

BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL

ADULT SOCIAL CARE & HOUSING OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

4.00PM 8 SEPTEMBER 2011

COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL

MINUTES

Present: Councillors K Norman (Chair); Phillips (Deputy Chair), Buckley, Gilbey, Jones, Peltzer Dunn, Turton and Wealls

Co-opted Members: Ms Averil Fuller (BHLINK)

PART ONE

12. PROCEDURAL BUSINESS

13A Declaration of Substitutes

13.1 The Link was represented by Averil Fuller (rather than Mick Lister as listed on the agenda front sheet)

1B Declarations of Interest

13.2 Cllr Wealls declared a personal interest in regard to Item 19. Cllr Wealls is a trustee of 'Impact Initiatives' a group which receives funding via Supporting People.

1C Declarations of Party Whip

13.3 There were none.

1D Exclusion of Press and Public

13.4 In accordance with section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, it was considered whether the press and public should be excluded from the meeting during the consideration of any items contained in the agenda, having regard to the nature of the business to be transacted and the nature of the proceedings and the likelihood as to whether, if members of the press and public were present, there would be disclosure to them of confidential or exempt information as defined in section 100I (1) of the said Act.

13.5 **RESOLVED** – that the press and public be not excluded from the meeting.

13. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

- 14.1 The Director of Adult Social Services explained to committee members that at point 5.2 of the draft minutes, the phrase “increasing the market of personal assistants” indicated that the council was working to increase the number of personal assistants available to work in the city and thereby give residents in receipt of personal care budget a greater choice of care provision.
- 14.2 The wording of point 5.6 of the draft minutes was amended, with t ‘would’ replaced with ‘will’ in the fourth paragraph of this point.
- 14.3 RESOLVED – That the minutes of the meeting held on 28 June 2011 be approved and signed by the Chairman.**

14. CHAIRMAN'S COMMUNICATIONS

- 15.1 The Chair voiced the committee’s thanks for all the work undertaken by the ASCHOSC scrutiny support officer Kath Vlcek. Kath is currently taking maternity leave but is expected to return to work in early summer 2012.

15. PUBLIC QUESTIONS, LETTERS FROM COUNCILLORS AND NOTICES OF MOTION

- 16.1 There were none.

16. MEMBER DEVELOPMENT SESSION - TRANSFORMATION OF SOCIAL CARE

- 17.1 This training session was presented by Denise D’Souza, Director of Adult Social Services and Lead Commissioner, People.
- 17.2 In answer to a question regarding how the council defined sustainability in terms of low level social care services, Ms D’Souza told members that this referred to the need to fund these services within the current funding envelope. This might potentially mean charging some users for services, although detailed modelling on aspects of this has not yet concluded.
- 17.3 The Chair thanked Ms D’Souza for her presentation.

**17. ACCOMMODATION & SUPPORT PLAN FOR PEOPLE WITH LEARNING
DISABILITIES**

- 18.1 This item was introduced by Diana Bernhardt, Lead Commissioner for Learning Disabilities.
- 18.2 In response to a question about the availability of data on where in the city learning disabled people actually lived, Ms Bernhardt told the committee that such information was not currently widely available, but work was ongoing with Housing to improve intelligence in this area.
- 18.3 In answer to a query as to why having an oversupply of certain types of supported housing might pose a financial risk to the council, members were informed that, if other

local authorities placed some of their residents in Brighton & Hove supported housing, the financial responsibility for supporting these people could pass to the city council. There was therefore a potential risk in having a surplus of certain types of supported housing – currently the city has a surplus in accommodation for under 25s.

- 18.4 In response to a question about how many additional supported housing places were required to meet the needs of learning disabled people, members were told that we probably needed an additional 45 places across the 3 years of the plan. However, this did not necessarily equate to an additional 45 properties, not least because a tweaking of current services might supply some of these places.
- 18.5 In answer to a question as to whether the plan included targets, members were informed that the plan, as a high-level strategic document, did not currently include firm performance targets, it being the intention to detail these targets at a more operational level via the Adult Social Care Performance Framework and the ongoing work of the Learning Disabilities Partnership. However, it was agreed that it might nonetheless be sensible to include some indicative targets in the high level plan, and officers agreed to consider this before submitting the plan for executive approval.
- 18.6 In response to a question about the relationship between the Learning Disability plan and the recently concluded scrutiny panel on services for adults with Autistic Spectrum Conditions (ASC), members were told that the panel report had informed the plan. For example, the importance of looking at interactions with the criminal justice system (where a disproportionate percentage of both people with ASC and people with learning disabilities are typically represented) and in raising awareness and improving accessibility of mainstream services for people with ASC, something which had been taken on board when developing the Learning Disabilities plan.
- 18.7 The Director of Adult Social Services promised to consider all the committee's comments and, where appropriate, make amendments to the learning Disabilities plan before it was presented to the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care for agreement.
- 18.8 The Chair thanked Ms Bernhardt for her contribution.
- 18.9 RESOLVED - That the report be noted and the minutes for this item be passed on to the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care for information.**
- 18. HOUSING AND SUPPORT: PREVENTATIVE SERVICES TO ACHIEVE SOCIAL INCLUSION**
- 19.1 This item was introduced by Jugal Sharma, Lead Commissioner, Housing.
- 19.2 In response to a question about how the success of clients moving on from Supporting People support was measured (e.g. whether 'success' was measured as clients leaving supported housing or whether it was measured as clients leaving housing and then still not requiring support after a certain period of time), Mr Sharma promised to provide details of the methodology used in writing.

- 19.3 In answer to a query about what supported housing providers thought the council could do better, the committee was told that they generally sought more involvement in council decision-making, particularly in terms of budget-setting.
- 19.4 In response to a query from a member as to the exact amount of savings generated by Supporting People funding, Mr Sharma agreed to check his figures and amend if necessary. Mr Sharma explained that the figure for cost savings was reached by comparing the cost of Supporting People support against the cost of providing a positive alternative source of support from another source.
- 19.5 The Chair thanked Mr Sharma for his contribution.

19.6 RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

19. COMMUNITY MEALS

- 20.1 This item was introduced by Phillip Letchfield, ASC Head of Performance and Contracting.
- 20.2 In response to a question on the typical costs of supplying community meals, the committee was told that these were likely to vary little from authority to authority, although the level of subsidy did vary considerably.
- 20.3 In answer to a query as to whether the council should be subsidising the cost of meals, Mr Letchfield told members that this was not necessary as all individuals were expected to pay for the cost of food from their own income, benefits etc. However, it might be necessary to pay for the cost of having meals delivered, although here it was important to distinguish between people who wanted a community meals services and those genuinely in need of it.
- 20.4 In response to a question of where this item had originated, members were told that it had been put forward by officers in ASC with the knowledge of the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care.
- 20.4 Members debated whether holding a workshop on this issue was a valid scrutiny activity. It was agreed that it was, but that to be effective, members attending a workshop would need to be thoroughly briefed. Briefing material should include information gleaned from 'exit interviews' with clients who chose to discontinue their community meals service, and data on the effectiveness of the 'safe and well' element of the service.
- 20.5 The Chair thanked Mr Letchfield for his contribution.
- 20.6 RESOLVED – That a workshop be held on the issue of community meals**
- 20. ITEMS TO GO FORWARD TO CABINET OR THE RELEVANT CABINET MEMBER MEETING**
- 21.1 There were none, other than the minutes relating to Item 18.

21. ITEMS TO GO FORWARD TO COUNCIL

22.1 There were none.

The meeting concluded at 5.45pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of

