

ADULTS COMMITTEE: MINUTES

Date: Wednesday 4 July 2019

Time: 2.00 pm to 4.10 pm

Present: Councillors A Bailey (Chairwoman) A Costello, S Crawford, J French, M Goldsack, M Howell (Vice-Chairman), B Hunt (Substituting for Councillor D Wells), S van de Ven (Substituting for Councillor N Harrison) and G Wilson.

In attendance: Councillor A Taylor (Item 191)

Apologies: Councillors N Harrison, D Giles and D Wells.

188. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Apologies received from Councillor Harrison (Councillor van de Ven Substituted) , Councillor Giles and Councillor Wells (Councillor Hunt substituted).

No declarations of interest were received.

189. MINUTES AND ACTION LOG – 22 MAY 2019

The minutes of the meeting held on 22 May 2019 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairwoman. Members noted the completed actions on the action plan.

190. PETITIONS AND PUBLIC QUESTIONS

The Chairwoman notified the Committee that one request to speak had been made by the Local Member for Queen Edith's. The Chairwoman clarified that the request to speak would be heard as part of item nine on the agenda, and that item nine would now be taken as the next item on the agenda.

191. THE HAVEN – MENTAL HEALTH SUPPORTED ACCOMMODATION FOR OLDER PEOPLE JUNE 2019

The Committee received a report that gave an update on the Mental Health Supported Accommodation Service at the Haven and sought approval for exploration of future commissioning arrangements and proposals.

The Chairwoman explained that there was an exempt appendix to the report. This was due to the small number of people that were supported at the Haven, and as a result, it would be difficult not to identify individuals in a detailed report. She asked the Committee to be mindful of the content of the exempt appendix during the discussion so that the debate could be heard in public.

In presenting the report officers explained that the report gave the Committee an update to the ongoing review of arrangements for individuals at the Haven following the update at Committee in January 2019. Officers had reviewed the needs of the individuals residing at the Haven since the end of last year. Social Workers had carried out assessments and as a result of this a number of individuals had now moved out of the Haven into alternative accommodation, to suit their ongoing mental health and physical needs. The current contract held by Metropolitan was due to end on 31 July 2019 and it was proposed not to renew the contract. Commissioners had explored the option of support being provided by Cambridge Housing Society, who provided the Extra Care service at Dunstan Court located over the road from the Haven. Provision had been made in the service specification at Dunstan Court for the provider to offer support to residents at the Haven at an hourly rate. Conversations continued with the remaining residents regarding their future needs which included looking at alternative accommodation or continuing to reside at the Haven with a change in support arrangements. Officers explained that if, in the long term the accommodation did become vacant then Commissioners had been considering exploring the potential to make use of the accommodation for young adults with learning disabilities.

A number of questions of clarification on the report were sought by the Committee.

One member questioned the requirement to go into a confidential session as the Committee were discussing an eight bedded unit. Officers explained, that on the advice of the Monitoring Officer, as there were fewer than five individuals residing in the accommodation, there was a risk individuals would potentially be identified so the detailed update was exempt from publication. The Chairwoman reiterated that the only time the Committee would go into confidential session was if the individuals would become identifiable from the discussion.

One member questioned what had happened to the individuals that had left the Haven and if the individuals were content with their move and if there were any additional costs who would pay them. He stated that there had been a lot of concern that individuals had been moved against their will, and that these were elderly frail people. Officers explained that the individuals had moved to a variety of other settings including nursing and residential care, all agreed moves for residents were dependant on their care and support needs. The costs were still born where applicable by the County Council and the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG).

The Chairwoman invited Councillor Taylor the Local Member for Queen Edith's Ward to speak.

Councillor Taylor addressed the Committee and explained that she had been the County Council for Queen Edith's for over 20 years and had been the Councillor since the Haven was first built back in 2005. She was

speaking on behalf of her constituents and the residents and their families residing at the Haven about their concerns in relation to the closure of the Haven. She had attended Committee back in January and expressed her concerns about the closure of the Haven, which had been raised in the local press and there had been a petition objecting to the closure. She explained that residents' anxiety levels had risen sharply as it appeared that they might have to move. At that time, the Chairwoman of the Committee had assured her that the Haven would not be closing and members of the Committee had asked her if she was assured of this. She stated that she had not been assured as no public signal had been given to the community that the Haven was staying open. She stated that she was speaking to Committee six months later and still found the situation gave her cold comfort and that her scepticism about the Council's intentions towards the Haven had been fully justified by the report in front of Committee, encouraging the remaining residents to move out and changing the level of support and care that they were receiving. She stated that officers had stopped nurturing the Haven and that residents were still in talks about moving on to more suitable accommodation. She stated that officers might call that encouraging and advising but that residents and their families had called it bullying and they felt that pressure was being put on them to move. One resident had told her that they did not want to move and that they would be upset if they had to move elsewhere. She explained that officers had stated that there were no referrals but that she understood from the community that the book was closed and that staff were told not to take any new referrals and that demand had been suppressed. She commented that the contract with Metropolitan would end at the end of July and that alternative provision would be provided by the contract at Dunstan Court but that this was a different type of support. Concerns had been raised by residents and their families that they would not receive adequate care such as accompanying individuals to the doctors and checking their medications. Since 2005 residents had received 24 hour care and this would not be provided by the new arrangements. It was important that there was support at night time as the residents were a group of very vulnerable elderly people. She stated that it was bad enough that people were being hounded out of their home and being bullied into leaving and that taking away their support in this way was putting them at risk of coming to harm. She explained that if something were to happen that the Council would be negligent.

A Member sought clarification from Councillor Taylor as to what was being provided to the individuals 'care' or 'support' as both terms were very different. The Chairwoman stated that this was a question for officers and would be taken after questions of clarification for Councillor Taylor.

A Member commented that Councillor Taylor had used some strong phrases 'hounded out' and 'bullied'. He asked Councillor Taylor if she had documented evidence from individuals on these statements or if it was hearsay. Councillor Taylor stated that she had conversations with all of the residents about the situation, she had no written evidence, just oral evidence.

Another Member also raised the use of the words 'hounded out' and 'bullied' and asked Councillor Taylor again whether this was hearsay or something that Councillor Taylor had evidence of. He asked if Councillor Taylor had made a formal complaint. Councillor Taylor explained that she had visited the Haven on various occasions and had spoken to the residents and families. Some of the correspondence had been by email as some family members did not live locally. Councillor Taylor stated that individuals had said that they felt bullied into moving out and that mental health workers had been putting pressure on them to find alternative accommodation. She stated that elderly residents were not in a position to write formal statements but that she had emails from relatives of the residents on the subject.

The Chairwoman stated that she was very concerned about the strong comments made. She sought clarification from Councillor Taylor that when issues had been raised with her as Local Member by the families and the residents and that they articulated to her that they were feeling 'bullied' and 'hounded out', had she raise these concerns at any point with any of the social care officers as it was a very serious complaint?

Councillor Taylor stated that originally she had found out about the situation at the Haven through the local press. She then took up her concerns and had a meeting with Sarah Bye and other officers and had told them that residents felt 'bullied', the word 'hounded out' was her word but residents had used the word 'bullied'. She stated that she took the complaint to the Chief Executive when she heard one resident had very serious concerns. Their mental state was serious enough for her to raise this with the Chief Executive.

The Chairwoman sought further clarification from Councillor Taylor regarding the need for individuals to move to suitable accommodation. She sought clarification from Councillor Taylor that she understood that the building had been deemed by social workers to be unsuitable for the current residents as the owners of the accommodation had not been prepared to adapt the accommodation to suit their changing physical needs, and that it was the Council's duty to ensure that the residents lived in a safe environment suitable to their changing needs. She stated that many people as they got older faced this situation where they could not, for example, live in a house that only had a toilet upstairs, but that many people would articulate that they would not want to move as they did not want change. She reiterated that the Council were not closing the Haven as the Council had no right to do this. The Council were talking about the best way to support people as individuals in whatever accommodation they were in which could include the Haven.

Councillor Taylor explained that she had been given three reasons why the changes were deemed necessary. One reason was that officers had stated that the accommodation was not suitable for peoples changing needs but that she had struggled to get any further details on this. She explained that the lift in the building was fully functioning and the individuals in the building did not currently have ambulatory needs that would stop them using the lift.

The other reasons given were that there was not enough people there because there have not been any recent referrals and that the service was expensive for the low number of people.

A Member asked if Councillor Taylor had been given any details of the alternative accommodation that individuals had moved to and any information on how much the material changes to the building would cost. Councillor Taylor explained that she had not been given any information on the accommodation that individuals had moved to and had not received any information in relation to how much it would cost to make the changes which she had asked for back in January.

The Chairwoman asked the officers to come back to the table so that the Committee could ask further questions of clarification.

The Service Director for Adults and Safeguarding addressed Members queries in relation to how the potential changes had been raised with residents. She stated that the Council had a responsibility to work with individuals and, where possible, find out what their needs and preferences were and then put in place arrangements that met those needs and preferences. Advocates had been used to support individuals at the Haven. The Council had a responsibility to ensure their practices were followed correctly and each individual had a named social worker and that if any issues had been raised that they would be taken very seriously.

The Chairwoman asked officers to respond in relation to the queries around the referrals and adaptations that would be required to the building. Officers confirmed that there had been no new referrals to the Haven over the last two years. They clarified that even before the review took place the Council had not stated that the Haven would close and any referrals were able to be accepted if they had been made. The Haven had always been available as an option to social workers. The landlord had tenancy agreements with each of the residents and were responsible for the communal areas within the building. The building was over three floors and there was a lift that went between the floors. The lift was described by the landlord as a service lift and not a passenger lift and although it was functional it has not been reviewed in the light of the changing needs of the residents. The landlord did not want to carry out a full structural survey. As there had been no new referrals they would not make any recoup on their investment. They had stated that if they were to put in a passenger lift this would cost in the region of £200,000 and they would expect the Council to pay a contribution towards this. Officers clarified that they had only been able to have this conversation with the landlord in the last couple of weeks.

A Member sought further clarification from officers on the issue of the use of the terms 'Care' and 'Support' and what they both entailed? Officers explained that the commissioned service that the Council had at the Haven was for support only. There were however some additional care packages that were commissioned to go into the Haven from other providers. Under the service specification that the Council had with Metropolitan, support

included helping residents attend appointments, helping them to look at the best way to live their lives and prompting them in relation to medication. Officers reiterated that the on-site support contract commissioned by the Council did not provide care, but that this was commissioned from other providers as necessary according to the needs of individuals at the Haven. A Member sought clarification from officers on whether there was someone on site 24 hours a day providing support and whether this would be provided by the new arrangements proposed from Dunstan Court. He also sought clarity on the extent that individuals that had moved out, felt that they were bullied or harassed into doing so and were they happy with their new accommodation and did they have to pay any additional costs. He concluded by asking what the indications from staff were that currently worked at the Haven. Officers explained that there were currently four members of staff on site and that the service also provided a sleep-in provision. There had been no incidents overnight for a significant period of time. There were a number of interventions that the Cambridge Housing Society could provide. There was a member of staff sited at Dunstan Court 24 hours a day, there was also emergency response provision if a resident raised the alarm. There was also the option of a sleep-in provision at the Haven. Officers clarified that the indications were that individuals had been happy to go to new accommodation after being shown a number of options and they had not been forced into making a decision. Where individuals had not shown a preference for an alternative placement then they were continuing to reside at The Haven. Where individuals had moved into a new placement, they had been supported with their transition and had not had to pay any additional costs. The service provider had been in consultation with staff regarding the changes and potential redundancies.

A Member sought clarification from officers on whether the sleep-in provision that had been mentioned could be provided by Cambridge Housing Society. Officers confirmed that this could be provided.

A Member asked what had changed over the last six months and could officers clarify what financial contribution the Council would have to make if adaptations were made to the building. She highlighted that she had experienced a similar situation in her division and when the people moved out they had not lived for very long after the move. She sought clarification on whether there would be any tracking on individuals following their move to see if there had been any impacts. The Chairwoman reiterated that the Council had no ability to close the Haven and that there had been ongoing work with individuals to ensure that their changing physical needs were being met. There had already been clarification that it would cost up to £200,000 to replace the lift but that the landlord had refused to allow any adaptations to the building. Officers explained that all current residents had a social worker to work with them to make the transition as easy as possible and support workers were available to help manage the practical and emotional needs and review the risks associated with the move. All residents were offered a choice including to remain at the Haven.

A Member queried whether there had been any safeguarding issues raised

with officers in relation to residents of the Haven. The Service Director: Adults and Safeguarding confirmed that she had not been made aware of any safeguarding issues.

A Member queried whether due to the increasing elderly population were there enough venues available to accommodate their needs and did the current available venues have the correct infrastructure? Officers explained that the pressure on social care was about having the right venues and that places like Dunstan Court that had been built for extra care were kept up to date under the relevant regulations.

A Member commented that there would always potentially be a time when an individual would need to move as their current accommodation was not suitable for their needs and that officers would then work with that individual to understand their changing needs. She sought clarification on how officers would manage that process? Officers reiterated that a review would take place with the individuals and their families/or advocate to look at suitable alternative accommodation taking into account any risks associated with moving the individual.

A Member queried why the Council were not using the Haven if the building was in a reasonable condition. Officers explained that the Haven was a support service. This cohort of people would normally require care and support needs and support accommodation was not widely used. So this tier of support was now not a step that was being used within the pathway. Officers were therefore proposing an alternative use of the accommodation for younger people with learning disabilities.

The Chairwoman brought the debate to a close and reiterated that the Council had no powers to close the Haven and that there were still individuals living there that the Council were supporting.

It was resolved by majority that:

- i) The Council continued to work with all remaining residents living at the Haven, monitoring any changes in need and, where applicable, waiting for each individuals' preferred placement to become available
- ii) The support contract with Metropolitan should cease on 31st July and new individual spot purchased arrangements put in place with Cambridge Housing Society to be managed from Dunstan Court.
- iii) The potential to use the accommodation for young people with a learning disability would be explored, with further discussions between the Learning Disability Commissioning Manager, Landlord, local Councillor and community representatives.

192. ADULT POSITIVE CHALLENGE REABLEMENT WORKSTREAM

The Committee received a report that provided an update on the Adult

Positive Challenge programme with an in-depth look at the Targeted Reablement work stream, and gave an update on the development of key metrics to monitor progress.

In presenting the report officers acknowledged that the reablement workstream had been a success story and that officers continued to look for opportunities to increase the cost avoidance contribution to the Adults Positive Challenge Programme, which currently stood at £1.3 million.

Officers gave examples of ongoing work on targeting reablement including total mobile solutions which had seen a productivity gain of 16% as support workers were able to make more visits. Officers highlighted the Enhanced Response Service that was now available 24 hours a day.

In discussing the report Members:

- Queried when information on the Learning Disability developing and enablement approach workstream would be available. Officers explained that this was a medium term workstream and a report and that joint work was ongoing with Children's services as outcomes would be achieved from taking a different approach when people were still in Children's services. Outcomes were likely to be seen in year two of the programme and a report would be scheduled to come to Committee when there was a more detailed plan- this was likely to relate to business planning 2020/21 **ACTION**
- Praised the calibre of people that the Council had been able to recruit through the programme and explained that they would like to see this continue through the promotion of the reablement career pathway. Officers explained that the reablement recruitment campaign had been successful because it was open to people with no experience in care, targeting people with the right values that wanted to make a difference.
- Questioned why the reablement recruitment programme had initially lost some people to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust (CPFT) and had the risks been factored into planning for the future. Officers explained that this had been a short term issue and that they did not see this as an ongoing challenge.
- Queried why there was a significantly lower proportion of people receiving reablement in Cambridgeshire that already received Council funded care support (4%) than in statistically neighbouring areas. Officers explained that this was due to the significant opportunities to work with an increased number of existing clients to maximise their independence and reduce current or future dependency on adult social care. There had been a significant increase in the input around equipment and technology which had met people's needs before they needed any hands on care. This had also allowed staff to work in a mobile way. The Chairwoman acknowledged that Cambridgeshire had a higher proportion of people receiving reablement than their statistical

neighbours (23% compared to comparators 10%). She highlighted that Cambridgeshire had a lower spend per head of population than its comparators and still had good outcomes.

- Sought clarity from officers on what the 'Changing the Conversation' element of the workstream involved. Officers explained that the standard process would be to carry out an assessment, but now the focus was on identifying and articulating what was important to the individual and find a solution that build on their strengths and assets and met their needs instead of drawing them in to a statutory process. This required respecting their capacity to make decisions about risk and put in technology and other changes in order to mitigate the risks. The Chairwoman drew the Committees attention to the examples given in relation to the changing conversations approach on page 36 of the papers. She highlighted that the approach acknowledged peoples strengths and took a positive approach.

It was resolved unanimously to:

consider the content of the report and note the work underway in the reablement work stream.

note the progress on tracking the impact of the programme and benefits achieved so far.

193. ADULT SOCIAL CARE INDEPENDENT SECTOR - LABOUR (WORKFORCE) MARKET UPDATE REPORT

The Committee received a report that provided an update on the social care labour (workforce) market across the Independent Sector.

In presenting the report officers explained that across the Eastern Region, the number of adult social care jobs had increased by 8.6% since 2012 (13,500). There was a turnover rate of 33.9% which was in line with the national and regional average and a vacancy rate of 8.4%. With future population growth the workforce would still continue to be a challenge with one in eight nursing places vacant, which equated to a shortage of 36,000 nurses. There was a drop of 18% of individuals applying for nursing courses.

Cambridgeshire had a slightly higher EU population than average and the feedback from providers was that the EU exit was having a drip feed effect and it was still difficult for providers to put any plans in place to mitigate impacts. The Local Authority was in constant communication with providers and the oversight and management of risks at a health and care system wide level were being managed via the Local Health Resilience Partnership. Alternative models of delivery had been utilised including reablement, domiciliary care, the Direct Payments Service and neighbourhood place based care provision. Key recent developments to support workforce development had included the implementation of the Social Work Degree Apprenticeship. The Department of Health and Social Care had also

launched a national recruitment campaign in February with the aim to driving applications into the adult social care sector.

In discussing the report Members:

- highlighted the need to have a longer term strategy that linked into the education system. A member commented that there was no synergy and that currently it was difficult to find teachers that had any social care knowledge. She acknowledged the work of the Health and Social Care Academy but acknowledged that the education needed to start earlier. She highlighted the need for joined up thinking with the Children and Young Peoples Committee on how this strategy could be taken forward. **ACTION.** She explained that she would raise this at the Combined Authority Skills Committee. A Member suggested that her colleagues lobby Government to reinstate the nurse's bursary as the removal of the grant had affected the number of people applying for nursing courses.

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

194. SERVICE DIRECTORS REPORT: ADULTS AND SAFEGUARDING AND COMMISSIONING

The Committee received a report providing an update on progress on Adult Social Care across commissioning and operational delivery.

In presenting the report officers highlighted the main issues and key developments covered in the report.

In discussing the report Members:

- Raised concerns in relation to the CCG review of funding and the implications for the Council and the proposed loss of funding to the voluntary sector. Officers explained that they had regular meetings with the CCG and were working hard to influence and support them in decision making. Officers explained that cuts in funding could potentially increase hospital admissions, increasing demands on hospitals and the reablement services. Officers were particularly concerned about the Carers Trust Contract as this was a jointly commissioned service. Members noted the CCG review of funding would be scrutinised through the Health Committee.
- Noted that lobbying for Fairer Funding continued. One Member queried what information was being given to MPs about the CCG funding. The Chairwoman explained that there was continued lobbying of MPs and the situation was serious. Her group were inviting Cambridgeshire MPs to come and hear about it and the Leader of the Council lobbied Westminster on a regular basis.

A Member commented that under 2.2.2 in the report under Technology Enabled Care there was a reduction of 10% in forecast homecare activity and 11% in residential due to the use of Technology Enabled Care. He

commented that this was a generalisation and queried whether this could be linked to the Neighbourhood Cares pilot. Members requested further information on how the reductions were achieved. **ACTION** Officers commented that an element of the reduction was due to the work of the Neighbourhood Cares team and other changes that had been made by the Huntingdon Locality Team and that in the Huntingdon area there was a good Providers Forum that was well engaged. Members queried whether more work could be done with staffing in terms of the extra sheltered housing provision to embed the technology. Officers explained the 'Changing the Conversation' workstream was a key factor in this work.

A Member commented that at a previous Committee there had been an action on what the Voluntary Sector could provide in terms of day care provision. Members requested a further update on any findings from this work as part of the Day Services Review which will be reported to Committee.

The Chairwoman concluded the discussion by highlighting the new Guide to Independence' that was highlighted in 2.3.10 of the report and congratulating officers on the improvement to Delayed Transfers of Care (DTOC) numbers.

It was resolved unanimously to note and comment on the contents of this report.

195. FINANCE AND PERFORMANCE REPORT – MAY 2019/20

The Committee received the May 2019/20 Finance and Performance report for the People and Communities Service.

In presenting the report it was noted that at the end of May 2019, People and Communities were forecast to overspend by £3.7million (1.4% of the budget). Within the Adults services the forecast overspend was £2.4 million (1.5% of the budget), with a forecast overspend of £4.9 million on budgets relating to care provision, with £2.5 million applied from grants to mitigate the overspend. The pressures forecast at this stage were predominantly in Older Peoples services, along with Physical Disability services to a lesser extent.

In discussing the report Members:

- Noted that it was not clear whether the same grants from Government would be granted for the next financial year. The Chairwoman commented that she would be lobbying Government on ensuring that the grants were repeated for at least the next financial year.

The Chairwoman commented on the improvements to the set of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) and acknowledged there was a need to continue to closely monitor the system wide Delayed Transfers of Care and the Learning Disability Employment figures.

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

196. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Members agreed to cancel the August reserve meeting and noted the date of the next meeting as Thursday 12 September 2019.

Chairwoman