

ADULTS COMMITTEE: MINUTES

Date: Thursday 12th April 2018

Time: 2.00pm to 2.30pm

Present: Councillors A Bailey (Chairwoman), S Crawford, K Cuffley, J French, J Gowing (substituting for Cllr Costello), N Harrison, D Wells and G Wilson

Apologies: Councillors Costello, Giles and Howell

76. APOLOGIES AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

77. MINUTES – 8 MARCH 2018 AND ACTION LOG

The minutes of the meeting held on 8 March 2018 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairwoman, subject to including Councillor Crawford in the list of those present, and modifying minute 70 by amending the second bullet point under the introduction 'Discussing the amended recommendations, one member' to read: 'pointed out that there had been a cost associated with the consultation exercise, and those who had received the consultation had been given cause to worry about the potential impact of the proposals on themselves or those they cared for; it would have been helpful if the cost of the exercise could have been reported to the Committee'.

The Action Log was noted. In relation to specific actions arising from Minute 64:

- members were advised that work had started on the map of support services for adults, but this was proving a substantial undertaking and would not be ready for circulation until mid-May 2018
- clarification was sought of the explanatory comment on the difference between Cambridgeshire's and Peterborough's per capita expenditure on services covered by the Floating Support Service commissioning review. Members noted that historically, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough had allocated funding differently in several service areas, and it was not possible to transfer funds between local authorities. The Commissioner (Adults) undertook to revisit the explanation; she was asked also to draw attention to any areas where the level of services received by residents differed significantly between Cambridgeshire and Peterborough.

Action required

With the agreement of the Committee, the Chairwoman reordered the agenda to take items 6 and 7, appointments and agenda plan, ahead of the confidential item 5, so that members of the public present could hear as much of the meeting as possible.

78. PETITIONS

No petitions were received.

79. PUBLIC QUESTION

The Chairwoman advised the Committee that a question had been received from Mrs Margaret Ridley, and although it did not relate to any item on the agenda for the meeting, she had agreed to exercise her discretion to allow the question to be put.

Mrs Ridley said that she understood that there was a real problem with people waiting for suitable care arrangements to be made before they could be discharged from hospital, but she was concerned that depositing a frail elderly person in a stranger's spare room was not a safe or appropriate solution. She asked why private discussions were continuing between CareRooms Ltd and officers and members of the County Council without any consideration of the matter by the Adults Committee. The Council should be opening up the discussion to the general public.

The Chairwoman, undertook to reply to the question in writing, and said that only one meeting had taken place with CareRooms Ltd that included Council members, when she and council officers, and one other member, had listened to the plans of the CareRooms Ltd Chief Executive in January 2018. This fell within the ordinary business of the Council, which had a statutory duty to manage the care market. There were no ongoing meetings between Council members and the company being held or planned, and the Council had not made any decision to commission services from CareRooms Ltd. If any such decision were to be proposed, it would be brought to the Adults Committee and would be considered in public.

Councillor Bailey explained that it would not be appropriate for her to answer detailed questions on the CareRooms model. The questions should be asked of the Chief Executive of CareRooms Ltd, who would be happy to meet with the questioner.

The Chairwoman reminded members that she had already responded to a written question from Councillor Crawford to full Council, and undertook to include this response in her written reply to Mrs Ridley. She thanked Mrs Ridley for attending, and expressed the hope that she would leave with a clearer understanding of what was and what was not taking place. Councillor Bailey gave Mrs Ridley her personal assurance that any proposal in relation to CareRooms Ltd would be considered in an open and transparent way.

The question supplied before the meeting and the Chairwoman's written answer, including her answer to the written question at Council on 20 March 2018, are attached to these minutes as Appendix A.

80. APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES, PARTNERSHIP LIAISON AND ADVISORY GROUPS, AND INTERNAL ADVISORY GROUPS AND PANELS

It was resolved to note that no appointments to outside bodies were required to be made.

81. AGENDA PLAN

It was resolved unanimously to note the agenda plan, subject to the following changes:

- a) add to July's agenda, an item on the Learning Disability Partnership Section 75 and pooled budget arrangements
- b) transfer two items from July to September 2018: the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust (CPFT) Annual Report; and the People and Communities Risk Register report
- c) add three new items to the agenda for September: Joint working with health – key priorities; Continuing Health Care deep dive; and Learning Disability employment deep dive
- d) add an Adult Safeguarding deep dive to the agenda for October 2018
- e) decide in September whether further six-monthly updates from CPFT would be required (currently on the agenda plan for December 2018).

The Democratic Services Officer was asked to circulate the revised agenda plan.

Action required

82. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

It was resolved unanimously

that the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business on the grounds that it contained exempt information under Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, as amended, and that it would not be in the public interest for this information to be disclosed (Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)).

83. CARE HOMES DEVELOPMENT WORK STREAM 1 INCREASE TO CURRENT BLOCK CONTRACTS

The Committee received a confidential report outlining the case for increasing residential, residential dementia, nursing and nursing dementia block bed care home provision across Cambridgeshire by increases to current block contracts, and seeking its agreement to specific changes to contracts with current providers.

The Chairwoman thanked the Commissioner (Adults) and the working party for their efforts, and congratulated her on an impressive piece of work.

It was resolved unanimously

to approve the recommended approach under Workstream 1 of the Care Home Development project to increase the existing block bed contract by 39 beds under current terms and conditions for the duration of the contract (1 plus 2 years).

Chairwoman

Text of Mrs Ridley's question submitted in advance of the Adults Committee meeting held on 12th April 2018

We understand that the Adults Committee has made a commitment, with the aid of a working party, to investigate the viability of introducing CareRooms Ltd into Cambridgeshire.

According to the Health Service Journal this "controversial 'CareBnB' firm "was forced to abort its first pilot in Essex after patient groups and social care directors raised safeguarding concerns. We raise two of these concerns below.

1. Safeguarding

It is not clear which patient groups are being targeted. CareRooms states that the discharged patients are relatively fit and that they are only receiving a bed plus meals and that if social care is necessary this will be brought in. If this is the case why then can't the patient receive care at home?

The landlords are not expected to have a health care background and will not receive training in health/social care because CareRooms wishes to avoid the landlords having to be approved by the CQC.

A Cambridgeshire County Council spokesperson told the Hunts Post that the service was an alternative to hospital or care home care. Care home care is usually considered if a patient is thought not to be safe in their own home perhaps because of confusion or the risk of falling. Placing such a patient in a strange environment would make them less safe.

Who will be responsible for responding to concerns from the patient or relatives when things go wrong? Both the County Council and the discharging hospital will have a duty of care to the patient. How is this to be provided and monitored?

2. Involvement of patients' own GP

The patient may be placed away from their GP practice area and although the patient remains 'on the books' there is no requirement for GPs to visit away from the practice area. The 24/7 availability of a video link to a private GP service (Qdoctor) is made out to be a strong selling point. Is the patient expected to register with Qdoctor and does that mean that they are de-registered from their previous GP practice? A GP via a video link is not going to be able to physically examine the patient and therefore he/she should not be prescribing for the patient. A deteriorating patient may therefore have to be moved back to hospital because the video GP cannot treat them and no one from the GP practice will be able to visit.

In the light of these and many other concerns, can the Adults Committee explain why these private discussions are continuing, particularly as they seem to be held without involving the full committee and without any public consultation.

Margaret Ridley

Jane Howell

Text of Chairwoman's Reply to Revised Questions from Mrs Ridley, dated 11th April 2018 – CCC Adults Committee

Thank you for your letter sent to me by email on 9th April 2018 and for the questions that you submitted yesterday which have been circulated to Members of the Committee.

It is not usual to take questions about items that are not on the Agenda. However, in the interests of transparency and to clear up any confusion and hopefully allay concerns, I am happy to receive your questions and thank you for bringing them and for attending here today.

I can confirm that only one meeting has been held to date with CareRooms that involved Members of the Council; Cllr Nichola Harrison and myself met with the Chief Executive of CareRooms Paul Gaudin on 16th January 2018 and Council officers were also present. The purpose of the meeting was to listen to Mr Gaudin's plans in developing and launching his business CareRooms. Such a meeting is perfectly within the constitution of the Council. To be clear, there are no ongoing meetings being held or planned between CareRooms and Council Members, including myself as Chairman of the Adults Committee.

As a result of that meeting it was agreed to provide CareRooms with information and insight into the system in Cambridgeshire; it is important to explain that this falls within the ordinary business of the Council which has a statutory duty to manage the care market in Cambridgeshire. The Council is interested in, and in fact needs to explore a range of approaches to facilitating independent living in the community, both for those who we support and those who fund their own care.

Please be assured however, that the Council has not made a decision, and indeed has no immediate plans to commission any services from, or enter into any partnership or contract with CareRooms. If such a plan was forthcoming at any time, you have my absolute assurance that it would come to the Adults Committee for consideration in public.

Because the Council is not planning to use the services of CareRooms, I do not think it would be appropriate for me to answer the detailed content of your questions about how CareRooms is dealing with safeguarding or the involvement of patients' own GPs; these questions all relate to matters of detail of the CareRooms model. CareRooms is an independent private business and should have the opportunity to respond to your questions themselves; it is not for the County Council to do so. I honestly believe these questions are a matter for you to refer to CareRooms and I know that Mr Gaudin would be happy to meet with you to answer your very valid queries.

I have found over the years, that it is always helpful to have an open mind and to listen to people that are looking at different and new solutions to problems. By way of example, we were very interested in our meeting with Mr Gaudin, in the technology based solutions that he is building in to his CareRooms offer, and we immediately saw and felt excited by the potential for the use of similar technological solutions, quite independently from anything to do with CareRooms. From such meetings, new ideas can form.

It may help to refer you to the text of my response to a written question submitted to Council on 20th March 2018, of which Members of this Committee will be aware. I will provide the text of my response in a written reply to you, but you can access both the

question and the response online on the Council's website, and again, I will provide the link for you in my written response.

Thank you again for taking the time to voice your concerns - it is always helpful to hear different points of view and I hope you will leave this meeting with a clear understanding of what is taking place and my personal assurances to you about doing things in an open and transparent way.

Yours sincerely

Anna Bailey

Chairman of the Adults Committee

Response to Written Question at Full Council on 20th March 2018

1. The decision to provide Care Rooms with information and insight into the system in Cambridgeshire falls within the ordinary business of the Council as the local authority has a statutory duty to manage the care market. As the information given to Care Rooms did not represent a change of Council Policy or commit the Council to significant expenditure there is not a requirement to present it to Committee. While at some point, it may be helpful to provide the Committee with information on the Council's involvement, our contact with Care Rooms is very much at an early stage. I can confirm that the County Council has not made a decision to enter into a partnership with Care Rooms. Rather, Cambridgeshire County Council is interested in exploring a range of approaches in terms of the most effective way to promote independent living in the community, both for those who we support and those who fund their own care. Within this context, the Council was approached by CareRooms Chief Executive Paul Gaudin. We have had initial discussions with him about his ideas of delivering home based services, as an alternative to traditional short-term institutional settings, such as care homes or hospitals. The model is at an early stage of development and the Council along with other national and local organisations has offered information and insight into the health and social care landscape. I can confirm that there are no immediate plans for the Council to commission any services from or enter into any partnership with Care Rooms.
2. As indicated in response to the previous question, as this matter falls within the ordinary business of the Council and within the Council's statutory responsibilities, it is clear that there has been no breach of "due process". I can confirm that the Council has not made any decision in relation to entering into a working arrangement with Care Rooms.
3. An initial meeting has taken place between Care Rooms and selected Adult Social Care staff employed by the County Council. Additionally, communication has taken place with the NHS in the form of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Foundation Trust, concerning the addition of a community nurse to the working group. Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Foundation Trust are receptive to this proposal and are considering the most appropriate representation.

Link to Written Question at Full Council on 20th March 2018 and Response

<https://tinyurl.com/CCC-questions-March-2018>