
MEETING	DECISION SESSION - EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR HEALTH & ADULT SOCIAL SERVICES
DATE	3 FEBRUARY 2011
PRESENT	COUNCILLOR MORLEY (EXECUTIVE MEMBER)
IN ATTENDANCE	COUNCILLORS FRASER AND SIMIPSON-LAING

14. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Executive Member was invited to declare at this point in the meeting any personal or prejudicial interests they might have in the business on the agenda. He declared he had none.

Councillor Fraser, who was in attendance at the meeting, declared a personal non prejudicial interest in agenda item 4 (2011-12 Health and Adult Social Services Budget Proposals) on which he had registered to speak, as he is a member of the retired section of Unison and a member of the retired section of the Acts Section of the T&GWU Section of Unite and also as the Council's appointed governor for the York Hospital Foundation Trust.

Councillor T Simpson-Laing, who was also in attendance at the meeting, declared a personal non prejudicial interest in agenda item 4 (2011-12 Health and Adult Social Services Budget Proposals) on which she had registered to speak, as she is a member of Unison.

15. MINUTES

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the last Decision Session of the Executive Member for Health and Adult Social Services, held on 21 December 2010, be approved as a correct record.

16. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION/OTHER SPEAKERS - DECISION SESSION

It was reported that there had been six representations to speak under the Council's Public Participation Scheme in relation to item 4 (2011-12 Health and Adult Social Services Budget Proposals).

A member of the public spoke out against the proposed cuts to mental health services contained within the budget proposals. She explained that a friend of hers had received support through council funded services for which she was grateful and had been doing well as a result, but that as a result of receiving a reduced level of care due to NHS cuts her friend had had to spend more time in hospital which she pointed out leads to problems of transition back into the community. She stressed that cuts were not cost effective to the Council and asked the Executive Member not to reduce services to disabled people nor remove ring fencing.

A representative of the Salvation Army spoke against the proposed cuts to prevention services. She provided examples of where York Salvation Army projects save money stating that their projects were high quality, inexpensive and in some instances subsidised by themselves. She stressed that prevention was cost effective and critical to future years where ongoing savings would need to be made. She pointed out that cutting prevention work would increase costs in many other areas of the Council's budgets and other statutory areas. She advised that the speed of changes to those delivering front line services needed to be carefully managed and new partnerships, including developing relationships, policies, protocols etc, needed time to work and that if providers were not given time to make these changes, services would fail.

The Co-Chair of the Valuing People Partnership Board spoke in relation to savings proposal ref ACE 115 (Learning Disability Development Fund). He stated that the money had previously been ring-fenced for this fund but would now fall within the base budget and be subject to a reduction. He explained that the schemes paid for through this fund were small and with a good return on investment. He asked the Executive Member to protect the remaining services and allow as much flexibility as possible in the future.

A Unison representative spoke against the proposed cuts to some services. She advised that outsourcing services was not a robust principal and left the services too far removed from accountability and would make them difficult to monitor. They raised concerns that there had been no discussion with Unison prior to market testing services but stated that she understood that they would now be consulted. She asked that more effort be put into looking at in-house options as an alternative to outsourcing. She also raised concerns about the proposed removal of one AMPH post from the Mental Health team, the effects this would have and that no consultation had taken place with the team in question. She asked the Executive Member to consider the implication of any cuts to services and urged great caution in recommending them.

Councillor S Fraser raised concerns about various aspects of the budget proposals including:

- Proposed changes to the Reablement Service – He warned that no consultation had taken place with York Hospital Trust regarding the proposed changes stressing the importance of these services to hospital discharge procedures. He stated that, following the failed privatisation of long term care services in homecare in 2006, there had been a large increase in delayed discharges from York Hospital due to social care arrangements not being in place.
- Equality Impact Assessments (EIA) – He questioned whether these had been carried out for the proposals contained in annex 3 bearing in mind the majority of staff working within these services were female and asked how the Executive Member had satisfied himself that the EIA had been shown to be robust in this respect.

- Service Pressure Proposal Ref ACEG07 (Direct payments and demographic increases in the Adult Care Population) - He asked the Executive Member to explain the disparity between the £2million of additional government funding that the council, in conjunction with the PCT, was expecting to be able to access in 2011-12, as quoted in Annex 2, and the £499,004 figure he had been given. He asked what the basis for the £2 million was, what guarantee he had been given and how he had assured himself that this would be forthcoming.

Councillor T Simpson-Laing spoke in relation the budget proposals. Firstly, she queried what involvement the Executive Member had had with plans for the proposed GP consortiums for the area and raised concerns that these GP consortiums may face difficulties in applying for funding if they were not seen as providing a service for the general public. Secondly, she stated that an article published on the front page of the Inside House publication had announced a 48.1% cut in the Supporting People budget for York. She advised the Executive Member that Nottingham Council had been threatened with a legal challenge in respect of their proposed funding cuts and raised concerns that York had not had time to discuss whether they faced a legal challenge too. To conclude, Councillor Simpson-Laing explained that she had worked for the last 16 years within learning disabilities and mental health and witnessed many cuts. She warned that both people receiving services and carers suffer from these cuts and questioned whether there was in fact a market to provide these services. She stated that in her opinion savings would not be made and would lead to a continued overspend in this portfolio area.

17. 2011/12 HEALTH AND ADULT SERVICES BUDGET PROPOSALS

The Executive Member received a report which presented the 2011-12 budget proposals for Adult Social Services in order that he could consider and provide comments on the budget proposals within the report, in advance of the proposals being considered by the Executive at its meeting on 15 February 2011. The budget proposals included:

- the national context regarding local government funding and the implications for City of York Council.
- the approach that had been adopted to develop budget proposals; the outcomes of the customer budget consultation.
- the revenue budget for 2010-11 to show existing budgets; the budget adjusted and rolled forward from 2010-11 into 2011-12.
- the cost of pay and price increases and increments for the portfolio.
- the proposals for budget service pressure costs and savings options for the portfolio area and fees and charges proposals.

The Director of Adults, Children and Education explained that the large reduction in funding to local authorities meant that the pure efficiency work of past years was not enough and advised that the report brought forward options for Members to consider and take forward. He emphasised that the budget papers contained a lot of positive news and stressed the Council's continued commitment to adult social care in general and in particular to prevention and working with partners and the voluntary sector. He asked

the Executive Member to note the proposed expansion of the Reablement Service and the significant investments in supporting the voluntary services which underpin statutory services. He explained that the Council faced a challenge in determining who was best placed to be the best provider of care, whether that be the Council or external providers.

The Director of Adults, Children and Education, the Assistant Director (Adult Assessment and Safeguarding), the Assistant Director (Adult Provision and Transformation) and the Corporate Strategy Manager (Integrated Commissioning) responded to specific questions and issues which had been raised by speakers under agenda item 16 (Public Participation).

The Executive Member responded further to issues raised and credited officers on putting together a set of proposals which looked beyond the immediate financial crisis to what adult social services (with joined up health provision) need to look like in five years. He acknowledged that a growing proportion of older people in our population translated into an even greater than expected demand for services and welcomed the proposals to double the number of hours available through the Reablement Service. He explained that the development of personal budgets would give control to individuals to spend the money allocated to them for care services. He stated that by already commissioning over three-quarters of homecare through independent providers, the Council had created a strong market and a field of quality providers, which in-house analysis and national research had shown to provide high quality care, and that if the Council chose not to commission these providers to provide these services then customers were likely to, leaving any in-house services to become increasingly uncompetitive. He thanked officers for their hard work in preparing the budget proposals in the difficult circumstances faced.

RESOLVED:

- (i) That agreement be given by the Executive Member that the budget proposals are in line with the Council's priorities.
- (ii) That comments made by the Executive Member on the budget proposals contained in the report and annexes be submitted to the Budget Executive on 15 February 2011.
- (iii) That officers be thanked for their hard work in preparing the budget proposals.

Reason: As part of the consultation on the Adult Social Services budget for 2010/11.

Councillor J Morley, Executive Member for Health and Adult Social Services

[The meeting started at 4.00 pm and finished at 5.30 pm].