

**MINUTES** of the meeting of the **ADULTS AND HEALTH SELECT COMMITTEE** held at 10.30 am on 14 July 2017 at Ashcombe Suite, County Hall, Kingston upon Thames, Surrey KT1 2DN.

These minutes are subject to confirmation by the Committee at its meeting on Monday, 4 September 2017.

(\* present)

**Elected Members:**

- \* Mr Chris Botten
- \* Mr Ben Carasco
- \* Mr Bill Chapman
- \* Mr Nick Darby
- Mr Graham Ellwood
- Mrs Angela Goodwin, Substituted by Mr Chris Botten
- \* Mr Ken Gulati
- \* Mr Saj Hussain
- \* Mr David Mansfield
- \* Mrs Sinead Mooney
- Mr Mark Nuti
- \* Mr John O'Reilly
- Borough Councillor Darryl Ratiram
- District Councillor Patricia Wiltshire
- Mrs Victoria Young

**Substitute Members:**

- \* Mr Chris Botten

**In attendance**

- \* Mr Mel Few

**1/17 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]**

Apologies received from Graham Ellwood, Angela Goodwin, Mark Nuti, Victoria Young, Patricia Wiltshire and Daryl Ratiram. Chris Botten substituted for Angela Goodwin.

**2/17 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETINGS: SOCIAL CARE SERVICE BOARD, 16 MARCH 2017 AND WELLBEING AND HEALTH SCRUTINY BOARD, 13 MARCH 2017 [Item 2]**

The Minutes of the previous meetings were approved as true and accurate records.

**3/17 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]**

There were no declarations of interest made.

**4/17 QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS [Item 4]**

The responses to the public and Member questions submitted were noted by the Select Committee. The questions are attached to the minutes as **Annex 1**.

The question author had a supplementary question to the response given to question one:

Will the Surrey Heartlands Sustainability and Transformation Partnership (STP) assure the public that it will be the subject to the same or similar memorandum of understanding as the other Accountable Care Systems; ensuring that the STP moderates demand growth, establishes a single system financial control total and receive a “devolved transformation funding package.”

This question was deferred for a more detailed response by the Chairman.

The question author had a supplementary question to the response given to question five:

Resultant of the proposed changes to the Ambulances service, can the service assure Members that there will be timely ambulance response times to meet patient needs?

This was referred to the Clinical Commissioning Group for a response by the Chairman.

#### **5/17 RESPONSES FROM THE CABINET TO ISSUES REFERRED BY THE SELECT COMMITTEE [Item 5]**

There were no recommendations made to Cabinet and no responses received.

#### **6/17 HOUSING RELATED SUPPORT [Item 6]**

##### **Witnesses:**

Helen Atkinson, Strategic Director of Adult Social Care and Public Health  
Kathryn Pyper, Senior Programme Manager Adult Social Care  
Mel Few, Cabinet Member for Adults  
Matthew Parris, Healthwatch Evidence and Insights Manager

##### **Key points raised during the discussion:**

1. Officers outlined the proposals in the report. The presentation given by officers to Members has been attached as Annex 1. It was highlighted by officers and the Cabinet Member for Adults that the service was facing significant financial pressures and that they were looking to reduce non-statutory spend in this area.
2. The Committee questioned the potential for service reduction of provision for Housing Related Support and what measures were being taken to safeguard those who would no longer receive support. Officers noted that the service hoped that providers would continue to maintain at least some provision but that the officers and providers

were directing those effected to other options, such as the voluntary sector.

3. It was noted by officers that the service was working with providers to outline the changes proposed clearly and also detail where other support can be found.
4. It was noted by officers that providers were being asked to refer those that require assessment to the service.
5. The timeline of the proposal was mapped out, explaining that there was an eight week period of consultation, after which Cabinet will make a decision. If Cabinet agrees the proposals officers would be looking to begin implementation in Oct 2017, with completion in April 2018. Officers suggested that there was an approximate £2.8 million saving from the implementation of the proposals.
6. Officers explained that the eight week provider-led consultation would be held between June 2017 and August 2017. Officers noted that the providers were leading on consultation efforts due to their first-hand experience with service users and their individual requirements. It was also noted that there was an online questionnaire and a service mailbox available to maximise the reach of the consultation. Members questioned whether the results of the consultation would be taken into consideration. The Cabinet Member for Adults stressed that, while the service would seriously consider any consultation results, there was a requirement to reduce non-statutory spend within the service.
7. It was highlighted by officers that a benchmarking exercise had been undertaken between the Surrey offer and other comparable local authorities. It was stressed that most had ceased provision for disabled and older people but had retained some floating support and provision for socially excluded groups.
8. Officers noted that there were accommodation based services available for socially excluded groups. It was also highlighted that there were networks available to identify members of socially excluded groups early. Officers noted that the proposals outlined in this report should not significantly change the situation of socially excluded groups. The representative of Healthwatch Surrey queried whether benchmarking exercises had been undertaken to assess the impact in other comparable local authorities. Officers explained that there was no quantifiable data available to be found from other local authorities and that any feedback from other authorities was anecdotal. The Chairman suggested that the service gather appropriate information for the Committee to ascertain if there were any measureable impacts on socially excluded groups.
9. Members highlighted that they had concerns regarding the risk assessment undertaken by the service and how the proposal outlined in the report would impact those in sheltered accommodation, particularly in response to the loss of the preventative aspect of the

service. The Cabinet Member for Adults recognised that the loss of preventative services would cause some issues but that the service was required to reduce spend in response to acute financial pressures.

10. Members questioned whether the withdrawal of funding would have a significant negative impact on working relations with District and Borough authorities as the providing authorities. Officers noted that the service generally had positive working relations with District and Borough colleagues and that there were alternate funding streams available to District and Boroughs to deliver their services.
11. The Committee questioned exempt accommodation and whether any of the valuable accommodation assets would be lost as a result of the proposals. It was stressed by officers that proposed changes were unlikely to affect exempt accommodation status, but there was a risk that providers may change social housing stock used for this provision into general housing stock.
12. Members questioned how many of current recipients receive duplicate packages of support and housing related support and how will these be effectively managed. Officers noted that this was dependant on the individual support plan and that there were no definitive numbers of these. It was stressed that the instances of these were uncommon. Officers did note that the service would not leave any service users vulnerable, but that there would be a gradual rationalisation of these packages to improve efficiency.

### **Recommendations**

The Committee notes the proposals for housing related support. It expresses its concern in respect to the long term impact of the proposals, in respect to both the future demand for statutory services and the partnerships with district and boroughs.

It recommends:

1. That officers outline how it will measure the long-term impact of those proposals, especially on socially excluded groups;
2. That officers provide in the Cabinet report further evidence of:
  - the basis of the planning assumption of 70%;
  - the scoping of current and future service provision for socially excluded groups, and full options analysis;
3. That the committee reviews evidence of the impact of the Cabinet's decision on social housing across Surrey in late 2018.

### **7/17 DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING [Item 7]**

It was noted that the next public meeting of the Committee would be held on 4 September 2017 at County Hall.

Meeting ended at: 11.41 am

---

**Chairman**

This page is intentionally left blank