

**BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL**

**ADULT CARE & HEALTH COMMITTEE**

**4.00pm 19 NOVEMBER 2012**

**COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL**

**MINUTES**

**Present:** Councillor Jarrett (Chair) Councillors Jones (Deputy Chair), Barnett, Marsh, Meadows (Opposition Spokesperson), Mears, K Norman (Opposition Spokesperson), Powell, Wakefield and Wilson.

**PART ONE**

**24. PROCEDURAL BUSINESS**

**24A Declarations of Substitute Members**

24.1 There were none.

**24B Declarations of Interests**

24.2 There were none.

**24C Exclusion of the Press and Public**

24.3 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.

24.4 **RESOLVED** - That the press and public be not excluded from the meeting.

**25. MINUTES**

25.1 The Director of Adult Social Services referred to paragraph 12.1 and reported that 11 providers did supply uniforms free of charge although 1 provider required a deposit. 2 providers did not supply a uniform for employees. Councillor Mears asked for this information to be sent to councillors in an email.

25.2 Councillor Mears referred to paragraph 17.3 relating to Windlesham Road. She asked for clarification about the budget for the in house learning disability service. The

Committee had been informed that the budget for the service was based on £840,000 savings over the next two years yet the report mentioned a figure of £600,000.

Councillor Mears referred to paragraph 17.13 and stated that she had previously chaired the Brighton & Hove Learning Disability Partnership Board and had detailed papers specific to Windlesham Road (February 2011) which stated that it was not considered a suitable building for the service. She queried the change in thinking about this building. Councillor Mears quoted the report which stated that “the layout of the property was not ideal for people with challenging behaviour”.

- 25.3 The Director explained that with regard to the budget, the £600,000 related to the learning disability providers part of the service. The remaining money related to the community care service. With regard to the February 2011 report, the Director stated that she would have to view the report before she was able to comment.
- 25.4 Councillor Mears expressed concern at the lack of financial information being submitted to the committee. She stressed that the Adult Care & Health Committee and the Children & Young People Committee were the most expensive and biggest spending committees. Councillor Mears stated that committee members required regular financial information.
- 25.5 The Head of Business Engagement explained the agreed corporate budget arrangements for all committees. Budget monitoring and the development of budget strategies/budget savings was carried out by the Policy & Resources Committee. There is a meeting of the Budget Scrutiny Panel for Adults in December which will have the opportunity to consider the budget proposals in detail. The Overview and Scrutiny Committee will review the budget proposals.
- 25.6 Councillor Mears stressed that under the committee system it was important for the committee to see detailed budget information.
- 25.7 Councillor Marsh made the point that Adult Care & Health Committee was an executive policy making committee and she was surprised that there were no budget items on the agenda for consideration. She considered that it was the responsibility of committee members to review budgets. As a committee member she would like a more detailed discussion on budget provision.
- 25.8 The Head of Business Engagement stressed that although she would like to provide the information requested, the process for development and consultation on the budget had already been set. As far as she was aware none of the other committees was receiving detailed budget information.
- 25.9 Councillor Meadows remarked that the committee had delegated responsibility to make decisions. There was no budget information. She stressed that she wanted to make a start on discussions about the budget. This Committee along with Children and Young people Committee were the only committees that were responsible for vulnerable people and she was concerned that the information was not available.
- 25.10 Councillor Mears stated that there was a cost to holding committee meetings and members needed to have items that required decisions. She queried whether decisions were being taken under delegated powers.

- 25.11 The Chair informed Members that that committee decisions were not being taken under delegated powers. He would try and ensure a more even workload in future.
- 25.12 Councillor Marsh reported that she had been a member of the Constitutional Work Group. She would be happy to provide help in balancing committee items. She would have liked to have seen some indicative work on the budget and requested this information in future.
- 25.13 The Chair stated that there was uncertainty about the final budget settlement but acknowledged Councillors' concerns and stated that he would have discussions with officers about having regular or standing items on the agenda regarding the budget.
- 25.14 Councillor Barnett referred to paragraph 17.10 and asked for reassurance that Ferndale Road would not be closed in 6 months time. The Chair replied that it would not close in the next couple of years but he could not guarantee what would happen in future years.
- 25.15 Councillor Meadows referred to paragraphs 17.26 and 17.29. She stated that the committee had not received financial information regarding funding for adaptations to Windlesham Road. The Director replied that she would send the figures to members.
- 25.16 **RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the meeting held on 24 September 2012 be agreed and signed as a correct record.

## **26. CHAIR'S COMMUNICATIONS**

### **Welcome to Councillor Wilson and Colin Vincent**

- 26.1 The Chair welcomed Councillor Chaun Wilson as a new member of the committee and a new member of the council. The Chair also welcomed Colin Vincent who would be attending in an observer status to represent the Older People's Council. Mr Vincent was the Older People's Council spokesperson for Adult Care & Health. He would ask the Chair in advance of each meeting if he wished to ask any questions.

### **Attendance at conferences/Events**

- 26.2 The Chair reported that since the last meeting he had attended the Age Uk AGM and an event celebrating the 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary of Carelink. This was a valued service with dedicated staff. The Chair had attended the National Adults and Children's Conference in Eastbourne and had met people coping with dementia. He was committed to meeting with them and helping their organisation. Last week the Chair had attended a health event at the King Alfred organised by the Learning Disability Team. He congratulated Cameron Brown (Manager) and the Learning Disability Team.

### **Knoll House**

- 26.3 The Director of Adult Social Services informed Members that Knoll House used to be a residential unit. It was then used as an intermediate service managed by the Sussex Community Foundation Trust until 6 weeks ago. It had been now been agreed that the Local Authority should take back the management of the service.

- 26.4 Members were informed that Knoll House had experienced difficulties and the new manager had suspended the service for a few weeks. The management were working with the Care Quality Commission to resolve the problems.
- 26.5 Councillor Barnett asked if Knoll House would still be used as a rehabilitation service. The Director confirmed that Knoll House continued to operate as a rehabilitation service, based on the same model as Craven Vale.
- 26.6 Councillor Mears stated that it would be helpful to have a briefing note on this subject. She would like to know the budget implications of the service coming back in-house, with timescales.
- 26.7 The Director advised that the main priority had been to ensure there was good rehabilitation. There was a shortfall in funding which was being paid by the NHS. The Director had made it clear that any additional funding must be paid by the NHS.
- 26.8 Councillor Jones asked if the NHS funding was recurring funding. The Director replied that the ongoing model had to be agreed with the commissioners.
- 26.9 The Chair informed Members that the Director had kept him up to date on this matter. Events had taken place quite rapidly. A briefing paper with as much information as was available would be circulated as soon as possible.

**27. CALL OVER**

- 27.1 **RESOLVED** – That Item 30 be reserved for discussion.

**28. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT**

(a) Petitions

- 28.1 The Chair noted that there were no petitions from members of the public.

(b) Written Questions

- 28.2 The Chair noted that no written questions from members of the public had been submitted for the meeting.

(c) Deputations

- 28.3 The Chair noted that a deputation relating to Residential Services Closures had been referred from the Council meeting held on 25 October 2012. Mr Jason Carlisle was in attendance and stated that he was happy to accept that councillors had read the deputation which was set out in the agenda. The Chair informed Members that he had responded to the deputation at full Council and was not proposing to repeat his response.

- 28.4 **RESOLVED** - That the deputation be noted.

**29. MEMBER INVOLVEMENT**

a) Petitions

29.1 The Committee noted that there were no petitions from councillors.

(b) Written Questions

29.2 The Committee noted that no written questions from councillors had been submitted for the meeting.

(c) Deputations

29.3 The Committee noted that no deputations from councillors had been submitted for the meeting.

**30. DAY ACTIVITIES COMMISSIONING PLAN**

30.1 The Committee considered a report of the Director of Adult Social Services which reminded members that a report was submitted to the meeting on 25 June 2012 that set out proposals for a consultation on a Day Services Commissioning Plan. The current report summarised the feedback on the current provision of day services in Brighton & Hove, made recommendations about a future vision for day services and outlined the next steps.

30.2 The Commissioner, Learning Disabilities & Older People presented the report and summarised feedback to the consultation. She informed members that the Day Services Needs Assessment had been placed in the Members Rooms.

30.3 The Commissioner stated that the feedback had shown that Day Services were highly valued but that there was a gap in knowledge regarding personal budgets. There was a lack of awareness regarding alternative services and some buildings were underused. The Craven Vale service was being reviewed and officers were identifying alternative day services for all service users. Section 7 detailed the Vision for Day Activities in the Future. The next step was to engage with service users and carers. If the recommendations were agreed officers would bring back a progress report with a plan.

30.4 The Director of Adult Social Services informed the Committee that the commissioning plan related to a broad range of individuals with different skills and needs. The plan considered how people could use individual budgets and direct payments. The Director stressed that direct payments could not be used to access in house services.

30.5 Councillor Norman stated that the report referred to what had already taken place at Tower House and Montague House when he was Committee Chair and later Cabinet Member. A few years ago there had been anxiety regarding the changes to those services, however the proposals had come to fruition and were working well. Councillor Norman saw the current report as part of the process of providing a better service. He agreed with the recommendations. There was now a need to move on to look at the

detail. At this stage he supported the proposals but stressed that more detail was needed in the next report.

- 30.6 Councillor Meadows stated that people had expressed anxiety about personal budgets. One of the concerns was that people with learning disabilities would become employers. Councillor Meadows agreed with the proposed vision for day services but disagreed with recommendation 2.2, "That the Committee agree the next steps set out in Section 8, that is to work with service users, advocates, carers and providers in the co-design and modelling of services to realise the Vision for day activities." Councillor Meadows felt that Section 8.5 was asking the Committee to agree to the closure of Buckingham Road and the transfer of the Connaught Day Options Base.
- 30.7 Councillor Meadows expressed concern about paragraph 5.1.5 relating to Craven Vale. She asked if a decision had already been taken to close the Craven Vale Day Centre. Councillor Meadows stated that she needed more information before she could agree recommendation 2.2.
- 30.8 The Director of Adult Social Services explained the situation in relation to Buckingham Road and Connaught Road. Both these buildings had been mentioned in reports to other committees. Buckingham Road had been mentioned in a report to Policy and Resources about work styles. The Director was now having conversations about these buildings. If a decision was required about the future use of the buildings, it would be necessary for a report to be submitted to the Adult Care & Health Committee for decision.
- 30.9 The Director explained that the report before Members was trying to explain that day services needed to be shaped by the people who used them. Building based services were needed for more vulnerable people. There were other service users who liked to use personal budgets. The Embrace initiative would be launched at the end of the month and this would provide useful information about activities across the city.
- 30.10 The Head of Commissioning Partnerships reported that there had been extensive consultation on the re-provision of day services for older people at Craven Vale. The service was currently operating for three days a week and occupancy was continuing to reduce. A number of service users had said they would like to go to Tower House. Service users had been fully consulted and were already going to Tower House one day a week.
- 30.11 Councillor Meadows mentioned that there was a café at Buckingham Road which helped service users with life skills. Art services were also provided. These services were not mentioned in the report. She asked where these services would be moved to in the future.
- 30.12 The Head of Commissioning & Partnerships assured Councillor Meadows that there were no proposals to close Buckingham Road at present. She agreed that tremendous work was being carried on at this service. If any proposals concerning Buckingham Road went ahead, the service would continue elsewhere.
- 30.13 The Chair stated that there was no suggestion that the service would not continue.

- 30.14 Councillor Meadow made the point that the report was asking members to agree an option on Buckingham Road. The Committee needed to know if there was a possibility that there would be a move from Buckingham Road. She could not agree the report without this information.
- 30.15 Councillor Marsh concurred with Councillor Meadows. She had great concerns about Buckingham Road. She asked if recommendation 2.2 could be re-worded more carefully. Councillor Marsh also asked for details on other activities that took place at Craven Vale.
- 30.16 The Director of Adult Social Care explained that the Buckingham Road service was based in two buildings. One building was used by mental health. The Sussex Partnership Foundation Trust had given notice on that building. The other building housed a range of activities. Two committee reports (Children and Young People's Committee and Policy and Resources Committee) had sited the names of Adult Care & Health buildings. There were currently conversations about where the services would be relocated if it was agreed they should move.
- 30.17 The Head of Commissioning & Partnerships explained that Craven Vale was used for short term intermediate care.
- 30.18 At this point the Senior Lawyer stated that not all the paragraphs in Section 8 of the report were proposals. Paragraph 8.1 was a proposal. Paragraph 8.2 was a proposed service mapping exercise. Paragraph 8.3 looked at further detailed work and contained three proposals. Paragraph 8.4 and 8.5 were information paragraphs. It was clear that if a decision was required about Connaught Road and Buckingham Road, a recommendation must be submitted to the Adult Care & Health Committee. Recommendation 8.6 proposed that work begin on the vision and a progress report be brought back to the Committee. If any decision was required about the Connaught Road and Buckingham Road buildings between programmed meetings, a special meeting would need to be arranged.
- 30.19 Councillor Wilson referred to tables in the report that related to the number of people supported and asked for details of what period this covered. She also asked for data on percentages of people consulted so far. The Commissioner, Learning Disabilities & Older People explained that the data represented people supported on a weekly basis and was based on current data and taken from the CareFirst database. There was no information on percentages of people consulted and this would be added.
- 30.20 Councillor Norman referred to paragraph 8.5 and made the point that the report did not say that Buckingham Road or Connaught Road buildings would close. He still supported the recommendations.
- 30.21 Councillor Mears stressed that the Buckingham Road and Connaught Road services were the responsibility of the Adult Care & Health Committee and discussions should have started at this committee.
- 30.22 The Director replied that it was her understanding that although the buildings were used by Adult Care & Health, all properties were managed corporately. There had been no

discussion with Adult Care & Health until the Director had seen the Policy and Resources report.

- 30.23 Councillor Mears made the point that if there was a move from the buildings the money would go to the general fund. She stated that the committee needed to be clear on where the money would be found for the services. Councillor Mears referred to paragraph 5.4.9 and stated that there was no education for younger people coming through the system. She asked what was being done about this situation. There needed to be different ideas on how these young people could be assisted. Councillor Mears referred to the financial implications in paragraph 10.1 and stated that there needed to be more detail. She felt that there were massive opportunities with other providers in the city. Young People wanted to expand their learning.
- 30.24 The Head of Commissioning & Partnerships replied that opportunities needed to be balanced with sensitivity. People felt strongly about day services and did not want them to change. There was a waiting list for council provided services. Some services were blocked with people who may require another type of service to suit their needs. The aim was to have more rigorously assessed services to ensure people in need could receive them.
- 30.25 Councillor Mears responded by stating that buildings should not be disposed until all the opportunities had been looked at.
- 30.26 The Director stressed that she had made it clear that if there had to be a move from Buckingham Road and Connaught Road, Adult Care & Health would need help in finding alternative space and capacity.
- 30.27 Councillor Jones stated that he was worried to read in paragraph 4.5 that the vast majority of people did not know about direct payments or personal budgets. He accepted that services had to evolve and broadly welcomed the report, however there needed to be clarity on how many people were consulted in percentages and more financial information.
- 30.28 The Director replied that the government had now announced that they recognised that personal budgets were not suitable for everyone and had reduced targets to move service users in the community on to self directed support to 70%.
- 30.29 Councillor Meadows stated that she was concerned that there would be financial implications for Buckingham Road should they move and she was not prepared to agree the report without full detailed information. She did not agree to paragraph 8.5.
- 30.30 Councillor Powell stated that she was shocked to hear that most people did not know about direct payments or personal budgets. She referred to the problem of the lack of post-19 education options mentioned in paragraph 5.4.9. She thought that the problem lay with the education providers who were reluctant to take on disabled students. She asked what conversations were going on to resolve this situation. Councillor Powell mentioned that one problem encountered by disabled students was that bus passes issued by the council could not be used before 9.00am.



- 30.31 The Head of Commissioning & Partnerships referred to Councillor Powell's first point and stressed that there was a need to highlight the benefits of direct payments. With regard to the second point she agreed that there needed to be conversations with education providers
- 30.32 Councillor Norman was pleased that the target for direct payments had been reduced to 70%. He stressed that people moving to direct payments did not have to manage the budget themselves. The council would manage the budget for them.
- 30.33 The Chair stated that there were mixed attitudes regarding direct payments and it was necessary for the council to expand the options and ensure people received the service they wanted.
- 30.34 It was agreed that in order to make the report acceptable to members, the Senior Lawyer's advice should be accepted. Section 8 of the report could be amended as follows. Paragraph 8.4 should be moved to become paragraph 3.11. Section 8.5 should be moved to become to paragraph 5.4.15.
- 30.35 **RESOLVED** - (1) That the proposed Vision for day activities set out in Section 7 in the report be approved.
- (2) That the next steps set out in Section 8, as amended, be agreed, that is to work with service users, advocates, carers and providers in the co-design and modelling of services to realise the Vision for day activities. **(Note: The amendments to Section 8 are as follows: Paragraph 8.4 to be moved to become paragraph 3.11, Relevant Background Information. Paragraph 8.5 to be moved to become paragraph 5.4.15, Feedback and Developments)**

**31. ITEMS REFERRED FOR COUNCIL**

- 31.1 **RESOLVED:** That no items be referred to Council.

The meeting concluded at 5.56pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of

