Hidden Surrey
Why local giving is needed to strengthen our communities
Foreword

Although Surrey is known to be one of the wealthiest counties in the United Kingdom, with the majority of its population enjoying a high quality of life, as the title of this revealing report suggests there are, in fact, many pockets of deprivation within the county. These are not evident from statistical data based on coarser mapping grids but become all too clear when finer grids are used. Furthermore, they frequently occur within towns and villages which are often associated in the minds eye with prosperity and high living standards. In some cases they are amongst the most deprived areas in the country.

Happily, Surrey also has numerous voluntary and charitable organisations, some of which are highlighted within this report, which are doing invaluable work in addressing the various needs of Surrey and the wider community. Between them they reach many, but by no means all, of the people and groups in need of help. However, in many cases these voluntary groups are encountering increasing difficulties in securing funding due to the reduction in available statutory and other grants. This is compounded by the short term nature and increasing bureaucracy of many grant programmes. All of this, of course, is further aggravated by the current drastic downturn in the UK’s economy.

Dr Helen Bowcock’s report provides an up-to-date perspective on social disadvantage within Surrey and examines it in the context of its effects on children, young people, older people and the disabled of our community. The author then makes a compelling case for the need to encourage and facilitate local giving by individuals, families, corporate bodies and donors of all kinds to help fund the needs of their local communities.

It was for this purpose the Surrey Community Foundation was established some three years ago with the aim of raising funds from donors and investing them on their behalf through a professional grant managing programme for Surrey communities. It is also building a donor subscribed endowment fund which will be there for the benefit of Surrey’s community in perpetuity.

Professor Patrick J Dowling CBE DL FRS retired as Vice-Chancellor of the University of Surrey at the end of June 2005, a post he held for 11 years. During that time he worked closely with the Surrey Community Foundation and was appointed a Deputy Lieutenant of Surrey in 1999. His understanding of the needs of the Surrey Community were greatly strengthened when he supported his wife Dr Grace Dowling in her role as High Sheriff of Surrey from 2004 to 2005. He was appointed CBE in the Queen’s New Year’s Honours List in 2001 in recognition of his work at the interface of Higher Education and Industry.

Dr Helen Bowcock is a Trustee of The Hazelhurst Trust, one of the first funds to be established with Surrey Community Foundation. She is also a member of the Foundation’s Grants Policy Panel and of its Personnel Group. She worked for a number of years as Director of Human Resources for a software company. In 2006 she completed a PhD in Sociology under the supervision of Professor Frank Furedi, author of Paranoid Parenting. Originally a graduate of Durham University, she has also studied Organisational Behaviour and is an alumni of The Philanthropy Workshop run by the Institute for Philanthropy.

Author’s note: This report includes a number of brief case studies of the work carried out by voluntary organisations and community groups within Surrey. Most of them have received grants from Surrey Community Foundation. They are intended to give an insight into the importance, breadth and range of this work around the county. However, many more not mentioned here have received grants and many more still are in need of financial support from donors.

Rensburg Sheppards Investment Management Limited is a wholly owned subsidiary of Rensburg Sheppards plc which is quoted on the London Stock Exchange. The company is the result of the amalgamation of some of the oldest names on the London Stock Exchange and our origins date back over 200 years.

The Rensburg Sheppards Group has 11 offices nationwide and around £1 billion of clients’ assets under management. Our office in Farnham, manages portfolios for private individuals, charities and personal pension funds.

We like to support local causes and are therefore delighted to be sponsoring the Surrey Community Foundation who undertake such valuable work in the county.

We look forward to working with the Foundation over the coming years, and wish them all the best for the future.

If you think we can be of any help, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Richard Mitton
Senior Investment Director
Rensburg Sheppards Investment Management
Clockhouse, Dogflud Way
Farnham, Surrey GU9 7UL
T: 01252 793345 richard.mitton@rensburgsheppards.co.uk
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Executive Summary

Surrey Community Foundation was established in 2005, in one of the last areas of the country to have a foundation of this kind. It is distinct from other non-profit and voluntary organisations locally in its objectives of raising funds from private and corporate donors and investing them on their behalfs through a professional grant management programme. It is also distinct in its objective of establishing a permanent endowment fund for the benefit of Surrey communities and thus provides a mechanism for the bequest of legacies and other assets.

The decision to create a Foundation in Surrey was based upon a thorough analysis of local needs which provided strong statistical evidence of pockets of deprivation right around the county.

During the last three years, the Foundation has further developed this knowledge and recognised the importance of updating its profile of Surrey and of identifying emerging needs and funding shortfalls. This report is the result of a consultation with voluntary organisations and community groups, as well as key individuals with a strong commitment to strengthening Surrey’s communities.

It is intended primarily to give an insight into the range and extent of opportunities locally for private and corporate funding and the critical need for increased levels of local giving.

Surrey’s appearance as a wealthy county is deceptive. Throughout there are tight pockets of deprivation, enclosed within housing estates or even within a few streets, with high levels of child poverty, low income, poor mental health and other significant problems. Often they are adjacent to affluent areas that may be provided elsewhere in the country by the state. These organisations report increasing difficulty in obtaining grant funding for precisely the reason that, when funds are allocated according to absolute numbers, Surrey seems less deserving than other places.

The imperative for government agencies to replace grant programmes with contracts places a further burden and cost upon the voluntary sector and is making many of the smaller organisations ineligible for public funds. Yet many of these smaller players are pioneers in their fields and are addressing some of the most acute needs and problems. Moreover, the preference for funding new projects makes it difficult for them to fund core costs.

Changing context for funding

Average male incomes in Surrey are 33% higher than the national average. Infrastructure locally is geared to an affluent population with the highest per capita ownership of vehicles in Britain. Consequently those living in relative poverty are all the more excluded from the norms around them. At the same time, local government receives significantly less funding per person for essential services than is the national average and only around one quarter of what is received for each person in Greater Manchester, for example.

With diminishing public funds, a greater burden is placed upon local voluntary organisations and community groups to deliver essential programmes and services that may be provided elsewhere in the country by the state. These organisations report increasing difficulty in obtaining grant funding for precisely the reason that, when funds are allocated according to absolute numbers, Surrey seems less deserving than other places.

The imperative for government agencies to replace grant programmes with contracts places a further burden and cost upon the voluntary sector and is making many of the smaller organisations ineligible for public funds. Yet many of these smaller players are pioneers in their fields and are addressing some of the most acute needs and problems. Moreover, the preference for funding new projects makes it difficult for them to fund core costs.
Social Deprivation
Surrey’s dominant cultural identity of affluent commuter towns and a highly educated population conceals not only hidden deprivation but also greater complexity at a localised level. For example, within the Sheerwater Maybury area of Woking, one third of the population are non-white, almost 40% have very low literacy and 58 different languages are spoken at the local school.

This county houses a relatively high number of prisoners, including two women’s prisons with the implications this brings for rehabilitation and the problems of poor mental health amongst offenders. It is known to harbour particularly high levels of domestic violence. It has the fourth largest population of Travellers and Gypsies within Britain.

Children and Young People
While statistics indicate that the average number of children living in poverty has decreased, at a national level, between 2001 and 2007 from 21% to 18%, the proportion in Surrey has increased from 9% to 10%.

While young people living here achieve well above national averages at the age of 11, those who have a Statement of Special Educational Need or receive school meals under-achieve against these averages. Exclusions from school of those with special needs are twice the national average. A recent Ofsted report raised deep concerns that statutory services for children with high levels of need, who do not meet the threshold for child protection, are inadequate.

There are many voluntary groups and organisations around the county who are working with young people, to engage them in meaningful activities and to provide them with structure, training and support. They range from the highly respected Surrey Care Trust with its programmes for those who are not at mainstream school or are at risk of being excluded to small volunteer led groups such as the Sea Cadets.

It is these voluntary organisations and groups that are most effective in delivering preventative programmes to divert young people from trouble. Community leaders express concern that the under-funding of Police and other public services poses a risk to this county. Young people who are allowed to be left behind can become prey to crime gangs from London and elsewhere. Those who live in ‘breedline poverty’ amidst affluence are particularly vulnerable to predatory criminal activity.

Disability
Families with a disabled child experience great difficulty and charities report a critical need to increase respite care. In general, the costs of bringing up a disabled child are three times higher than those for a child without disability and the parents’ opportunity for work is significantly reduced. In Surrey, where the costs of living are exceptionally high, this places a particular strain, notably increasing the risk of family breakdown.

The South East has the highest rates of sickness absence in the country, with mental and stress related illnesses the greatest factors. The closure of Brookwood Hospital in the early eighties transferred much responsibility for caring for those with mental health problems to the voluntary sector. Organisations such as Oakleaf Enterprises are highly effective in returning those with mental health problems to employment, but are experiencing the closure of important sources of public funding.

Older People
Surrey has both a slightly higher proportion of older people and a higher life expectancy than is the national average. The costs of social and residential care are much higher here than in neighbouring counties, reinforcing the importance of enabling older people to stay living in their own homes. Voluntary organisations that provide services to people in their homes and provide opportunities for social and leisure activity are critical to maintaining independence. They report a noticeable increase in cases of Alzheimers.

Community
Britain has been described as ‘the most centralised state in the developed world.’ Local giving provides a way of reclaiming our communities, particularly in a county that is being starved of state funds. There is growing interest in establishing funds to pool private donations from donors who would like to support their immediate town or village. This enables people regardless of their financial means to become donors and provides a source of permanent endowment for local causes.

There is increasing interest in the capacity of community philanthropy to address some of our most enduring social problems. This report is intended to reveal the extent and range of opportunities locally for private and corporate donations. Not only is there need to support established professionalised charities but also small, grassroots community groups that engender self-reliance and community cohesion.

Concluding comments
It is clear that government is neither able nor willing to provide the resources necessary to address many local needs. Donors bring not only essential financial but also moral support. Very often, they can respond more flexibly and co-operatively to funding requests by leaders of voluntary and community organisations operating under difficult and uncertain conditions.

Governments at local and national levels need to be honest about the limits of what they are willing and able to do so that in Surrey, where we are hard up against those limits, we can clearly delineate the role and scope of local giving. Bureaucratic waste and onerous regulation are disincentives to philanthropy.

We have, within this county, a strong tradition of local giving with some outstanding examples of philanthropy and of impressive leadership within voluntary and community organisations. At a time of profound economic change, we need to build upon this strong foundation to encourage self-reliance and to enable those with surplus wealth to make sound social investments for the good of this fortunate county.
1. Introduction

Surrey is a county of contradictions. Almost one quarter of its land is covered by trees making it the most densely wooded county in Britain, yet it contains stretches of the M25 that are the busiest and most congested roads in Europe. A relatively low proportion of its population are from ethnic minorities. Only 5% were classified as non-white in the last census in comparison to around 30% for much of London. However, over one third of one of Woking’s electoral wards, Sheerwater Maybury, is non-white and the oldest purpose built mosque in the country can be found there. In one area within this electoral ward almost two thirds of the population were classified as non-white and thirty eight different languages are spoken at the local school. In Surrey, children perform well above national averages at the age of eleven, but those who have Statements of Special Educational Needs under-achieve against averages. With its proximity to London Surrey has, after the capital, the highest

minorities. Only 5% were classified as non-white in the last census in comparison to around one in ten for much of London.1 However, a constant theme of this report is that the averages and higher level statistics that determine Surrey’s image of affluence conceal a very different picture at a localised level. The same county that ranks lowest in the county for households headed by a lone parent contains tight pockets of deprivation where proportions are high including an area near Ewell (Ruxley) with 35.8% and 35.7% in one on the edge of Camberley (St Michael’s). Surrey ranks lowest too on the league table for Child Poverty with an overall average of 10% in comparison with much of London’s average of over 35%. But there are numerous pockets around the county where the rate of Child Poverty is well over 30% and is as high as 42% in the Park Barn area of Guildford, Westborough, and 44% in one area of Beddington.2 What is most alarming about these 2007 statistics is that they seem to indicate that, in those confined areas of Surrey where child poverty is high, it has increased since data was published in 2001 while the overall percentage for England has declined. There are reasons for this.

As a county, Surrey is very badly treated in government funding formulae. It contributes around £5.5 billion per annum to the Treasury but does not receive a commensurate return. In fact, only £205 is received per person for essential services in comparison to a national average of £695 and £856 for each person in Manchester.3 The high level statistics that show that the earnings of men who live in Surrey are 35% higher than the national average and 25% higher for women work against those in need. They seem to provide all the reason the national government needs to spend elsewhere the taxes that are generated here, in a county where there is no electoral cost in doing so. It could be argued that social exclusion is nowhere better demonstrated than in Surrey. A county of stark contrasts with tight pockets of deprivation, often concealed within housing estates, next to areas of well above average wealth. If child poverty here has increased over recent years it is likely to increase further. The continued reduction in government funding threatens the survival of voluntary organisations that are working to address the root causes of child poverty. And it threatens many others who work with those in need such as the elderly, the disabled and the homeless.

Our former Chief Constable of Police, Bob Quick, describes the county as ‘the goose that lays the golden egg.’ “It is the biggest contributor to The Exchequer of any area but, like other statutory authorities, Surrey Police is under-funded.” He points out that we have “pockets of severe deprivation, vulnerability and risk that, in so many ways, are not being identified effectively. Funding is based upon a crude formula that is predictive and draws conclusions on population, deprivation, social groupings, earnings, health indices etcetera and concludes that the population of Surrey is affluent, well educated and not in need of a great deal.”

One important source of information for this report has been these voluntary organisations within Surrey, from large charities to small community groups. Regardless of their size, they have given a consistent message that raising funds has become more difficult and more competitive. Although there is a view that Surrey organisations always say, there are clear reasons to believe them. Large scale grants from the European Social Fund have become more difficult to obtain for Surrey organisations which often lose out to other areas in the South East. The imperative for statutory authorities to cut costs and to replace grant programmes with contracts to outsource services will effectively make public funds inaccessible to smaller organisations. They have neither the critical mass to be eligible nor the resources to succeed in the complex tendering processes. There are concerns also that the 2012 Olympics are diverting funds to London.

Elaine Tisdall, Chief Executive of the Surrey Care Trust, points out that as the numbers of deprived people are fewer in Surrey than in other parts of the county, the voluntary sector is required to provide services that are provided elsewhere by statutory agencies. And yet, at the same time, claims for grant funding are weakened by this same factor that small, tight pockets of deprivation appear less deserving than areas of more widespread poverty affecting larger numbers of people. The current funding climate places a particularly onerous burden upon Surrey’s voluntary sector creating a disadvantage not only in real numeric terms but also in morale. The situation is summed up by Elaine Tisdall who says that “we are bidding all the time, running a race with this funding climate.”

It is not always apparent what an essential role some of our voluntary organisations play and this is particularly so in a county like Surrey where the capacity of government diminishes as a result of budget reductions. These organisations are, in general, most effective in playing a preventative role and thus saving the public purse. For example, a pioneering literacy project in the most deprived area of the county, Maybury and Sheerwater, aims to prevent children who struggle from falling further behind in education. The lifetime cost to the state if a child fails at school and subsequently veers off on a trajectory of drug-taking, unemployment and offending is estimated by the KPMG Foundation to be well over £1 million.

It is our voluntary organisations that are taking Surrey’s young people who have been excluded from school, re-engaging them in vocational training and teaching them life skills. They are delivering services to the elderly and disabled to enable them to remain optimally independent in a county where the costs of social care are particularly high. They are providing the advocacy and advocacy services that are available outside of the county and the way that it is concealed.

There is a renewed interest in the potential for philanthropy to address enduring social problems but Surrey may seem, on the surface, an unlikely place to invest private wealth in this way. While there is already a strong precedent within the county for considerable charitable giving, very often the money goes to high profile causes outside of the county or overseas. For the very same reason that social deprivation within Surrey is concentrated in tight pockets, largely hidden from view, it is often insufficiently visible or appealing to attract the funds that are desperately needed. For much of the second half of the twentieth century there has been a strong assumption that it is the duty of government to provide infrastructure and services where they are most needed. But there are now numerous pockets in our most deprived areas that would not survive without private or corporate financial support. Traditionally, communities have supported local sports facilities, youth clubs, museums, choirs and so on; with less public funding available, there will be an increasing need for community fund-raising.

The primary purpose of this report is to highlight the way in which private and corporate giving is needed locally it is only in the last four years that statistics have been gathered at a very local level revealing the extent of deprivation within the county and the way that it is concealed. In other words, affluence makes it harder for those who live in or below ‘breadline poverty’ not only because disabilities in the quality of life are greater but also because it diverts resources away from the area and camouflages local need. If nothing else, it has driven up the price of real estate so that there is an acute shortage of affordable housing and the high cost of premises places an enormous burden on non-profit making organisations. Is there an obligation then for those who have surplus wealth, who enjoy the many benefits of living in Surrey, to invest in their local communities? If the answer is ‘yes’ then there are different ways that it can be fulfilled, from the provision of premises as a ‘gift in kind,’ to the establishment of a permanent endowment fund, to ‘immediate impact’ grants whether large or small.

Surrey is reputed to be ‘the divorce capital of Europe’ but, according to the last census, has a relatively high proportion of households comprised married couples with dependent children, 20.4% in comparison to a national average of 17.48%.1 And, the county has the lowest proportion of lone parent households with 5.94% in 2001. The census also
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1 Data from Office of National Statistics, government social future group

2 Information provided by Surrey County Council

3 KPMG Foundation, the Surrey Trust, Hidden Surrey 2006
Private and corporate philanthropy offers hope for the survival of voluntary organisations and community groups although it is unlikely to offer a full substitute for publicly funded grants. A very important purpose of Surrey Community Foundation is to establish endowment funds so that local organisations have permanent sources of finance. The uncertainty of funding from some government agencies means that it is often difficult to sustain established and successful pieces of work. They are subject to an annual budget cycle which means that there is no assurance of continuation beyond the current financial year. But one of the most consistent messages from the leaders of these organisations is just how demoralising it has become to live with this degree of uncertainty and to an annual budget cycle which means that it is the pioneering work at the hard edges of our society that will suffer. If voluntary groups do not have access to the right social networks or the critical mass to employ fund-raisers then they are finding it very difficult to keep afloat and the effort of fund-raising detracts from the delivery of the essential services they provide. So this report is a request to those who have the means to consider how they could help. The Community Foundation is in a strong position to introduce them to projects and organisations right around the county that would benefit from new sources of funding.

We have reached a critical stage in Surrey where the need for an increased level of private and corporate giving is the only way in which much valuable work can continue. There is a view that we have too many voluntary organisations and that some form of rationalisation is no bad thing. While there has certainly been a proliferation of new charities the problem is that it is the pioneering work at the hard edges of our society that will suffer. If voluntary groups do not have access to the right social networks or the critical mass to employ fund-raisers then they are finding it very difficult to keep afloat and the effort of fund-raising detracts from the delivery of the essential services they provide. So this report is a request to those who have the means to consider how they could help. The Community Foundation is in a strong position to introduce them to projects and organisations right around the county that would benefit from new sources of funding.

There is also much more that government could do to ease the burden on our voluntary organisations and community groups. In Surrey, with the high costs of real estate, publicly owned premises could be made available on more favourable terms than they are currently. Many groups are finding the high cost of rent for premises prohibitively high. In some cases, they would like to take over the management of council owned premises and optimise the asset to bring in further revenue in a way that is not being done at present. Government at national and local levels needs to be honest about the limits we can delineate the role of private giving. This report is not only an appeal for increased private investment in our communities but an appeal also to reclaim those communities and to run them more effectively making the most of limited means. Affluence may make it harder for those in need, but those with surplus wealth who choose to support their local communities offer a solution to the problem rather than contributing to it.

We have no derelict shipyards or redundant mines to provide the powerful visual reminders of hardship. The geography of need here in England’s richest county is far less evident. Poverty is both distributed and concealed. Very often, it is concentrated within a housing estate or even within a few streets. The low rise housing of, say, the Park Barn estate in Guildford or of Ockford Ridge in Godalming harbours high levels of need but it is not conspicuous. As many contributors to this report have emphasised, it is surely harder in qualitative terms to be poor amidst wealth. But there are some very real and tangible consequences to being deprived in a county where the average male income is 33% higher than the national average. For example infrastructure locally is designed to serve a population that relies far less upon public transport than is the case for areas of more widespread poverty. Surrey residents have the highest per capita ownership of cars in the country. Many of this county’s most deprived places have very little in the way of shops, pubs or leisure facilities. Without adequate transport, the local sports centre is inaccessible to those on low incomes. Many can neither afford to get there nor to participate even if they could.

At county level, according to many significant measures, Surrey appears to have less deprivation than any other administrative region in this country. We rank lowest on the league table for Child Poverty, for example, and for a number of other measures on the Index of Multiple Deprivation including education, employment and health. When statistics are gathered from the boroughs and electoral wards that make up this fortunate county the dominant picture that emerges is one of great affluence and little need. But in recent years – since around 2004 – official statistics have become available at a more detailed level for groups of 1500 people or so. They reveal that right around Surrey, within every borough, there are small but distinct pockets of deprivation.

This quotation from a report on the development of a Council for Voluntary Services for Guildford and Waverley gives an insight into local hardship: “The bus service in Guildford and Waverley is not frequent outside of the main towns and is costly. Residents of Ockford Ridge in Godalming live at the top of a steep hill. Those who have mobility problems, travel with a pushchair or are simply looking to travel back with groceries need to rely on buses if they have no access to a car. Bus drivers will no longer assist mothers to get on the bus with their pushchairs apparently for Health and safety reasons. The buses that do run are expensive for those on low incomes. For instance, a member of SMART (St Marks Active Residents group) in Ockford Ridge told us that to take her three children to Guildford to go swimming making a prohibitive total cost of approximately £35 for one outing."

2. Social Disadvantage in Surrey

4 The National Council for Voluntary Organisations estimates that the number of general charities in the UK increased from 120,000 in 2004/05 to 164,195 in 2006.

5 These areas are called “Super Output Areas” (SOAs), described by the Office of National Statistics as “a new geography for the collection and publication of small area statistics.” They are better for statistical comparison than electoral wards as they are much more consistent in size. Most wards in Surrey are made up of between 3 and 5 SOAs.

6 Data from the 2001 Census and 2007 Survey of Communities.

7 The average number of cars a vehicle household holds in Surrey is 2.49 whereas the national average is 1.99. Office of National Statistics.
Where deprivation is closely juxtaposed with affluence as it is in Surrey, statistics can work against those in need. For example, data gathered from a whole ward such as Farnham Upper Hale would not reveal the extent of deprivation within it. It would show, at ward level, a score on the Index of Multiple Deprivation of 11.06, well below the national average score of 21.57. What this aggregation does not show is that while in one area of the ward deprivation is minimal with a score of 1.82, in another, across a main road, it is 26.09. While in other areas of the country whole wards and suburbs can be characterised for their poverty, it is not so in Surrey where few contain more than one deprived zone.

Index of Multiple Deprivation: average of SOA scores (2007)
This chart shows the levels of Multiple Deprivation in one of Farnham’s electoral wards, demonstrating the way that areas of high deprivation are adjacent to areas that are much more affluent.

Areas in Surrey with the highest levels of Multiple Deprivation

The Index of Multiple Deprivation 2007 combines a number of indicators, chosen to cover a range of economic, social and housing issues, into a single deprivation score for each small area in England. This allows each area to be ranked relative to one another according to their level of deprivation. The chosen indicators are income, employment, health deprivation and disability, education, skills and training, barriers to housing and services, crime and living environment.

See Appendix 1 Tables of Statistics, page 46

Statistics and indices such as the Index of Multiple Deprivation mean that it is now straightforward to map those areas in the county where people are living on low incomes and experiencing other related problems such as higher levels of crime, child poverty, poor transport and so on. There are a number of agencies that, in the course of their work, need to identify and target these locations. We are particularly well served in Surrey by our Police force with its network of Neighbourhood Police officers who work closely with community groups to build greater confidence and strengthen communities. Surrey County Council is working continuously to map the areas of greatest need. Several years ago the Council designated ten ‘Self-reliance’ areas where funding has been given to support community activities. This was intended to build cohesion and develop the capacity for bringing in further sources of funding. Surrey Care Trust delivers programmes throughout the county to address problems of social exclusion and deprivation. Surrey Community Action and the network of councils for voluntary services have a detailed insight into local needs and can work against those in need. For example, with affluence as it is in Surrey, statistics on education and training, The Lifelong Learning Partnership supports community projects throughout the county that aim to overcome barriers to learning.

Surrey Care Trust is a substantial Surrey wide charity that has earned great respect for its work in transforming the lives of people in difficulty who may be hampered by precarious income and low qualifications. With its emphasis upon education, learning and developing skills the Trust delivers a number of programmes throughout the county. They include STEPS, which provides mentoring and support to young people who are dismissed as no-hopers and are at risk of being excluded. In addition, the programme provides alternative education from learning centres in Staines and Woking to those who have been excluded. For offenders who have been sentenced to carry out community work rather than going to prison the Trust offers employment and the opportunity to develop new skills on its ‘Swingbridge Community Boots’. The staff at Surrey Care Trust have a keen appreciation of the most acute needs locally through their Crisis Grants programme which, on a weekly basis, receives desperate requests for basic items such as a school uniform or a second hand refrigerator.

There is therefore considerable knowledge of where deprivation exists and of voluntary and community activity that seeks to address the problems for those people who are living in relative poverty. These organisations range from substantial charities such as Surrey Care Trust through to small community groups such as Opportunities at Sandy Hill, described overleaf. The real challenge is to identify new sources of funding so that many valuable projects and organisations can survive. But, even with these potential sources, there is also the challenge of making smaller amounts work more effectively and of ensuring that the grants are well invested and serve the purpose intended. The unique role of the Community Foundation is to encourage donors to invest locally whilst also ensuring that the causes they support accord with donors’ values and represent a sound social investment. It is also the Foundation’s role to strive to identify the most pioneering work by groups that may not be the most accomplished fund-raisers but offer solutions to some of our most intractable problems.

The case study overleaf of the work in Sandy Hill on the edge of Farnham demonstrates the value and the potential of voluntary and community activity.
Over the last six years Carol has extended the training programme into a range of other areas and has called it ‘Opportunities’. In addition to IT classes, tuition in numeracy, literacy and life skills including nutrition, cooking, budgeting and parenting is provided. IT classes are provided by Carol, who is supported by other tutors. The weekly Yoga classes, are extremely popular, and these are backed by a counsellor who teaches stress management. Citizens Advice Waverley provide an outreach service, which has been very well received by residents, as many find it difficult to make the journey into town and to enter an office building, particularly with small children. Carol encourages the members of Opportunities to obtain formal qualifications and some have achieved NVQ Level 1 in IT and others have gone on to Level 2. Another student is taking a place to study at Merrist Wood College this academic year.

Opportunities has come to be much more than an educational programme. A strong sense of community has developed amongst members who provide each other with much mutual support and friendship. Most are single parents who were extremely isolated before they joined the group and were having to face considerable difficulty on their own. One member said "Without being here I would be a recluse" and another commented that "If we didn’t have this place we would be sitting on our own at home." And another, with three young children, said that "at 26 I thought that life was finished. I needed to see other people."

A mother who had been relocated from a different part of the county because of domestic violence commented that, as a result of finding the group, she felt that her children ‘can be kids again’. They had witnessed the violence and, arriving in a new place with no social network or support, they were confined to their house. She ventured into The Bungalow to begin to learn IT and found that it offered much more than technical training. Her children feel safe with the other parents in the group and she has found friendship and the motivation to continue her education. She is also gaining confidence in her own parenting skills as this had been undermined by an abusive former husband and by her isolation.

Carol appreciated very early on that by bringing people together to learn she could help them to gain in confidence and trust and thus to share their experiences and to help each other. She has developed her own warm relationships with the members and provides them with support. The students are encouraged to develop their skills and to aim higher. It was recognised at the start that some of the students would not be sufficiently confident to attend courses in Farnham or elsewhere and that, because most experience multiple problems, their attendance may be erratic at times. Technical colleges require a minimum of ten attendees before they will deliver a course to an external location and this would not have worked in the context of The Bungalow. It was important also to provide childminding on site so that members knew that their pre-school age children would be safe so that they could concentrate on learning.

Such is the progress of the Opportunities Project that the group are endeavouring to adopt a business approach to use their IT and Life Skills to provide services to other people on the estate and beyond. Another important factor in the group’s success is the physical location of The Bungalow. It is at the entrance of the estate right next to the primary school. Members can come straight in after dropping their children at school and consider it now as a resource that belongs to them and a place that is safe. As Carol observes ‘the heart is coming back into the village’. They are raising money by making and selling cakes at the school to fund some trips over the summer and a visit to the pantomime. Although a summer holiday is beyond the reach of members, they look forward to sharing the experience of taking their children on outings. Most would not have considered doing this on their own.

During its existence Opportunities has received financial support from Surrey County Council and from the Learning Skills Council. County Council funding has come to an end but a grant from The Haxehurst Trust via the Community Foundation is ensuring that it continues. There is much more work to be done within this Project. New members are coming along. Further classes could be provided and the social enterprise needs to develop further. Carol would like to extend services to people over the age of 50 who may also be isolated and who could bring skills and knowledge such as gardening. She has also identified the need to replicate this model in other locations that are experiencing the same sort of problems and do not have anything like Opportunities.

Offenders

In this section on Deprivation it seems appropriate to include the question of offenders and ex-offenders and the work that is being done locally. We have four prisons in Surrey and two of these are for female offenders. Nationally the prison population is at its highest ever with 83,000 prisoners in England and Wales. Severe overcrowding means that, increasingly, offenders are being sent some distance from their homes and this, in turn, is creating problems for their rehabilitation. At present, the re-offending rate is at 65% for adults and as high as 85% for 18-20 year olds.8 There are some pioneering schemes within Surrey with the primary purpose of reducing the re-offending rate and of diverting ex-offenders into employment and training. According to a recent report by The Policy Exchange ‘the biggest drivers of reoffending – lack of employment, suitable accommodation and access to healthcare – need to be carefully considered in an offender’s resettlement plan’.9

Two of Surrey’s four prisons are for women, although they make up only 5% of the prison population nationally. The same report on mental health in prisons states that women ‘suffer shorter sentences but during that time their children may be taken into care and they may lose both their job and their home. There are relatively few women’s prisons so family visits often involve a long journey and may be difficult to arrange for any children involved. All these factors increase the likelihood of mental stress.’ The needs of female offenders are of particular interest in this report given the relatively high proportion of them who are imprisoned locally. The report goes on to say that ‘Of all groups, women in prison have the highest levels of emotional and psychological distress, often related to past abuse and exacerbated by distance from home and children’.
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8 Figures provided by the SSU Crime Unit
9 Policy Exchange In and Out of Sight, 2008

9 Policy Exchange In and Out of Sight, 2008

10 The housing estate of Sandy Hill on the edge of Farnham ranks as one of the areas of highest deprivation in Surrey. Ten years ago there were areas which many people were not happy to visit. The housing office located in ‘The Bungalow’ on the estate was not seen in any way as a community resource but was treated with suspicion by residents who only entered it if they really had to. There was little sense of community cohesion and relatively high levels of crime and vandalism. Many residents were trapped, unable to obtain employment through lack of skills, low literacy and numeracy and thus unable to support their own children to learn and progress at school. A high proportion are single parents who had not completed their education. In 2002 the estate’s warden took the initiative to establish IT training courses at The Bungalow and a training consultant, Carol McFarlane, was appointed.

Opportunities, Sandy Hill

The housing estate of Sandy Hill on the edge of Farnham ranks as one of the areas of highest deprivation in Surrey. Ten years ago there were areas which many people were not happy to visit. The housing office located in ‘The Bungalow’ on the estate was not seen in any way as a community resource but was treated with suspicion by residents who only entered it if they really had to. There was little sense of community cohesion and relatively high levels of crime and vandalism. Many residents were trapped, unable to obtain employment through lack of skills, low literacy and numeracy and thus unable to support their own children to learn and progress at school. A high proportion are single parents who had not completed their education. In 2002 the estate’s warden took the initiative to establish IT training courses at The Bungalow and a training consultant, Carol McFarlane, was appointed.
Jobmatch

During his time as High Sheriff of Surrey, Adrian White carried out a number of prison visits and, consequently, identified an acute need to provide employment opportunities for ex-offenders. He engaged the commitment of John Sandy, former Director and Prison Governor, to help him establish Jobmatch. Ruth Coltofeanu, recently retired senior Probation Officer, joined as the JobMatch Project Co-ordinator working with the Prison Service, Probation and Police Services and finding potential employers. The purpose of this organisation is to persuade employers to take on ex-offenders and to match those being released from prison to the jobs made available to them. As indicated, the reconviction rate of adults who leave prison is 65% and is 85% for young offenders. The rationale for Jobmatch is that, if those leaving prison are offered accommodation, employment and thus money they are far less likely to reoffend. This is based upon sound data from other comparable schemes which have seen reconviction cut by up to 80%. One such scheme works with people being released from Reading prison. Another project called SOS is operated by the St Giles Trust in London and has a point of contact within Jobmatch to discuss any problems that may arise. Jobmatch works with offenders to help them to build their lives in Surrey although their time in prison may have been spent elsewhere in the country. Due to severe overcrowding, offenders who originate from the county are often sent some distance away. The founding members of the Jobmatch team work closely with the Probation Service so that they can begin to establish a dialogue with offenders before they are released. They are interviewed to determine whether they have made a genuine effort to use their time inside to change their attitude and must indicate that they are keen to work. This is particularly challenging as, very often, they have a poor work record and those who are most at risk of re-offending are targeted including those categorised as ‘Persistent and Prolix Offenders’. If they are considered eligible for work they are matched to a job and are provided with mentoring once their employment has begun. It is important not only that the ex-offender has someone to call upon when they need to but also that the employer has a point of contact within Jobmatch to discuss any problems that may arise. Between March 2007 and 2008 38 people were interviewed for potential employment and, of those, 20 were placed in jobs and are still employed. The remainder were either considered unready for employment or decided against proceeding. Those who succeeded in taking jobs are working in a range of different fields that include catering, gardening, construction, road maintenance, plumbing, hospitality, floristry and mechanics. Send Prison has a good gym where one woman was able to train to a high standard and become a fitness instructor on her release. Clearly the success of this scheme relies not only upon the expertise within Jobmatch but also upon the willingness of the wider community to support the scheme. The importance of those employers who agree to provide job opportunities is paramount. However one of the major obstacles to the successful rehabilitation of ex-offenders is the acute shortage of accommodation, a particular problem in Surrey because of the high costs of real estate. The support of the local police force is also an important factor in the success of this scheme. For example, a local branch of Surrey Police found and funded accommodation for one person for several weeks to enable him to take up a job when the accommodation that he had been allocated was no longer available.

Jobmatch has reached an important stage in its development as an organisation. The successful placement of 20 ex-offenders demonstrates its effectiveness and its great potential in reducing crime. So far, it has minimised costs by relying heavily upon the dedication of its founding members who have voluntarily given much time to get it started. It was instigated by Adrian White who has provided its funding to date and has provided support and office accommodation. However, it will soon need to secure further funding to become sustainable and to find its own premises. It will also require continuing community support to extend its bank of employers and to engage further volunteer mentors. JobMatch is now preparing to obtain charitable status in its own right.

Conclusion

There are some valuable schemes run locally by voluntary organisations to prepare offenders for their release and rehabilitation into society. At present an outreach worker from the St Giles Trust, a London based charity, is working with some of the women at Send Prison. This is part of a pioneering and highly regarded scheme to provide mentoring, advocacy and job-brokering to offenders to change their beliefs and their lives. In 2001 the Coldingley Crime Diversion Scheme was established. This enables prisoners to develop new skills and gain qualifications by working with young people at high risk of offending. But it also diverts these young people away from crime into constructive activities. The need for a grant from a private donor this work may well have come to an end, demonstrating the fragility of many of these projects and the critical need for an increased level of giving to support them.
There are approximately one quarter of a million young people under the age of 20 living in this county and they make up almost one quarter of the county’s population. Surrey is, in general, a good place to bring up children. Many families move here out of London for a higher quality of life, more space, access to the countryside, good sports facilities and excellent schools. Surrey school children perform above national averages in educational league tables and 2% of them are educated privately at secondary level in comparison to a national average of 7%. We are considered to have one of the best youth choirs, orchestras and jazz bands in the country and overall musical, sporting and academic achievements from this county are highly commendable and must surely be maintained. However, in keeping with the overall picture of social deprivation locally, there are very stark contrasts in the circumstances and in the prospects for young people who are growing up here.

3. Children and Young People

Experience increasing complexity and volume in the cases they take on; the overall context in which they are required to operate is highly problematic. Funding from statutory sources is uncertain and has, in some cases been reduced or been withdrawn; at the same time, there is increased competition to grant-making organisations. A further difficulty for them is the cost of compliance with regulations for child protection.

Guildford offers two of the top performing independent grammar schools in the country, yet, a stone’s throw away, is a school described as being hampered by ‘a legacy of under-achievement’ in which almost one third of pupils have a Statement of Educational Needs. In both Mathematics and English, 11 year olds in Surrey achieve results well above national averages. Yet, in areas with a statement of Special Educational Needs and those who are eligible for free school meals under-perform against national averages. It is beyond the scope of this report to explore the much wider national issue of certain schools having a disproportionate number of pupils who under-perform. But it is within its scope to draw attention to their existence within this county and the reasons why here it may be particularly difficult for them to reverse their fortunes. It does commend certain voluntary organisations such as White Lodge and Mencap for their effectiveness in providing essential services. It also confirms that some of them are picking up essential services. It also confirms that some of them are picking up essential services.

Schools with poor academic performance have difficulty in recruiting teachers. But in Surrey the cost of real estate is compounding the problem of attracting and retaining good staff. According to the County Council’s recent audit, ‘Surrey has the highest turnover of teaching staff of the 34 shire counties at 19%’. A sample of primary school advertisements showed that 70% had no applicants, 30% had one applicant and only 20% had more than one applicant. This difficulty has a significant impact not just upon educational standards but also upon participation in precisely the subjects that may engage and motivate children who struggle under the formal curriculum. Surrey’s Joint Area Review published in July 2008, confirms that those young people with highest levels of need are effectively excluded from activities that are the norm in an affluent area. It finds that in Surrey ‘there is a massive reliance on car ownership with many young people finding it difficult to access leisure, sporting and cultural opportunities, in part due to the relatively high cost of public transport’. But the Review also finds that the most vulnerable young people are not being well served by statutory services. In its main findings it concludes that: “The contribution of local services to improving outcomes for children and young people at risk, or requiring safeguarding, is inadequate. A too limited range of preventative services is failing to close the gap between the outcomes of most children and young people in Surrey and those who are the most vulnerable. There is an inadequate range of services for those children and young people who have a high level of need but who do not meet thresholds for child protection.”

This review raises real concerns about the circumstances of young people who are experiencing difficulties particularly those below the threshold for child protection. It does commend certain voluntary organisations such as White Lodge and Mencap for their effectiveness in providing essential services. It also confirms that some of them are picking up essential work that cannot be fulfilled by statutory organisations and that highlights the difficulties that they are experiencing in carrying out this work.

“Voluntary and community sector agencies in Surrey report an increase in the complexity of cases they are being asked to support and voices a high level of dissatisfaction with the commissioning and contracting processes and a lack of consultation by the partnership with community groups regarding the range and type of provision required.”

Support for those voluntary organisations striving to address the needs of the most vulnerable and disadvantaged young people within the county is of paramount importance. Interviews conducted for this report confirm that while they are experiencing increasing complexity and volume in the cases they take on; the overall context in which they are required to operate is highly problematic. Funding from statutory sources is uncertain and has, in some cases been reduced or been withdrawn; at the same time, there is increased competition to grant-making organisations. A further difficulty for them is the cost of compliance with regulations for child protection.

Areas in Surrey with the highest levels of Child Poverty

Out of the 47 sub-Regions of England Surrey ranks 47th with a score for child poverty of 38% in East London which ranks highest of all sub-regions. Surrey is separated in these statistics by some margin from other areas, with the regions nearest on this index scoring 12% and the average for England as a whole at 18%.

Costs and risks of child poverty

Child poverty is defined as ‘the number of children living in households with less than 60% of median income, both before and after housing costs are taken into account.’ It is the statistics on child poverty that best highlight the deceptiveness of Surrey’s image of affluence and the disturbing effect of high average household income. Out of the 47 sub-regions of England Surrey ranks 47th with a score of 0.1 for child poverty. This means that overall an estimated 10% of children live in income deprived households in comparison to 58% in East London which ranks highest of all sub-regions. Surrey is separated in these statistics by some margin from other areas, with the regions nearest on this index scoring 12% and the average for England as a whole at 18%.

However, a closer look at statistics at a detailed level reveals a more disturbing picture for Surrey. Although, at a national level, the number of children living in income deprived households has declined between 2001 and 2005 from 21% to 18%, there has been a slight increase within this county during that time from 9% to 10%. Areas such as Greater Merseyside or Tyne and Wear have seen their rates of Child Poverty decline during this period by several percentage points. In 2005, there were fifteen Super Output Areas (SOAs) within Surrey with Child Poverty at over 30%. By 2007 this number had increased to thirty four SOAs with over 30%, while ninety three SOAs within the country are shown to have above average Child Poverty. In one area of Redhill the proportion is as high as 44% and is 42% in one area of Guildford. And, as indicated, often these areas of poverty are very close to areas of the least deprivation in the country. The ward of St Michaels in the borough of Surrey Heath, for example, has one SOA with a score for child poverty of 29%, another 12% and the third 3%.

See Appendix 1 Tables of Statistics, page 47
Sea Cadets

The borough of Spelthorne contains pockets of deprivation where crime is at its highest within Surrey. PC Andrew Pearcey, who is a member of the Safer Neighbourhood Team, places high priority upon engaging with local young people and finding them constructive things to do. He works closely with the local Sea Cadets who provide sessions three times per week for around 50 young people, aged 11-18 years old, who are socially excluded. But, like others, he also points to the high public costs of exclusion. “There is a pathway of anti-social behaviour cost the taxpayer £3k per annum once they get caught up in the criminal justice system.”

The cost to our society and to our county of social exclusion is not simply a financial one. Chief Constable Bob Quick describes a risk particular to Surrey with its proximity to London and other bordering areas of high crime. He argues that although crime within our county is relatively low and offending by people who live here is going down, predatory crime from offenders who cross over the county borders is increasing. Drug traffickers in particular ‘see Surrey as lucrative and soft.’ They target vulnerable young people and consider the pockets of deprivation here as ‘fertile ground’ not only to peddle drugs but to recruit to their gangs. The Chief Constable fears that Surrey is reaching a ‘tipping point’ and police funding is inadequate to address these risks. The increasing importance of Neighbourhood Policing and of grassroots community engagement is evident. There is much that can be done, even with small grants, to fund community projects aimed at preventing the cycle of deprivation and diverting deprived young people away from crime into constructive activities. In Surrey we have a particularly strong Neighbourhood Policing programme with officers who are closely in touch with local needs.

Phil Hunter, leader of Sunbury and Walton Sea Cadets, cites examples of young people who have thanked him for diverting them from getting into crime. Some of them have learning difficulties and arrive at the club feeling that they have never achieved anything. With considerable patience and hard work the volunteers provide them not only with new experiences and skills but also with greater confidence at school. As a small voluntary organisation the Sea Cadets operates on a shoestring. Andrew Pearcey considers it an invaluable resource and points out that the prevention of youth offending cannot work effectively if young people have nowhere to go and nothing to do. But he fears that the club’s future is under threat as it cannot afford to maintain the building in which it meets. He also points out that although his beat is on the fringes of London, it does not benefit from the same high profile fundraising campaigns as the capital such as ‘Help a London Child’.

Liquid Connection

Six years ago Kyle Oliver took the initiative to establish Liquid Connection in North Leatherhead, an area that ranks high on the index relating to income deprivation and where Child Poverty is at 28%. He recognised the need to engage with the young people to address what he saw as ‘despair and rejection and the poverty mentality.’ Having moved to this country from California, he observed the extent to which family structures in the UK have broken down and this impact upon children and adolescents. His was a genuine, grassroots response to local need and over the last few years he has instigated and managed a number of projects with and for young people in the immediate area as well as running ongoing ‘detached youth work’.

For the last five years, twice a year, Liquid Connection has taken groups of up to 50 young people away on a residential holiday camp. This is, in most cases, the only opportunity for them to be away from home and the programme is always over-subscribed. The organisation also runs an under 18 nightclub, Elysium, and a regular graffiti workshop which brings artists to demonstrate street art to young people to divert them from leaving graffiti elsewhere in the town. Street Link is run from a double-decker bus which is hired from a supporter of Liquid Connection and has been equipped with sound recording equipment, flat screen TV and computers. It is operated as a mobile unit and goes out to the places where young people congregate. Its computers are used for constructive purposes such as identifying and applying for jobs. An ‘urban sports’ project, the Grind, engages fifty adolescents in activities such as skateboarding, inline skating and BMX riding. The inclusion of urban sports in the Olympic Games has given it renewed appeal to young people who would not otherwise have any opportunity for sport. This is, according to Kyle Oliver, the most difficult of all the activities to run but enables him and his team to engage with the most disadvantaged young people who are most at risk. In addition to providing urban sports, they also provide the only decent meal that many of them are likely to have during the week.

BLISS is a scheme run for girls only and was set up recognising that they were not participating in and benefiting from the activities and services provided. Earlier this year, a group of 11-18 year old girls were taken to Zambia to spend nine days on a farm to understand the way of life there and experience being away from home. Although they themselves were from lone parent, low income households, they were given an appreciation of absolute poverty and have conducted their own fund-raising to give to their Zambian hosts.

During its six years of operation, Liquid Connection has made an impact. Kyle Oliver observes that ‘the mood has changed’ morale is higher and there is a real sense of community cohesion. The organisation has earned the respect of the local police in its effectiveness in diverting young people from crime. However, the most acute need is the provision of ‘detached youth work’, engaging with those who are most at risk, who do not participate in the programmes and activities offered. The only way this can be achieved is for the staff of Liquid Connection to go out and find them and to begin to gain their trust and to establish a dialogue. But funding is a continual challenge and grant making organisations tend always to have a preference for projects rather than ongoing activities such as detached youth work. Even the projects themselves have shortfalls in their funding but Kyle and his highly dedicated team would rather work unpaid than cancel a holiday programme, for example.

The staff of Liquid Connection all live locally and have strong connections within the community they serve. In addition to the precariousness of funding they have to contend with an onerous regulatory regime. Yet the effectiveness of their work relies upon the capacity to respond flexibly to the needs they identify, to a much more targeted and interactive method of youth work visiting young people in their homes, establishing a dialogue with parents and with the police. In an ideal world, they would like to have their own premises and to have a more reliable, continuous funding stream.
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Leatherhead Youth Project

In 2003 three churches in Leatherhead took the initiative to establish the Leatherhead Youth Project to bring about change in their communities through providing a high level of youth work. An important objective was to provide a safe, welcoming place for disadvantaged young people to gather and the All Saints Church Hall was refurbished to create the BFree Youth Cafe. It is open every week night from 3.15-6.15 pm; many young people come straight from school and attend every evening. Two youth clubs called Courage and Victory are also run for younger age groups on Sundays. An associated project called BLAZE led by Joe Crome provides young men with the opportunity to broaden their horizons, with various trips including football matches and visits to London. They have also begun to clean up gardens for vulnerable elderly people. This activity is being done in collaboration with Age Concern and Surrey Police and is an exemplary community activity. The young people have the opportunity to work in teams and to carry out work that benefits their community. Jay Bristow, one of the Youth Workers, points out that it also provides the chance to have fun or to get on with homework.

LYP works in close partnership with Liquid Connection, Freestyle, the holiday programme is run collaboratively between the two organisations and the Youth Workers employed by both work together in a highly co-operative way. The organisations also work closely with the local schools and Jay Bristow regularly runs the assembly in the local primary school where he can engage with the children there. Since its inception, this project has experienced great success in drawing in large numbers of young people, providing them with a safe environment in which to have fun or to get on with homework. But as the café manager Andy Gill and his colleagues point out, there is still a lot of work to do in an area with high deprivation, with a high proportion of ‘Children in Need.’

Sheerwater and Maybury Partnership

In Maybury and Sheerwater, the ward that ranks highest in Surrey on the Index of Multiple Deprivation, the link between social deprivation and poor literacy is acutely evident with an estimated 38% of its population with low literacy levels. Steve Thomas, who has been running the Sheerwater and Maybury Partnership, points out that although in general literacy levels have increased by around 10% over the last decade, they have remained static in this ward. While nationally low literacy is around 19%, the figure of 38% in Maybury and Sheerwater may be a significant under-estimate. His mission is to tackle the problem of children arriving at secondary school at the age of 11 with a reading age of 7 years or younger. As he points out, the whole school curriculum presumes a reading age of 11 and so these children get left further and further behind. The targeted intervention, using a system called ‘synthetic phonics,’ provides each child with an individual volunteer tutor.

Life Chances

Clearly there are some excellent voluntary organisations in this county striving to address the problems that result from living in relative poverty. Their leaders emphasise the way in which they are trying to reverse a cycle of deprivation in which a young person growing up in deprived circumstances has a much higher chance of facing disadvantage and severe problems in adult life. According to the Social Market Foundation ‘children who grow up in poverty face a substantially higher risk of being disadvantaged adults. This association increased between a cohort growing up in the 1970s and one growing up in the 1990s.’

Deprivation, the link between literacy and social deprivation, has an impact on young people’s educational prospects. Children who grow up in poverty face a substantially higher risk of being disadvantaged adults. This association increased between a cohort growing up in the 1970s and one growing up in the 1990s.

Like many small voluntary organisations, funding for the Partnership has been precarious and scarce. Yet Steve Thomas points out that the economics of improving literacy are clear: While poor literacy is the common denominator in communities that are socially deprived the probability of a young person being excluded from school and of entering crime increases three or fourfold if they are failing at the age of 11. His arguments are supported by a report by KPMG which quantifies the potential cost to the state of the special needs education, truancy, unemployment benefits and crime if a young person fails to read adequately. KPMG’s research estimates a lifetime cost well in excess of £1 million if poor literacy precedes a trajectory of failure and exclusion resulting in poor health and crime.

The Sheerwater and Maybury Partnership has made significant progress in recent years. It has been approached by other schools in Surrey to replicate the successful programme elsewhere, demonstrating that children are struggling to learn to read in other parts of the county. In response to growing interest, Steve Thomas has created a new organisation called ‘Let’s Read.’ This is distinct from the Partnership which will continue to focus on broader local needs. Let’s Read represents an exciting and positive step towards ensuring that children are not disadvantaged for life by poor literacy. But of course, it needs financial support from donors.

Children have a much lower than average proportion of young people aged between 16 and 18 who are not in Education, Employment or Training. The overall average for the county is 3.5% in comparison to the rate for England of around 8% and up to 10% in the North East. The boroughs with the highest proportions locally are Reigate and Banstead (4.9%), Runnymede (4.0%) and Spelthorne (4.0%). But given the relatively low numbers it is perhaps more within our reach to address this problem and to engage young people who are at risk than it is in an area where the problem is more widespread. The need for intervention is reinforced by the Joint Area Review that finds that in Surrey ‘too many children with learning difficulties and/or disabilities are excluded from school in 2006, nearly half (47.69%) of statemented children in mainstream schools had fixed-term exclusions and, in 2005, 23.7% in special schools had fixed-term exclusions. The rate of permanent exclusions was twice the national average in 2006.’

There are, however, some excellent examples locally of programmes that provide some form of vocational training together with clear guidance and discipline. Others are addressing specific problems such as ADHD.

13. The Long Term Costs of Literacy Difficulties December 2006 KPMG Foundation
14. The Long Term Costs of Literacy Difficulties December 2006 KPMG Foundation
40 Degreez

40 Degreez provides a base in Farnham for many organisations working with young people. It was established to fulfil the need for a place to go for young people who may not have the opportunity or the means to participate in clubs, who are otherwise out on the streets.

One of its most successful programmes has been an outreach project run in collaboration with three Farnham schools. They use the centre to provide one to one tuition to pupils who have been temporarily or permanently excluded or may be finding school difficult and need some time out, to talk things through in a quiet environment. As a result of this project, permanent exclusions are estimated to have reduced by 50%. In collaboration with the Bourne Children and Youth Initiative a new youth worker has been recruited who is researching and developing programmes for them. This is providing the opportunity to experience success but also to develop relationships and to observe a clear code of conduct.

Skillway

This organisation is located in a former chapel on the edge of Godalming. It takes students referred by their secondary schools who are struggling with the formal academic curriculum and may have behavioural difficulties. It teaches practical and technical skills including woodworking and furniture making, engineering and motor mechanics, metalwork and jewellery. The students can gain accreditation for their skills with the Open College Network and an important objective is to teach discipline and to instil confidence. They work in groups of six with two tutors per group. This is a very different environment to the schools they have come from; it offers them the opportunity to experience success but also to develop relationships and to observe a clear code of conduct.

Skillway relies heavily upon volunteers to work as tutors. It is facing very challenging times with a continuous need to recruit new volunteers but also a severe shortfall in funding. With the conclusion of the European Social Fund grant earlier this year, it has effectively lost one third of its funding. It constitutes yet another example of a pioneering voluntary organisation within the county, serving the needs of young people who are at risk. Its objective is that students return to their schools at the end of a year-long programme with self-confidence, new skills and a clearer focus.

GASP

The villages of Gomshall, Albury, Shere and Peaslake are among the most attractive places to live in Surrey. But within this area there are small numbers of young people who are growing up in income deprived and often broken households.

When, several years ago, car torching became a problem the local churches took action to establish some form of activity to divert them from minor crime and provide them with skills and interests. A centre was purpose built to conduct classes to teach 13-17 year old car mechanics, maintenance and driving. Classes are held three times per week, with one exclusively for girls.

The young people are, in most cases, referred by their schools because there has been some problem with their application to schoolwork. They must show an interest in cars and mechanics and a willingness to learn new skills. In addition to the mechanical, technical aspects of the courses students also learn discipline and teamwork. Some have gone on to study mechanics at places such as Brooklands College.

The Studio ADHD Centre

The Studio in Capel, specialises in working with children, adolescents and their families with Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD). Its founder and lead consultant Nancy Williams recognised the requirement for a dedicated centre for children with this disorder whose needs could not be met within the statutory services. It became clear to her that therapeutic provision would be far more effective if the children could come to a special place, designed for their needs. She raised funds and had ‘The Studio’ built in her own garden. Her objective is to realise the talents and often exceptional abilities of children with ADHD and to offer a range of preventative programmes in health, physical and mental wellbeing.

As a voluntary organisation, The Studio works in partnership with Surrey Community Action, Surrey Youth Service and Surrey Council for Voluntary Youth Services (Youth Focus).

Over the years The Studio has not only helped hundreds of children but has also helped their families. At present, due to limitations of funding, Nancy is only able to take the most desperate cases and most often the families are in crisis by the time they reach her. However, the Studio also has a commitment to provide ongoing support to clients over a period of years. There are an estimated 9000 plus children in Surrey with ADHD, a figure that implies considerable unmet need. There is a strong correlation between ADHD and offending by young people. In light of this, the preventative value of this specialised programme is considerable.
Gypsies and Travellers
Although it is difficult to estimate total numbers, Gypsies and Travellers are thought to be the largest minority ethnic group within the county. Nationally, Surrey has the fourth largest population. The Surrey Traveller Community Relations Forum was formed in 1996 to act as a focus for both traveller and service providers. Recently a Grassroots grant was awarded to enable this organisation to continue to fund Driving Theory Test courses for travellers aged 16 and over. As some of them have limited access to mainstream education it is often difficult for them to obtain this qualification without additional assistance. The organisation works closely with the Youth Offending Team who refer young people who would benefit from this extra support as a way of preventing criminal behaviour.

Teenage Conceptions
In Surrey, teenage conception rates are relatively low in comparison to the rest of the South East and to national rates. The county has the lowest rate of any county for conceptions in under 18 years olds, 3.25% of births were to mothers under the age of 20 in 2006. But this should be seen in a broader context. A report by UNICEF shows that ‘the under 20 birth rate in the UK is the second highest out of 28 OECD countries.’ Moreover, the Joint Area Review finds that in Surrey, the reduction of the teenage pregnancy rate is significantly below the national target set by central government. It found that ‘in 2006, the rate of teenage conceptions was 25.4 per 1000 representing a poor improvement of 7.9% since 1998 against national progress of 15.4% over the same period.’ It also found notable variations around the county in the effectiveness of programmes aimed at reduction. For example, in Epsom and Ewell there was a 57% reduction rate from 2004-6 but in Surrey Heath an increase of 21% over the same period.

One highly innovative non profit organisation in Surrey is Peer Productions, has developed an approach to communicating with young people in a way that offers real hope for an improvement in reduction rates.

Peer Productions
The work of this remarkable organisation is unique in this country. It was founded by two artists Nina Lemon and Jason Orbaum who recognised the potential to apply their expertise to train young actors but, at the same time, to address difficult issues such as teenage pregnancy. They take groups of young people aged between 16 and 23 and put them through an intensive one year programme in which they are taught acting and theatre and film production. The groups create their own productions and go out and perform for audiences in schools and for disadvantaged groups. The organisation uses an apprenticeship model in which training is fast and relies heavily upon practical experience. Very often the apprentices have not been motivated by conventional education; the groups range in educational attainment from high achievers to some who have been formally excluded. The training programme lasts for a full academic year, during which time the apprentices work on a voluntary basis.

One of the most impressive aspects of Peer Productions is that three different groups benefit from each artistic production. Young people, some of whom have unsuccessfully applied to drama school, receive excellent tuition and the opportunity to act. In turn they work with people who are in difficulty, such as teenage mothers, young offenders and people with mental health problems, who receive confidence building drama and film sessions and describe their experiences, providing the content for the productions. These are performed to audiences including many school children who may never have been to the theatre and benefit not just from seeing a play performed but from the moral and social messages contained within it. Peer Productions has had great success in producing a play about teenage pregnancy, using the lived experiences of young parents to convey its harsh reality but also to provide clear instruction about safe sex. Very often the messages are conveyed by stealth whilst the audience is being entertained but feedback from the audiences indicates that they have been clearly understood. The play is one and a half hours in duration – the longest produced by the company – and has been performed before 10,000 pupils in Surrey, Kent, Hampshire and Berkshire during a thirteen week tour in the spring and summer of 2008.

The company’s founders and their General Manager Claire Tristram work six days a week to keep the organisation going and to deliver its ambitious programme of activities. They have plans to extend the social enterprise aspect of the organisation and this year they are establishing a ‘Graduate Company’ to enable those who complete the apprenticeship to work as actors. Their reliance so far upon grant funding means that a considerable amount of time must be spent completing applications, on average about thirty each year. Like many non profit organisations they find it difficult to obtain funding for core costs such as staff costs and the rent for their use of the Woking Youth Arts Centre. They are the only organisation in Britain to offer this combination of youth peer education with theatrical production. They also have a novel approach to tackling the problem of teenage pregnancy.
A report by the Thomas Coram Institute finds that although pregnant teenagers make the point that there is a lack of capacity. Discussions with local health visitors confirm their concerns about unmet need. They find that deprived teenage mothers are often isolated and have little in the way of social networks or family support. Health visitors are struggling to respond to an increasing demand to provide them with regular visits. They identify a need for “crib points” to fund places at nursery for children under the age of three who receive no stimulation at home. Statutory funding is available for children over the age of three but, even by this stage, the most deprived have missed out and are far behind by the time they reach school. Their mothers may not have the confidence, nor the motivation to join playgroups and, in the absence of clear role models, do not know how to stimulate and play with their children. Health visitors also identify the need to provide a meeting place for teenage mothers who are often very marginalised and isolated so that they can form social relationships and receive parenting advice and tuition. In this context, the work of the Haslemere Young Parents Group provides an excellent model for addressing this area of need.

Haslemere Young Parents

The risks to children growing up in adverse circumstances are clearly understood by Sarah de Marcos and Claire Matthes. As a former homestart-coordinator for Haslemere, Sarah identified the need for a group specifically for young parents in the area as she discovered that some young parents found the established groups to be intimidating and unaccommodating of their particular needs. Not only are the parents that concern Sarah and Claire much younger than the norm in a town like Haslemere, but their sense of exclusion is often heightened by lack of confidence, low income, poor mental health, (including most commonly depression) and family breakdown. Some have experienced domestic violence and drug and alcohol abuse. They often find themselves isolated by being re-housed in cheaper areas that they do not know, separated from extended families and from the surroundings in which they grew up. Some struggle to get to Haslemere, to what is familiar, from places like Farndon and Milford where social housing is more readily available. However, some have no immediate or extended family and no role models, they experienced hardship as young children – sometimes resulting in family breakdown.

The Haslemere Young Parents group provides a vital service to those parents in need of it but it also provides an opportunity for social development for their children. In many instances, it is the first and only opportunity the children have had for any social interaction. “We have found that in general the members find parenting challenging and some of the children are in need of interaction and stimulation. Developmentally, some children are behind with speech and language. Parents themselves may be isolated and therefore their children are not interacting with peers.” The prospects for adequate literacy and educational attainment are poor when a child arrives at primary school having missed out on early social development.

Not wishing to skate and the maintenance of the building is an ongoing expense. As an indoor facility, Skaterham offers a secure controlled environment for young people which is safe from vandalism. It is a model that could be replicated elsewhere with sufficient support. In Haslemere the youth club called ‘A Place to Be’ also relies upon donations from private trust funds as well as receiving support from local authorities. It was instigated in response to the gap in service provision for young people in Haslemere, a very affluent town with pockets of deprivation. A pilot was set up to get young people off the streets and into a safe, warm environment where they could simply meet their friends. It has developed into a successful operation offering music, dance, games and other activities and has an ongoing requirement for financial assistance. These same needs exist in other towns and villages in Surrey.

Surrey is a much more rural county than often imagined. Facilities for young people in rural and semi rural areas are limited and transport to get into local towns that may be better served is inadequate. For example local police officers, together with the parish council of Smallfield, recognise the need for a local youth club as there is no suitable transport to surrounding villages. With little to do, some of the young people are committing minor offences and relationships with older people are deteriorating. Its proximity to Gatwick airport means that employment is readily available and this has increased its population and also the proportion of young people within the village. Proposals for a youth club have strong support from the council, the local school and the community Initiatives that have provided opportunities for constructive activity and learning have had demonstrable results in other parts of the county.
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Sayers Croft

The Sayers Croft Environmental Education and Trust was established in 1996 and operates from a site in the Surrey Hills which was originally built in 1938. The Trust’s mission is to involve the whole community, particularly children and young people, in the enjoyment, appreciation, understanding and care of the natural environment. In addition to the school project mentioned above, it offers a programme of youth clubs, holiday activities and educational courses. In recent years, staff have made great efforts to engage with the local community and they place importance on keeping charges sufficiently low to make the centre inclusive and available to all.

Conclusion

This section on Children and Young People in Surrey necessarily occupies a dominant place in this report. The rate of family breakdown that has increased during the last twenty years or so has created an acute need for services that support children who are affected by it. Pioneering voluntary organisations and community groups are providing these essential services and are also offering programmes that aim to prevent the dysfunction and breakdown that results in young people becoming marginalised and vulnerable. Within this county we have some outstanding initiatives led by true social entrepreneurs. They have identified problems and unmet needs and have been prepared to take risks and to work unstintingly to address them.

While the work of these organisations gives hope, they themselves struggle to survive. Significant recent changes in the funding of voluntary services and compliance with an increasingly onerous regulatory regime could serve to undermine the essential services these groups provide. Some funding streams have dried up and others are heavily over-subscribed and yet, in all cases, their leaders point to considerable unmet need. As the Chief Constable highlighted, there are risks to the overall safety of our communities if young people are allowed to be left behind. There is much that local giving and that community philanthropy can do to mitigate these risks but also to improve the life chances of young people who would otherwise be left behind. And this is not simply a question of money to meet shortfalls in funding but also there is much moral support that can be given to those organisations most effective in improving the life chances of young people in Surrey.

Surrey Scouts

Long established organisations such as Surrey Scouts are experiencing continuing strong demand for membership and at present demand exceeds supply. Social changes mean that it is increasingly difficult to recruit adult volunteers as people work longer days and there is a requirement for a greater flexibility in the hours worked. Although relatively small in geographic terms as a county, Surrey Scouts has the fourth largest membership in the country. Much of its fund-raising is very local and for relatively small sums, but on occasions larger scale appeals are launched. At present there are proposals to improve the training facilities at Bentley Copse, a large camp site near Shere which Surrey Scouts owns. Richard Shortman, County Commissioner, points out that, as an organisation, Scouts Groups are ‘great levellers’ bringing together young people from different backgrounds to work and play together.

4. Disability

This chapter does not in any way attempt to cover all disabilities or all of the issues associated with the disabled people. But it identifies some of the effects of disability and the way in which voluntary organisations and community groups are working to improve the quality of life for the disabled and, in many cases, for their families. It identifies certain social changes that are exacerbating the difficulties faced by such families, in particular the tendency that has accelerated in recent years for families to break down under the pressure of having a disabled child. It includes mental health, disabilities in old age and the difficulty of obtaining funding for causes that do not have a strong public appeal.

Children and Young People

There are approximately 3,200 children who are officially registered as disabled within Surrey. However, this register only includes those who satisfy its criteria and excludes many children who have emotional or behavioural disabilities. Experts estimate that the actual number of disabled children is likely to be closer to 4,000. So, for example, Disability Challengers has some 2,500 children on its own database but readily acknowledges that it is, by no means, providing services to every disabled child within the county.

Surrey has some leading charities devoted to improving the quality of life of disabled young people and their families. In the early 1990s a paediatrician at The Royal Surrey in Guildford recognised that disabled children have the same, if not a greater need, to play as any other children but that they miss out. Although they may be given various therapies for their different needs, the basic right to play, to engage with other children and to have fun is lost with the misfortune of being born with or acquiring a disability and thus serves as a double injustice. According to Disability Challengers, “because leisure activities are an opportunity to make friends, preventing disabled children from accessing them deprives them of friendship or happy and fulfilling social lives.”

The impact upon families of having disabled children is considerable. Statistics show that 55% of families with a disabled child are living in or on the margins of poverty. Families supporting disabled children are twice as likely to have no parent working for more than 16 hours per week (52% compared with 26% of other families). Only 16% of disabled children’s mothers work full or part-time.

In addition research has found that it costs three times more to bring up a disabled child compared to a non disabled child.

As these statistics show, families with a disabled child are much more likely to be suffering financial and other forms of deprivation and the fact of having a disabled child considerably reduces the opportunity for employment for the main carer. In an area such as Surrey, where the costs of living are exceptionally high, this deprivation is felt more acutely. Family breakdown and its negative impact is a continuous theme throughout this report and it is certainly a dominant factor in the difficulties faced by many families with a disabled child. Those charities working with families with a disabled child report that a disproportionate number are headed by a lone parent. Inevitably this leaves an even greater burden for the remaining parent and a desperate need for some respite.

In households in which both parents are present there is still the need to have a break from the demands of caring for their disabled child and a need for siblings too to have time for themselves. Organisations such as Disability Challengers and Cherry Trees fulfil an essential dual purpose. They provide not only the highly valued facilities and services to enable disabled children to have fun but they also offer the families an alternative and trusted source of care. Disability Challengers now has centres in both Guildford and in Farnham. The excellent facilities that have recently been completed in Farnham received considerable local financial support and demonstrate the capacity of local philanthropy.

16 Some of the 3,200 children on this database lie in counties bordering Surrey but Disability Challengers estimate that about 99% are within Surrey
18 Contact a Family (2004) No Time for Us. Relationships between Parents who have a Disabled Child: a survey of over 2,000 parents in the UK
19 Research by the Stationery Office
21 Some of the 2,500 children on this database lie in counties bordering Surrey but Disability Challengers estimate that about 99% are within Surrey
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23 Joseph Rowntree Foundation
Psds is a small, but growing, registered charity whose principal goal is to provide support for children with Down Syndrome and their families in Surrey. The members meet regularly as families to share their experiences and provide a network of support, friendship, advice and expertise.

This benefit not only the children with Down Syndrome, but also their siblings, the parents and all family members. The charity also provides access to a range of professional services, such as speech and language therapy, and has an extensive library of resources for members and their families to make use of. The aim is for the children to have access to the opportunities available to all others and for there to be no ceiling on what they might achieve.

The group was set up for all of the reasons above but, in particular, the founders felt that when their children were born, it was difficult to find other families with their experiences and provide a network of support, friendship, advice and expertise.

Although the care in adult hospices is provided predominantly to people with cancer at the end of their lives, children’s hospices are somewhat different. With an improvement to around 75% of cure rates for childhood cancers, this disease accounts for no more than about 16-20% of the children and teenagers cared for by the CHASE service. The majority of life-limiting conditions result from degenerative genetic diseases, major organ failures and brain injuries and associated complications from birth and other accidents such as near drowning. Advances in neonatal care have increased the life expectancy of children with complex conditions and medical needs.

CHASE provides different services according to a family’s needs at different times; they are planned short breaks, emergency and end of life care.

A significant part of the work of CHASE’s multidisciplinary care team is carried out in the families’ own homes, where many children would prefer to stay. The emphasis is upon support for the whole family, including siblings and grandparents. Often parents find themselves with many hours devoted to caring for their very sick child leaving little or no time for other children. So the opportunity for the child, with or without other members of the family, to be cared for at CHASE’s is of enormous value. A particularly specialized service is the preparation for the end of a child’s life and care for the family afterwards. All staff at CHASE’s, including catering and maintenance, are trained for this necessary part of the hospice’s work. Clearly training and support for staff are an essential part of the organisation’s costs. The one grant that comes from government sources ends soon and will not be replaced.

The primary purpose of Cherry Trees in West Clandon is to provide a home from home for disabled children who can play and can stay overnight in a place that is familiar, where they feel safe and comfortable. At present, Disability Challengers has a limited capacity to provide overnight care at its centre in Guildford. The organisation has ambitions to extend its site in Farnham to provide overnight accommodation in its efforts to fulfill considerable unmet demand.

"We need to do so much more. There are 800 families on our waiting list who don't get places, this equates to approx 2,700 child spaces. This is long term, another capital project, we want to change the way overnight respite care is given. Sending children for overnight respite care is a desperate measure when parents can’t cope. The children go somewhere that is often not fun and where they don’t know anyone. Our aspiration long term is that we would like to make it more fun, it should be like going for a sleepover at friends. If you have a disabled child they are rarely invited for a sleepover anywhere.” Sue Haworth-Edwards, Disability Challengers.

Disability Challengers works closely with special schools such as Treloars, taking pupils with Autistic Spectrum Disorders. Latest estimates show that Autism occurs in at least 60 of every 10,000 births in this country and that it is four times more common in boys than girls. The need for respite services for children with complex needs, in particular those with autism, is highlighted in the Joint Area Review.12

The Orpheus Centre

This is an inclusive residential performing arts centre near Godstone that provides opportunities for young disabled adults aged 18-25 years with a physical impairment or learning disability. It is also an excellent example of philanthropy at work in Surrey. Richard Stilgoe has used not only his wealth and material assets to create the centre but also his professional talents as a musician and entertainer to stimulate and inspire his ‘apprentices.’

The apprentices may come from any part of this country. Many are reliant upon wheelchairs and have both physical and learning disabilities and in some cases these are profound. Their talents are encouraged and they are given the opportunity to perform publicly or to participate in technical aspects of producing a public performance. Richard’s philosophy is that the most powerful way to communicate how effective music can be in developing independent skills is to perform in front of an audience. Performances are staged within the Centre and the apprentices have also performed at nationally recognised locations such as The Royal Opera House and the Birmingham Conservatoire.

The humour and commitment and dedication of members of The Orpheus Centre are striking, importantly, the objective of their apprenticeship is not only to provide learning and fulfilment but also to equip the apprentices with the skills and confidence to live as independently as possible. A new wing was added recently to the collection of buildings that make up the Centre to provide self-contained studio bedsits for final year apprentices. Although during their first two years they have catering and care provided to them, in the last year they are required to fend much more for themselves to prepare for life beyond the Orpheus Centre. The value of equipping them with the capacity for self-reliance in some aspects of their lives is important not only for their own wellbeing but also has significant economic implications in reducing the costs of care during adulthood.
Currently, there are 1.2 million disabled people in Britain, according to official statistics, with twice as many as non-disabled people. Disabled people are twice as likely to have no qualifications as non-disabled people. In comparison to 16% of non-disabled people, 40% of disabled people over age in Britain are economically inactive. It is estimated that incapacity Benefits by increasing the proportion who work. It is also estimated that 45% of the disabled population of working age in Britain are economically inactive in comparison to 10% of non-disabled people. Disabled people are twice as likely to have no qualifications as non-disabled people. According to official statistics, there are currently 1.2 million disabled people in the UK who are available and want to work. As the staff at the Orpheus Centre clearly recognise, building the confidence of disabled people is a major factor in enabling them to fulfil potential and to participate in society. There is much that voluntary and community organisations are doing to this end, both to develop social skills and confidence and to equip disabled people with practical and vocational skills and with qualifications.

### Elmbury

**Community Link**

This was originally an initiative by a former mayor of Elmbridge who observed that there was no community support within the borough for disabled adults. Although originally envisaged as an advocacy service and drop-in centre, it now provides regular scheduled activities for its members on weekday evenings and at weekends. It offers music, art, dancing and games to provide members with cultural and educational opportunities. It also offers an alternative source of care and a highly valued opportunity for social interaction. One of its great strengths is that members attend regularly and know each well. Many are very vulnerable and this familiarity is of great importance. Staff give them jobs to do such as helping with catering and in return they are paid a small amount. In several cases members have gained sufficient confidence and skill from attending sessions that they have gone on to obtain employment with organisations such as Sainsbury and Jessows.

### Mental Health

Disabled people with mental health problems have the lowest employment rates of all categories of disability. The South East has the highest rates of sickness absence in the country, of which mental illness and stress related illnesses are the largest factors. The closure in 1981 of Brookwood, a psychiatric hospital near Woking, as part of the national ‘Care in the Community’ policy increased the role of voluntary organisations locally. For example the South West Surrey Association for Mental Health and what is now Oakleaf Enterprises were both originally founded as a direct consequence of the closure of Brookwood. Today they continue to fulfil an invaluable role but in an increasingly difficult context in which funding has become highly uncertain.

"Mental health and well-being are both aspects of public health that historically, have been relatively neglected. However, poor mental health is a key factor that underpins many physical health problems and acts as an underlying driver for much health risk behaviour, including smoking, substance misuse and obesity. Additionally, poor mental health has a significant impact on wider society, affecting parenting skills, family and social cohesion, educational achievement, anti-social and offending behaviour, sickness absence and economic productivity." 22

### Canterbury Care Centre, South West Surrey Association for Mental Health

The Canterbury Care Centre was established following the closure of Brookwood Hospital in 1981 so that former patients were provided with somewhere to go where they could take part in activities and develop interests. Since then it has grown to be able to accommodate up to thirty-five people with mental health problems. In most cases they are referred by the local mental health teams and the overall objective is to provide them with the skills to return to formal employment. The length of time and the nature of employment varies according to the severity of the condition. The staff and volunteers at Oakleaf work with their clients not only to provide training but also to help them to write a CV and to handle an interview. They also seek employment opportunities, often initially as a voluntary placement, and they provide ongoing support once the client begins to work. Oakleaf’s Chief Executive, Clive Stone, points out that although there is much prejudice and misunderstanding around mental health, the level of motivation of those returning to work following mental illness is particularly high.

### Oakleaf Enterprises

This organisation, based in Guildford, provides vocational training for people with mental health problems. In most cases they are referred by the local mental health teams and the overall objective is to provide them with the skills to return to formal employment. The length of time and the nature of employment varies according to the severity of the condition. The staff and volunteers at Oakleaf work with their clients not only to provide training but also to help them to write a CV and to handle an interview. They also seek employment opportunities, often initially as a voluntary placement, and they provide ongoing support once the client begins to work. Oakleaf’s Chief Executive, Clive Stone, points out that although there is much prejudice and misunderstanding around mental health, the level of motivation of those returning to work following mental illness is particularly high.

Specific training is provided in IT, horticulture, upholstery and packing and some of the trainers themselves are former clients at Oakleaf. The organisation has developed its own social enterprise, so that it raises 35% of its revenue through selling its own services. This revenue is vitally important as, like many other organisations, funding streams have to come to an end or have become more uncertain. Grants from The European Social Fund and The New Deal for the Disabled ended in 2008 and the organisation is facing a deficit. At the same time, the demand for its services continues, with a potential increase in drug induced psychosis and, in today’s economic climate, those that have developed depression through being made redundant.
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Advocacy and Advice
As the number of people over the age of 65 increases as a proportion of the overall population, diseases associated with aging will also increase. For example, SAVI (Surrey Association for Visual Impairment) has observed an increase in the numbers of people with macular disease. At the other end of the spectrum, the organisation is also aware that the improvement in survival rates of children who are born prematurely also means that an increasing number are likely to have problems with hearing and eyesight. Services that help people to come to terms with a disability such as visual impairment, as well advising them on the products and services that are available to them, form an important part of the role fulfilled by an organisation such as SAVI. Although it delivers some services available to them on the products and services that are not exploited. Organisations such as SAVI, Just Advocacy, DISCASS and others play an important role in representing the rights of the disabled. The needs of disabled people are also addressed in different ways by a plethora of small, grassroots groups that provide a meeting point for social interaction and for shared activities and interests. For example towns like Addlestone and Godalming have successful and thriving clubs for people who have a visual impairment. They are managed and run by volunteers and costs are minimal but nonetheless, they benefit from small donations from within their local communities to cover catering expenses, for example. As competition for funding intensifies, these groups are finding it harder to compete for the small amounts that keep them afloat. They cannot claim to be innovative in what they do nor can they point to growth or innovation or growth. It has been able of a community activity that is not about purpose in going. This is a good example lost their community and therefore their purpose in going. This is a good example of a community activity that is not about innovation or growth. It has been able to survive because a private donor was willing to provide it with financial support.

GAMBIT
This group was established by SAVI almost twenty years ago for people with varying degrees of visual impairment. They meet in a church hall on the edge of Guildford each week and most members are over the age of seventy-five; some have been attending since the beginning. They value the opportunity it provides them to learn and to develop their skills in Braille or in the simpler language called Moon.

They work in pairs with help and tuition from a paid co-ordinator; although in time Braille is likely to be superseded by more advanced technology the members of GAMBIT have no desire to learn new techniques. As they point out, they need to keep working on and improving their knowledge of Braille and enjoy the opportunity that this provides to work with others. The weekly meetings are highly sociable and members break to prepare refreshments and hold a raffle to cover the costs. Without these meetings some members would be completely isolated.

Until recently SAVI covered the costs of the group from its funding from Surrey County Council. However, funding has been cut back and the group members do not satisfy Social Services disability risk criteria. An attempt to take members to a local day centre failed as they felt that they had lost their community and therefore their purpose in going. This is a good example of a community activity that is not about innovation or growth. It has been able to survive because a private donor was willing to provide it with financial support.

Conclusion
The encouraging news that should emerge from this chapter is that voluntary organisations in Surrey continue to pioneer and continue to draw upon the substantial wealth and talent within the county to improve the life chances of the disabled. Disability Challengers and The Orpheus Centre exemplify the potential strength of local voluntary activity. But this chapter has also highlighted yet again the precariousness of funding for voluntary organisations and the increasing dependence upon them to provide essential services to address local needs. In the case of some disabilities, numbers are likely to increase as the proportion of people with age related conditions increase. These are not, in many cases, causes that can compete well for public sympathy and thus for public funds. In this context, the importance of small, grassroots community groups should not be overlooked as often people seek to share the experience of a particular disability and to create their own community from it.
5. Older People

Surrey’s population is projected to increase steadily over the next 25 years at the rate of 0.5% per year, the biggest increase will be in those over the age of 60. The number of people over the age of 85 is projected to nearly double by 2029, with a 50% increase in the 80-84 age group. According to Age Concern “In Surrey, 21.1% of the population is aged 60 plus (2001 Census), which is slightly higher than the UK percentage (20.7%). Of potential significance is the current profile showing 13.3% of the Surrey population to be aged between 50 and 60, compared to 12.5% nationally.” This is the effect of the ageing of the post war generation of baby boomers. And while life expectancy is increasing nationally in Surrey it is higher than the national average and continues to improve. For example, according to the most recent available statistics the average life span for men in England was just over 76 years but in Surrey it is higher than the national average and continues to improve. For example, according to the population to be aged between 50 and 60, compared to 12.5% nationally.

“In Surrey, 21.1% of the population is aged 60 plus (2001 Census), which is slightly higher than the UK percentage (20.7%). Of potential significance is the current profile showing 13.3% of the Surrey population to be aged between 50 and 60, compared to 12.5% nationally.” This is the effect of the ageing of the post war generation of baby boomers. And while life expectancy is increasing nationally in Surrey it is higher than the national average and continues to improve. For example, according to the most recent available statistics the average life span for men in England was just over 76 years but in Surrey it was over 80. For English women the average was just over 78 but over 82 for Surrey.

Not surprisingly, demand for social care for older people is projected to increase, with forecasts suggesting a rate of 1% between 2003 and 2010. In the financial year 2003/4 Surrey County Council was providing services to help around 7,400 older people to live in their own homes. However, this falls short of the estimate of 13,000 indicating considerable unmet need. Fewer people are helped to live at home in Surrey in relation to other counties within the South East and relatively few people are supported in residential and nursing homes. “Neighbouring county councils can provide similar levels of care much more cheaply than Surrey because their service costs are much lower. Surrey County Council spends more on adult social care than many similar county councils but it is very expensive to buy care services in Surrey and the authority receives limited funding from Government (State of the County).”

As one of our MPs Jeremy Hunt describes on his website, it is not only living on limited means in a wealthy area that is challenging but also attempting to do so in an area that is ‘starved’ of public funding.

“Anyone who thinks Surrey is so prosperous that the biggest challenge is how to stop too many BMWs clogging up the country lanes should have been a fly on the wall at my surgery in Sainsbury’s yesterday. A 70 year old lady came to see me to explain that having retired she was now once again applying for jobs. Why? Because she could not survive on the measly £92 a week she got from her pension. Because of price rises, food now took up more than half of it at £40 a week. She could only afford to visit her daughter in London once a month. She put aside £45 a month in a scheme to pay for food and presents at Christmas.”

Tony Lee, Chief Executive of Age Concern Surrey, observes that older people tend to move to rural areas on retirement, usually while they are still independent and able to drive. However, many older people become isolated particularly if they are prevented from driving and become widowed. As he points out, an older man who has commuted into London for many years may never have had the time or the motivation to become involved with a local community nor to build local social connections. A report on Lone Older Men commissioned by Age Concern Surrey states that ‘older men without partners are more likely to move into residential care, despite having lower average levels of disability than lone older women’.

The report also emphasises that older men are far less willing to take advantage of clubs that are geared to the needs of older people. Services offered by Age Concern such as befriending are a key priority to address potential isolation and to maintain independent living.

There are, within the county, a significant number of older people who are ‘asset rich but cash poor,’ and, with greater life expectancy, this produces relative hardship in later life. However, some have neither cash nor assets, with a life expectancy well below the norm for this area. The ward of Maybury and Sheerwater, in particular, shows the highest levels of deprivation amongst older people and lowest life expectancy. Certain diseases such as Diabetes Type 2 are prevalent amongst the people of ethnic origin who live in this area. A study conducted by the University of Surrey concluded that members of the Pakistani population have difficulty in making the lifestyle changes necessary to manage this disease. It identified religious and cultural barriers in relation to taking exercise, for example and the need to improve the understanding of the disease and its management. The study has laid the foundations for a community development project to improve self-management and to address cultural and religious barriers by providing, for example, single sex exercise classes.

In fairness she had just applied for pension credit, which she said would give her an extra £10-15 a week. But poverty in a ‘rich’ area is doubly challenging, not just because of your wealthier neighbours but because public services are starved under unfair funding formulas. Nearly half the rent paid by this lady for her council house is redistributed to other parts of the country. If she were to get cancer the local NHS would spend half the amount on her that it would spend on someone equivalent in Nottingham.” Jeremy Hunt, 26th April 2008

Not surprisingly, demand for social care for older people is projected to increase, with forecasts suggesting a rate of 1% between 2003 and 2010. In the financial year 2005/6 forecasts suggesting a rate of 11% between 2003 and 2010. In the financial year 2005/6
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Older People

The primary purpose of a charity such as Camberley Care Trust is to enable older, infirm and disabled people to continue to live in their own homes. Services that are essential for this are the provision of transport and the provision of staff to carry out home repairs, security and maintenance.

Volunteer drivers take and assist the Trust’s clients to fulfil needs such as attending hospital appointments and shopping; the growth of ‘out of town’ shops has increased the need for transport for the elderly. For people who are vulnerable or isolated, the availability of help from a trusted source is of great importance given that they need to be able to enter their homes to get household goods, for example, or to make the property secure. Those who can afford to pay for this ‘Care and Repair’ service do so but the charge is waived for those who cannot. Until recently, the Trust had employed a Home Visitor to assess the needs of new clients and to advise them on their rights to financial and other assistance; shortfalls in funding have meant that this service had to be discontinued. At the very time when this organisation is experiencing an increase in demand for its services – 3% for transport and 5% for Care and Repair – it is also experiencing the withdrawal of some funding from statutory sources. And while the local churches continue to provide financial support, revenue streams have become less predictable and the organisation is having to draw on reserves to continue.

The Alzheimers Society

The initiative to establish voluntary services to address Alzheimers Disease was first taken in Surrey. And, as a county, with a relatively large proportion of older people, this and other forms of dementia present an increasing problem. The purpose of The Alzheimers Society is to provide services to those suffering not only from Alzheimers but all forms of dementia and to provide help and advice to their carers and families. There is much that can be done to improve the quality of life of a person suffering from dementia. This starts with early diagnosis and an important role for the Society is to promote awareness amongst medical practitioners. But often, taking the first step to seek diagnosis is an extremely difficult one and much support can be given to a family during this process before they feel able to seek medical help.

In some locations, branches of the Society provide day centres for those with dementia in which they are offered care, stimulation and exercise. This highly specialised support can make an enormous difference and bring out a sense of humour and enjoyment of some aspects of life that may have been lost during the grim period when dementia was beginning to take its toll. There is much that can be done also to provide specialised knowledge and training to staff in nursing homes so that they in turn can improve their levels of care.

Chris Wyatt of The Alzheimers Society, describes the impact of dementia upon people. “To see someone slowly disintegrating before your eyes is the cruellest thing. You are left with the shell.” She points out that most often, by the time people find their way to a branch of the Society, they are ‘at the end of their tether’. Dementia is not related to economic or social circumstances and for many this will be the first time in their lives that they have felt the need for community support. The financial burden of dementia related diseases is considerable. If a person has savings of more than £24,500 they may not be eligible for any other financial assistance. In a county like Surrey, many have fixed assets but little available cash. And, once over the age of 65, those with dementia are no longer considered eligible for funding from Primary Care Trusts but are passed over to social services. However, if they are receiving medication and have an official diagnosis they may find social services unwilling to provide funding and are passed between the two. Like many other voluntary organisations, The Alzheimers Society and its branches are facing increasing costs and receding funding streams. They will be forced to increase their costs for day care and other services but there is deep concern about the capacity of clients to pay.

Camberley Care Trust

A multitude of different voluntary organisations and community groups are providing services to enable older people to retain as much independence as possible and to remain in their homes. These range from the provision of practical assistance with shopping and maintenance, to befriending schemes and regular social activities to advice on conditions like dementia and visual impairment. In its own right, Age Concern is made up of a network of branches that vary considerably in their size and structure. So for example Runnymede Age Concern employs a number of staff members and delivers transport and day centre services on contract to the County Council. At the other end of the spectrum, a branch such as Godstone is managed and run by volunteers who offer befriending services and organise social events. Regardless of their size and level of formality, these organisations and groups will play an increasingly important role as the proportion of older people increases.

Day Centres

In some parts of the county day centres for older people are provided and maintained by the County Council. In Waverley, they are the responsibility of the borough council and are operated by voluntary organisations that rely upon a mixture of statutory and grant funding and donations. For example, Brightwells Gostrey Centre in Farnham undertakes its own fund-raising for capital items such as the buses that transport elderly people to and from the centre. The overriding purpose of these centres is to address the widespread problem of social isolation, providing the opportunity for social contact and for mental and physical stimulation. The value of this investment in the health and wellbeing of older people is to play a potentially preventative role, enabling some to remain independent within their own homes for as long as possible. The problem of social isolation is considerable and very often the visit to the centre will be the only opportunity for social contact. At present, the staff of the Gostrey Centre cannot accommodate the needs of those with dementia if they are likely to wander from the building. However, staff have observed a marked increase in cases of dementia over the last five years or so and therefore an increasing need to provide appropriate services.

The centre will relocate in 2010 to a new building provided by the borough council. The organisation will face increasing challenges as costs and demand for places increase. At present the people who benefit tend to come from the less well off section of the population and very often charges are waived for those who cannot afford to pay. The trustees and management recognise the need to diversify the activities and services that the Centre offers to draw in a wider and younger client group to sustain its work.
Conclusion

Statistics show that Surrey has a slightly higher proportion of people in the older age group than the national average, but also that in general, people within this county are likely to live longer. At the same time, the state provides less for older people whether they require residential care or stay in their own homes. There is clearly an economic advantage in helping people to remain independent for as long as possible but, given that the preference of many is to maintain their own homes, the social and emotional benefits to them are clear. Increasingly, the voluntary sector is being called upon to make this independence feasible. As people live longer there is an increasing burden even for those who have assets to their name. And, in residential care where it is required are becoming an increasing requirement, requiring particular attention. The costs of these services and of their need for services that help to maintain health and wellbeing will continue to grow, with the marked increase in dementia the result. As people live longer their need for services that help to maintain health and wellbeing will continue to grow, with the marked increase in dementia requiring particular attention. The costs of these services and of residential care where it is required are becoming an increasing burden even for those who have assets to their name. And, in areas of social deprivation within the county there are acute needs amongst older people as evidenced by much lower life expectancy and its correlation with a range of health and social problems.

6. Community

The underlying purpose of any community foundation is to provide the mechanism and the services to enable people to give to their local communities. Surrey Community Foundation has been established to serve the needs of the people of Surrey. However, it is a socially diverse county that encompasses densely populated, urbanised centres such as Sunbury or Ashford and more rural villages such as Hambledon or Peaslake. Many people identify with the immediate hamlet or village or town in which they live rather than the administrative or geographic entity that we call Surrey. The motivation to give, therefore, is in many cases a very local one and it is clear that more people would like to find a way of giving to their local communities in the knowledge that the money can only benefit their own specific locality.

Another important point about community foundations is that they were established to enable people to support their local communities, regardless of their financial circumstances. The origins of the community foundation movement in the United States are described in this way: “In 1914 a banker named Frederick Goff, an employee of the Cleveland Trust Company, conceived the notion of a foundation that would enable individuals from all walks of life to become philanthropists. The Cleveland Foundation thus became the world’s first community foundation and the prototype for hundreds more to follow, first in the United States and, more recently, worldwide.” 24 In Britain, the emergence of a powerful welfare state in the mid twentieth century seemed to undermine the need for a culture of philanthropy; even the term itself is sometimes considered a rather outdated one. But now, at the beginning of the twenty first century, the need for philanthropy at all levels should be very clear.

And in Surrey, in particular, where a considerable proportion of the taxes that residents pay flow straight out of the county to other parts of the country, the concept of establishing permanent endowments for local use is gaining in appeal. The consequence of receiving an unfair share of revenue, in an overall context in which public funds are already severely overstretched, is that the need for local philanthropy is perhaps nowhere more apparent than it is in this county. According to The Policy Exchange: “Once a highly revered notion with dynamic local government, Britain is now the most centralised state in the developed world.” 25 Centralisation has enabled governments to divert money away from this area so that many local needs are not and cannot be fulfilled with public resources. Local funds established to serve local communities are not only of financial importance but also provide the opportunity to reframe communities as our own and to ensure that money is well spent.

One of the great frustrations for voluntary organisations is that grant funding is often short term, perhaps for a three year period or less. There is an increasing need to establish permanent sources of community capital to fulfil local needs, whether it is the replacement of cricket nets for the local club or the provision of a crisis grant to enable a toddler to attend nursery. Community funds, such as the Peaslake Village Fund described below, offer the opportunity for residents to pool resources and to make cash, property or land available in a tax efficient way. For many it is also a logical and meaningful way of bequeathing a legacy. Voluntary groups, charities or individuals within the community can apply for funding and they can be either existing entities or new projects. Grants are awarded by a panel made up of people who represent the particular community in question, who can ensure that the money is spent in the way intended.

---

24. The Insider’s Guide to Grantmaking (and Other Money Matters) 2nd Ed. 2004
Some years ago the people of Peaslake pulled together to purchase their local primary school when it was threatened with closure. They raised money from local business and individuals to ensure that local children still have the opportunity to receive primary education at no cost close to home and that the school, with its continuing fund raising to meet ever growing costs, still remains at the heart of village life.

In a separate initiative, but with a good model already in place to work together and raise funds, the village established The Peaslake Village Fund with Surrey Community Foundation. Although administered and advised by the Community Foundation, decision making about the allocation of funds remains firmly with the community itself. For example, it has been able to fund a Christmas dinner for around fifty older people within the village and has recently awarded a grant to the village church St. Marks, towards the restoration of the clock.

In 2003 the Hambledon Village Trust was established for the benefit of the village: its first project was to purchase the freehold of the shop. Since then the Trust has successfully raised funds, both to restore a derelict barn that forms part of the shop premises and to upgrade and expand the shop and Post Office facilities. It also spearheaded action to fight off the recent threatened closure of the Post Office. The shop operates on a non-profit basis and relies entirely upon volunteers for its management and operation. The Trust has successfully sustained the shop through its own fund-raising and by encouraging donations from local residents, as well as by securing grants from the Post Office, Surrey County Council, Waverley Borough Council and Surrey Community Foundation. More recently, the village has established a fund with Surrey Community Foundation, managed by a panel of local people, to raise funds and award grants for groups and projects within the village.

There are vibrant communities within Surrey with residents who are committed to maintaining the value of village and community life. In rural areas in particular the continuing risk of losing post offices, shops, pubs and schools can prompt community action and motivate people to claim ownership of their communal resources as demonstrated in Peaslake and in Hambledon. The success of these initiatives rests firmly upon the willingness and commitment of individuals to preserve what they value around them. However it cannot be done without money. The same villages that are at risk of losing their local institutions are precisely the ones that are endowed with large houses and country estates. They attract wealthy people from London and elsewhere who seek the beautiful surroundings that this county offers. The need to support the local community is often not apparent, particularly if there is no formal mechanism to do so. Yet every village within the county faces a continuing threat to its institutions and a struggle to fund local infrastructure such as sports facilities, playgroups, youth clubs and so on. The establishment of a permanent endowment for local use only makes sense and offers hope for the preservation and renewal of our communities.
Some Concluding Comments

This report reviews the potential for community philanthropy in Surrey but has not attempted to cover every area of interest. It is a ‘work in progress’ and there is considerable further scope to look in detail at other themes, for example the arts, and to continue to update our understanding of local needs and the opportunities for grant funding. It is perhaps the first report of its kind to anticipate what potential donors may wish and need to know about the particular challenges of fund-raising in Surrey and about the many and varied causes that they could support. It comes at a time of profound economic change when questions are being asked about the dramatic increases in expenditure over recent years and about what is deemed necessary. It seems inevitable that it is going to get even harder for voluntary organisations to fund their work in a context in which perceptions of need are being re-evaluated. With this in mind, some key points emerge from the findings of this review.

- The general affluence of the county conceals its deprivation and diverts funds away to areas of more widespread relative poverty. Surrey is given low priority by a central government that takes advantage of the county’s capacity to generate revenue to spend most of it elsewhere.

- Spiralling costs, most notably the price of real estate, significantly impact upon the price of delivering services within the county. They place a particular burden upon the capacity of voluntary organisations to carry out their work and make it much harder for schools and other public institutions to recruit and retain good staff.

- Costs have also been inflated by a significant increase in regulation with the compliance with child protection and Health and Safety legislation most prominent in this escalation. Not only has it increased the effort that many organisations need to make to be compliant and to become eligible for funding. It is also a disincentive to volunteering and thus shifts work formerly undertaken by volunteers to paid staff.

- It is often very unclear where government funding starts and stops, but almost every voluntary organisation or group that contributed to this research has experienced a recent reduction in statutory funding. At the same time, some of them are picking up responsibilities that formerly were fulfilled by the state and may continue to be elsewhere in the country.

- Many voluntary organisations, including small informal groups, can fulfil vital roles that statutory organisations cannot. Some of the front line work with marginalised young people in trouble is a notable example. There is a risk that the contract culture that seeks to capitalise on the cost efficiency of the voluntary sector will undermine effective smaller players who have a detailed understanding of specific areas of need.

- A number of the organisations described in this report have received grants from Surrey Community Foundation. In some cases this has provided not only a source of funding that has ensured their survival but has also provided the opportunity for a dialogue between them and the donor. This has resulted in some flexibility, to allow the organisation or group to keep operating whilst it developed detailed plans. In some cases donors have also been willing to provide long term funding, thus providing greater stability and certainty.

- There is a clear need to increase the level of giving by individuals and companies within Surrey. We have already some outstanding examples of local philanthropy at work and a strong tradition and culture of giving within certain areas. In the current climate, however, there is not only the need to increase the level of giving but to extend it to organisations that are good at what they do but are less accomplished at fund-raising.

- Surrey continues to be a prosperous county with abundant financial, intellectual and professional resources. We are well placed to lead the way in revitalising a culture of local giving, to restore philanthropy as a force for positive social change.
### Appendix 1 Tables of Statistics

#### Index of Multiple Deprivation: Average of Super Output Area Scores (2007) Filtered by Sub Region: Surrey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Lower Level SOA</th>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Av. Score</th>
<th>Nat. Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Woking 004F</td>
<td>Maybury and Sheerwater</td>
<td>Woking</td>
<td>41.09</td>
<td>4169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Spelthorne 001B</td>
<td>Stanwell North</td>
<td>Spelthorne</td>
<td>31.79</td>
<td>7462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Reigate &amp; Banstead 008A</td>
<td>Merstham</td>
<td>Reigate &amp; Banstead</td>
<td>31.24</td>
<td>7677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Guildford 002D</td>
<td>Westborough</td>
<td>Guildford</td>
<td>31.07</td>
<td>7756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Woking 005B</td>
<td>Goldsworth East</td>
<td>Woking</td>
<td>28.12</td>
<td>9026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Waverley 001A</td>
<td>Ockford Ridge</td>
<td>Waverley</td>
<td>26.63</td>
<td>9750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Waverley 002E</td>
<td>Sandy Hill</td>
<td>Waverley</td>
<td>26.09</td>
<td>9995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Epsom &amp; Ewell 005A</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>Epsom &amp; Ewell</td>
<td>25.95</td>
<td>10063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Spelthorne 002C</td>
<td>Ashford North &amp; Stanwell South</td>
<td>Spelthorne</td>
<td>25.87</td>
<td>10108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Spelthorne 001C</td>
<td>Stanwell North</td>
<td>Spelthorne</td>
<td>25.62</td>
<td>10247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Runnymede 006D</td>
<td>Chertsey St Ann’s</td>
<td>Runnymede</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>10307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Reigate &amp; Banstead 008A</td>
<td>Redhill West</td>
<td>Reigate &amp; Banstead</td>
<td>25.48</td>
<td>10318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Reigate &amp; Banstead 006E</td>
<td>Horley West</td>
<td>Reigate &amp; Banstead</td>
<td>25.26</td>
<td>10440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Elmbridge 008A</td>
<td>Walton Ambleside</td>
<td>Elmbridge</td>
<td>25.03</td>
<td>10588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Spelthorne 002B</td>
<td>Ashford North &amp; Stanwell South</td>
<td>Spelthorne</td>
<td>24.92</td>
<td>10649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Spelthorne 008E</td>
<td>Sunbury Common</td>
<td>Spelthorne</td>
<td>24.87</td>
<td>10673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Epsom &amp; Ewell 002C</td>
<td>Ruxley</td>
<td>Epsom &amp; Ewell</td>
<td>24.72</td>
<td>10755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Woking 004D</td>
<td>Maybury &amp; Sheerwater</td>
<td>Woking</td>
<td>24.63</td>
<td>10813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Spelthorne 005B</td>
<td>Ashford East</td>
<td>Spelthorne</td>
<td>24.59</td>
<td>10842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Spelthorne 001D</td>
<td>Stanwell North</td>
<td>Spelthorne</td>
<td>24.13</td>
<td>11110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Guildford 002C</td>
<td>Westborough</td>
<td>Guildford</td>
<td>23.59</td>
<td>11436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Guildford 007D</td>
<td>Stoke</td>
<td>Guildford</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>11536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Epsom &amp; Ewell 007A</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>Epsom &amp; Ewell</td>
<td>22.96</td>
<td>11832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Guildford 007C</td>
<td>Stoke</td>
<td>Guildford</td>
<td>22.87</td>
<td>11889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Elmbridge 004D</td>
<td>Walton North</td>
<td>Elmbridge</td>
<td>22.42</td>
<td>12204</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Child Poverty Scores (2007) Filtered by Sub Region: Surrey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Lower Level SOA</th>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Nat. Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reigate &amp; Banstead 008A</td>
<td>Redhill West</td>
<td>Reigate &amp; Banstead</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>4027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Guildford 002A</td>
<td>Westborough</td>
<td>Guildford</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>4537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Elmbridge 008A</td>
<td>Walton Ambleside</td>
<td>Elmbridge</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>5316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Surrey Heath 004C</td>
<td>Old Dean</td>
<td>Surrey Heath</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>5316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Woking 004F</td>
<td>Maybury &amp; Sheerwater</td>
<td>Woking</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>5316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Epsom &amp; Ewell 002C</td>
<td>Ruxley</td>
<td>Epsom &amp; Ewell</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>5585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Elmbridge 004D</td>
<td>Walton North</td>
<td>Elmbridge</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>6217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Guildford 007C</td>
<td>Stoke</td>
<td>Guildford</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>6542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Guildford 002C</td>
<td>Westborough</td>
<td>Guildford</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>6542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Reigate &amp; Banstead 008A</td>
<td>Merstham</td>
<td>Reigate &amp; Banstead</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>6542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Spelthorne 001B</td>
<td>Stanwell North</td>
<td>Spelthorne</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>6542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Spelthorne 001C</td>
<td>Stanwell North</td>
<td>Spelthorne</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>6542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Spelthorne 003B</td>
<td>Ashford East</td>
<td>Spelthorne</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>6542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Surrey Heath 004E</td>
<td>St Michaels</td>
<td>Surrey Heath</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>6542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Waverley 002E</td>
<td>Farnham Upper Hale</td>
<td>Waverley</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>6542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Woking 005B</td>
<td>Goldsworth East</td>
<td>Woking</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>6542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Guildford 001C</td>
<td>Ash Wharf</td>
<td>Guildford</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>6899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Spelthorne 002B</td>
<td>Ashford North &amp; Stanwell South</td>
<td>Spelthorne</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>6899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Epsom &amp; Ewell 005A</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>Epsom &amp; Ewell</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>7216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Runnymede 002F</td>
<td>Englefield Green West</td>
<td>Runnymede</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>7216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Runnymede 003A</td>
<td>Addlestone Bourneside</td>
<td>Runnymede</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>7216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Waverley 003A</td>
<td>Farnham Castle</td>
<td>Waverley</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>7216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Epsom &amp; Ewell 007A</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>Epsom &amp; Ewell</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>7566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Guildford 005B</td>
<td>Worpleston</td>
<td>Guildford</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>7566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Woking 004D</td>
<td>Maybury &amp; Sheerwater</td>
<td>Woking</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>7566</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Local Knowledge Indices of Deprivation for SOA's in England

England: 0.18
### Older Person Poverty Scores (2007) Filtered by Sub Region: Surrey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Lower Level SOA</th>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Nat. Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Woking 004A</td>
<td>Maybury &amp; Sheerwater</td>
<td>Woking</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>1009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Woking 004D</td>
<td>Maybury &amp; Sheerwater</td>
<td>Woking</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>1301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Woking 004F</td>
<td>Maybury &amp; Sheerwater</td>
<td>Woking</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Woking 005B</td>
<td>Goldsworth East</td>
<td>Woking</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>3009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mole Valley 003D</td>
<td>Leatherhead North</td>
<td>Mole Valley</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>6227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Reigate &amp; Banstead 008A</td>
<td>Merstham</td>
<td>Reigate &amp; Banstead</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>6227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Guildford 007C</td>
<td>Stoke</td>
<td>Guildford</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>6697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Woking 009C</td>
<td>Hermitage &amp; Knaphill South</td>
<td>Woking</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>6697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Elmbridge 004D</td>
<td>Walton North</td>
<td>Elmbridge</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>7222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Epsom &amp; Ewell 007A</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>Epsom &amp; Ewell</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>7222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Woking 011E</td>
<td>Old Woking</td>
<td>Woking</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>7222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Guildford 015C</td>
<td>Onslow</td>
<td>Guildford</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>7776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Reigate &amp; Banstead 005A</td>
<td>Preston</td>
<td>Reigate &amp; Banstead</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>7776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Runnymede 008B</td>
<td>Foxhills</td>
<td>Runnymede</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>7776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Guildford 012D</td>
<td>Westborough</td>
<td>Guildford</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>8389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Reigate &amp; Banstead 010A</td>
<td>Redhill West</td>
<td>Reigate &amp; Banstead</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>8389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Runnymede 002D</td>
<td>Englefield Green West</td>
<td>Runnymede</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>8389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Runnymede 006D</td>
<td>Chertsey St Ann’s</td>
<td>Runnymede</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>8389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Spelthorne 008E</td>
<td>Sunbury Common</td>
<td>Spelthorne</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>8389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Surrey Heath 008A</td>
<td>St Michaels</td>
<td>Surrey Heath</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>8389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Waverley 005E</td>
<td>Godalming Farncombe &amp; Catteshall</td>
<td>Waverley</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>8389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Woking 004B</td>
<td>Maybury &amp; Sheerwater</td>
<td>Woking</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>8389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Elmbridge 003D</td>
<td>Molesley South</td>
<td>Elmbridge</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>9029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Guildford 001D</td>
<td>Ash Wharf</td>
<td>Guildford</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>9029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Reigate &amp; Banstead 008C</td>
<td>Merstham</td>
<td>Reigate &amp; Banstead</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>9029</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Local Knowledge Indices of Deprivation and Classifications
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