

MINUTES of the meeting of the **ADULTS AND HEALTH SELECT COMMITTEE** held at 10.00 am on 15 June 2023 at Woodhatch Place, Reigate, Surrey, RH2 8EF.

These minutes are subject to confirmation by the Committee at its meeting on Wednesday, 4 October 2023.

Elected Members:

- * Helyn Clack
- * Nick Darby
- * Robert Evans OBE
Angela Goodwin (Vice-Chairman)
- * David Harmer
- * Trefor Hogg (Chairman)
- * Rebecca Jennings-Evans
- * Frank Kelly
Riasat Khan (Vice-Chairman)
- * Borough Councillor Abby King
- * David Lewis
Ernest Mallett MBE
- * Michaela Martin
Carla Morson

(* = present at the meeting)

Co-opted Members:

- * Borough Councillor Neil Houston, Elmbridge Borough Council
- * District Councillor Charlotte Swann, Tandridge District Council

22/21 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

Apologies were received from Ernest Mallett. Carla Morson attended the meeting remotely. There were no substitutions.

23/21 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETINGS: 13 APRIL 2023 [Item 2]

The minutes were agreed as a true record of the meeting.

24/21 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

Trefor Hogg declared a personal interest as a community representative at NHS Frimley CCG.

25/21 QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS [Item 4]

Witnesses:

Mark Nuti, Cabinet Member for Adults and Health

Key points raised in the discussion:

1. One Member question and one public question were received, and the responses are appended to these minutes.
2. The member of the public asked a supplementary question and was critical of the written response and the Council's Adult Social Care management of the provider at Greenways. How can the Committee be certain that public money is being spent responsibly and safety managed effectively in these circumstances. The Cabinet Member referred to the written response and advised that senior staff had visited the home to inspect and felt confident the Council was using the taxpayer's money in the right way. The Chair would seek further briefings to make sure processes were in place and being followed.
3. The Member's supplementary question sought a review by the Committee at its next public meeting on 4 October 2023. The Chair requested that the Cabinet Member meet with affected residents to which he agreed. The Chair reiterated that the Committee would be seeking a briefing on the processes before taking any further action

26/21 SURREY HEARTLANDS INTEGRATED CARE STRATEGY [Item 5]

Witnesses:

Mark Nuti, Cabinet Member for Adults and Health

Rachel Crossley, Executive Director for Public Service Reform

Lucy Clemence, Health Integration Policy Lead

Liz Bruce, Joint Executive Director Adult Social Care and Integrated Commissioning

Key points raised in the discussion:

1. A Member asked about areas of deprivation in Surrey and the prevalence of health issues therein and how this strategy will benefit residents. The Health Integration Policy Lead responded that the rationale for the strategy was to show what the Council and NHS were there to do for all residents and to bring together the new partnership and demonstrate how it will work together. Furthermore, the strategy was a guide for the Integrated Care Board to direct its resources.
2. The Chair asked about the place-based approach, the connections between this strategy and the Surrey Health and Wellbeing Strategy and for witnesses to elaborate on how the strategy would contribute to the Council's climate goals. The Executive Director

stated that the places were based on the former Clinical Commissioning Group areas and hospital footprints that did not align with local government boundaries which presented some organisational challenges for example, how to delegate more decision making to a place what would governance look like. There was already place representation on the Health and Wellbeing Board. The Executive Director was the net zero lead for the NHS in Surrey and there were now green plans for each of the ICSs and hospital trusts with a 2050 target with a lot of work ongoing on but limited funding.

3. A Member asked to what extent did the Fuller's stocktake report shape this Strategy particularly around access to urgent care and the national need for more investment in primary care. The stocktake was reflected throughout, particularly in Ambition 2 around how the integrated neighbourhood teams would influence how person-centred care across health and social care was delivered to populations across Surrey Heartlands and support services like same day urgent care. A response to the Fuller Stocktake called *One Service, One Plan* had been submitted to NHS England. The Executive Director highlighted cloud telephony in primary care as an example of investment in that sector.
4. A Member asked about rural deprivation and how NHS Surrey Heartlands would manage risk. The Executive Director talked about investment in data teams and access to more information at a lower level than before and how this would allow them to look at smaller populations and their needs. The Cabinet Member commented that the Neighbourhood Teams would support this as well integrating with the Council's *No One Left Behind* priority.
5. Regarding bed management the Joint Executive Director referenced the work that the Council had been doing with two hospitals. Surrey and Sussex Hospital (SaSH) and the Royal Surrey, that had lower performance on discharge to assess and could now evidence greater numbers of patients discharged in a more safe and timely way with a reduced period of stay.
6. The Chair raised the demand for mental health provision and whether there be a system wide approach to this need. The Health Integration Policy Lead cited the Mental Health Investment Fund's support for prevention programmes. There was also the Mental Health Improvement Plan across the system. The Lead acknowledged the workforce challenge in this area and in response to the Vice-Chair would go back to the team on the deadline date for bids for grants from the Fund.
7. Witnesses were asked how the strategy would break from the past to empower minority ethnic communities. The Health Integration Lead stated that there was a focus on priority populations and key neighbourhoods which included BAME communities, and the

ambition was that service development and delivery would be driven by local communities. The Vice-Chair followed up by asking how the strategy might help tackle taboos surrounded mental and sexual health in BAME populations. The Executive Director cited the work of outreach teams in public health, inclusive materials, translatable webpages and gathering quarterly user data on uptake, and support in migrant hotels and work to reduce stigma. Surrey Minority Ethnic Forum (SMEF) had helped design wellbeing coordination service and awareness training.

8. The Chair asked how Surrey Heartlands and the Council would measure the effectiveness of the strategy. The challenge was the breadth of ambition and the cross-cutting nature of the strategy as well as the long-term national funding to allow for future planning. Where metrics already exist for Ambition 1 they would be utilised. For Ambitions 2 & 3 these would be monitored the Integrated Care Partnership. The data would need to be supplemented by resident voices but this was currently work in progress.
9. A Member asked how officers planned to recruit and retain enough staff to deliver on the ambitions of the strategy. The Health Integration Lead highlighted the United Surrey talent system-wide strategy and its innovative approaches such as the Health and Care Academy and connections to the Council's skills plan.

RESOLVED:

The Select Committee recommends that Surrey Heartlands ICS:

1. Ensures adequate senior management training provision at every level of this strategy, including the promotion of effective management techniques amongst commissioners and providers.
2. Continues to align with the Integrated Care Strategy with the wider Health and Wellbeing Strategy for Surrey.
3. Embed work on reducing digital exclusion amongst residents within the strategy, and to increase support for those who lack digital access.
4. Expand the use of Provider Collaboratives, and to ensure that these collaboratives are effectively monitored.
5. Expand support for those with protected characteristics through helping to tackle reservations surrounding mental and sexual health.
6. Further integrate green prescribing as part of a holistic approach to health and wellbeing.

27/21 MENTAL HEALTH IMPROVEMENT PLAN UPDATE [Item 6]

Witnesses:

Mark Nuti, Cabinet Member for Adults and Health

Liz Bruce, Joint Executive Director Adult Social Care and Integrated Commissioning

Liz Uliasz, Chief Operating Officer

Lucy Gate, Public Health Principal

Jonathan Perkins, Independent Chair Surrey Mental Health System Delivery Board

Graham Wareham, Chief Executive - Surrey and Borders Partnership (SaBP) NHS Foundation Trust

Professor Helen Rostill, Deputy Chief Executive - Surrey and Borders Partnership (SaBP) NHS Foundation Trust

Jonathan Fisher, Chair – Surrey Coalition of Disabled People

Maria Millwood, Non-Executive Director – Healthwatch Surrey

Immy Markwick, Mental Health Lead, Independent Mental Health Network

Patrick Wolter, Chief Executive – Mary Frances Trust

Key points raised in the discussion:

1. The Chair asked about unmet need in the system and what plans there were to improve data collection. The Deputy Chief Executive stated that current modelling showed that only a third of need is being met in Surrey in line with national trends so there was a lot to do and that the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment stated the need for improved measurements of need based on studies within Surrey. **There also needed to be more focus on reporting and measuring local needs accurately instead of the high level of local variations in the level of reporting.** There was a willingness in the system to work together to identify this level of data and the impact of interventions. This would help to target resources more effectively. The Chief Operating Officer advised the Committee that Adult Social Care was developing a business case to allow them to increase their staffing levels to meet need.
2. In response to the witnesses' emphasis on a holistic approach to mental health a Member asked for their views on the Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner's statement that Surrey Police would not be attending all mental health incidents. The Chief Executive of SaBP said that there was ongoing joint work with Surrey Police and recognition that the force would continue to be involved when their unique skills were appropriate. There were plans to allow the Police not to have to wait with people in a state of distress in Emergency Departments by creating mental health clinical decision units. Partners would work through the new guidance for Police attendance.
3. A Member queried the impact of social media on service demand. The Chief Operating Officer reported that they had seen an

increase in referrals for children and young people. Social media could be a factor in this but could not directly attribute social media to these referrals. The Chief Executive of SaBP agreed that social media could be an aggravating factor but not an exclusive reason in its own right.

4. On the topic of the national funding allocation the Independent Chair advised that when developing the Mental Health Improvement Plan they chose to prioritise other areas they could influence within Surrey rather than on lobbying for greater funding from central government. It was important to have good data in Surrey to be able to negotiate on the funding in the future. The Public Health Principal commented that it was a recommendation of the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment to improve data on need and Public Health would be working with the Surrey Data Hub on Serious Mental Illness (SMI) registers using a dedicated data analyst.
5. A Member raised the funding of General Practice Integrated Mental Health Services (GPimhs) in the county. The Deputy Chief Executive explained that this was the last year of national Service Development Funding (SDF) after five years of specific funding. After this is it will become part of the baseline budget allocation or business as usual.
6. Support for those residents whose mental health has been affected by the cost-of-living pressures and food insecurity is available. The Public Health Principal said there was place-based prevention work called 'Toolkit C' to engage residents to unpick key challenges then work with existing services. There had been evaluation to ascertain the reach of services to food banks and benefits advisers.
7. The Chair of the Surrey Coalition of Disabled People raised an issue about cuts to direct payments in recent statements. The Joint Executive Director Adult Social Care and Integrated Commissioning apologised and said she would take this issue away and respond in detail to the Coalition. The Vice-Chair reported that she had heard of this issue from residents as well.
8. Regarding suicide a Member asked what was being done to identify causes, the measures to reduce suicide and support those at risk. The Public Health Principal referenced the real-time surveillance database for suicide and suspected managed by Surrey Police that is reviewed daily and a fortnightly learning review of cases of suicide or suspected suicide. An annual thematic review was underway and some initial findings were an increase in suicide or suspected suicide in adults with long term conditions. The 2023 Suicide Prevention Strategy sets out preventative interventions.

9. As a follow up the Member also raised lessons learned from recent coroner criticisms and the status of the Abraham Cowley Unity. The Chief Executive said coronial criticisms were part of their usual learning process and the Abraham Cowley Unit was expected to complete in Autumn 2024.
10. A Member asked about data for attempted suicide with particular reference to the LGBTQ community. The Public Health Principal referred to the real-time surveillance database but said this only tracked cases known to the police and the definition of attempted suicide was a challenge so Public Health were procuring a database that would collect other data from other partners such as social care and SaBP to improve the rigour of data..
11. Witnesses were asked about workforce recruitment and retention issues. The Chief Operating Officer mentioned the *Think Ahead* programme which the Council had made a bid to for 10 student social work places. It received 5 which would mean more mental health social workers and internally Adult Social Care had 20 apprentices due to become newly qualified social workers, many with an interest in mental health, this year as well. The Chief Operating Officer also mentioned that they would be developing a retention strategy to understand why people chose to leave social work. Adult Social Care would work the Integrated Care Board (ICB) on workforce recruitment and retention as this was not just a social care issue. The Deputy Chief Executive mentioned the importance of the United Talent Strategy and being able to grow our own staff, especially a career pathway for those with lived experience, rather than rely on international recruitment.
12. The Vice-Chair queried Surrey's mental health service delivery as compared to other systems. The Joint Executive Director has asked for research to be done in this area and what 'good' looks like. The Cabinet Member met with the Chief Executive of the charity Chasing the Stigma that ran a nationwide *Hub of Hope* online system that tracks local mental health services based on an individual's postcode which the Council was considering adopting to aid with navigating the complex pathways into mental health services. In Surrey, officers had been working with the Mental Health Alliance to understand needs around first contact. The Council was looking to commission a lay phone line to allow direct escalation to SaBP and de-escalation for those who have had contact with services.
13. The Chief Executive of the Mary Frances Trust commented on the relationship between the voluntary sector and statutory organisations saying they felt involved and supported, their voice was being heard in the designing and delivery of services. Financial stability and contracts across the sector remain key challenges for the sector but their expertise was valued.

14. The Chair raised the related topics of discharge, the Home First service and bed management. The Chief Operating Officer explained there were a number of issues affecting discharge flow: the level of demand and finding the right providers to work with more complex cases. The Council and the Mary Frances Trust had created a discharge hub to plan patient's discharge from an early stage and help people to return to their own homes. Adult Social Care had also launched a Mental Health Housing protocol across Surrey district and boroughs with SaBP. The Deputy Chief Executive explained that Home First was fairly new set up as an admission avoidance scheme in the community to wrap services around individuals with high intensity needs and support their recovery. It has capacity for around 60 people and there was evidence that the service was beginning to prevent admissions. The Chief Executive of SaBP stated that learning from other parts of the country to amend pathways and the freedom of using in-house beds at the North West Hospital versus private beds was aiding bed management alongside the already mentioned mental health clinical decision units and the discharge hub.

RESOLVED

The Select Committee recommended:

1. To continue to provide support to residents struggling with their Mental Health as a result of the cost-of-living crisis.
2. To thoroughly examine the root causes of suicide amongst Surrey residents, and to utilise these findings to formulate robust suicide prevention measures.
3. To ensure effective, transparent, and coordinated Continuity of Care for residents with Mental Health Needs.
4. To continue to develop and share data on geographical and clinical areas of mental health need, and to develop robust measurements on comparing of residents being treated relative with those with unmet mental health needs.
5. To continue to improve the Bed Management Operating Model so as to improve discharge and flow.
6. To expand the adoption of place-based approaches so as to provide targeted support to local areas with higher mental health needs including protected characteristics and ethnic characteristics.
7. To expand the use and reach of the HOMEfirst approach, and to ensure adequate allocation of resources for this.
8. To ensure sustainable commissioning arrangements to support VCSE partners providing Mental Health Services.

28/21 REPORT ON THE FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE HEALTH INEQUALITIES TASK GROUP [Item 7]

Witnesses:

Angela Goodwin, Vice-Chair (Task & Finish Group Lead)

Key points raised in the discussion:

1. The Vice-Chair as Chair of the Task & Finish Group introduced the report and the approach that was taken going on to highlight the 21 recommendations made by the group. The Vice-Chair asked for any feedback on the report from the Committee by 26 June 2023 before the report was shared with witnesses directly. The Vice-Chair thanked the witnesses, the Members of the Group and the Public Health team.
2. The Cabinet Member thanked the Task Group for their work. He agreed with the importance of education and described some collaborative work that was starting on education people about their health and how to navigate the health system.
3. A Member thought that it was important to publish the findings widely. The Member also asked whether the Military Covenant was considered. The Vice-Chair advised that it was not considered on this occasion primarily due to the size of the brief and where the Group could add most value. This could be considered in a future scrutiny review.

RESOLVED:

The Committee agreed the content of the report.

29/21 RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKER AND FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME [Item 8]

Key points raised in the discussion:

1. The Committee noted the reports.

30/21 DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING [Item 9]

The Committee noted its next meeting would be held on 4 October 2023.

Meeting ended at: 1:42pm

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

Public Question:

Jo Bostock to ask: can the Council remain in compliance with their duty to use public money responsibly and their obligation to safeguard the public if the facility at Greenways is allowed to continue?

Context to question

Greenways, a residential property in the small village of Fox Corner was rented to a company called Applenet Care and Support Ltd around October 2020. The house is being used as a residential care facility for people with a range of mental health needs, including ex-offenders and those with a history of substance abuse. (Surrey County Council Adult Social Care [SCC ASC] email 24/5/23). SCC ASC is financing the operation.

No consultation has ever been held with residents of Fox Corner by Applenet or SCC ASC. Over the last 2 years, there have been a series of extremely concerning incidents, including violent incidents and anti-social behaviour committed by people housed at Greenways. Applenet's management also have a publicly available history of failure in running facilities of this kind (for example Coghlan Lodges, Berkshire).

Incidents include:

- An individual housed at Greenways (described by Applenet management as a 'Problematic Schizophrenic') used illegal drugs and offered them to passers-by. He frightened local residents with his behaviour and endangered his own life by sitting at the front of the property with his feet in the road. Applenet management were unaware of his behaviour until the very alarmed local residents told them. Applenet then failed to effectively manage the situation, which escalated with the individual standing on the entrances to neighbouring houses to use drugs, having a lot of arguments and shouting at others on the front drive of Greenways and finally an incident in which a visitor to a neighbouring house was assaulted. Shortly after this the man was arrested and "**readmitted** to a secure mental health facility" (SCC ASC email 24/5/23).
- An individual who was a known arsonist but who supposedly had an "appropriate risk assessment" (SCC ASC Briefing 12/12/22) in place was able to enter a property in Fox Corner and set fire to a vehicle, causing thousands of pounds of damage and endangering lives.
- Staff at Greenways have been threatened by residents with a knife (ASC email 24/5/23).
- On multiple occasions several police vehicles have arrived at Greenways in response to serious incidents or to arrest people placed there by SCC ASC.
- Verbal abuse directed at young girls waiting for the bus across the road from Greenways by residents of Greenways

The management of Applenet continually show a disregard for laws, proper processes and are dishonest in their conduct. The following are examples clearly

visible to other residents of Fox Corner. We can only assume there are a multitude of failures that we cannot see:

- Applenet have never consulted the Planning Authority about the use of the property. Guildford Borough Council Planning have found that the property is being used for a purpose for which it does not have planning permission. (Class C2 use). SCC ASC response to this was: "Guildford do not seem to be unduly concerned and have asked the owners to submit the required information" (ASC email 24/5/23). This is a very misleading interpretation of the findings of misuse by GBC who have concluded that a full planning application must be made.
- Applenet purchased a large 3 bedroomed mobile home which was delivered to the property in November 2022. There had been no consultation with the planning authorities or with neighbours. Applenet told neighbours that they didn't think anyone would mind. The mobile home was only removed after significant volumes of complaints by local residents.
- Applenet have applied for an HMO licence, only after a complaint was raised to the local council by a Fox Corner resident.
- Applenet do not and have never had an adequate rubbish collection procedure, resulting in a build-up of rubbish on the property and the routine misuse of Surrey's domestic bin collection services.
- Applenet have told SCC ASC a number of lies, which SCC ASC have willingly believed. These include claims of "ongoing liaison with the community" and the existence of "a neighbourhood Whatsapp group". Both of which are simply not true but which SCC ASC seem to have relied on to inform their decision making processes

Based on what we know of Applenet's history of failure and what we can see of Applenet's current failures and lack of honesty and based on the response of SCC ASC, we have no confidence that SCC ASC is adequately scrutinising and monitoring the facility at Greenways. The safety of the public is at risk and SCC is complicit in this. The facility must therefore be immediately closed.

Draft Response to Member of the Public Question:

'Can SCC remain in compliance with their duty to use public money responsibly and their obligation to safeguard the public if the facility at Greenways is allowed to continue?'

- SCC has taken all reasonable measures to ensure that the **supported independent living** (it is not a residential care/nursing care home service) service run by Applenet based at Greenways in Fox Corner is providing a good service to people who are highly complex and vulnerable. Under the Care Act 2014 SCC is legally required to support all people who have an eligible Adult Social Care (ASC) need, this includes people with mental health needs and people who may have a history of offending. All the people placed

with Applenet have an eligible ASC need and have been assessed as requiring supported independent living.

- Applenet went through a tender process to be on the Mental Health and Substance Misuse Supported Living Dynamic Purchasing System framework, which they passed. Applenet were added to the framework in March 2022.
- There is no legal requirement to consult neighbours when supported independent living services are set up. Consultation for other services in the county have not taken place either.
- Since Applenet were added to the framework in March 2022 they were assigned a lead relationship manager who had holds regular contract monitoring meetings with them.
- When the service first opened 2019/20 two people were placed at the property and incidents did take place at the service that led to police visits during their stay. They were moved on to accommodation that could meet their needs more appropriately. Admissions since then have been carefully managed in order that only people with a suitable level of support needs are accepted onto the service.
- When the Police have been called to other incidents at the service this has been well managed and in some instances the Police attendance has been a planned call not an emergency response.
- Staff from front line social work teams regularly visit the service to support the people who live at the property and to support the staff.
- Since concerns were raised two ASC directors have been out to visit the property and a quality assurance visit conducted and no un-due concerns have been raised about the service.
- It is not clear at present from Guildford Borough Council have requested planning permission for change of usage to the property. It remains SCCs opinion that the service is not a residential one.

The Council does consider that it is using public money responsibly to support complex and vulnerable individuals. The Council has taken appropriate actions in liaison with other public services to safeguard the public in the vicinity of the service.

This page is intentionally left blank

Keith Witham's Member's Question – response

8.6.2023

Julian Temblett-Wood (Quality Assurance Lead, Adult Social Care, Surrey County Council)

Member's Question from Keith Witham:

Would the Adults and Health Select Committee please consider an investigation into the events and circumstances of "Greenways", Ash Road, Worplesdon to establish why SCC public funds are being used to knowingly enable a provider who is in breach of planning and licencing regulations?

Due to the severity of the allegations will the Cabinet Member agree to instruct withdrawal of financing from this facility pending the results of the investigation?

Context/background to question:

For the Select Committee, ASC is aware that residents of Ash Road are very concerned regarding the use of the premises "Greenways" by Applenet Care and Support to house ex-offenders with mental health needs, financed by SCC Adult Social Care despite the provider NOT having planning consent from the local authority for that use, and NOT being licenced by the local authority as an HMO (House of Multiple Occupation). SCC Adult Social Care are knowingly using public money to enable a provider in breach of planning regulations. This cannot be a sustainable position.

Fox Corner is a small rural residential area, part of the parish of Pirbright, located in between Guildford and Woking. It is an isolated area with little bus service, and miles from community facilities, food shops or any employment opportunities in either Woking or Guildford.

Requests from nearby residents that ASC Officers also speak directly to local residents to understand the impact the unlicenced use of the property is having on the local community and to cross check / validate what they are told by Applenet have been ignored.

SCC ASC is aware that there is no planning permission in place for:

- The use of Greenways as a residential care facility
- The use of Greenways as an HMO (for which planning is required when occupied by more than 5 people which is currently the case – and is Applenet's plan)
- The use of the garage for residential purposes, for which it has and is being used.

Would the Cabinet Member agree that SCC has a duty to uphold rules and regulations – especially when dealing with matters of public safety, and as such must immediately stop spending taxpayers' money on Greenways until all licensing and planning issues are resolved.

Response:

As a note of clarification, Greenways is a supported independent living scheme and not a residential care facility. The key distinction between these two types of services is that a supported independent living scheme is not registered with the Care Quality Commission. Supported independent living schemes do not require any specific planning permission.

Police attendance:

Police have been in attendance at the service on five occasions to date in 2023.

19/02/2023: Surrey Police came to check up on a tenant, as he texted them that he is feeling low. They had a chat with him and left. No further action taken.

27/02/2023: The Police came to arrest a tenant regarding an arson allegation. Police investigation is still pending. This tenant has now moved to another house.

15/03/2023: A tenant was arrested at the house for breaking his license conditions and was recalled. The tenant is now in Hospital.

11/05/2023: A parent of a tenant called the police and reported that her daughter was being verbally abused. Police arrived and had discussions with the family and Applenet Management. They also spoke to another tenant regarding the incident.

01/06/2023: The police came back as a follow up to the 11/5/2023 incident and spoke to the tenant and the management again. Case now closed.

Actions taken and planned:

The County Council have taken a number of steps in response to the concerns raised as set out above. The Head of Integrated Commissioning and the Chief Operating Officer visited the scheme in Early May 2023 following initial receipt of the concerns.

The Lead Mental Health commissioning manager for Greenways has met with the provider a number of times to discuss the concerns raised and ensure appropriate measures are in place. This with regard to the safety and welfare of the tenants of Greenways and with regard to ensuring that disturbance levels are minimised.

Adult Social Care mental health commissioners will continue to liaise with the provider and Guildford Borough Council to ensure that measures are in place to ensure the scheme is run appropriately in the context of the needs of the clients, HMO regulations and the setting of the service.

Adult Social Care will liaise with Guildford police to consult on their position with regard to Greenways.

Social Care Practitioners will continue to work closely with the provider and other professionals to ensure anyone moving to Greenways is suitable in terms of their support needs.

Social Care Practitioners will continue to monitor the stability and progress of their clients living at Greenways. Where it is assessed that people cannot be supported appropriately at Greenways, they will be supported to move on.

Quality assurance:

The Quality Assurance Lead for adult social care carried out a monitoring visit to the service on 2.6.2023. A summary of observations and information gathered is summarised below:

- When the scheme opened in 2019 there was a period where some of the tenants' needs were too high for the scheme. These tenants were moved on and since then admissions have been carefully managed.
- The provider has taken a range of measures in order to ensure the service is stable and that people in the surrounding areas are not disturbed.
- Support plans and risk assessments were in good order. We observed tenants going about their daily lives and returning from activities in the community.
- Tenants we met gave very positive feedback about their experience living at Greenways, telling us how they had improved their independent living skills and increased their confidence in their time there.
- The scheme appeared to be stable and well run. Professionals we spoke to were very complimentary about the service. There was a sufficient level of staffing for the tenants that were there during the day and night-time.
- The scheme has a 1 year licence to operate as a House of Multiple Occupation. This was issued by Guildford Borough Council in April 2023 following a compliance inspection. A two week follow up inspection was made to check on some minor recommendations. The Borough Council is liaising with Surrey County Council with regard to the nature of the service in consideration of a 4 year extension.
- The provider was able to demonstrate that they had a proactive approach to engaging with health and social care professionals to ensure tenant's needs were met in a timely way.

Conclusion and response:

In light of the positive engagement with the provider; the assurance regarding the quality of the service delivery and outcomes being achieved for tenants, Surrey County Council does not consider that it would be appropriate, proportionate or reasonable to cease funding for Greenways at this point.

Surrey County Council will continue to work closely with the provider and all relevant agencies to ensure the scheme is being run appropriately.

This page is intentionally left blank