ADULTS COMMITTEE: MINUTES

Date: Wednesday 22 May 2019

Time: 2.00 pm to 4.20 pm

Present: Councillors A Bailey (Chairwoman) A Costello, J French, N Harrison, M Goldsack, M Howell (Vice-Chairman), D Wells, J Whitehead (substituting for Councillor Crawford) and G Wilson.

Apologies: Councillor S Crawford.

174. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Apologies were received from Councillor Crawford (substituted by Councillor Whitehead) and Councillor Giles.

Councillor Costello declared a disclosable interest under the Code of Conduct in Minute no.178, Housing Related Support (HRS) Services, as she knew a number of the residents at St James Court in Ramsey in a personal capacity. She was not present whilst the item was discussed or for the vote.

175. NOTIFICATION OF CHAIRMAN/WOMAN AND VICE-CHAIRMAN/WOMAN

The Committee was advised of the appointment of Councillor Anna Bailey as Chairwoman and Councillor Mark Howell as Vice- Chairman of the Committee by Council for the municipal year 2019-20.

176. MINUTES AND ACTION LOG – 21 MARCH 2019

The minutes of the meeting held on 21 March 2019 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairwoman.

Members noted that that the Willow Court tender for contract would be going to the Joint Commissioning Board in June 2019. Members noted the remaining actions on the action plan.

177. PETITIONS AND PUBLIC QUESTIONS

The Chairwoman notified the Committee that three requests to speak had been made by members of the public in relation to item 5 on the agenda 'Housing Related Support Review' and one request to speak by the local member for Romsey. The Chairwoman clarified that the requests to speak would be heard as part of item five on the agenda.

178. HOUSING RELATED SUPPORT (HRS) SERVICES

The Committee received a report asking them to consider the approach taken to reviewing Housing Related Support Services.

In introducing the report Officers clarified that of the £7.4 million spent on Housing Related Support by the County Council per year, £4.35 million was spent on services for working age adults and £1.2 million was spent on services for older people. Officers explained that it was not a statutory requirement for the County Council to provide Housing Related Support Services, however the Council recognised the potential it had to contribute to the prevention agenda and had continued to invest in these services. The Housing Related Support budget paid for dedicated staff who were able to deliver specialist support to meet specific needs of each person. Cost related to accommodation, such as rent and services charges, were not covered by this funding.

Officers concluded the introduction of the report by confirming that the Committee were being asked to consider and approve the extension to a number of commissioned services for adults as set out in section 2.2 of the report, and to consider and approve the removal of funding for services specified in 2.3.2 of the report.

The Committee heard three Public Speakers in relation to the content of the report.

The first speaker Dr Fiona Blake, Chair of Trustees for Jimmy's spoke in support of the proposals for Jimmy's Assessment Centre. She highlighted that over the last seven years of the contract term with the County Council, the Assessment Centre at Jimmy's had supported over 300 individuals with a move to second stage more sustainable accommodation. She acknowledged that the cut in funding would have an impact on the service that they could provide but that they would be working closely with commissioners and Housing Related Support Providers in the development of innovative and sustainable service transformation reforms to deliver services to the homeless and those whose are vulnerable in terms of housing. She hoped that they could seek a sustainable solution beyond the proposed 18 month extension term of the contract.

A Member sought clarification from Dr Blake as to whether Jimmy's was comfortable with the proposed £40,000 cut to funding. Dr Blake acknowledged that they were not completely comfortable with the cut to funding but appreciated the position of the council. She also acknowledged that it was important to assist the council and move forward with future collaborations, calling on their donors to seek to reduce their reliance on the contracts. She concluded that it was a good opportunity but that they knew there were risks and there was a potential impact on service but that they looked to cover this with restructuring.

The Chairwoman explained that the Committee had also received written

comments from Councillor Linda Jones expressing her concerns in relation to the cuts imposed on Jimmy's Assessment Centre (see appendix 1).

The Chairwoman gave a formal response to Dr Blake (see appendix 2).

Before introducing the second speaker the Chairwoman addressed the Committee and stated that a letter had been received from MP Daniel Zeichner in opposition to the proposed cut to funding to An Lac House and the letter had been circulated to the Committee (see appendix 3). She also highlighted that other correspondence had been received from the Cambridge Ethnic Community Forum (see appendix 4) and individuals and relatives of residents of the house.

The second speaker Mrs Trinh Johns, Deputy Chair of the Abbeyfield Cambridgeshire Vietnamese Society/An Lac House, spoke in opposition to the proposed cut to funding for An Lac House. Mrs Johns made five points in her speech focusing on the complex care needs for Vietnamese elderly residents that were currently being met in a culturally appropriate setting at An Lac House. She highlighted their concerns that Vietnamese Elders did not speak English and that currently they had bilingual staff who could support them. The society questioned whether interpretation requirements could be met through the alternative Older Person's Visiting Support Service. She highlighted the view of the society that there would be an increased financial burden to the Council if these needs were to be met through residential or nursing care. She also highlighted the society's view that the County Council's Community Impact Assessment did not acknowledge the disproportionate impact of the proposals on religion and belief.

A Member sought clarification from Mrs Johns on what the practical impact would be in terms of a cut to staffing in relation to the financial impact. Mrs Johns clarified that the figure would be £42,000 a year.

A Member sought further clarification on whether the main part of the money received covered the Manager's position and what their role involved. Mrs Johns explained that this was correct and that the manager checked each room every morning to ensure the welfare of residents, they organised Doctors' appointments and visits to the house, organised shopping every day for the chef and organised lessons and activities to keep the residents active.

A Member questioned whether this was the only scheme of its kind in the Country, how many referrals did they have from outside of the county. A member of the society clarified that three residents were from outside of the county.

The Chairwoman gave a formal response to Mrs Johns (see appendix 5).

Councillor Kavanagh, the local member for Romsey addressed the Committee in relation to his opposition to the cuts proposed for An Lac House. He explained that An Lac House was a hugely important part of the community, and was also important across the county, nationally and

internationally. He drew attention to page 40 of the papers in relation to the negative impacts that were anticipated in the Community Impact Assessment. His view was that there had been a mis-interperation of equality and diversity and he was not convinced a comprehensive impact assessment has been carried out. He stated that the reputation of the council could be put into question. He highlighted that short term floating support would not be good enough in terms of providing the translating that the residents required. He concluded by stating his view that financially it would cost the council much more in providing alternative support and that the committee should have made this decision under the category of exceptional circumstances.

A Member sought further clarification from Councillor Kavanagh on his concerns in relation to the Impact Assessment. Councillor Kavanagh stated that reading the Impact Assessment on page 40 of the papers, it was vague and lacked depth and he questioned whether it had been carried out properly.

The third public speaker Mr Chris Jenkin, a Trustee of the Cambridge Churches Homeless Project addressed the committee and highlighted the work of the “It Takes a City” (ITAC) initiative emerging from the Cambridge Summit on Homelessness on 29th November 2019. He explained that the ITAC Action Groups were working on digital communications, information development, housing, women, young people, support and employment, and the connections with City and County officials and programmes.
He gave endorsement of the direction of travel towards Housing First, but highlighted a concern over scale and timing, given the extremely poor move-on rates currently and the pressure on existing services. He highlighted the current and potential relationship between ITAC and the HRS Review, and the wider Homelessness Transformation Review and the subsequent Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Housing Related Support Commissioning Strategy.

The Chairwoman gave a formal response to Mr Jenkin (see appendix 6).

The Chairwoman thanked all of the public speakers for attending the meeting and sharing their views. She explained that the speakers would receive the formal responses given at the meeting and that they would be included as an appendix to the minutes of the meeting.

In discussing the report:

- A Member questioned why the Alms Houses and An Lac House were in a separate category in the report. The Chairwoman explained that there had been a large review of sheltered housing a number of years ago which had resulted in a move to floating support services. She explained that these contracts should have been included in this review at the time but were not included as they had been in a different budget at the time of the review.

- A Member commented that some individuals were not capable of leaving their accommodation and if the funding were to be taken away, where did the council expect them to go. Officers clarified that Housing Related Support Funding was for support services and did not fund accommodation. If these individuals had care needs they would be assessed to identify the care they required and in this would be acted on in accordance with statutory responsibilities. The review was not about closing down accommodation.

- A Member sought agreement from the Chairwoman that the recommendations of the report be considered separately. The Chairwoman agreed that she would take a vote on each recommendation at the end of the debate.

- A Member sought clarity on the value of the grant funding and the additional costs that might be incurred if An Lac House reduced their staffing who were providing care. The Member requested that the value of grant funding per annum be added to the minutes for clarity as follows:

    - An Lac house - £41,729
    - Jimmy's - £40,000
    - Ramsey Welfare Charity - £8,877
    - Wisbech Charities - £3,357
    - Foundation of Edward Storey - £21,874

  Officers explained domiciliary care is very different from Housing Related Support. Domiciliary or home care consists of a series of visits to provide personal care- help with food, washing and other personal care needs and the nature of this care means it is Care Quality Commission Regulated. Officers also explained that many people were successfully supported to live independently in their own home and a lot of work could be done with very little additional support required.

- A member queried the reaction from the Alms Houses in relation to the review as the committee had received no representations from them. Officers clarified that every organisation had the opportunity to engage with the review. Officers had one brief exchange with one of the Alms Houses and the others had accepted the proposals that had been put forward.

- A Member questioned the points raised by the public speaker for An Lac House and asked Officers to clarify whether Housing Related Support Funding would cover care and end of life needs and translation. Officers confirmed that this funding would not cover these needs, as these are met through separately funded services. It was clarified that the funding focused on helping individuals to be independent and to move to a stable environment.

- A Member expressed support for the review and commented that a lot of services had been piecemeal and that there was a need to review

services in the interests of value for money and meeting modern needs and being more responsive. She explained that ideally the homelessness review would have been completed before the decisions were made at committee. She expressed her support of the cut to the budget for Jimmy's after hearing their views. She highlighted her concern that the committee had not heard from representatives from the Alms Houses and welcomed that Willow Walk would be tied in to the wider review.

- A Member questioned whether there was anything unique about the Alms Houses. Officers explained that Alms Houses in general did not have any dedicated on-site support and sought support from the community. The Chairwoman reiterated that that this was the focus of future services in terms of support from the wider community.

- A Member expressed concern that the costs for An Lac House might escalate. Officers explained that there was an equity issues and that all individuals regardless of origin or beliefs needed to be treated on an equal basis. They reiterated that this was a very difficult decision for the committee to make.

- A Member sought further reassurances that the other groups highlighted in 2.3.2 of the report had received adequate consultation on the proposals as there was no representation from them at the committee meeting. Officers reassured the committee that there had been full consultation with all of the concerned parties including visits by officers.

In bringing the discussion to a close, the Chairwoman expressed her support for the Housing First Model and the prevention agenda and encouraged further engagement on this with district colleagues. She clarified that Officers would support An Lac House to look for national funding.

It was resolved unanimously to:

a) review and approve the approach being taken to review Housing Related Support services.
b) consider and approve the extension to a number of commissioned services for adults, as described in section 2.2.
d) committee agree to receive a further report on the detailed progress in autumn 2019.

It was resolved by majority to:

c) consider and approve the removal of funding for services specified in 2.3.2.

179. PROCUREMENT OF CARE AND SUPPORT SERVICES IN EXTRA CARE SCHEMES – BAIRD LODGE, EDEN PLACE, MILLBROOK HOUSE, NESS COURT AND SOMERS COURT

The Committee considered a report outlining the case for tendering the care and support services in Baird Lodge, Eden Place, Millbrook House, Ness Court and Somers Court extra care housing schemes.

In discussing the report Members:

- queried the recommendation to tender all of the services together as one lot and asked if there had been any consultation with the market on this approach . Officers explained that they had chosen this method of tendering to avoid applicants “cherry picking” contracts. No issues were anticipated with the tender process.

It was resolved unanimously to:

a) agree to tender the care and support services in Baird Lodge, Eden Place, Millbrook House, Ness Court and Somers Court extra care housing schemes.
b) delegate award of the contract to Executive Director for People & Communities for decision.

180. RE- COMMISSIONING OF THE DIRECT PAYMENT SUPPORT SERVICE

The Committee received a report asking them to consider the recommissioning of the Direct Payments Service.

In discussing the report Members:

- Noted that work was underway reviewing the take up of Direct Payments and looking at how the take up could be improved in the future. Officers explained that this work would be fed into the recommissioning process.

- Queried whether there would be any training available for Personal Assistants. Officers explained that a strategy was needed in relation to the take up of Personal Assistants and better communications were required in order to attract individuals to the role.

- Noted that the Council was aware that performance on direct payments needed to improve and Officers had been in discussions with other authorities who were having the same challenges. Officers explained that the main issue was the ability to access the right people to be Personal Assistants and a concern amongst older people about managing the process. A direct payments card had been introduced which had helped to improve the process and make it simpler.

- Requested that Officers ensured that as part of the recommissioning

process there was a target for the successful organisation to increase Direct Payments take-up. They also sought assurances that the organisation had an in depth understanding of the needs across Cambridgeshire and Peterborough, helping individuals to access as much as they could in their communities. Officers explained that the provider would be working alongside the social work teams. Officers explained that the contract had been let in Peterborough and they had seen an increase of uptake of 25%.

It was resolved unanimously that:

a) the re-commissioning of the Direct Payment Support Service to be in place by 1st April 2020.
b) to agree the delegation of award of contract to the Executive Director, People and Communities.

181. CAMBRIDGESHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL - ADASS REGIONAL SELF ASSESSMENT UPDATE

The Committee received a report providing feedback from the external challenge process in relation to the Self Assessment which the committee received for consideration in December 2018.

It was resolved unanimously to:

consider the feedback on the Self Assessment and note how this aligns with actions agreed at the regional challenge event.

182. ADULTS POSITIVE CHALLENGE UPDATE

The Committee considered a report providing an update on the Adults Positive Challenge programme with an in depth look at the Technology Enabled Care (TEC) Workstream and the interface with the Think Communities Programme. The report also provided feedback on how the learning from the Neighbourhood Cares Pilots (NCP) had been applied to the programme as id developed.

In discussing the report Members:

- Welcomed the case studies included in the report in particularly how outcomes could be achieved for individuals and their families through the delivery of TEC solutions.

- Queried whether an intercom service using landlines could be reviewed as part of the TEC workstream. Officers agreed to review this as part of the workstream. **ACTION**

- Questioned whether the Council could challenge themselves more in

terms of the targets set. Officers explained that they were currently working on a set of targets and would be taking this into consideration.

It was resolved unanimously to:

a) consider the content of the report and support the increased use of Technology Enabled Care to support people to live independently, and reduce demand for statutory care and support.
b) note the interface between Think Communities and Adult Positive Challenge Programme.
c) reflect on how the learning from the Neighbourhood Cares Pilots is being applied to the wider practice change in the Adult Positive Change Programme.

183. DELAYED TRANSFERS OF CARE DTOC PROGRESS REPORT

The Committee received a report providing an update on progress related to Delayed Transfers of Care (DTOC).

In considering the report Members:

- Discussed the commissioning criteria and the examples given of how the authority could commission differently. Members highlighted their concerns in relation to use of mixed sex wards. Officers explained that this was an NHS responsibility and that sometimes there was a need to be flexible about use of space to make maximum use of capacity. Officers to share these concerns with NHS colleagues.

- Noted that over the last two months there had been some improvements in performance. Officers explained that there had been a review of how delays were recorded and that the brokerage team was now fully staffed. Officers were reviewing the data on a weekly basis.

It was resolved unanimously to note and comment the report.

184. FINANCE AND PERFORMANCE REPORT – OUTTURN 2018 – 19

The Committee considered a report on the 2018/19 outturn Finance and performance report for the People and Communities Service (P&C).

In presenting the report it was noted that People and Communities at the end of the year was overspent by £4.8 million, which was around 2% of the budget, and £180,000 less than the latest forecast. Within these figures Services related to Adults Committee were forecast overall in January an overspend of £1.15 million for the year – around 0.8% of the budget.

In discussing the report Members:

- Congratulated Officers on the huge amount of work that had been done throughout the year to ensure that any overspend was minimal.

- Queried how confident Officers were that the Council would receive the grants that they were expecting. Officers explained that they were confident for this financial year but that there was great uncertainty in relation to April 2020 and this was a major concern, in particular in relation to the Older Peoples budget and continuous price increases.

- Noted that the Social Care Green Paper continued to be delayed by Government.

It was resolved unanimously to review and comment on the report.

185. MULTI AGENCY SAFEGUARDING ARRANGEMENTS FOR CAMBRIDGESHIRE AND PETERBOROUGH

The Committee received a report outlining the new safeguarding arrangements for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough.

In presenting the report Officers explained that there was now one single governance structure for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough for both Adults and Children's Safeguarding and that separate Adults and Children's.

In discussing the report Members:

- Noted that there had been a lot of national interest in the new model as an example of best practice and that the sovereignty of both Councils had been recognised within the model.

It was resolved unanimously to note the report for information.

186. APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES

The Committee considered a report containing the Committees agenda plan and training plan and asking them to consider appointments to outside bodies and internal advisory groups and panels.

In discussing the report Members:

- Noted that Councillor Bailey would be visiting the Isle of Ely Society of the Blind to discuss the Council's representation on their Board.

- Noted that a revised Training Plan would be available at the next meeting.

It was resolved to:

(i) review its agenda plan attached at Appendix 1 of the report;

(ii) review its training plan attached at Appendix 2 of the report;

(iii) agree the appointments to outside bodies as detailed in Appendix 3 of the report and

- appoint Councillor Howell as the representative for Camsight.
- appoint Councillor Goldsack as the representative on the Older Peoples
  Partnership Board.
- appoint Councillor Howell as the representative on the Adults Safeguarding Board.

187. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Members noted the date of the next meeting as Thursday 4 July 2019.

Chairwoman