



**Improving Healthcare Together 2020 – 2030  
CVS small grants scheme  
Final report from Central Surrey Voluntary Action**

## Table of Contents

<b>1. Executive Summary .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2. Aims of the CVS scheme .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>3. Methodology.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>4. The case for change - overview of feedback .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>4.1 Evaluating the proposals - The model of care .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>4.2 Key Themes - Concerns.....</b>	<b>8</b>
4.2.1 Transports, Travel and Parking .....	8
4.2.2 Suggestions addressing these concerns .....	8
4.2.3 Environmental and Sustainability .....	8
4.2.4 Issues and questions expressed by participants and addressed by IHT .....	9
4.2.5 Additional feedback relating to particular participants from VCS consultation .....	10
<b>5. Proposed locations .....</b>	<b>12</b>
5.1.1 Epsom as a location for new specialist care hospital.....	12
5.1.2 St Helier as a location for new specialist care hospital.....	12
5.1.3 Sutton as a location for new specialist care hospital.....	12
<b>6. An overview of possible impacts .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>7. Additional comments.....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Appendix 1.....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Appendix 2 - Demographics of CVS scheme participants .....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Appendix 3: The breakdown of spend: .....</b>	<b>18</b>

## 1. Executive Summary

Central Surrey Voluntary Action (CSVA) engaged with a wide range of Voluntary, Community Sector (VCS) organisations through two methods of engagement.

Firstly, CSVA identified VCS organisations working with seldom heard groups, provided funding through Improving Healthcare Together 2020-2030 Community Chest Fund and supported organisations such as Age Concern Mole Valley, Age Concern Epsom & Ewell, Age Concern Banstead, Staywell Community Centre, Foodbank serving the people in Epsom & Ewell, Leatherhead, Banstead and Tadworth, The Old Moat- Richmond Fellowship, The Generation Church, Sunnybank Trust and Learning Disability Carer Group (SWAG) to lead consultation events with their service users.

Secondly, Central Surrey Voluntary Action held VCS organisations consultation event attended by Epsom & Ewell Citizen Advice, Mid Surrey Dementia Trust, Surrey Downs Diabetes UK, Cobham area food bank, Ashted Good neighbours, Surrey Coalition of Disabled People in Surrey Down's CCG area.

A total of 161 participants took part in the various CVS/ VCS led engagement events and workshops. The majority of the participants agree with the proposed model of care, bringing together 6 core services in new specialist emergency care hospital and keeping 85% of services in refurbished District General Hospitals at Epsom and St Helier and understand the reasoning behind the location of the new specialist hospital and the wider proposal. The following concerns regarding the new model care were raised by the participants of CVS/ VCS consultations.

### **Travel and Transport**

Across all groups, there is a consensus that travels, and transport will be a key issue for all options. Particularly looking at the model of care (Sutton hospital), many people are concerns about the hospital distance from Sutton train station and the lack of buses between Surrey Downs and Sutton, especially for older and disabled patients (physical and learning disabilities). They are also concern about the time it takes to reach Sutton hospital via private car or public transport as the road of often congested and the bad conditions of the road.

### **Parking**

There is a concern around the availability of parking and raising parking fees, which particularly affect older people, people with learning or physical disabilities, their carers and people from a deprived background. The general consensus is that there should be more blue badge parking, free or subsidised parking for visitor and patients. Alternative options like park and ride and more frequent shuttle bus services between the hospitals

### **Environmental and Sustainability**

Participants expressed concern about the impact on the environment when building a new hospital and improving the existing hospital. They also expressed concerns about the increase in pollution and congestion around Sutton hospital. More investment in public transport would address these issues.

## 2. Aims of the CVS scheme

The CVS Scheme was established to ensure that impacted populations and harder to reach groups were supported to take part in the Improving Healthcare Together consultation, via existing networks and trusted voluntary and community sector organisations and groups. The scheme was run through borough Councils for Voluntary Services, or CVS, as recognised umbrella organisations for the voluntary and community sector in their area, resourcing them to create opportunities for target groups to learn about and share their views on the proposals under consideration. Establishment of the scheme followed recommendations from the Improving Healthcare Together Programme's Consultation Oversight Group.

Target groups for the CVS scheme included the following:

- Maternity Services – women aged between 16 – 44 who may be planning a pregnancy/ are pregnant or women who have given birth in the last 12 – 18 months
- Paediatric Services – children & young people who might need to be admitted to an inpatient bed – could be any children.
- Gypsy Roma Travellers (largest population in Surrey Downs)
- Low income households – for example, people living in the following wards (St Helier, Ravensbury, Pollards Hill, Cricket Green, Beddington South, Figge's Marsh)
- LGBTQ+ communities
- Carers – including young carers
- People with physical, speech, hearing, learning or visual impairments
- Older People
- Refugees, migrants and asylum seekers
- People with mental health needs
- People who are homeless
- Children and Young People – including their parents/carers
- Black and minority ethnic communities
- People experiencing alcohol and/or substance abuse difficulties
- People who are housebound
- Faith groups

### 3. Methodology

Central Surrey Voluntary Action (CSVA) identified Voluntary and Community Sector (VCS) organisations who provide services and support for the target groups identified by the IHT team. 20 organisations were identified to take part in the community chest fund to carry out their consultation with their service users. Improving Healthcare Together 2020-2030- Voluntary Sector Engagement Proposal was initially sent to 20 identified organisations via email, this followed several 1:1 conversations to encourage the organisations to get involved with the consultation to ensure that seldom heard cohorts are aware of the proposals and their concerns and ideas were included in the consultation.

Voluntary Sector organisations face limitation on time and staff resources to take part in the consultation as their service users are vulnerable people who need one to one time to walk through the IHT plans. After much discussion with the groups, it was decided that community chest grant should be increased from £300 to £400 to create a bigger incentive to take part. As a result, 9 organisations agreed to take part in the consultation and 161 people in Epsom & Ewell, Tadworth, Mole Valley and Banstead shared their views on the proposed plans. Voluntary and community sector organisations in East Elmbridge declined to take part in the consultations, although some attended CSVA VCS consultation event.

CSVA provided all the material each group needed to carry out their consultation with their service users. As well as provided one to one support for the organisation's to understand consultation documents and the proposed changes and finally, CSVA attended and led several sessions, four in total, to record the view of the participants as well as assist in the presentation of the proposal and answer any questions participants expressed. In addition to providing support of the 11-voluntary organisation, CSVA also organised an IHT consultation event for the representatives of 20 organisations in Epsom and Ewell, Mole Valley and East Elmbridge to discuss the plans and record their concerns. CSVA displayed consultation questions in Epsom and Dorking volunteer centres, handed out questions in events and meeting we attended and requested the questionnaires to be handed out to participants in community groups like Sunday teas. And finally, we featured IHT event consultation in our newsletters, promoting the IHT website and encouraging more organisations to share in their thoughts and concerns about the consultation directly to the IHT website.

### Activities held

Target Population	Name of organisation	Activities were delivered for target populations	Individuals were reached per target population
Carers	Learning disability carers group (SWAG Club)	One group session. 4 sessions by video conferencing due to coronavirus lock down	9
Low income households	Epsom and Ewell foodbank	6 one to one sessions	51
Older People	Age Concern Epsom and Ewell, Age Concern Banstead, Age Concern Mole Valley Staywell Day centre	3 group sessions	47
People with mental health needs	The old moat (Richmond Fellowship)	1 group session	5
People with learning difficulties	Sunnybank Trust	3 one to one sessions	12
Faith group	Generation Church	1 group session	17
Voluntary organisations	CSVA	1 group event	20
<b>Total</b>			<b>161</b>

Total number of questionnaires distrusted: 100

Total number of easy read: 20

Total number of other languages: 0

#### 4. The case for change - overview of feedback

What extent there was understanding of the challenges faced by Epsom and St Helier Hospitals?

83.8% (135) of the participant in all voluntary and community sector (VCS) organisations consultation have a good understanding of the challenges faced by Epsom and St Helier Hospital and all agree that current hospitals, Epsom and St Helier, needed improvement and upgrading. The participant felt that the purposed model of care is a good solution to address these challenges. The specialist care under one roof, being close of the Royal Marsden is seen as a positive. Many understood the rationale around the proposal to build a specialist hospital in Sutton, as it is a central location for both Surrey Down and Sutton & Merton residences. The participants feel a new hospital would benefit the community as a whole. However, a minority of people feel the specialist hospital should be built in Epsom but are willing to travel further to receive specialist care.

##### 4.1 Evaluating the proposals - The model of care

Overall, 161 service users from Surrey Downs' Voluntary and Community Sector organisations where consulted for the Improving Healthcare Together. The majority of people consulted support the proposed model of care to improve Epsom & St Helier Hospital and to build new specialist hospital in Sutton which brings together six core services. A joint consultation carried out the by Foodbank in Banstead, Epsom & Ewell, Tadworth and Leatherhead and Generation Church found that 66.2% of those who took part in the consultation agreed that the model of care was good, while 72% understood the reasoning behind the plan. This reflected other participants from Age Concern Banstead, Age Concern Mole Valley, Sunnybank Trust, The Old Moat and Central Surrey Voluntary Action's VCS consultation event. The consensus among the participants where that Epsom and St Helier hospital need urgent refurbishment and a new specialist Hospital will means patients will have access to treatment under one roof and it would overall have a positive benefit to the communities.

## 4.2 Key Themes - Concerns

### 4.2.1 Transports, Travel and Parking

Across all participants in the VCS consultation, travel and transport is the main concern. For service user of Age concern Banstead, Age Concern Mole Valley and Stay Well centre, charities who support older people in Surrey Downs Area, felt that cost of travel and more parking, especially disability parking, should be made available across all three sites. There is also concern around cost of parking at the hospitals and the lack of public transport, particularly after 6pm, for people living in Fetcham, Bookham and Leatherhead to access the Sutton Hospital site. Many people felt this would have a negatively impact on older people, their families and carers.

These concerns were also raised by service users and carers of Sunnybank Trust, a learning disability charity working in Epsom & Ewell. Additionally, participants raised concerns about the lack of buses from Sutton station to the new Sutton hospital site, an anxiety round driving in busy roads in Sutton and potential difficulties for patients with learning disabilities and carers which live further away in Surrey Downs area. Participant at The Old Moat – Richmond Fellowship, a mental health charity also shared concerns around lack to buses to and from Sutton station to the location of Sutton Hospital. Participants at Central Surrey Voluntary Action consultation event attended by Epsom & Ewell citizen advice, Mid Surrey Dementia Trust, Surrey Downs Diabetes UK, Cobham area food bank, Ashted Good neighbours, Surrey Coalition of Disabled People etc highlighted the concern around travel between the three different sites and the need for specially adapted buses to serve people with disabilities.

### 4.2.2 Suggestions addressing these concerns

- Frequent shuttle buses between the three sites
- Free parking and/or subsidies parking from older people, people with mental and physical disabilities and their carers and families.
- Buses should be available from Sutton station to Sutton hospital.
- Improve parking facilities across all three sites.
- Increase disability parking, widen the parking spaces to ensure that specially adapted vehicles can safely manoeuvre.
- Improving the road conditions in and around the new Sutton hospital site.

### 4.2.3 Environmental and Sustainability

Participants from Sunnybank Trust, learning disability carers group (SWAG) and CSVA consultation events expresses concerns around environmental impact and sustainability for building the new hospital in Sutton. Participants are concerned about the increase traffic and congestion around Sutton due to the new hospital which will negatively impact the residents in and around the area. Participants at the CSVA event, suggested while increasing investment in public transports may address some of the issues, that this is a good opportunity to find long term sustainable and 'out of the box' solutions to address these issues, such as hospital run volunteer car schemes or special shuttle service to transport frail and elderly home.

#### 4.2.4 Issues and questions expressed by participants and addressed by IHT

**What will be the future running costs of the three options? If we have three hospitals rather than two - is there not more expensive and travel costs between three sites - additional managers, support staff, maintenance etc.**

The future running costs of the hospital have been incorporated into the financial analysis, in particular in terms of income and expenditure. This can be found in Section 13 of the PCBC, which can be accessed on the IHT website – here: <https://improvinghealthcaretogether.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/12/Pre-consultation-Business-Case-9-Jan-2020.pdf>.

**How is the environmental impact being measured?**

The environmental impact analysis has been based on air quality and carbon emissions assessment. The Air Quality and Green House Gases assessments methodologies have been outlined in sections C and D of Appendix 1 (see pages 63 – 74) to the draft interim Integrated Impact Assessment report. The appendix is available on the IHT website – here: <https://improvinghealthcaretogether.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/Draft-IIA-Interim-Report-Appendix-1-Jan-2020.pdf>

**What are the differences in pollution potential with the three options?**

Wider sustainability impacts for each proposed option (based on magnitude, likely duration, and likelihood) are detailed in the draft interim Integrated Impact Assessment report, section 5.13, pages 120 – 124. The report is available on the IHT website – here: <https://improvinghealthcaretogether.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/IHTIIA1.pdf>. Depending on location, the delivery of acute services on a single hospital site will likely have a minor impact on air quality, with the Sutton Hospital option the only option to offer potential improvements.

#### 4.2.5 Additional feedback relating to particular participants from VCS consultation

##### New specialist emergency care hospital

Sub-theme	Raised by	Comments
Learning disability awareness training	The Sunnybank trust and Learning disability carer group (learning disabilities)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ More training on how to better support people with learning disabilities for staff in all hospitals.</li> <li>○ The design and refurbishment of the Epsom and St Helier and Sutton hospital should try and cater to people with learning and physical disabilities i.e. step-free access, where possible.</li> <li>○ Better signage using more iconography and braille.</li> <li>○ More specialist equipment to assist people with disabilities, bigger changing room and toilets.</li> <li>○ Involve carers and people of learning disability like providing tours of the new hospital to ensure people with learning disabilities are familiar with the new/ refurbished hospitals.</li> <li>○ Any disruption in Epsom and St Helier hospital should be clearly communicated to people with learning disability and their carers.</li> </ul>
The cost of refurbishing Epsom and St Helier plus building Sutton Hospital	Foodbank (people from deprived backgrounds) Sunnybank Trust (Learning disabilities) and learning disability carer group (Carers)	Is £500 million enough to carry out these works to high standard?
Investment in Aftercare in the community and in hospital  Taking births away from local (Epsom) Hospital	The Old Moat Richmond fellowship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Would money also be improving aftercare, including care in the community as well as care in hospital?</li> <li>○ Taking the option away to give birth at a local hospital. Women will have to travel further away to access maternity services.</li> </ul>

85% of services staying put in district general hospitals at Epsom and St Helier

Sub-theme	Raised by (name of group and target population)	Comments
Parking	The Sunnybank trust (Learning disability) Age Concerns (older people) Foodbank (deprived background) The old Moat (Mental Health)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Current parking needs to be improved i.e. more parking is needed, more blue badge parking, closer to the hospital.</li> <li>○ The cost of parking should be reduced or be free.</li> <li>○ The groups also suggested park and ride scheme and more shuttle bus between the hospitals</li> </ul>
Decision making and time taken to implement the model of care	CSVA VCS Event (mental health, citizens advice Epsom, foodbank Cobham)  Age concerns (older people)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Why does it take so long to build the new hospital?</li> <li>○ Why does that decision take so long to be made after the consultation?</li> <li>○ Who will be making the final decision?</li> </ul>

## 5. Proposed locations

Overview of feedback from groups on the proposed locations for the new specialist emergency care hospital

### 5.1.1 Epsom as a location for new specialist care hospital

The service users of the Foodbank from Epsom & Ewell, Leatherhead, Banstead, Tadworth generally favour building the new specialist hospital in Epsom. However, they are willing to travel further for specialist care. Participants from the Age Concerns (Mole Valley and Banstead), Sunnybank Trust, The Old Moat- The Richmond Fellowship who expressed preference for the new specialist hospital in Epsom stating familiarity with the hospital, having good local public transport and favour the idea of having specialist care hospital close to the communities in Surrey Downs. However, Epsom location is the least popular location for participants on the Learning Disability Carer Group. The participant across VCS organisations also shared concerns around whether there is sufficient space at Epsom general, especially in light of the recent sale of the land at Epsom hospital. The participants from Age Concerns (Mole Valley and Banstead), Staywell community centre, The Old Moat- The Richmond Fellowship and CSVA VCS organisations events also expressed concerns around increase traffic around Epsom Town Centre one-way system, which will negatively impact pollution levels and assess for patients and ambulances. The consensus around this option is that while the Epsom location would benefit the residence in Surrey Downs areas, it would negatively impact residence in Sutton and Merton. They would have to rely on private transport to access the specialist hospital due to limited public transport connecting residence from Sutton/ Merton to Epsom Hospital as well as expensive parking and public transport.

### 5.1.2 St Helier as a location for new specialist care hospital

Generally, an unpopular location for the majority of the participants in Surrey Downs. Looking at participants who favour this option, 3 participants from Foodbank consultation preferred the location citing familiarity and close proximity, the good service they received and looks more feasible to have the new specialist hospital being built on the site. Majority Learning Disability Group (SWAG) and Sunnybank trust felt the St Helier location is also a good option as they felt it had good public transport connections and building the specialist hospital would have a minimum impact on them. Participants from The Old Moat – The Richmond Fellowship had concerns around the increased cost of the built due to the age of the building.

All Participants from Age Concern Mole Valley, Age Concern Banstead and Stay well Community centre do not support St Helier as a possible location for the new specialist hospital, citing that it was too big, too far away for the majority to residence in Surrey Downs and cost of public transport from areas like Bookham, Leatherhead and Fetcham is too high. Representatives from VCS organisations at CSVA consultation event felt that building a new hospital and refurbishing it would cause too much disruption for patients and staff and they echoed concerns raised by Age Concern participants that the cost of transport is too high for Surrey Downs residence.

### 5.1.3 Sutton as a location for new specialist care hospital

The majority of VCS representatives at CSVA consultation event, Age Concerns (Mole Valley and Banstead) Staywell centres favour Sutton as the location for the new hospital and having all the

specialist care under one roof however, very small minority (one person) didn't like the idea of going to London and felt that Sutton was 'too close to London'. For participants from the joint consultation from the Foodbank and Generation church expressed that Sutton location for the new specialist hospital is their second preferred option after Epsom, citing the central location for communities in Surrey Downs and Sutton/ Merton, they also trust the recommendations made by clinicians behind the New Model of Care.

## 6. An overview of possible impacts

While Sutton option is a favourable option for most participants there are important issues around transport (roads access) and accessibility of public transports, the cost of parking and the availability of parking spaces are key concerns for all participants (section 4.2.1). They have made recommendations to address these issues (sections 4.2.2).

There is also concern expressed regarding the lost services in Epsom hospital- Foodbank and The Old Moat – Richmond Fellowship participants expressed worries around loss of paediatric beds, maternity and mental health services from Epsom hospital which they feel will negatively impact the families in Surrey Downs Area. While participants from the Foodbank consultation expressed concerns about the negative impact length of travel to Sutton hospital might have on families visiting patients in the new specialist hospital.

The impact of people with learning disabilities and their carers are also important to consider when building a new hospital and refurbishing the Epsom and St Helier hospitals, such as;

- More training on how to better support people with learning disabilities for staff in all hospitals.
- The design and refurbishment of the Epsom & St Helier and Sutton hospital should try and cater to people with learning and physical disabilities i.e. step-free access, where possible.
- Better signage using more iconography and braille, which will aid older people as well as the general population navigate around all three hospitals.
- More specialist equipment to assist people with disabilities, bigger changing room and toilets.
- Involve carers and people of learning disability like providing tours of the new hospital to ensure people with learning disabilities are familiar with the new/ refurbished hospitals.
- Any disruption in Epsom and St Helier hospital should be clearly communicated to people with learning disability, their carers and other patients.

## 7. Additional comments

AIMS	The aims and objective of the plans and the consultation was clearly communicated, and all materials need to carry out in consultation was given in a timely manner.
PEOPLE INVOLVED	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Were target populations successfully reached?</li> </ul> <p>No, many in the voluntary sector have been involved in previous consultations and felt that this is another pointless exercise which will come to nothing. People have consultation fatigue which impacted their involvement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How were challenges in reaching seldom heard people addressed?</li> </ul> <p>The amount of money and time to carry out the consultations with the voluntary sector organisations is not sufficient. The target group of people the voluntary sector are often high needs and vulnerable therefore it takes considerable time and effort for the staff to explain the plans, discuss options and record the service users' responses. Therefore, we increased the amount of funding to £400 per organisation, which meant more organisations were willing to participant.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What would help identify and reach the right people if you did this again?</li> </ul> <p>More time and money. The local voluntary sector, particularly in Surrey is underfunded and under resources. The consultation takes considerable about of staff time and organisation's resources therefore, sufficient financial incentives needs to be in place to encourage more VCS organisations to take part.</p>
METHODS	The consultation document is hard to understand for most people. It is a long document and many people are confused about the proposed plans. A lot of the questions asked in the consultation is not easily understood by the service users and had to be reworded or additional explanation is needed. The animation and easy read materials helped a lot to ensure people understand the plans.
TIMING	There need to be a lot more time for vulnerable people to contribute to the consultation. This is especially key in hospital consultations, cohorts like people with learning disabilities who use hospitals frequently due to their commodities, need more time and

	engagement.
COST	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>How much money did you spend?</b> The project was budgeted at £9,912</li> <li>• <b>What other costs were there?</b></li> </ul> <p>A significant part of my time in the last few months is spend helping and supporting the VSC organisations with planning the event, understanding the material, presenting the IHT plan at their events and recording the responses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Was the process proportionate / value for money?</b> From CSVA it was proportionate as we felt that seldom heard groups should contribute to the consultation.</li> </ul>
OUTCOMES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Where did you consider what you heard? (and record)</b></li> </ul> <p>Overall, participants were positive about the model of care. General feeling among the participants were that something needs to be done to improve Epsom &amp; St Helier hospitals and that the population in Surrey Downs deserve better care and healthcare facilities. <i>'get on with improving the services and build a new hospital'</i> and <i>'we can't stay in this limbo'</i> was something that was expressed many times. People are willing to travel to get better care and Transport and parking issue in Epsom and St Helier need to be better designed and improved.</p>
LEARNING	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>What worked well?</b> Having smaller consultation group such as the VCS orgs consultations worked very well. In the general public consultation is very aggressive and hostile therefore, many people, regardless of whether they are vulnerable or not, found it difficult to express their support for the model of care.</li> <li>• <b>What would you do differently in the future?</b> More time to engage VCS orgs. Giving more time to engage with vulnerable people.</li> </ul>

## Appendix 1

### List of groups engaged, target populations and numbers for each

<b>Group Name</b>	<b>Target population</b>	<b>Number of people engaged</b>	<b>Number of questionnaires completed (if relevant)</b>
Sunnybank Trust	People with a learning disability	12	
Learning disability carer group (SWAG Group)	Carers	9	
The Old Moat	Mental health	5	
Age Concern Epsom and Ewell	Older people/ disabilities	5	
Age Concern Banstead	Older People/ Disabilities	15	
Age Concern Mole Valley	Older People/ Disabilities	17	
Staywell Centre Banstead	Older people/ Disabilities	10	
Generation Church	Faith group	16	
Epsom & Ewell/ Leatherhead foodbank	Deprived communities	51	
CSVA Event	Representatives from Voluntary and Community in Central Surrey area	20	

## Appendix 2 - Demographics of CVS scheme participants

Characteristic		Number of participants
By age	Insert age categories from equality monitoring form	
	25-34	16
	35-44	25
	45-54	10
	65-74	10
	75 or older	52
By gender	Insert categories from equality monitoring form on separate rows	
	Women	70
	Men	40
	Prefer not to say	
	Not answered	
By gender identification	Insert categories from equality monitoring form on separate rows	
	Prefer not to say	
	Not answered	0
By sexual orientation	Insert categories from equality monitoring form on separate rows	
	Prefer not to say	
	Not answered	0
By disability	Insert categories from equality monitoring form on separate rows	
	Prefer not to say	
	Not answered	0
By carer	Insert categories from equality monitoring form on separate rows	9
	Prefer not to say	
	Not answered	
By ethnic group	Insert categories from equality monitoring form on separate rows	

	Prefer not to say	
	Not answered	0
By religion	Insert categories from equality monitoring form on separate rows	
	Prefer not to say	
	Not answered	0

### Appendix 3: The breakdown of spend:

Item	Total numbers	Costing	Total
Community Chest VCS organisations events/ consultation	11 organisations took part in the IHT consultation	£400 per organisation engagement session plus collecting feedback	£4400
CSVA VCS engagement event x 1 (leatherhead)	20 organisations	Staff (4) costs to facilitate and administer the event (half a day) plus room booking and refreshments	£1,500
CSVA support and presentation the recording responses from VCS organisations	- Age Concern Banstead - Staywell community centre - Age Concern Mole Valley	Staff cost x 3 hours per event, plus 2 hours supporting VCS organisation x 3 events	£525
CSVA time providing one to one support for VCS organisation consultations	- 8 organisations	Average 2 hours per organisation providing help and support over the consultation period	400
Feedback and Report writing		1 staff x 5 hours a day x 4 days plus working over the weekend	£700
CSVA management fee 15%	n/a	£1500	£1500
Marketing Budget via newsletters, social media	n/a	£50	£50
		<b>Total</b>	<b>£9,075</b>