Holistic, integrated approach:** Support needs to encompass benefit to the whole community. Understanding the lack of critical mass
- 3. Building capacity:** Local community organisations/facilities/activities
- 4. Making connections** between community activity and external agencies. Supporting links between local community needs and the work of statutory providers. Networking between rural groups (community transport, village halls, etc.)
- 5. Evidence of needs:** Information from local sources to provide evidence on rural needs and the impact of changes and developments
- 6. Involvement in direct service delivery:** Role of infrastructure bodies linking the statutory sector and the local voluntary and community sector organisations
- 7. Access to small grants:** Key issue for small rural community organisations. Rural VCS infrastructure has an important role to play
- 8. Specialist support/advice:** Transport, community buildings, recreational space, community pubs and shops

### Key principles identified from the research

- Integrated infrastructure support
- Community capacity building
- Strategic role and strong rural voice

The report produced by Lord Haskins and published in late 2003 makes clear the need to change the way in which infrastructure support is delivered to rural communities. Recommendations focus on decentralising to local levels and to making frontline delivery more co-ordinated and efficient, and it is important that these principles help 'steer' the development of Defra-funded proposals in Surrey and that this work synchronises with the new form of Government rural delivery as it emerges.

A key element of the approach taken in Surrey has been to ensure that developments are guided by a clear and cohesive strategic approach to the development of infrastructure provision in the county, with a strong rural strand. Taking this into account, the Steering Group has adopted the development of a two-tier approach to proposals, with integrated strategic and operational elements. The key component is the development of a long-term strategic plan for infrastructure provision in the county (with a clear rural strand) but it was considered important that some immediate actions should be taken to address current key gaps and needs at an operational level. These actions will not only build and strengthen the current delivery of infrastructure support within the county, but will also provide important information and feedback to inform the development of the key strategy itself.

In response to the research undertaken for this funding proposal the Steering Group have taken the view that is essential that all the generic and specialist infrastructure organisations undertake a strategic overview of their work to ensure the most efficient delivery of infrastructure services over the next 3 years.

With the clear gap in infrastructure provision in Waverley borough, the Steering Group have decided to act immediately and to allocate a proportion of this funding towards addressing this issue, exploring the infrastructure needs in the area and consulting on the most appropriate and effective ways of addressing these needs. This action will strengthen the overall strategic approach by supporting the development of a comprehensive and integrated provision of infrastructure across the county, building inter-organisational links and sharing best practice and a cohesive approach.

The significant shortfall in rural infrastructure support through capacity building with rural communities in the county has also been identified a key priority by all partners as one that requires immediate attention. Therefore the Steering Group have again ring fenced part of the Main Spend funding to start to address this. In addition to providing a one-off improvement in the effectiveness of rural community capacity building to rural communities, this work will also provide valuable up to date information on the needs of rural communities that can again inform and support the development of the overall strategic development plan for infrastructure development for the county.

## **Section Seven: Implementation Plan**

Full details of the three components making up the proposals submitted for Surrey are as follows:

### **Component One: Development of a strategic approach in the county**

*To undertake an action research project to establish joint planning and service delivery protocols between the existing generic and specialist infrastructure organisations in Surrey. The project would develop a strategic approach to planning and the delivery of infrastructure provision in Surrey.*

#### **Evidence of need**

The current level of joint strategic planning and delivery of services within the generic and specialist infrastructure organisations within Surrey is at a low level. There is little history or track record of joint working or planning of infrastructure services either internally within the sector or between the sector and key external stakeholders.

The research has uncovered the need for improved communication and understanding relating to what services each of the infrastructure organisations is currently providing and of any development plans. It is recognised that this would lead to greater joint working, co-operation and more efficient service delivery that will be pro-active, needs-led and would build and share experience and best practice between the agencies.

#### **Implementation plan**

To undertake this work it is proposed that a working group is established to lead the process. There are a number of options for this. The existing rural infrastructure group could be formalised and given the responsibility for taking the work forward, perhaps as a sub group of the Rural Communities Forum or the existing CVS network.

The group would appoint an independent facilitator to chair the group, who would also have responsibility for taking the initiative forward.

#### **Objectives**

- To enable the members of the generic and specialist infrastructure organisations to develop and participate in joint working and partnership initiatives.
- To develop a strategic plan for infrastructure provision within Surrey, which would then be used as the foundation for developing a clear and effective strategic approach to voluntary and community sector development and activity.

- To ensure the strategy has a clear, strong and effective 'rural strand' , to ensure that the needs and concerns of Surrey's rural communities are taken into account and to help address the inequalities in provision identified in the supporting research
- To build on the achievements of others: to utilise and learn from best practice where this type of work has been undertaken elsewhere in the country.

## **Implementation plan**

### **Partnership**

- Working group formed made up of appropriate and representative members
- Independent facilitator appointed to chair working group
- Terms of reference agreed

### **Research and mapping**

- Desk research on other similar initiatives (Buckinghamshire, etc.) to ensure learning from best practice.
- Map services provided to the voluntary and community sector by the infrastructure organisations (areas to include: funding advice, identifying and mapping community needs, personnel support, training and development, development and support of partnership working, finance services, capacity building, representation, mediation, IT and databases and volunteering development work)
- To review existing databases on local voluntary activity

### **Activities**

- Design, agree and implement protocols for joint planning and service delivery between the organisations
- Develop agreed approach to accountability and representation issues, links to partnerships and statutory agencies
- Produce a 3 year strategic plan describing how the services of the organisations will develop and compliment each other
- Market work undertaken to ensure work is explained to all stakeholders
- Launch event arranged and delivered, helping to raise the profile of the work

### **Milestones**

- September 2004: Working Group convenes
- Three-monthly bulletins circulated to all stakeholders giving details on progress made
- March 2005: Outline report circulated for comments and feedback

- Summer 2005: Publication of 3 year strategic plan
- Early autumn 2005: Launch event and marketing of work
- March 2006: Evaluation report produced

### **Outputs**

Key output: 3-year strategic plan for the development of joint working, planning and service provision for the generic and specialist infrastructure organisations in Surrey.

### **Outcomes**

- Agreements on appropriate joint working mechanisms
- Clear statements on the respective (and complementary) roles of infrastructure organisations in the county
- Greater co-operation, support and sharing of resources and skills between the organisations.
- Greater understanding of the importance of infrastructure provision and of the unique role undertaken by the organisations

### **Impact**

- More effective and comprehensive provision of infrastructure services in Surrey
- More effective use of resources and sharing of skills
- Improved relationships with funders and statutory agencies, built on improved understanding of roles and 'added value', along with greater clarity and understanding of the key roles of infrastructure organisations

### **Evaluation**

During the development and production of the strategy, the Working Group would report on progress on a three-monthly basis, which would be available to any interested stakeholder. Following publication, implementation of the work would be monitored, with a brief evaluation report produced by March 2006. This would provide feedback on the process and give guidance on any future developments.

### **Sustainability plan**

The project is time-limited and will be completed with the production of the strategy by summer 2005. However, this will be a 'working document', and will be used as the foundation for developing and extending co-operation, joint working and planning over the coming years.

The Working Group would be expected to continue to meet (probably on a 6-monthly basis) to monitor and review the implementation of the strategy and to begin to address the wider issues of strengthening links with local authorities and the greater involvement of a wider range of organisations.

### **Timetable**

Costed strategic plan to be produced by summer 2005.

<b>Budget</b>	<b>£</b>
Lead body costs of developing tender, consultation with key stakeholders, etc (4 days @ £200)	800
Facilitator to lead work, chair meetings and undertake work between meetings (12 days @ £350 per day)	4,200
Strategy development and drafting (8 days @ £350)	2,800
CEO time/organisation time (22 days @ £200 per day)	4,400
CVS Network Officer Manager expenses (10 days@ £55 per day)	550
Neutral venue costs and refreshments (x 10)	1,000
Awaydays/Board Development Days, etc. (3 days @ 1,200 per day)	3,600
Launch event	1,600
Evaluation (3 days @ £350)	1,050
<b>Total</b>	<b>20,000</b>
<b>TOTAL PROJECT COSTS</b>	<b>20,000</b>
<b>TOTAL REQUESTED FROM DEFRA</b>	<b>10,000</b>
<b>MATCH FUNDING (SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL)</b>	<b>10,000</b>

## **Component Two: Activity plan to identify potential models for the development of infrastructure in Waverley**

*To consult and research the infrastructure support needs of voluntary and community sector organisations in Waverley Borough and to produce a report to include costed recommendations for possible delivery models.*

### **Evidence of need**

Research undertaken with voluntary and community sector infrastructure organisations, statutory organisations and other stakeholders in Surrey indicated a clear gap in infrastructure provision in Waverley, one of the largest rural areas in the county. Data collected showed that this gap made an impact not only at a district level but also on infrastructure support across the county. Some limited work has already been undertaken within the area to identify possible ways to address this issue but wider consultation has not taken place.

### **Implementation Plan**

#### **Partnerships**

- Establish a local Steering Group to guide and manage the process of identifying the infrastructure support needs of the local voluntary and community sector and to identify the most appropriate mechanism for the delivery of this support.
- The Steering Group would be made up of key stakeholders from all sectors in the district and some county representation to guide and support local engagement. Ideally this would include representatives from the local voluntary and community sector, Surrey Community Action, borough council, etc. Involvement of representatives from NACVS and RAISE would also be helpful.

#### **Activities**

- Elect Chair and agree terms of reference for the Steering Group.
- Agree an appropriate and realistic timetable for the work, to include milestones and communication strategy to ensure the initiative is widely known and understood by key stakeholders.
- Develop and agree a detailed work programme for the work, which would include the following components:
  - a) Convene Steering Group
  - b) Compile a research database of key organisations and contacts based in Waverley borough. Map, review and identify existing infrastructure support currently delivered within the borough and identify the delivery mechanisms used, with particular emphasis on contact with those traditionally 'hard to reach' such as BME organisations.
  - c) Identification of current gaps (and duplication) in services with work undertaken to identify the priority infrastructure needs for voluntary and community sector organisations within the borough (possible mechanism:

- a broad and inclusive survey, followed up by targeted interviews and focus group activities)
- d) Develop potential models (with associated costings) for most effective delivery of the identified infrastructure support, taking into account previous consultation.
  - e) Consultation with key stakeholders regarding the possible delivery models for infrastructure. This is the key priority for this work and it is important to ensure that it is carried out as widely and inclusively as possible, both to ensure maximum opportunities for input and to develop ownership by the voluntary and community sector. Possible mechanisms to use would be targeted surveys, workshops, structured feedback sessions and focus groups, with targeted follow-up interviews and other structured activities, with a key focus on reaching all groups, including BME, older people, etc. It is important, however, for the Steering Group to have clearly-defined responsibilities for guiding and supporting the consultation process.
  - f) Communications strategy to ensure wide and comprehensive understanding of the initiative, maximising opportunities for involvement
  - g) Links to existing infrastructure and networks within the borough (Town and Parish Councils, etc.), county (particularly the Surrey CVS Network) and at regional and national level.

### **Milestones**

- Formation of Steering Group (Oct 2004)
- Agreement of key priorities for the initiative (Nov 2004)
- Development of work programme (Dec 2004)
- Circulation of publicity to ensure wide and effective communication to all stakeholders (Dec 2004)
- Consultation on potential models (Feb 2005)
- Publication of final report and costed recommendations (Apr 2005)

### **Outputs, outcomes, impact**

Production of a report, to include:

- Funding and sustainability options for identified models
- 3-year development plan
- Costed recommendations

In terms of taking the project forward, it is important to have designated staff time (preferably in partnership with the CVS Network Officer) to work with the Steering Group. Key criteria for those undertaking the work would be an independent and objective approach, with an understanding of the need for a sensitive and confidential approach.

### **Evaluation**

The processes of consultation and of communication with wider stakeholders will include opportunities for participants to give feedback on progress, and the results of this will be included in the final report. The Steering Group will take on

main responsibility for co-ordinating evaluation of the project, using the agreed work programme as a 'benchmark' to track progress.

### **Sustainability**

The project is designed to be time-limited and completed with the production of a comprehensive report with costed recommendations for action. As such, it is envisaged that this report will include clear guidance for the development of the recommendations, but this will be addressed as a separate project.

**Timetable:** Report and costed recommendations to be produced after 9/12 months.

<b>Budget</b>	<b>£</b>
<b>Worker time * (Consultation activities, research, database development, interviews, focus groups consultation with Steering Group)</b>	
14 days @ £350 per day	4,900
CVS Network Manager expenses (10 days @ £55 per day)	550
<b>Worker time * (Collating and analysis of research results, development of options, report/plan)</b>	
7 days @ £350 per day	2,450
CVS Network Manager expenses (5 days @ £55 per day)	275
<b>Venue/refreshment costs (Steering Group Meetings/Focus Group)</b>	600
<b>Survey (Freepost, stationery, photocopying)</b>	950
<b>Overheads: (travel, telephone, e-mail)</b>	450
<b>Printing/report production</b>	275
<b>Communications, marketing and promotion</b>	550
<b>Payment for Voluntary organisations time (Calculated at £200 per day)</b>	1,400
<b>Total</b>	<b>12,400</b>
* This work would be undertaken by an external consultant in partnership with the CVS Network Manager.	
<b>TOTAL PROJECT COSTS</b>	<b>12,400</b>
<b>TOTAL REQUESTED FROM DEFRA</b>	<b>12,400</b>

### **Component Three: Increasing the effectiveness of Infrastructure support for rural community capacity building.**

*To develop the provision of direct capacity building infrastructure support to rural communities within the county.*

#### **Evidence of need**

Research was undertaken by consultants, as part of the DEFRA-funded early spend, which showed key gaps and shortfall in the provision of infrastructure support in rural areas. The research information demonstrated a relatively consistent situation across the county. Generic VCS capacity building work is concentrated in urban areas, with rural work often taking up only 10% of organisations' work. A similar situation can be seen in relation to the provision of information advice and assistance, with 87% of delivery being urban, with very limited outreach capability. This is particularly important as community development outreach is likely to be the most effective mechanism for delivering this work in rural areas.

Lack of outreach rural community development support was additionally identified as the most significant gap in provision. This need was repeatedly mentioned by the infrastructure bodies, public sector partners and users interviewed.

#### **Implementation Plan**

This project aims to increase the effectiveness of infrastructure support for rural community capacity building as a one-off effort in Surrey by achieving a number of time-limited outputs and concurrently to develop local funding to sustain this activity beyond March 2006.

The three specific areas of community development infrastructure support that the project will focus on are:

- Improving the effectiveness of support for community led planning
- Developing a community mentors scheme
- Improving the effectiveness of networking between communities and developing the rural voice

This project fits DEFRA's vision for a successful support structure in *Specification and Advice to Partnerships* specifically with regard to the following points:

- Improved community development support
- Greater community involvement in local service delivery
- Wider network for information, good practice exchange, learning & representation including community organisations (parish councils, WI, Young

Farmers, faith communities, BME communities, village halls etc.) and social enterprises at district, linked to county, linked to regional level.

- Mechanisms for sustaining the effort, building on good practice and disseminating learning

**Aims:**

**1. Community led planning and project development**

**A.** To develop a *Surrey Community Planning Toolkit* to guide and support communities. This will be made available in hard copy and via a web site. Surrey is one of the few counties in the country currently without this local infrastructure support.

**B.** To tackle social exclusion by improving access to services through developing community capacity and improved communication with service providers, parish plans will be used as the tool. Furthermore, communities will be trained in participatory techniques to ensure they work inclusively, involving and taking into account the needs of socially excluded groups.

**2. Developing 'Community mentors' feasibility and pilot**

To share skills between communities by developing *Community Mentors*, who would advise and guide other communities on subjects such as developing community participation in projects. This work will be focused initially on the issue of community planning, creating mentoring between groups. After the feasibility and pilot in the first 18 months, this work could be broadened out to include other community skills, activities and groups including village halls committees, community shops, voluntary car schemes, and youth groups.

**3. Connecting communities and developing the rural voice**

To consult on and develop social networking opportunities in order to:

- Develop the rural voice, improving advocacy and representation of rural community needs by infrastructure organisations through the countywide infrastructure strategy
- Provide opportunities, linked to the above, for communities to influence county, regional and national policy and rural proof service provision through improving links between Surrey's Rural Community Forum (made up of professionals) and 'grassroots' rural communities.
- Share best practice between communities

**Objectives:**

**1. Community-led planning and project development**

- To develop a *Community Planning Toolkit* to guide communities
- Fostering ongoing funding support and recognition of the value of infrastructure support for parish and community plans and capacity

building development work, with district and borough councilors, local committees, the Local Directors and Surrey County Councilors.

- To train communities to involve socially excluded groups in the production of plans, skills to be shared through mentoring, see below

## **2. Developing community mentors pilot**

- To conduct desk research into the operation of similar existing schemes to learn from others (for example Derbyshire and Humber and Wolds RCCs)
- To develop a pilot work plan
- To establish an e-mail network of community planning mentors to share good practice
- To set up mentor visits to advise other communities
- To offer training and support to mentors as required
- To evaluate lessons learnt from the pilot and produce a report with recommendations for developing the scheme

## **3. Networking communities and developing the rural voice**

- To develop a plan as part of the production of the county infrastructure strategy (proposed as part of this bid) on strengthening, representation and advocacy for Surrey's rural communities into district and county strategy and at a regional level SERCC, SERAF, GOSE and SEEDA.
- Consult communities on the best model for delivery of networking opportunities to enable and facilitate local groups and communities to share experiences, learn from others and develop a voice in rural proofing services. This would then run as a pilot project. Key to this will be linking them to the Surrey Rural Communities Forum. Evaluating the effectiveness of the piloted model.

### **Delivery**

It is proposed that improving the effectiveness of infrastructure community development support is delivered through the recruitment of one worker. The worker would work in rural and, as required, in urban fringe, urban areas or market towns, sharing good practice in community planning and action between these geographical communities.

The worker would take an outreach approach to working with communities and link with the county Market Towns Co-ordinator to ensure that this work is 'joined up' and does not take place at the expense of urban areas. The CDW could have a flexible base, aiming to build ways of effective joint working with the local district-based infrastructure organisations, supported by the emerging countywide strategy (component one).

The work of the post also needs to be linked into the outcomes of the Modernising Rural Delivery Review as they emerge to foster sustainability. The worker will be part of a supportive learning environment in the host organisation.

## **Milestones**

August – November 2004	Mentors project desk research and workplan
September 2004	Recruitment
October – December 2004	Appointment and induction of post holder
October 2004	Work programme agreed
January/February 2005	Regular liaison is established with key Local Authority personnel.
March 2005	First six month report
October 2005	Second six month report
March 2006	End of DEFRA funding report

## **Sustainability plan**

This is a short-term contract post designed to achieve a step change in the effectiveness of community capacity building as a one-off investment. However there will also be a focus on increasing local funding for rural community development infrastructure support.

The work programme has a number of time limited outputs and outcomes (see overleaf) which will ensure the work has ongoing benefits for communities beyond March 2006 and provide evidence of the impact the worker can make.

## **Outputs**

### **1. *Community led planning and project development***

- A community planning toolkit to guide communities on producing parish and community plans which will help to sustain support
- Increased support and recognition of the value of capacity building infrastructure work amongst district and borough councillors, local committees, the Local Directors and Surrey County Councillors to support this work in future.
- Production of Parish and Community Plans involving socially excluded groups, leading to increased community-led service delivery and 'rurally-proofed' statutory service provision in order to tackle rural social exclusion.

### **2. *Developing 'Community mentors' pilot***

- Establishment of an e-mail network of community planning mentors to share good practice
- An evaluation of the lessons learnt from the pilot and a report with recommendations for developing the scheme

- This pilot will build the capacity of communities permanently meaning that if the workers were to withdraw communities would be better placed to help each other.

### **3. Networking communities and developing the rural voice**

- A blueprint for improved representation and advocacy of rural communities. This will form part of the Surrey county infrastructure strategy
- The results of the pilot linking rural communities to the Surrey Rural Communities Forum will be evaluated and consensus agreed on a way forward.

## **Outcomes**

### **1. *Community led planning and project development***

- More effective infrastructure support for rural community capacity building and greater joint working between infrastructure bodies linked to the county infrastructure strategy
- Increased support and recognition of the value of capacity building development work in improving service provision and tackling social exclusion amongst district and borough councillors, local committees, the Local Directors and Surrey County Councillors to support this work in future.
- Community led plans are more inclusive and produced involving socially excluded groups

### **2. *Developing community mentors pilot***

- This pilot will permanently build the capacity of the involved communities giving them the ability to address their own problems and offer support to other communities to build capacity in the same way.
- Mentors will be able to maintain contact with others through the e-mail network.

### **3. Networking communities and developing the rural voice**

- Rural communities have improved opportunities to network and share skills increasing community capacity
- Communities are engaged with service providers through links with the Rural Communities Forum, improving rural proofing of services
- Wide range of stakeholders are better informed and able to be more effective in tackling social exclusion through improving access to services.
- Advocacy and representation of rural community needs is clarified and strengthened through links to SERCC and the county infrastructure strategy.

## **Other outcomes**

- The increase in the numbers of these posts will create a 'critical mass' of rural CDW's, able to demonstrate the benefits of the capacity building infrastructure support to local partners and future funders.

- More effective joint planning and partnership working undertaken between infrastructure organisations through the development of a county wide infrastructure strategy which will support the work of these community development workers.

### **Impact**

- A one-off 'step change' in the effectiveness of infrastructure support for rural community capacity building
- A focus on developing local funding to sustain this support

### **Evaluation**

In addition to the evaluation already noted under outputs, the postholder would provide a report on their work on a 6-monthly basis. This would be delivered as a written document, but could be based on a range of sources or activities, with a final report produced in March 2006. Good practice and lessons learned will be shared through the SERCC regional network of rural development workers and the Surrey Social Inclusion Group

### **Project management**

The Community Development Worker would be employed and managed by Surrey Community Action, who would work guided by the principles of the Surrey Compact using the Rural Infrastructure Working Group as a reference point.

### **How this project will tackle rural social exclusion and improve service delivery**

Rural inequalities tend to be hidden due to being widely and sparsely-spread throughout an area, as opposed to being concentrated in a particular neighbourhood. Statistics data and indices of deprivation are not designed to measure small numbers or isolated environments. Addressing rural social exclusion therefore needs a focus on access and provision of services, transport and affordable housing. The work of infrastructure organisations in rural communities is therefore crucial to tackling social exclusion in rural areas and overcoming the lack of public service provision.

Nationally, Surrey receives the lowest level of support for rural community development infrastructure support linked to standard area-based social exclusion data. However, the cost of living in Surrey is amongst the highest in the country. The more affluent an area, the worse the quality of life becomes for those residents on restricted incomes and extreme disparity of income highlights their comparable lack of opportunity. The ability of the more affluent to travel or pay a premium to access the services they need restricts the access of those socially excluded (for whatever reason) to services and opportunities which improve their quality of life. It is in these Surrey communities that provision of local resources through community development support, in terms of volunteers, finance and expertise, can be effectively channelled through infrastructure bodies. Their expertise leads to the delivery of more sustainable community

provision of services and creates less drain on the public purse. Improving the effectiveness of (and developing local funding for) community development support is therefore of crucial value to delivering sustainable rural community activity and tackling social exclusion in Surrey.

Communities within Surrey are increasingly delivering services themselves, moving from the traditional role of managing community buildings in rural areas, to running community shops and transport schemes. This trend will continue as public service providers continue to struggle to deliver in rural areas. For example Surrey County Council has just been forced to cut £700,000 of bus services, reductions mainly taking place in rural areas. There is a growing reliance on community and voluntary transport in the rural parts of the county, as mainstream public transport continues to be lost. Statutory agencies are looking increasingly towards this sector to provide transport for their clients. Outreach infrastructure support is crucial to helping communities deliver services.

It has been identified nationally by the RCC network that Parish and Community Plans are the most effective way of identifying community needs, tackling social exclusion, building community capacity and developing the provision of community services. Parish and Community Action Plans are being developed by communities, as they identify service provision needs, support increased community service provision and tackle social exclusion through involving excluded groups and improving access to services. For example, Alfold Parish Plan identified youth as an excluded group within their community; this prompted a youth consultation event and the establishment of a community-run youth service at no cost to government. Community development worker support is vital to ensuring that quality plans are produced and that excluded groups and individuals are involved in their production. There is currently a lack of community development worker support for communities producing plans, infrastructure support needs to be made more effective by this one off investment and local funding developed to sustain the activity.

**Costings (made on the basis of an annual salary of £22,983)**

<b>Salary (18 months)</b>	<b>34,140</b>
<b>NI</b>	<b>3,755</b>
<b>Pension</b>	<b>1,707</b>
<b>Travel</b>	<b>1,875</b>
<b>Recruitment/Training</b>	<b>1,700</b>
<b>Venue/meetings costs</b>	<b>750</b>
<b>Toolkit production costs</b>	<b>3000</b>
<b>Mentor expenses</b>	<b>2000</b>
<b>Management costs</b>	<b>4,094</b>
<b>Operations costs (PC set up/maintenance, telephone, stationery, depreciation, etc.)</b>	<b>4,628</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>57,649</b>
<b>TOTAL PROJECT COSTS</b>	<b>57,649</b>
<b>TOTAL REQUESTED FROM DEFRA</b>	<b>57,649</b>

## 8. Financial Breakdown

### Mainspend proposals: Aggregated Costs

	<b>Total Costs</b>	<b>Defra funding</b>	<b>Match funding</b>
<b>Component One</b> Strategy development	20,000	10,000	10,000
<b>Component Two</b> Waverley infrastructure	12,400	12,400	
<b>Component Three</b> Community Development	57,649	57,649	
<b>Total requested from Defra:</b>	<b>£80,049</b>		
<b>Total cost of proposals:</b>	<b>£90,049</b>	<b>(made up of 80,049 Defra funding and 10,000 match funding)</b>	

## **9. Addressing Rural Social Exclusion**

Whilst the perception of Surrey is of an affluent county, it is clear that rural social exclusion is an important issue that requires action. Issues such as the very high average cost of housing and the reliance on the car for transport in rural areas of the county can exacerbate the problems experienced by disadvantaged individuals and families in villages across Surrey. The proposals contained in this document aim to develop a variety of measures designed to make a contribution to addressing the issues related to rural social exclusion in Surrey. Specifically:

- Component One aims to build and develop the effectiveness and efficiency of infrastructure support in the county, with a clear emphasis on rural provision. A key element of this will be to ensure that the strategy adopted is both inclusive and comprehensive, and takes into account the needs and concerns of socially-excluded rural residents. Developments and actions identified will be 'rural-proofed' to ensure that they recognise the issues of concern and that actions are designed to make a real and direct contribution to reducing rural social exclusion.
- Component Two provides a means by which those living in Waverley borough have the opportunity to access support for local action. Consultation and the development of potential models for the development of infrastructure provision in the borough will take into account the needs of socially-excluded individuals and groups and again, any identified actions will be 'rural-proofed' to ensure that this issue is addressed effectively.
- Component Three directly addresses the issue of rural social exclusion, and actions to address concerns related to this will form an important part of the work of the Community Development Worker. In addition, information and feedback on issues of concern and the identified needs of those in rural areas experiencing social exclusion will be captured and used to provide feedback to for the work being undertaken in Component One. Developing and strengthening the 'rural voice' will help to address rural social exclusion, as will the greater understanding of rural community needs.

## **10. Addressing Diversity**

The issue of diversity is an important one, ensuring the needs of diverse community groups are identified and understood, and the proposals developed do take into account this key issue. This includes the following key actions:

- The postholder will have access to training and development opportunities targeted on extending their understanding the needs of diverse communities
- Induction work will include work on diversity, inclusion and social exclusion, including information, introductions to networks, key partnerships, etc

- The wide membership and inclusive approach of the Surrey Steering Group will be used to help ensure actions taken recognise diversity in the community and reflect the make up of the Surrey population.
- All participating organisations will be expected to have Equal Opportunities policies.

**Appendix A: Accountable Body Constitution, Accounts and Annual report**

## Appendix B: Names and addresses of Consortium members

Organisation	Contact name	Position	Address 1	Address 2	Address 3	Postcode
<b>Central Surrey CVS</b>	Sally Dubery	Assistant Director	The Cedars	14 Church Street	Epsom	KT17 4QB
<b>Elmbridge CVS Steering Committee</b>	Kate Emerson	Chairman	12 Ashley Rise		Walton on Thames	KT12 1ND
<b>Elmbridge VB</b>	Priscilla Austen	Bureau Manager	Residents House	Community Walk	Esher	KT10 9RA
<b>Farnham Vol Service Council</b>	Tony Shepard	General Manager	Vernon House	28 West Street	Farnham	GU9 7DR
<b>Godalming VB</b>	Don Barnes	Manager	Carriers House	8 Wharf Street	Godalming	GU7 1NN
<b>Guildford AVS and VB</b>	Kate Peters	Manager	39 Castle Street		Guildford	GU1 3UQ
<b>Haslemere &amp; District VB</b>	Kathy Grace	Manager	4 High Street		Haslemere	GU27 2LY
<b>Reigate &amp; Banstead CVS</b>	Lynne Loving	Manager	76 Station Road		Redhill	RH1 1PL
<b>Runnymede AVS</b>	Heather Cook	Chief Officer	Unit 12-13	The Sainsbury Centre	Chertsey	KT16 9AG

<b>Surrey Community Action</b>	CEO and Abby Thomas	Chief Officer/Head of Communities Team	Astolat, Coniers Way	Burpham	Guildford	GU4 7HL
<b>Tandridge Vol Service Council</b>	Andy Parr	Manager	The Star Centre, Oxted Library.	14 Gresham Road	Oxted	RH8 0BQ
<b>Voluntary Action in Spelthorne</b>	Sarah Clarke	Manager	Community Link	Knowle Green	Staines	TW18 1XA
<b>Voluntary Services Surrey Heath</b>	Christine Furneaux Manager		Community Link, Surrey Heath House	Knoll Rd	Camberley	GU15 3HH
<b>Woking AVS and VB</b>	Lesley Kitchen	Director	Provincial House	26 Commercial Way	Woking	GU21 6EN
<b>Surrey County Council</b>	Elaine Garfitt	SCC VCS Lead Manager	County Hall	Penrhyn Road	Kingston Upon Thames	KT1 2DN
<b>Surrey County Council</b>	Mike Dawson	Head of Countryside	County Hall	Penrhyn Road	Kingston Upon Thames	KT1 2DN
<b>Surrey CVYS</b>	David Cox	Director	Astolat, Coniers Way	Burpham	Guildford	GU4 7HL
<b>Waverly Borough Council</b>	Wendy Varcoe	Community Care Officer	The Council Offices	The Burys	Godalming	GU7 1HR
<b>Age Concern - Surrey</b>	Tony Lee		Rex House	William Road	Guildford	GU1 4QZ

## **Appendix C: Letters of support from members**

## **Appendix D: Further details of the Surrey Context**

The key element of this work (identified by both the Steering Group and the findings of the research) has been to ensure that rural communities can develop a strong and effective 'voice'. The proposals have been guided by a desire to ensure that the concerns of rural communities are heard and responded to and that rural residents have the opportunity to influence and guide policy where it affects them. It is also important to develop the support required to build the capacity of communities to become involved in service delivery.

Strong rural communities can be more effective not only in identifying issues of concern, but also in addressing them, and the voluntary and community sector have a key role in enabling and facilitating this. Strong and effective infrastructure will help to support and sustain a vibrant and engaged sector, achieving benefits for all stakeholders.

Comprehensive infrastructure provision across the county is critical. There needs to be greater clarity and wider understanding of the roles of the infrastructure organisations, a greater focus on rural provision along with the development of a strategic dimension to infrastructure provision that will be shaped by the current gaps in infrastructure provision and the needs of the sector.

### **The Surrey Compact**

The development of a Compact was a key recommendation in the SCC Best Value Review on 'Links with the Voluntary Sector' in March 2002. A cross-sector Compact Working Group consulted with over 3000 organisations to produce the Surrey Compact document, which was officially endorsed by the Surrey County Council in February 2004. The Surrey Compact, which has also been endorsed by over 250 voluntary and community groups, will be officially launched on 3 July 2004.

The next steps, so as to ensure the Compact way of working becomes a reality in Surrey, will be to produce five Codes of Good Practice on Funding, Working with Communities, Volunteering, Planning Policy & Consultation and Equality & Diversity. It is planned that this Rural Infrastructure Strategy and the components of the implementation plan will inform the development of all these codes, ensuring that the voice of the rural communities is heard.

### **Population**

The population of Surrey in 2001 was 1,059,015, with the most populous borough being Guildford (129,717): the smallest was Epsom & Ewell (67,015). The biggest growth since 1991 was in Reigate & Banstead (+6.6%) and Elmbridge (+6.5%). The populations of Epsom & Ewell and Spelthorne fell by 1%, but in Spelthorne this fall was due to boundary changes. There was also a slight decrease in Waverley.

About 230,000 people out of a total of 1,060,000 live in rural areas. Rural communities in Surrey vary widely, ranging from locations with a few houses and no local services to very large villages and small towns with a full range of services. Their socio-economic composition also varies considerably, from communities that are on the edge of London to those in open countryside in the south of the county.

Figures from the 2001 Census show some key trends for the county. For example, the population of Surrey increased by 2.5% (25,400) between 1991 and 2001, significantly less than the rate of increase for the South East of 4.2%. The rate of increase for the whole of the UK was 1.7%. Almost 20,000 of the change in Surrey's population was due to natural change (that is, more births than deaths), whilst boundary changes account for a loss of 4,200. The remainder (10,000) was due to net inward migration.

The rural population tends to be older than average with more over 65 year olds than in urban areas (23.4% of the rural population is over 60 compared with 21.6% for Surrey as a whole).

The 1991 census showed that 2.8% of county's population was made up of individuals from ethnic minority communities with the greatest concentrations being found in Woking, Guildford, Redhill and the fringes of greater London.

### **Housing**

Surrey has the highest average house prices of any county in England. House prices in the more rural parts of the county are often well above these averages. The continued high demand and limited supply of new housing have pushed the house prices up. Consequently local people and rural workers are increasingly priced out of the housing market in rural areas. There is a growing level of 'hidden' housing demand because young people and young families are often forced to remain with parents because of the lack of affordable housing.

The lack of affordable housing in rural parts of the county is a major issue for public sector workers, rural businesses and for young people and young families. Proposals are under way to develop affordable housing schemes in rural areas but these are still in their infancy.

### **Employment**

The patterns of work in rural Surrey have changed dramatically over the past 20 years. Farming, retail business, banking and post offices have all declined. However employment levels, as elsewhere in the country, have risen along with average earnings.

Many of the population who live in the rural parts of the county commute to jobs in the towns. Unfortunately Government spending on economic regeneration in

rural areas concentrates on 'Rural Priority Areas' and no part of Surrey qualifies for this help.

There are about 450 principal employers in Surrey employing about 140,000 people (approximately one third of all employed people in the county). Principal employers in Surrey include the University of Surrey, BP, Legal and General and several large NHS hospitals.

### **Transport**

Transport is another major challenge in the rural parts of the county. Those residents who live in these areas who do not have access to a car can often experience rural social exclusion. It is estimated that 17% of households in Surrey do not currently own a car and are dependent on public transport, taxis, lifts, cycling or walking. A lack of car can lead to problems accessing services, jobs and education.

However it is anticipated that the traffic in rural parts of Surrey will increase by approximately 50% by 2031 giving concern as to how the rural lanes and villages will cope with such an increase in traffic.

### **Rural issues**

Many rural communities have a strong sense of self reliance with active parish and town councils who develop initiatives that will meet the needs of the local population. However, many local services in the rural communities are either in decline or have migrated from small village communities to nearby rural towns or urban areas. Small rural communities are often less self-sufficient than they use to be.

In the County Council's *Surrey Rural Strategy (October 2003)* common issues were identified that affected the delivery of all services to the rural parts of the county.

- Unit costs of delivery of public services are higher in rural areas as compared to urban areas, due to economies of scale
- Difficulties of accessibility and transportation, both in terms of getting people to points of service delivery and getting services to people
- The recruitment and retention of staff and volunteers is a problem particularly with high housing costs and an ageing population in rural areas

### **Health & Social Care**

The problems of delivering health and social care services in the rural parts of the county are due to several factors:

- the higher levels of older people in the rural parts
- lack of health services in rural areas
- inadequate transport to GP's and hospitals

- welfare benefits which are not weighted to consider Surrey's high cost of living
- Users and carers in rural Surrey are more likely to be socially and physically isolated with little or no opportunity for mutual support with fewer specialist local services
- Aids and adaptations to property may be more difficult to obtain in rural areas

Access to day care facilities and other services can involve long traveling distances for the service user and higher costs.