

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

CABINET

DATE: 27 OCTOBER 2015

**REPORT OF: MRS LINDA KEMENY, CABINET MEMBER FOR SCHOOLS,
SKILLS AND ACHIEVEMENT**

LEAD OFFICER: JULIE FISHER, DEPUTY CHIEF EXECUTIVE

**SUBJECT: OPTIONS FOR OVERNIGHT SHORT BREAKS FOR CHILDREN
WITH DISABILITIES IN EAST SURREY**



SUMMARY OF ISSUE:

The Cabinet is being asked to consider whether or not Surrey County Council should commission short breaks for disabled children from Surrey and Borders Partnership NHS Foundation Trust (SABP) at Beeches Bungalow (referred to as "Beeches" throughout this report). There are two key issues that Cabinet are asked to weigh up and balance in making this decision:

- 1) the impact of closing Beeches on those families currently using the service and on those in the community that might otherwise have been able to access the service.
- 2) the value for money provided by Beeches to residents. In considering this second issue volumes of current and future demand will be important.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

It is recommended that:

1. Surrey County Council conducts an objective and verifiable assessment of the needs of children with disabilities.
2. A revised special educational needs and disability (SEND) strategy will be brought back to Cabinet that includes recommendations from the SEND Governance Board regarding future provision for short breaks.

Whilst recommendations 1 and 2 are being completed:

3. Surrey County Council contracts with SABP for overnight short breaks at Beeches for up to 12 months as an interim arrangement.

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

Surrey County Council would benefit from a more comprehensive assessment of future demand to determine whether or not additional short breaks provision for children is required. Any recommendations in relation to short breaks provision should be considered in the round, alongside all arrangements for disabled children. This approach will enable Surrey County Council to be confident in its commissioning decision. In order to allow time for this review it is recommended that a block contract is agreed with SABP for overnight short breaks at Beeches for up to 12 months.

The SEND Governance Board have developed a programme of work to review the provision of all SEND services for children and young people that supports Surrey County Council's emerging SEND strategy.

DETAILS:

Background

1. In September 2014, Cabinet received a report in respect of the consultation arising from a joint strategic review of short breaks for disabled children. Cabinet agreed a specific recommendation in relation to Beeches; an overnight short breaks home in Reigate commissioned by NHS Guildford and Waverley Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG), on behalf of the Surrey CCGs and provided by SABP. The September 2014 recommendation was:

Surrey County Council and Guildford and Waverley CCG work with SABP to transfer commissioning arrangements to individual spot purchase at a fair price.

2. This recommendation was accepted in September 2014 and the CCGs gave notice to SABP ending their contract for the provision of short breaks at Beeches 12 months later. However, it was not possible to implement the decision to move to a spot purchasing arrangement, in light of this Cabinet agreed in July 2015 that Surrey County Council:
 1. negotiates an acceptable block contract with SABP for overnight short breaks at Beeches **or**;
 2. funds alternative services, which may result in Beeches being closed by SABP.
3. In order for consultees to have an opportunity to comment further Cabinet also agreed to reopen and conclude the consultation process by 2 October 2015.

Legal duty

4. Surrey County Council has a statutory duty to provide short break services that are designed to assist individuals who provide care for disabled children to continue to do so, or to do so more effectively by providing them with breaks from caring. Among a range of services, this includes the provision of overnight respite away from the family home.
5. The Department for Education guidance published in 2011, highlights the importance of engaging with users of short break services in developing a range

of provision to best meet families' needs and enhance the ability of parents to care for their disabled child and any other children they may have.

Other relevant duties include:

6. **The Children and Families Act 2014** introduced Education, Health and Care Plans for children (from birth to age 25) with special educational needs, including those who are disabled, offering families a personal budget and greater control and choice in ensuring the needs of their children are met.
7. **The Care Act 2014** places responsibilities on the authority to assess and, where eligible, meet the needs of carers. The Act includes provision for an adult carer of a disabled child to ask for an assessment of their caring needs in advance of the child reaching 18. Where a local authority carries out such an assessment, it has the power to provide support to the carer even though they are caring for a child not an adult.

Council policy

8. The January 2014 Joint Strategic Review: Short Breaks for Surrey Children and Young People with Disabilities describes short breaks as: "an opportunity to spend time away from their parents, relax and have fun with their peers...Short breaks also give parents the opportunity to have a short break from the demands of daily overnight care for their child with disabilities. Short breaks are a lifeline for many families of children and young people with disabilities and act as a preventative service helping to stop the breakdown of families".
9. Surrey County Council is developing a strategy for children with SEND, this strategy is titled SEND 2020 and clearly sets out the authority's intention to support children within families and their community. This policy intention is based on evidence that children with SEND are more likely to develop within a family context and young people more like to develop independence within the context of their own communities.

The provision

10. The Care Quality Commission (CQC) describes Beeches as: "a five bedded mixed sex respite care home for young people below the age of 18 with severe physical and / or mental health and learning disabilities. It provides day care, overnight care and after school 'tea visits' aimed at providing respite opportunities for carers. It is orientated around the school day and the school year". It is owned and managed by Surrey & Borders Partnership Mental Health NHS Foundation Trust (SABP). CQC judged Beeches to be meeting five of their six standards in July 2014, with only the 'safety, availability and suitability of equipment' standard needing action.
11. Children currently using Beeches present with a mix of needs including cerebral palsy, physical disabilities, visual impairments, severe learning difficulties, global developmental delay, sleep disturbance, speech and language disorder, epilepsy, profound deafness, Lennox-Gastuat Syndrome, Autistic Spectrum Disorders (ASD), wheelchair use and precocious puberty. This list is not exhaustive; it does illustrate the complexity of need that children that use Beeches present. The provision has the capacity to support some complex health needs, although children at Beeches do not meet the NHS threshold for continuing care. Children at Beeches are aged from 15 to 18 years.

CONSULTATION:

12. The joint strategic review of short breaks took place in 2013-14 between Surrey County Council and NHS Guildford and Waverley Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) on behalf of the six Surrey CCGs with responsibility for children's services in the county. A consultation for the review took place from 24 February to 24 May 2014. Feedback from the consultation was used to develop joint recommendations that were then agreed by Surrey County Council's Cabinet on 23 September 2014 and all six NHS Surrey CCG boards in September and October 2014.
13. In May 2015, Surrey and Borders Partnership NHS Foundation Trust informed the Surrey County Council, the CCGs and family voice Surrey that it proposed to discontinue short breaks services at Beeches from November 2015. In light of this outcome, Cabinet agreed on 29 July 2015 to consult further before determining if Surrey County Council should fund services at Beeches, or fund alternative services, which may result in Beeches being closed.

Consultation and engagement activity

14. As a result of this decision, Surrey County Council ran a formal online public consultation for eight weeks from 4 August 2015 to 2 October 2015.
15. The following additional feedback has also been considered.
 - I. 13 impact statements about the potential closure of Beeches from family voice Surrey.
 - II. Views captured from three public meetings, 2 meetings with parents and Family Voice, a visit to both Beeches and Applewood and a meeting with social workers from the children with disabilities team (east Surrey).
 - III. two surveys supported by family voice.
16. A full consultation report considering all feedback can be found in part 2. This report is confidential and will not be released to the public to protect the identities of those who have taken part. All feedback has been used to develop the recommendations for Cabinet based on eight key consultation themes that emerged as detailed below.

Consultation and engagement summary

Online survey feedback

17. Surrey County Council received 14 responses to its online consultation. 71% of these were received from the families of children with disabilities in Surrey and 14% responses were received from professionals who work with disability services.
18. The feedback from current users is centred on the impact the removal of the service will have on their children and the wellbeing of their families. The families that do not currently use Beeches say that there is unknown need within the community and Surrey County Council is failing to reach out to families. They comment that Beeches is not offered as an overnight short break option to

families and that it does not feature in Surrey County Council's directory of short breaks. Overall, the feedback is that short breaks are a lifeline to families (described in the joint strategic review) and without them they would not be able to cope with their children's needs.

Impact statements

19. The impact statements were from parents (8) and a sibling (1) of existing users; a parent of a past user (1); parents who wish to use the service (2); and one other (1). Family voice has confirmed that the authors of the statements have given permission for the statements to be published as shown within part 2 of this report.
20. Family voice Surrey has provided the following summary of the 13 impact statements:

Respite is a necessity for the families of children with severe and complex learning disabilities. It allows the whole family – child, parents and siblings – to continue to function despite extreme, 24/7 challenges.

The Beeches was opened to meet the respite needs of local 'SLD' families, and it continues to do so. Its location opposite Brooklands School means that all 85 families of children on roll can potentially benefit from a 30 hour period of overnight respite while the local authority only pays for 16 hours, as the children can be walked from Brooklands to The Beeches at the end of one school day and back to school again the next day; after school 'tea visits' that similarly maximise the respite for parents. It is also the closest respite centre to the nearby secondary SLD School Clifton Hill.

There is no comparable alternative provision in Surrey providing the homely environment, the opportunity for these children to socialise with their local peer group nor the benefit of extended respite.

The impact statements demonstrate an extraordinary level of emotional attachment and trust in The Beeches, which the families feel is sadly lacking in other SEND services across Surrey. It is also our belief that the demand exists to make The Beeches financially viable.

Public meetings

21. Three public meetings were held at local special schools:
 - a. 22 September – Woodlands School
 - b. 23 September – Clifton Hill School
 - c. 2 October – Brooklands School.

Two meetings were held with parents of children that use Beeches and Family voice on 26 August and 17 September. Feedback was also sought from staff and service users during two visits to Beeches 29 August and Applewood 26 September.

22. Comments and views from all meetings have been captured as part of the consultation feedback summaries below.

23. A meeting was held on 2 October to gather views from six social workers from the children with disabilities team in east Surrey. They said that the east of the county was “lacking overnight respite provision”. The overall view was that residential units are not appropriate for younger children. This view is supported by research. Rather than impose a rule such as the ‘no overnights for under tens’ the group thought a child’s needs should be assessed case by case but young children should only have access to residential overnight short breaks in exceptional circumstances. Children should be supported in the family context wherever possible. The group commented that the uncertainty associated with Beeches may have led to a reduction in demand, although some had made referrals that were rejected by the NHS. When asked whether Beeches was needed, the consensus was yes but not in its current format - improvements could be made to the offer.
24. The wider children with disabilities team’s management commented that Beeches is an outdated facility and no longer fit for purpose citing four examples of children where Beeches had been unable to meet their needs. Reasons included: children’s behaviour; complex health needs where Beeches staff did not have the specialist expertise or equipment; disturbed sleeping patterns; and concerns about the facility’s proximity to the road and safety.

Parent led surveys

25. Family voice Surrey has provided information from one parent led survey it supported in June 2015, ‘Short breaks and respite provision for disabled children and their families in east Surrey’ in June 2015 and from a ‘Survey about therapies and respite’ it ran in September to October 2015. There were 73 responses in total: 23 in the first and 50 in the second. Nine people completed both surveys. Therefore, the survey data provided is from 64 individuals in total.
26. These surveys focused on unmet demand for short breaks in Surrey. All the respondents were parents or carers of children with disabilities Surrey. Many of those surveyed said either that they did not know they were entitled to respite or that they had not managed to get an assessment. Of the parents who had been offered respite, many reported that they had not been told about Beeches. The September-October survey asked specifically about Applewood as an alternative to Beeches. Some respondents claimed that Applewood was not able to offer an equivalent service.
27. Family voice provided the following combined analysis of the two surveys referenced above
- 36 out of 64 (56%) parents had had their needs assessed.
 - 28 out of 64 (44%) parents had not had their needs assessed.

Of the parents who had been offered respite:

- 21 were not told about Beeches at all.
- One was told that their child did not meet the criteria.
- One was told that there was no availability.
- Four were told their children were too young.
- Six were told that Beeches was closing.
- Three said that if they had been offered Beeches, they would not have taken up the offer.

- More than 50% of families said if they had been offered Beeches they would have taken up the offer. The balance across tea visits, midweek overnights and weekends / holidays was roughly equal.

Further detail and response analysis on these surveys has been provided by Family Voice and can be found in part 2.

Consultation themes from all feedback

28. Eight key consultation themes have emerged and are described below along with the Surrey County Council's response:

29. **The impact of change on children:** Some consultation respondents say that, if Beeches closed, it would have a negative impact on the lives of existing users. Beeches users are reported to have formed attachments to other users of the service, to Beeches staff and to the home. Withdrawal of the service, these respondents say, will lead to sadness, and increased stress and anxiety.

Response: Prior to accessing any other short breaks provision an 'all about me assessment' is undertaken. This will highlight to staff the individual needs, likes and dislikes of each child and young person and will enable staff to take account of friendship groups when managing placements. Any change period is managed and planned for each young person. For example, a young person can access both Applewood and Beeches services at the same time during a short individual transition period based on an individual needs assessment. Staff may support children in both settings for a period of time to ensure there is a 'familiar face' and that the new service fully understands the needs of the young person.

30. **Travel implications:** Some consultation respondents say that, if Beeches closed, they would have to use a different respite service, one further from home. Beeches users are said to have conditions that mean long journeys would be very difficult eg autism, anxiety, incontinence. Furthermore, there is concern about the rescheduling of existing arrangements (with other family members, employers, etc), and the distance of any of the alternative services from East Surrey Hospital.

Response: A risk assessment would be undertaken for all children's journeys. Based on assessed needs, one to one or two to one support can be arranged whilst children and young people are being transported to Applewood or other alternative services. All children attending Applewood have an 'all about me' document in place, which details the action that staff need to take should the child experience a seizure or medical emergency. Agreement can be made with the Ambulance Service to access East Surrey Hospital if this is the most appropriate provision. Transport will be arranged according to need for families affected and to minimise any difficulties for parents and carers.

31. **Satisfaction with current provision:** Some consultation respondents report that Beeches is offering an excellent service. It is reported that the staff at Beeches understand the individual needs of its users. Beeches is also said to be homely and welcoming and it is said to have facilities well suited to the needs of its users.

Response: Surrey County Council notes the level of parental satisfaction with Beeches.

32. **Impact on family wellbeing:** Many consultation respondents report how Beeches is advantageous to different members of the family and that by offering respite, it helps maintain healthy family relationships. There is concern that the withdrawal of Beeches will result in sleep loss, mental health deterioration, reduced leisure time and fewer family trips and holidays. Beeches is said to both help parents cope at work and siblings find time to do school work.

Response: Families will still be able to access the same amount of short breaks. Some children and young people who access Beeches currently will get the added benefit of arranged transport, extending the amount of time siblings get to spend with their parents. New legislation will mean from 2015 young carers can receive their own assessment to indicate what support they need. Applewood offers the same level of support to families as Beeches.

33. **Unmet demand:** Many respondents suggest there is demand for short breaks in Surrey that goes unmet. It is suggested that families who could benefit from short breaks are not being offered it. Also it is suggested that, if awareness was raised of its services to the community, Beeches could operate closer to full capacity.

Response: Surrey County Council proposes to re-assess need and related demand as part of the implementation of its new strategy: SEND 2020.

34. **Value for money:** Some respondents suggest that Beeches provides very good value for money. Some suggest that because the closure of Beeches would increase other Surrey County Council costs, it is a false economy to do so. These responses all emphasise the quality of the service that Beeches provides.

Response: See part 2 of this report.

35. **Lack of alternative provision:** There is awareness that there are alternative providers of short breaks. Some respondents feel that none of the other services that are available offer the same kind of care that Beeches provides. The issues cited are: care, levels of staff training, location, and facilities.

Response: Surrey spends a significant amount more than comparable authorities on short breaks, including Ruth House, Applewood, Beeches, White Lodge and Cherry Trees. Applewood in particular is able to meet a range of needs often catered for at Beeches. Provision is fully considered below (para 48-54).

Need and demand analysis

36. For the purpose of this report 'need' refers to the assessed or diagnosed need of children and "demand" is concerned with both the requirement to meet this need placed on Surrey Council and preferences of parents. Parents also express needs for their children and family, these typically differ from a professional assessment in terms of the volume of provision allocated to a care plan.
37. There are approximately 8,000 children with disabilities aged 5 to 18 in Surrey of these 809 children receive social care support from Surrey County Council. Currently nine families use Beeches with one young person in the process of moving to adult services in 2016.

38. Surrey County Council records show that of the 400 children assessed as 'children in need' (s17, Children Act, 1989) by the east Surrey children with disabilities team 37 have been provided with overnight short breaks. At the end of September 2015 all of these children were successfully placed in provision with no complaints from the parents. At the end of September 2015 the east Surrey team had no recorded disagreements with parents in relation to care plans. Furthermore, at this time there were no children awaiting assessment or reassessment for an overnight short break.
39. The public consultation regarding Beeches found that overwhelmingly parents expressed a need for more short breaks and crucially provided at the time and location parents wanted them. This narrative is set out in the consultation report and runs counter to much of the information provided by the service.
40. In Surrey there are two Surrey County Council run facilities: Applewood and Ruth House. Ruth House is a specialist unit for autistic young people and Applewood provides for young people with similar needs to those at Beeches. Surrey County Council also has contractual arrangements with two voluntary sector providers; Cherry Trees and White Lodge. Some young people with both complex care and health needs are referred to Tadworth, another voluntary sector provision that specialises in care for children and young people with complex health needs. In addition to this Surrey County Council also commissions bespoke packages for families using provision at schools, short break foster carers and personal support.
41. Overall in Surrey there is potential increased demand for services as the population grows at a rate of about 5% over the next 10 years. Families of children with disabilities are increasingly using personal support and direct payments to arrange short breaks care so this does not necessarily translate to an increase in families needing overnight short breaks. As set out above there is surplus capacity in the current arrangements if demand does increase and the ability to commission new provision as it is required.
42. In the September 2014 Cabinet report concerning short breaks it was stated in paragraph 20 of the report that: "There is insufficient capacity within the market to provide overnight short breaks and current block contracts with Cherry Trees and White Lodge would have insufficient capacity to take children from both Beeches and Applewood." This assessment was written in support of keeping Applewood open, a modern purpose built, Surrey County Council owned building and did not make clear any future need for Beeches.

Conclusion

43. There is conflicting data in relation to demand that limits Surrey County Council's ability to make a confident commissioning decision. In arriving at this recommendation the following issues have been considered:
- Legal duties in relation to short breaks.
 - Surrey County Council policy ambitions in relation to children with SEND.
 - The feedback from consultation.
 - The needs of children and their families.
 - The impact of Beeches' closure on the wellbeing of the children and families.
 - The best use of resources to ensure value for money.

44. The consultation undertaken prior to, and after the July 2015 Cabinet report demonstrated that there would be a significant impact on some families if Beeches were to close. The disruption to children's routine, the change in environment and the additional journey time all would have had a negative impact on the lives of the children using Beeches. The closure of Beeches would have also negatively impacted on the wellbeing of carers. This impact is best explained by the carers themselves and is set out in the consultation findings and a number of impact statements written by parents and carers in their own words (see Part 2).
45. However, this impact has been comprehensively assessed and can be reasonably mitigated by management action. The impact alone is not sufficient reason to commission SABP to provide short breaks, given the cost of the service. Based on the current occupancy rate an overnight short break at Beeches is not value for money. The price currently paid by the CCG is higher than other comparable provision in Surrey, however, Surrey County Council has successfully negotiated a better price with SABP. A full evaluation of value for money can be seen in Part 2 of this report; this information is commercially sensitive and as such is not in the public domain.
46. The key issue in relation to this decision is one of demand. There is conflicting evidence in relation to the needs of children and their families and the demand this places on Surrey County Council now and in the future. Surrey County Council would benefit from a more comprehensive analysis of the needs of children with disabilities at a whole population level; this makes commissioning decisions of this type difficult to make with confidence. Need is effectively assessed by social workers; there is though no aggregation of this data. Beeches' uncertain future appears to have obscured demand over an extended period resulting in the apparent reduction in demand at the facility.
47. A more robust needs assessment would involve profiling the needs of all children by age, condition / diagnosis and geography. Co-morbidity where children have multiple conditions should be considered, as should those changes in needs that occur as children get older. The needs of children should be grouped or categorised in a way that allows provision / markets to be modelled or projected. This process is central to sound commissioning decisions and should be augmented by a summation of the individual assessments made by social workers, to give a richer picture of children and families lived experience.
48. Surrey County Council is currently developing a new strategy for children with SEND; central to this emerging strategy is a policy intention to support children in a family and community setting. The commissioning of short breaks will help Surrey County Council deliver this policy. The current lack of clarity in relation to demand and Surrey County Council's emerging policy referred to above are the primary reasons for the recommendations to Cabinet.

RISK MANAGEMENT AND IMPLICATIONS:

49. There is some certainty that the usage at Beeches will reduce over the next four months and it could take some time before additional placements at Beeches are made.
50. The slow take up of new places could be exacerbated by the fact that SABP are finding it difficult to recruit and retain staff. The possibility of imminent closure has not helped recruitment and retention issues.

51. Continued uncertainty for families.
52. Children's Services officers work to the principle that for children under the age of 10, family based care is the first option and if the child's behaviour or needs are such that this is not possible, then residential care would be provided as part of their care plan. Children of different ages cannot be placed at the same time and so different times would need to be allocated to younger children or to teenagers which would impact on availability and capacity.
53. The needs assessment planned to be undertaken as part of the SEND work, could show that Beeches is not required and the county council will be tied into a contract for up to 12 months.
54. Funding for commissioning Beeches has not yet been identified.

Financial and Value for Money Implications

55. A comparative analysis of value for money can be seen in Part 2 of this report for reasons of commercial sensitivity.
56. The Surrey CCGs currently have a block contract for residential short breaks with SABP Beeches for £565,000 per annum. The CCGs have given notice on this contract and it will end on 31 October 2015. In addition Surrey County Council is currently funding one to one and two to one additional support at around £17,000. Financial implications of funding alternative services have been estimated around £100,000 per annum.
57. The Children's Services budget for residential short breaks in 2015-16 is £3 million. There is currently a pressure on this budget and there is a small overspend forecast.
58. The current contract price equates to 19% of the £3m residential short breaks budget. The current numbers accessing Beeches equates to 6% of the total number of children in receipt of overnight short breaks in Surrey.
59. If the recommendation to contract with SABP is agreed this will be a new commission and will require funding to be identified from within existing Children's Services budgets. As at the end of September the Children's Services budget is forecast to overspend by £1 million and the Directorate is forecasting a £3m overspend. Managers are working on reducing these overspends.

Section 151 Officer Commentary

60. The Section 151 Officer recognises that additional time is required to undertake a needs analysis to determine the optimal medium to long term solution. However, if the recommendations are agreed there is a need to fund the additional costs resulting from the contract for Beeches in the short term. The Council will need to decide how to fund this from existing budgets. This will be challenging from within Children's Services budgets in view of their existing forecast overspend.

Legal Implications – Monitoring Officer

61. There is a clear expectation in public law that a council should carry out a consultation process whenever it is considering making any significant changes to service provision.
62. Members must give due regard to the results of the consultation, as set out in part 1 and part 2 of the report and in the annexes, and take them into account in reaching a decision, together with the responses to the consultation comments, and the financial and value for money implications set out in the report.
63. The public sector equality duty (section 149 Equality Act 2010) also applies to the decision that the Cabinet is being asked to make. In reaching a decision, members must have due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity for people with protected characteristics, foster good relations between such groups and eliminate any unlawful discrimination. These matters are dealt with in the equalities and diversity section below.

Equalities and Diversity

64. An updated Equalities Impact Assessment (EIA) has been completed which assesses the two potential outcomes:
- Outcome 1: Children and young people will continue to use Beeches funded by a block contract agreed between Surrey County Council and SABP.
 - Outcome 2: Alternative Services.
65. Outcome 1 would mean no change for children and young people accessing Beeches and their families. It would mean that Surrey County Council resources would have to be redirected from elsewhere within children's services. This redirection of resources could impact negatively on a different cohort of children and a further EIA will need to be carried out to assess the extent of any impact before future funding decisions are made.
66. Outcome 2 would impact on the children and young people who access Beeches and their families. This impact and the proposed mitigation are set out from paragraph 12 of this report, impact in relation to gender equality, sexual orientation and ethnicity is considered in the EIA appended to this report.

Other Implications:

67. The potential implications for the following Surrey County Council priorities and policy areas have been considered. Where the impact is potentially significant a summary of the issues is set out in detail below.

Area assessed:	Direct implications:
Corporate Parenting / Looked After Children	No significant implications arising from this report.
Safeguarding responsibilities for vulnerable children and adults	All Surrey County Council short breaks provision complies with the council's safeguarding policy and officers regularly monitor the implementation of this policy.
Public Health	No significant implications arising from this

	report.
Climate change	No significant implications arising from this report.
Carbon emissions	No significant implications arising from this report.

WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:

Officers will conclude negotiations with SABP to provide short breaks from Beeches and undertake a full assessment of the needs of children with disabilities in order to inform future commissioning decisions.

Contact Officer:

Garath Symonds, Assistant Director for Young People, Surrey County Council, garath.symonds@surreycc.gov.uk, 01372 833543.

Consulted:

Fran Morgan	Co-chair - Family Voice
Andrea Collings	Co-chair - Family Voice
Trudie Lambert	Parent
Lesley Tinker	Parent
Christine Patient	Parent
Paul Placitelli	Parent
Caroline Budden	Deputy Director - Children's, Schools and Families
P-J Wilkinson	Assistant Director - Schools and Learning
Ian Banner	Head of Children's Services Commissioning
Sandy Thomas	Specialist Service Manager, Children's Services
Sarah Baker	Group Manager, Legal Services
Paula Chowdhury	Strategic Finance Manager
Emma Law	Category Manager, Procurement

Background papers:

Cabinet report joint strategic review of short breaks – 4 February 2014
 Cabinet report joint strategic review of short breaks – 23 September 2014
 Joint strategic review of short breaks in Surrey independent analysis of public consultation, QDAS – 30 June 2014.
 Cabinet report Joint strategic review of Short breaks for children and young people with disabilities - 29 July 2015.
 Department for Health research data (social services performance assessment framework indicators 2000-2001 and mid 2001-02).

Glossary

CCG	Clinical Commissioning Group
CWD	Children with disabilities
CWD with complex needs	Children with profound and multiple disabilities, complex health needs and challenging behaviour
CYP	Children and young people
Direct payments	This cash payment allows families to organise care services themselves, allowing them to choose the services which meet their individual needs.
EIA	Equalities Impact Assessment

SABP	Surrey and Borders Partnership NHS Foundation Trust
SCC	Surrey County Council
SEND	Special educational needs and disability
Personal budgets	The indicative budget that will be made available if a young person or child is assessed as needing additional and individual support at home and when out and about in the local and wider community.
SEN	Special education needs
Child and family assessment	A children with disability team assessment for children and young people with disabilities and complex needs
Transition	Planned move from Children services to Adult services

Annexes:

Annex 1 - Equalities Impact Assessment
Part 2 report – item 21