

## **SOCIAL CARE AND INCLUSION SCRUTINY & PERFORMANCE PANEL**

MONDAY 7 OCTOBER 2013 AT 6.00 P.M.

**Panel Members Present:** Councillor T. Oliver (Chair)  
Councillor B. Douglas-Maul  
Councillor D. Barker  
Councillor J. Rochelle  
Councillor D. Coughlan  
Councillor D. James

**Officers Present:** John Bolton, Interim Executive Director  
Andy Rust, Head of Joint Commissioning  
Peter Davis, Head of Community Care (Operations)  
Santokh Dulai, Service Manager, Mental Health  
Marcus Law, Senior Commissioning Development Manager, NHS  
Mark Williams, Commissioning Development Officer  
Tracy Simcox, Commissioning Lead  
Matt Underhill, Committee Governance & Business Manager

### **293/13 APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received for the duration of the meeting from Councillor Nazir and Councillor Rattigan.

### **294/13 SUBSTITUTIONS**

Councillor James substituted for Councillor Nazir for the duration of the meeting.

### **295/13 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AND PARTY WHIP**

There were no declarations of interest or party whip identified at this meeting.

### **296/13 MINUTES**

The Panel considered the minutes of the meeting held on 17 September 2013.

#### **Resolved:**

**That the minutes of the meeting held on 17 September 2013, copies having previously been circulated, be approved as a true and accurate record.**

### **297/13 COMMISSIONING MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES AT BROADWAY NORTH RESOURCE CENTRE**

The Chair introduced the item. He explained that proposals in relation to Broadway North were an important issue that had been discussed by the Panel several times previously.

The following is a summary of the introduction and subsequent discussion:

- The Interim Executive Director explained that he had read all the service user comments. In coming to a clear proposition it was his responsibility to ensure that he fully understood the impact of closure and that the right mitigating action following closure would be taken. He explained that following that process he remained minded to recommend closure to Cabinet. He noted the importance of managing service users through this process. He explained that the trade union proposal for the continuation of the residential element of services at Broadway North had been well researched and in turn had been considered very seriously by officers. However, he explained that in the end he was minded to recommend closure;
- The Head of Joint Commissioning explained that the process of analysing the consultation feedback had just missed being ready for the Panel's previous meeting. However, this now formed part of the report being presented. It was explained that the report also provided a brief reprise of the recommendation for closure. The report also included a response to some of the key issues and concerns of service users, together with the full trade union proposal and officer response;
- It was explained that Appendix 3 contained details of consultation activity with six hundred individuals, formed of two hundred service users and four hundred carers. Key amongst the issues and concerns identified by service users were doubts about the quality of services going forward. Officers explained that the model of care going forward would be co-designed by service users, with individuals making use of their personal budgets in determining the type of care they receive;
- A Member pointed out that it was only residential services that were proposed for closure. Officers confirmed this and explained that provision at Broadway North was divided into two parts with a day time service which continued to be developed. However, a saving of £100k had been identified in relation to the closure of residential services. Officers also explained that going forward there would be a focus on front end recovery services. However, a Panel Member expressed concern explaining that she did not think it was possible to stop individuals going into crisis. Officers agreed to investigate the case of a resident where there had been delays in the referral to mental health care services. A further Panel Member highlighted the importance of decisions being made in the best interests of service users, rather than as a matter of funding. He also expressed serious concerns regarding the consultation given that some of the service users "did not feel listened to". On that basis he disagreed with officers who had described the consultation as a success;
- In response to a Panel query officers explained that too many people end up in residential care and this represented a poor outcome for the population. It was further explained that it was intended to reduce the requirement for residential services by strengthening community based support provision. The Interim Executive Director also explained that the Social Care budget was around £1m less than the previous year, with year on year reductions of 7% over each of the next four years, and that he would be required to make decisions regarding services based on the resources that were available to him following locally made decisions by Members. The Chair pointed out that he had not supported this budgetary reduction but both agreed that very significant financial challenges lay ahead. Both had previous experience of taking decisions to close facilities

and pointed out the importance of ensuring that the alternative model and provision that was put in its place was robust and effective;

- The Head of Community Care (Operations) explained that the consultation exercise had been extensive. With the first half of the time in each session spent seeking to understand the impact of closure. The second part of the consultation was very productive as it featured an exchange of ideas regarding the shape of services going forward. It was intended that services would be based upon a person specific recovery model, with residential care a last resort. At the same time the Dudley and Walsall Mental Health Trust were in the third year of a three year review of the mental health services that are delivered;
- The Chair explained that he had been made aware of concerns that had recently resurfaced that it was intended to sell off the Broadway North Resource Centre site and grounds. He was also concerned that given there had been eighteen months to two years of working up alternative models of provision, with a focus on front end services, he remained to be convinced that effective alternative provision was in place. The Chair explained that the impression he had formed following a visit to the Lonsdale House residential unit, operated by Caldmore Housing Association, was that it did not sit with vacancies. It was his understanding that Lonsdale had fifteen beds, with two catering for long term residential care. This meant that there were thirteen beds with six or seven regularly occupied meaning that there was an ongoing occupancy rate of 50%. His concern was that if an individual was in crisis and required residential care Lonsdale House might not be able to accommodate them. It would then be necessary for alternative provision to be identified elsewhere. However, officers expressed confidence that the alternative provision available at Lonsdale House would be effective. It was explained that in this respect Lonsdale could step up or step down capacity with floating support also in place to meet demand. Broadway North provided a 24/7 level of care that would not be required as part of the new model. It was also explained that a recent rise in occupancy rates at Broadway North was likely to be as a result of a spike in use based on a service that is being proposed for closure being more prominent in individual's thinking. Officers highlighted that regular service users have visited the alternative provision at Lonsdale and had been very positive. It was also explained that personal budgets would support the development of a range of alternative community-based provision. This approach would also see greater participation in the support of individuals by family members meaning that the demand for crisis support would be lower. Following a further Panel query it was explained that it was the view of officers that it would not be appropriate to operate a Detox service from Lonsdale House and alternative venues were being explored by partners, including the Public Health Substance Misuse Commissioning Team;
- It was explained that current bed occupation rates at Broadway North were 6.5 – 7 with drug and alcohol treatment (DAT) occupancy taking this figure up to 10. It was also explained that there had been a 70% increase in occupation rates at the Centre. However, it was anticipated that that within three or four months there would be a lower number of referrals or demand for this service. Officers agreed that if all the beds at Broadway North were occupied it would be cost effective. However, given the person specific recovery model these beds would not be required and represented a poor outcome for the residents of Walsall. The proposal would effectively mean that the council would go from operating a service with over-capacity to operating one with lower capacity but which met anticipated demand. Members identified potential additional services that could be offered by Broadway North including working with the Police to make it a

secure place of safety. However, it was the view of officers that the Centre was not appropriate for such a facility. Officers also explained that it would not be possible for Broadway North to be considered for a residential facility for older people with dementia, particularly as it would demand at least £500k of capital investment to ensure the Centre was fit for this purpose.

- The Chair concluded the item with the following statement: Since the original commissioning led review two years ago, managers have regularly endeavoured to give us the best possible reports on progress, but we retain concerns as to alternative availability, access and care quality pathways. This Panel therefore recommends to Cabinet that for assurance and stability of delivery that residential services be retained at Broadway North Resource Centre for a period of up to twelve months, to enable detail and development of a “recovery college” model, on site governance structures, and on the feasibility and pathways of a bespoke community-based model. The proposal was seconded by Councillor Coughlan with five Members in favour. Councillor Rochelle voted against the recommendation stating his view that he was confident officers were making the appropriate decision.

### **Resolved:**

That the Panel recommends to Cabinet that for assurance and stability of delivery that residential services be retained at Broadway North Resource Centre for a period of up to twelve months, to enable detail and development of a “recovery college” model, on site governance structures, and on the feasibility and pathways of a bespoke community-based model; &

the report be noted.

### **298/13 INTRODUCTION OF ASSISTED TRANSPORT POLICY**

The Head of Joint Commissioning introduced the update. The following is a summary of the update and subsequent discussion:

- It explained that the policy proposes the cost of transport forms part of normal expenditure for service users and should be met through their own personal resources, this might include the use of a mobility car if this forms part of their assessed need entitlement. However, the Chair did note his concern regarding the exclusive use of such a vehicle for transport to and from day care services. He explained that this transport should be seen as available to a carer to enable them to lead as full a life as possible as well, with the distinction made for those who were full time carers. Those with an assessed need for transport will fund this cost through their personal budgets;
- It was further explained that around 260 people who were potentially affected by this change have received letters of explanation. Of this group around 40 have already decided to make their own arrangements as a reaction to the consultation;
- A consultation exercise was undertaken with those in receipt of assisted transport. Key themes that emerged included the need for escorts for those with dementia or a learning disability, while it was also clear that the current system for billing required overhauling. The Chair noted the importance of the billing system being effective and avoiding scenarios whereby service users received

large bills covering long periods of transport assistance, with more frequent billing more reasonable. The Interim Executive Director explained that work was underway to improve the billing system, this included support being provided by council officers using the Vanguard Systems process;

- It was also explained that some of those receiving assistance with transport will make a contribution to the cost with a subsidy being provided by the council. There were others who would meet the full cost of transport. Officers agreed to provide Members with details of the average cost of a journey. Officers also explained that people would be able to identify suitable alternative activities to day care centres such as a visit to a garden centre.

**Resolved:**

That the report be noted.

**299/13 DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

The Chair informed Members that the date of the next Panel meeting would be 7 November 2013.

The meeting terminated at 8:08p.m.

Chair:

Date: