

**Cheltenham Borough Council**  
**Cabinet – 15<sup>th</sup> September 2015**  
**Shopmobility – Future Delivery – Consultation Report**

<b>Accountable member</b>	<b>Councillor Rowena Hay - Cabinet Member Healthy Lifestyles</b>
<b>Accountable officer</b>	<b>Wilf Tomaney – Townscape Manager</b>
<b>Ward(s) affected</b>	<b>All</b>
<b>Key/Significant Decision</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Executive summary</b>	<p>Cabinet on 14<sup>th</sup> July 2015 received a report on the future delivery of the Shopmobility service, which has been served notice to quit its current premises. Cabinet resolved to consult on its future delivery. Provisional analysis of the consultation results indicates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• significant support for continued provision of a Shopmobility service in the town;</li> <li>• whilst the favoured organisation for continued delivery is the Borough Council, there is general acceptance that delivery could be through another organisation;</li> <li>• a town centre location close to car parking is favoured.</li> </ul> <p>The report recommends that the Council proceeds with relocation to the Horse &amp; Groom, St George’s Place and then commences a procurement exercise to establish interest from other organisations in operating the service.</p>
<b>Recommendations</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>That Cabinet agrees the relocation of the Shopmobility service to the Horse and Groom, St George’s Place with the one-off costs being funded from within the existing service budget.</b></li> <li>2. <b>That Cabinet commits to a commissioning process for the Shopmobility service, the process to commence in January 2016.</b></li> <li>3. <b>That in the interim a review of fees and funding sources is undertaken, in conjunction with the 2016/17 Budget Setting Process.</b></li> </ol>

<b>Financial implications</b>	<p>The anticipated current year under spend within the service area is likely to cover the costs of the relocation.</p> <p>The outcome of a review of fees and funding sources will need to be fed into the 2016/17 Budget Setting Process.</p> <p><b>Contact officer: Nina Philippidis, Business Partner Accountant nina.philippidis@cheltenham.gov.uk, 01242 264121</b></p>
<b>Legal implications</b>	<p>When the Council undertakes the commissioning review, it will need to have regard to its Public Sector Equalities Duty contained in Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010. It will need to consider the likely or actual effects of proposed changes in the service on persons who share a protected characteristic (as defined by the Act).</p> <p>If the decision of the commissioning review is to outsource the service to another provider, the council will need to undertake a procurement exercise in compliance with its contract rules to select that provider.</p> <p><b>Contact officer: Donna Ruck, Solicitor, donna.ruck@teWKesbury.gov.uk, 01684 272696</b></p>
<b>HR implications (including learning and organisational development)</b>	<p>There are significant HR implications as highlighted in the report. Consultation and negotiation with the individuals and trade unions is required for contractual changes. Should the service be transferred there would be TUPE and possible redundancy implications which must be considered. HR's continued involvement as options and decisions are considered is essential.</p> <p><b>Contact officer: Richard Hall – HR Business Partner, Richard.hall@cheltenham.gov.uk, 01242 774972</b></p>
<b>Key risks</b>	<p><b>If a suitable relocation option is not agreed, then the authority could be vulnerable to having no relocation site available by November.</b></p>
<b>Corporate and community plan Implications</b>	<p>Shopmobility contributes to the following Corporate Plan objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sustain and grow Cheltenham's economic and cultural vitality</li> <li>• People live in strong, safe and healthy communities</li> </ul> <p>Delivery considerations have an impact on the following objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transform our council so it can continue to enable delivery of our outcomes for Cheltenham and its residents</li> </ul>
<b>Environmental and climate change implications</b>	<p>None</p>

<b>Property/Asset Implications</b>	<p>The property is the only one the Council owns in the town centre with sufficient space to accommodate Shopmobility. The relocation of Shopmobility into the building will ensure that the service is not lost to the town, and will help bring the building back into use. Following the relocation of Vision 21 the majority of the property has remained empty, apart from one room on the ground floor currently occupied by Cheltenham Print. This room will be incorporated into Shopmobility to provide reception facilities when Cheltenham Prints lease expires in March 2016.</p> <p>The first and second floors are unattractive and uneconomic to refurbish, but could be let to provide light weight storage space for instance to someone like The Wilson.</p> <p>If in the future the Shopmobility service is no longer required or relocates elsewhere then this opens up redevelopment/disposal options.</p> <p><b>Contact officer: David Roberts@cheltenham.gov.uk</b></p>
------------------------------------	--

## 1. Background

- 1.1 The report to Cabinet on 14<sup>th</sup> July 2015 established that the Shopmobility service has been served notice to quit its current premises in Beechwood Arcade by 1<sup>st</sup> November 2015.
- 1.2 The report also set out key facts around the current operation of the service. These included
- a. the financial position as follows:

	<b>2014-15 Budget</b>	<b>2014-15 Outturn</b>	<b>2014/15 Variance</b>	<b>2015-16 Budget</b>
<b>Expenditure</b>	£74,250	£55,894	£18,356	£81,450
<b>Income</b>	(£13,800)	(£7,138)	(£6,662)	(£14,000)
<b>Net</b>	<b>£60,450</b>	<b>£48,756</b>	<b>£11,694</b>	<b>£67,450</b>

- b. a decline in patronage and income as follows:

	<b>2011-12</b>	<b>2012-13</b>	<b>2013-14</b>	<b>2014-15</b>
<b>Annual visits</b>	3,156	2,736	2,362	2,280
<b>Daily average visits</b>	10	9	8	7
<b>Net Budget</b>		£79,250	£64,550	£60,450
<b>Net Outturn</b>		£68,227	£55,037	£48,756
<b>Avg cost per visit to CBC (Outturn)</b>		£25	£23	£21

- c. Usage

patterns as follows:

	<b>Frequency of use per client</b>	<b>No. of clients</b>	<b>Registration Address</b>		
			<b>Cheltenham</b>	<b>Rest of Glos</b>	<b>Other</b>
<b>Apr 2012- Mar 2015</b>	1	200	20%	36%	45%
	2-5	88	30%	43%	27%
	6-20	42	33%	57%	10%
	21-50	22	68%	27%	5%
	>50	6	83%	17%	0%
	<b>All</b>	<b>358</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>39%</b>	<b>33%</b>

- 1.3 There were three main issues identified

- a. Should there continue to be a Shopmobility service in Cheltenham and if so;
  - b. Where should it be located; and
  - c. How should it be delivered?
- 1.4 Cabinet resolved to undertake a consultation on the three main issues and receive a report on its results at this meeting.

## 2. Reasons for recommendations

- 2.1 In considering how to respond to the three substantive issues identified, Cabinet now has three information sources, specifically designed to help inform decisions:
- a. The report from the Overview and Scrutiny task group and the consequent recommendations of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee presented to Cabinet on 14<sup>th</sup> July. Both were presented to Cabinet on 14<sup>th</sup> July;
  - b. The consultation undertaken in response to the Council's Duty to Consult and the Cabinet's resolution of 14<sup>th</sup> July. The consultation ran between 6<sup>th</sup> August and 1<sup>st</sup> September. Section 4 "Consultation and Feedback" (below) and Appendix 2 between them set out a summary of interim consultation responses up to 24<sup>th</sup> August (due to reporting deadlines); a complete summary analysis will be circulated at or before the meeting as a revised Appendix 2 and an updated Section 4.  
and
  - c. The Community Impact Assessment (Appendix 3).
- 2.2 It is evident that any changes to the provision of Shopmobility will affect a vulnerable section of our community and there is a sensitive assessment to be made. Cabinet needs to weigh consideration of these information sources against the budgetary position, both of the Council in general and of this service in particular (see Table 2) and opportunities for addressing falling patronage of the Shopmobility over recent years (see Table 3).

### Issue – Continued Provision of Service.

- 2.3 Turning to the first main issue of continued provision of a Shopmobility service in the town, the interim results show 100% in favour of the continued provision of a Shopmobility service in the town. This was also the view of the Scrutiny Task Group and the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.
- 2.4 It is recommended that Cabinet seek to retain a service in the town. The approach outlined below in relation to the other two main issues is designed to help achieve that.

### Issue – Future Location

- 2.5 If the service is to continue in any form (whether within or outside the Council) it needs a site to operate from. The Notice to Quit requires vacating the Beechwood Arcade site by 1<sup>st</sup> November and there is now a critical time issue. The Task Group and Overview and Scrutiny Committee recognised the critical timeframe and recommend that relocation is a priority and should take place before further consideration of which organisation should run the service. Officers agree with this analysis.
- 2.6 Because the move is de facto as a result of the notice to Quit, the consultation concentrated on the criteria best suited to a new location. The responses favour a town centre location close to parking and buses, preferably with on-site toilet facilities. This reflects the view of the Scrutiny Task Group.
- 2.7 Operationally, approximately 65-70 square metres floorspace is required to accommodate storage, minor cleaning and maintenance facilities, front of house and staff facilities.
- 2.8 A problem with the service currently is a falling patronage. Anecdotal evidence suggests that proximity to a busy car park and/or a "street" presence would be useful both in raising profile and patronage.

**2.9** Table 1 identifies the current budget and last year's outturn profile. In 2014-15, a net under spend of £11,694 was achieved; a similar figure is anticipated this year. As no additional budgetary provision has been allocated towards the one-off costs of relocation, it is important that these can be funded from within existing budgets.

**2.10** The Scrutiny Task Group identifies the 3 sites which have potential for relocation, all of which have an ability to meet the criteria. A brief summary is set out below with approximate costs for comparison purposes, only costs substantially additional to existing costs are given (predominantly build and rental cost). Costs do not include relocation cost which will be common to all sites, business rates (already within budget) or other operational costs.

a. Regent Arcade contains the town's busiest car park and has a high footfall. It is considered, largely for this reason, to be the location best able to grow patronage of the service. Two options were considered

i. A Portacabin within the existing car park.

- This is thought to be technically achievable, though there is some uncertainty around plumbing and drainage.
- Informal discussions suggest that landlord's consent would be forthcoming.
- Building cost (one-off) in excess of £30,000
- Rental cost – nil.
- Loss of income from about 10 car parking spaces – Notionally 10 x £1616 per space (2012/13) = £16,160 per annum.

Option rejected on cost grounds.

ii. A shop unit within the Arcade was considered, however none were available to the Council.

b. High Street Car Park (rear of Henrietta Street) – Portacabin in car park. Well located for the High Street, the Brewery and bus hubs.

- Technically achievable.
- Building cost (one-off) in excess of £30,000
- Rental cost – nil.
- Loss of income from about 10 car parking spaces - Notionally 10 x £1910 per space (2012/13) = £19,100 per annum.

Option rejected on cost grounds.

c. Horse & Groom, St George's Place. Conversion of building vacated by Vision 21. Located close to Chester Walk car park (privately run). Got potential for synergies with TIC at the Wilson. Reasonable proximity to High Street, Brewery, bus hubs. |Frontage to street.

- Technically achievable.
- Conversion cost (one-off) estimated at £10,000
- Rental cost – nil.

This is the option which is easiest to achieve and lowest cost. Officers are currently developing this option. A design is prepared and implementation is considered to be achievable by the move date if authority given swiftly. Relationship to car park is not as convenient as other options, but is acceptable. Footfall is weakest of the three locations.

**2.11** It is recommended that Cabinet notes the one-off virement in the current financial year of £11,000 from within existing Shopmobility budgets to fund costs of relocation.

- 2.12 It is recommended Cabinet identifies the Horse and Groom as its preferred relocation site and that officers progress implementation of the move.

#### Issue – Delivery of Service

- 2.13 The Task Group considered that provision of the service outside the Council was an option which should be explored and O&S Committee recommended that seeking partnership options with other local service providers should form part of strategies to enhance the service. Both recognised that the process of identifying other providers should follow, not precede, relocation.
- 2.14 The consultation responses favoured the Council as the operator. However, did recognise that both charities and community organisations as strong alternatives. There was no strong desire for operation either by the private sector or by a tourism operator. Nevertheless, officers are of the opinion that no option should be ruled out at this stage; ability to meet operational criteria and deliver outcomes within an acceptable budgetary framework should be the determining factor in any commissioning process.
- 2.15 Officers have identified some interest from other organisations in operating the service. However, the move to full financial independence from the Council seems unlikely to be immediate and is likely to involve a progressive move to independence over a number of years. The attractiveness of the service is likely to depend on synergies with any new provider – this could include customer base, staff resource and skills, hardware or proximity of premises.
- 2.16 Staff would be subject to TUPE arrangements.
- 2.17 It is recommended that following relocation, the Shopmobility service is put forward as a commissioning option.

#### Additional Financial Support.

- 2.18 Through both the Scrutiny process and the consultation there is recognition that there are opportunities to enhance the budgetary position of the Shopmobility service.
- 2.19 The Task Group considered that Shopmobility could look for link partners and organisations; they were particularly interested in links to NHS and occupational health services. The Task Group had no appetite to consider introduction of charging for disabled parking to finance the service.
- 2.20 The consultation delivered a large number of suggestions including:
- a. 30% of respondents suggested increasing fees. There were a wide variety of suggestions about how this might work, but frequently mentioned were increasing the annual membership to £50 (an 80% increase) and introduction of a daily or hourly fee on top. There were concerns raised about protection for those on low incomes.
  - b. 12% felt that the service should seek donations from the public and others.
  - c. 11% considered that business sponsorship should be sought.
  - d. It was frequently suggested that the profile needed to be raised (through better publicity or a higher profile location)
  - e. Interestingly, 5% of respondents suggested some sort of parking charge.
- 2.21 Shopmobility staff recognise that there are untapped opportunities and the relocation is an opportunity to relaunch the service with a review of these opportunities.

### **3. Alternative options considered**

- 3.1 The main body of the report considers a range of options.

### **4. Consultation and feedback**

- 4.1 The Scrutiny Task Group report and O&S Committee have made recommendations which are discussed in section 2 of this report and were considered by Cabinet on 14<sup>th</sup> July.
- 4.2 The consultation ran between 6th August and 1st September. It was directly mailed to all registered users of the Shopmobility Service; a range of local charities and interest groups; local

branches of relevant national charities; local business groups; private businesses involved in provision of mobility aids. It was publicised through a press release and covered in the Echo. A questionnaire was available on the Council's website and paper copies were available at Municipal Office's reception and the Shopmobility office.

**4.3** Due to reporting deadlines, an interim analysis has been undertaken of the 104 questionnaires received by 24<sup>th</sup> August. An analysis of all responses will be presented as an update at the Cabinet meeting. Appendix 2 sets out the interim average results relating to "numeric" questions.

**4.4** A summary of the results is set out below.

**a.** On the three critical issues:

- Continuity All respondents considered that there should continue to be a Shopmobility service in the town.
- Location A town centre location close to car parking and bus stops, with on-site toilet facilities was favoured. Proximity to health services or visitor attractions was not considered important.
- Delivery The Borough Council was considered the best placed organisation to run the Shopmobility Service. However, there was a reasonable degree of confidence in either a charity or community group leading the operation. There was little support for a private company leading; nor a "tourism organisation". There were few suggestions for other body's which might be involved – two respondents suggested a business organisation such as the Chamber of Commerce.

**b.** Other questions attempted to understand what kind of service would be important and glean ideas around how funding might be supplemented.

- Services Hire of scooters and wheelchairs is seen as most important, followed by professional and pleasant staff. Hire during temporary disability and for holidays are considered important. Free, covered car parking are thought desirable.
- Funding opportunities There were a range of suggestions, the most popular being:
  - A variety of fee increases - annual fee; daily charge etc. (32% of respondents)
  - Seek charitable donations (12%)
  - Council funding (11%)
  - Business support (11%)
  - Raise profile (8%)
  - A variety of parking charge suggestions (5%)

**c.** General points

- The comments reflect highly on the professionalism, caring and friendly nature of Shopmobility staff.
- Comments on the value of the service regularly mention how important it is in allowing disabled people to have a more fulfilling life by enabling access to the town centre and its facilities and allowing them to use the centre with their friends and family.
- About 50% of respondents own a scooter or wheelchair and are a user of the service.

## **5. Performance management –monitoring and review**

**5.1** Through appropriate contract management and procurement procedures.



<b>Report author</b>	<b>Contact officer: Wilf Tomaney, wilf.tomaney@cheltenham.gov.uk, 01242 264145</b>
<b>Appendices</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Risk Assessment</li> <li>2. Consultation Summary</li> <li>3. Community Impact Assessment</li> </ol>
<b>Background information</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Cabinet Report 14<sup>th</sup> July 2015 – “Recommendations from the Scrutiny Task Group – Shopmobility”</li> <li>2. Cabinet Report 14<sup>th</sup> July 2015 – “Shopmobility – Future Delivery”</li> </ol>

The risk				Original risk score (impact x likelihood)			Managing risk				
Risk ref.	Risk description	Risk Owner	Date raised	Impact 1-5	Likelihood 1-6	Score	Control	Action	Deadline	Responsible officer	Transferred to risk register
1	Risk of adverse impact on quality of life of disabled and aged people if there is no Shopmobility provision	WT	June 15	5	4	20	Reduce	Implement measures to secure long term future of Shopmobility outside the Council	September 2016	WT	
2	Any environmental risks	None									
3	If suitable relocation options are not identified in September, then the Council could be vulnerable to having no relocation site available by November.	WT	June 15	5	4	20	Reduce	Agree preferred relocation option at September Cabinet.	September 2015	WT	

**Explanatory notes**

**Impact** – an assessment of the impact if the risk occurs on a scale of 1-5 (1 being least impact and 5 being major or critical)

**Likelihood** – how likely is it that the risk will occur on a scale of 1-6 (1 being almost impossible, 2 is very low, 3 is low, 4 significant, 5 high and 6 a very high probability)

**Control** - Either: Reduce / Accept / Transfer to 3rd party / Close

**Questionnaire - The Future of Shopmobility in Cheltenham**

**Interim analysis – of 104 responses to 24<sup>th</sup> August 2015.**

**Full analysis to be circulated in due course.**

**Responses shaded grey**

Cheltenham's Shopmobility office is moving. It has been served a notice to vacate its current premises at Beechwood Arcade by November 2015.

The Borough Council has decided to use the move as an opportunity to review the Shopmobility service and seek the views of interested people on its continued provision, the way in which it is provided and its future location.

Shopmobility has about 350 registered users and offers a valuable lifeline. It helps them to live more fulfilling lives; gives them the ability to use the town centre's shopping, leisure and cultural facilities; and enables them to meet socially with friends. For many, their contact with Shopmobility staff is an important part of their social life. About a third of users are from Cheltenham, a third from the rest of Gloucestershire and a third from elsewhere in the country.

The Shopmobility Service is operated by Cheltenham Borough Council. In 2014-2015 the Council spent about £56,000 on Shopmobility and it generated an income of just over £7,100. Between March 2011 and March 2015 use has declined from 3,156 to 2,280 visits per year. This puts last year's average cost to the Council at £21 per visit.

The following questions will take about 10 minutes to complete and will give the Council an idea of what local people, users and organisations think of Shopmobility and its future provision. Its findings will be reported to the Council's Cabinet in September and will be used to inform decisions on the future.

If you have any questions about the survey, phone the Shopmobility office on Cheltenham 255333.

If you are posting your response, please reply to

**Shopmobility  
Level 1a  
Beechwood Shopping Centre  
High Street  
Cheltenham  
Glos  
GL50 1QD**

**Questionnaires must be received by 4:30pm Tuesday 1<sup>st</sup> September 2015.**

## On-going Provision of a Shopmobility Service Questionnaire Interim analysis

### Total response - 104 (interim - at 24<sup>th</sup> August 2015)

1. Do you use the Shopmobility Service Yes – 86 : No - 17
2. Do you value the Shopmobility service Yes – 103 :No- 1
3. Please give your reasons for how you value the service.

- **78 respondents – rely on service to access town shopping and other facilities**
- **24 – provides independence**
- **22 – improves quality of life**
- **12 – excellent reliable service, friendly staff**
- **9 – easy access to car park**
- **6 – enables people to support local economy**
- **4 – value the holiday hire**
- **4 – value temporary use while recovering from injury**
- **3 – use it when disabled parent is visiting family**
- **3 – enables me to stay out longer**
- **3 - Indispensable service**
- **3 – other towns have good Shopmobility service**
- **2 each – may need it when I get older; serves an increasingly elderly population; central location; cost; meet and greet.**

4. Should there continue to be a Shopmobility Service in Cheltenham? Yes – 104 : No - 0

5. If the answer to Q3 is “Yes”, which organisation do you think is best placed to run the Shopmobility Service?

Please rank in order of preference as many as you wish (1 best placed - 6 worst placed)

Organisation	Rank 1-6
a. Cheltenham Borough Council	1 <sup>st</sup>
b. An existing charity	2 <sup>nd</sup>
c. Another voluntary or community group	3 <sup>rd</sup>
d. A private company	6 <sup>th</sup>
e. A tourism organisation	4 <sup>th</sup>
f. Another body Please specify which	5 <sup>th</sup>
•	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>2 respondents – Local trade organisation</b></li> <li>• <b>2 - any willing provider</b></li> <li>• <b>2 - New operator at Beechwood</b></li> <li>• <b>1 – Park &amp; ride</b></li> <li>• <b>1 - Not CBC</b></li> <li>• <b>1 - Only CBC</b></li> <li>• <b>1 - A charity</b></li> <li>• <b>1- Any financially viable provider</b></li> <li>• <b>1 – Social services</b></li> </ul>

6. How do you think Shopmobility's income could be supplemented or supported?

- **34 respondents - Increase fee (various suggested permutations)**
- **13 – accept charitable donations**
- **11 – Council should fund**
- **11 – Local business sponsorship or support**
- **10 – Raise profile (advertising, signage, better location etc.)**
- **5 – Charge for parking (various permutations)**
- **4 – introduce volunteer staff**
- **3 – Sell merchandise**
- **3 – charge for meet and greet**
- **3 – better relationship with bus company**
- **2 – appoint fundraisers**
- **1 each – sponsorship from scooter suppliers; increase membership; supply through other outlets (e.g. Everyman); expand scope of repairs in the workshop.**

**Relocation of the Shopmobility Service**

7. What do you think is important in choosing a new location for Shopmobility ?

Place "X" in box

a. In the Town Centre

Not important	1	2	3	4.22	5	Very Important
---------------	---	---	---	------	---	----------------

b. In a car park

Not important	1	2	3.87	4	5	Very Important
---------------	---	---	------	---	---	----------------

c. Close to a car park

Not important	1	2	3.86	4	5	Very important
---------------	---	---	------	---	---	----------------

d. Close to bus stops

Not important	1	2	3.41	4	5	Very Important
---------------	---	---	------	---	---	----------------

e. Close to health-related service

Not important	1	2.60	3	4	5	Very Important
---------------	---	------	---	---	---	----------------

f. Close to visitor attractions

Not important	1	2.62	3	4	5	Very Important
---------------	---	------	---	---	---	----------------

g. A shopfront on the street

Not important	1	2.59	3	4	5	Very Important
---------------	---	------	---	---	---	----------------

h. A covered space for training

Not important	1	2	3.01	4	5	Very Important
---------------	---	---	------	---	---	----------------

i. Toilet provision on-site

Not important	1	2	3.57	4	5	Very Important
---------------	---	---	------	---	---	----------------

## The Service

### 8. What is important about a Shopmobility service?\_

Place "X" in box

#### a. Hire of mobility scooters

Not important 

1	2	3	4.22	5
---	---	---	------	---

 Very Important

#### b. Hire of wheel chairs

Not important 

1	2	3	4.21	5
---	---	---	------	---

 Very Important

#### c. Hire of other mobility aids

Not important 

1	2	3.59	4	5
---	---	------	---	---

 Very Important

#### d. Professionalism of staff

Not important 

1	2	3	4.12	5
---	---	---	------	---

 Very Important

#### e. Pleasant staff

Not important 

1	2	3	4.14	5
---	---	---	------	---

 Very Important

#### f. Social contact for users

Not important 

1	2	3.45	4	5
---	---	------	---	---

 Very Important

#### g. Advice and information about health and disability services

Not important 

1	2	3.36	4	5
---	---	------	---	---

 Very Important

#### h. Sale of mobility aids

Not important 

1	2.99	3	4	5
---	------	---	---	---

 Very Important

#### i. Hire of equipment for holidays

Not important 

1	2	3.62	4	5
---	---	------	---	---

 Very Important

#### j. Hire during temporary illness

Not important 

1	2	3.81	4	5
---	---	------	---	---

 Very Important

#### k. Free parking

Not important 

1	2	3.76	4	5
---	---	------	---	---

 Very Important

#### l. Covered parking

Not important 

1	2	3.53	4	5
---	---	------	---	---

 Very Important

#### m. Personal shopping assistance

Not important 

1	2.69	3	4	5
---	------	---	---	---

 Very Important

### 9. How can the Shopmobility Service be improved?

- **33 responses – current service is excellent**
- **9 – Raise profile (better advertising; social media; publicity in clinics etc.)**
- **3 – better location**
- **3- later opening**
- **3 - Sunday/bank holiday opening**
- **2 – involve local stores**
- **2- closer to bus stops**
- **2 - move to Regent Arcade**
- **2 - ground floor location**
- **2 - locate close to outdoor car park.**
- **1 each – on-line booking; make available to park & ride users; consult local disable groups on improvements; make it free; offer short hire discount; sell batteries; make Winchcombe St disabled parking only; larger spaces; more staff; better toilets; staff training;**

## About you

10. Age – Place “X” in box

Under 18	18-30	30-40	40-50	50-60	60-70	70-80	Over 80
0	3	8	12	31	22	10	14

11. Gender ..... male– 33 : female - 66

12. Do you have a permanent mobility disability? ..... yes – 71 : no - 31

13. Do you have, or have you ever had, a temporary mobility disability? .. yes – 69 : no - 30

14. Are you visually impaired? ..... yes – 5 : no - 96

15. Do you own any of the following? 53 positive responses

- a. Mobility Scooter ..... yes - 42
- b. Powered Wheelchair ..... yes - 5
- c. Wheelchair ..... yes 34

16. Are you any of the following – place “X” in all boxes that apply

a. Registered disabled	54
b. Unregistered but use mobility aids	19
c. A carer for a Shopmobility user	11
d. A friend or relative of a Shopmobility user	18
e. A charity working with disabled people	4
f. A charity working with the elderly	3
g. A private business working in the care sector	0
h. A private business dealing with mobility aids	0
i. Other Specify here -	0

**Any other comments** Please use this space to make any other comments

- 21 responses – loss of Shopmobility would have significant impact on lifestyle & independence
- 12 - Shopmobility is a vital service to disabled people & carers
- 11 – Excellent staff/service/equipment
- 8 – Shopmobility allows visits to town centre & its facilities
- 5 – the Council has a duty to provide Shopmobility
- 4 – Shopmobility should be retained
- 3 – a town of Cheltenham’s prestige needs Shopmobility
- 2 each – Shopmobility is a right not a privilege; Shopmobility is increasingly needed as extent of pedestrianisation increases; Shopmobility is good for the economy; Shopmobility is important for disabled people on low income; Loss of service is discriminatory to disabled people; Own scooter is not able to be transported to town; Consult with disabled groups on reprovision.
- 1 each – would be forced to shop elsewhere; enable holidays for disabled; important service as disabled parking becomes more difficult; adjust spending priorities to retain Shopmobility; important for both regular use and when carer is unavailable; important because disabled parking is poor in Cheltenham.
- 1 each – reprovision should– retain meet & greet; retain undercover parking; retain access to toilets; retain low cost parking; extend to more than one site; work closer with the NHS; link with TIC at The Wilson.

## What is a community impact assessment?

A community impact assessment is an important part of our commitment to delivering better services for our communities. The form will help us find out what impact or consequences our functions, policies, procedures and projects have on our communities, as well as employees and potential employees.

By undertaking an impact assessment, we are able to:

- Take into account the needs, experiences and circumstances of those groups of people who use (or don't / can't use) our services.
- Identify any inequalities people may experience.
- Think about the other ways in which we can deliver our services which will not lead to inequalities.
- Develop better policy-making, procedures and services.

## Background

<b>Name of service / policy / project and date</b>	<b>Shopmobility - relocation</b>
<b>Lead officer</b>	<b>Wilf Tomaney</b>
<b>Other people involved in completing this form</b>	<b>Collette Sekulic Rhonda Tauman</b>



## Step 1 - About the service / policy / project

<b>What is the aim of the service / policy / project and what outcomes is it contributing to</b>	Shopmobility provided mobility aids for rent, available for use in the town centre. It contributes to Corporate Strategy 2015-16 Economic Outcome and Community Outcome.
<b>Who are the primary customers of the service / policy / project and how do they / will they benefit</b>	Residents and visitors with a mobility difficulty.
<b>How and where is the service / policy / project implemented</b>	Currently delivered from the car park of Beechwood Arcade. Notice to quit has been served. Currently searching for an alternative suitable location.
<b>What potential barriers might already exist to achieving these outcomes</b>	<p>The Council's budgetary constraints.            Falling numbers using the service – reasons unclear- possible reasons are</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• location (reducing passing trade);</li> <li>• cost; and</li> <li>• increasing private ownership of mobility aids.</li> </ul> <p>All anecdotal, no positive evidence.</p>

## Step 2 – What do you know already about your existing / potential customers

<b>What existing information and data do you have about your existing / potential customers e.g. Statistics, customer feedback, performance information</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Declining use year on year.</li> <li>• Three year analysis of users shows registration address as follows               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 28% Cheltenham</li> <li>○ 39% rest of Gloucestershire</li> <li>○ 33% outside Gloucestershire</li> <li>○ Regular users tend to be Cheltenham based; one-time users largest proportion is from out of County; moderate users, largest proportion from rest of Glos.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Usage appears low compared to similar towns/cities (notably Worcester and Gloucester – anecdotal).</li> <li>• Comparative costs to clients are difficult to assess because of the variety of payment methods across the various providers nationally. A number of services are free to customers. Cheltenham looks to be on the high side of the norm for services which charge.</li> <li>• O&amp;S Shopmobility Task Group, Cheltenham Chamber of Commerce and Cheltenham Business Partnership want to see a continued service in the town.</li> <li>• The service receives positive responses for customers</li> </ul>
<b>What does it tell you about who uses your service / policy and those that don't?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a small core of regular users who are very frequent users.</li> <li>• Users are roughly even split in terms of the three divisions used for analysis of the registration address. This suggests some value to tourism and to the town centre economy.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Primary users are people with a mobility disability, usually (but not exclusively) those without access to their own equipment. Many are late middle-age or elderly, though again, not exclusively.</li> </ul>
<b>What have you learnt about real barriers to your service from any consultation with customers and any stakeholder groups?</b>	<p>Consultation shows significant support for the continuation of the service. There is some support for increased fees to help the service survive.</p> <p>There is a preference evident through consultation for continued provision of the service by CBC, however, a recognition that it could be provided by charities of the community.</p>
<b>If not, who do you have plans to consult with about the service / policy / project?</b>	<p>Will need to undertake some consultation on any relocation options – but realistically they are very limited; and notice to quit by November means remaining in situ is not an option.</p> <p>Decision to close service or procure to another supplier will need consultation.</p>

### Step 3 - Assessing community impact

How does your service / policy / project impact on different groups in the community?

Group	What are you already doing to benefit this group	What are you doing that might disadvantage this group	What could you do differently to benefit this group	No impact on this group
People from black and minority ethnic groups				No specific impact
Gender				No specific impact
Gender Reassignment				No specific impact
Older people / children and young people	Older people are a major user of the service	Closure is likely to impact on ability to access town centre for shopping, leisure or social contact.	Seek to retain service in some form within the town.	
People with disabilities and mental health challenges	People with mobility disabilities are a major user of the service	Closure is likely to impact on ability to access town centre for shopping, leisure or social contact.	Seek to retain service in some form within the town.	
Religion or belief				No specific impact
Lesbian, Gay and Bi-sexual people				No specific impact
Marriage and Civil Partnership				No specific impact
Pregnancy & Maternity	Potential user of service, but not a major target		Seek to retain service in some form within the town.	
Other groups or communities				No specific impact

## Step 4 - what are the differences

<b>Are any groups affected in different ways to others as a result of the service / policy / project?</b>	Financially disadvantaged groups may be affected if unable to access Shopmobility. Users of public transport may be disadvantaged if Shopmobility is required to move away from town centre.
<b>Does your service / policy / project either directly or indirectly discriminate?</b>	No
<b>If yes, what can be done to improve this?</b>	n/a
<b>Are there any other ways in which the service / project can help support priority communities in Cheltenham?</b>	There may be synergies between the service and other organisations in the town. These can be considered as part of the commissioning process.

## Step 5 – taking things forward

<b>What are the key actions to be carried out and how will they be resourced and monitored?</b>	Implement Relocation– monitored against a set of criteria, including conformity with DDA; accessibility to town centre; accessibility to car parking.  Implement commissioning review.
<b>Who will play a role in the decision-making process?</b>	Cabinet, informed by all party member discussion and officer advice.
<b>What are your / the project’s learning and development needs?</b>	Need clarity around the commissioning process.
<b>How will you capture these actions in your service / project planning?</b>	Need to develop full project plan. No project manager yet appointed.

17.