

---

Meeting	Health, Housing and Adult Social Care Policy and Scrutiny Committee
Date	12 March 2019
Present	Councillors Doughty (Chair), Cullwick (Vice-Chair), Cuthbertson, Flinders, Hayes, Steward and K Taylor
Apologies	None

---

## **72. Declarations of Interest**

At this point in the meeting, Members were asked to declare any personal interests not included on the Register of Interests, any prejudicial interests or any disclosable pecuniary interests in relation to business on the agenda. None were declared.

## **73. Minutes**

The Chair informed the committee that he was not happy with the style of minutes and would not be signing them as a correct record. A majority of Members agreed that the minutes did not show enough detail and were keen to support the Chair.

Therefore, the minutes of the meetings held on 15 January 2019 and 12 February 2019 were not signed.

## **74. Public Participation**

It was reported that there had been no registrations to speak under the Council's Public Participation Scheme.

## **75. Quarter 3 Finance and Performance Monitoring Report**

Members received the Quarter 3 Finance and Performance report for Health, Housing and Adult Social Care.

Officers informed the committee that there was a discrepancy between the table shown on page 19 and paragraph 3 of the report. The figure of £830k was the correct figure regarding mitigations.

In response to Members' questions regarding whether anything would be approached differently with the budget for 2019/20, officers stated

that the bulk of the overspend within the directorate sat with Adult Social Care. The officer added that an additional £4 million pounds of funding was being attributed to Adult Social Care in the budget for 2019/20 with a particular focus on counteracting contract price inflation, the two home closures and demographic growth, particularly picking up the issue of young people transitioning from Children's Services to Adult Services. The officer also noted that the council has established a service risk fund as a one off budget of 800k for the purpose of services coming forward with invest to save proposals.

Members asked officers to elaborate on the missed savings of £227k in the learning disability working age residential budget. Officers explained that these savings were still expected but due to delays in starting some initiatives in this area, these savings would hopefully be delivered in 2019.

Members expressed concern regarding not recruiting to posts as a potential mitigation and were worried that undue pressure may be applied to services to not recruit to vacant posts that need filling. Officers stated that this would be a minority of posts and examples include where the authority may have recruited with temporary posts which come at a higher cost to the authority. Officers also added that whenever a vacancy presents itself, it is an opportunity to consider that post and scrutinise whether it could be managed differently.

Members questioned the statistics on the percentage of the population that were offered, and subsequently took up, health checks. Officers informed the committee that this was an area for concern. However, it was also noted that the context to these statistics was important. A health check was only offered once every 5 years to the eligible population (in York c. 55,000) and these will be staggered across the 5 year contract. The Director of Public Health did note that performance in this area was poor and that it was a concern.

In response to member questions regarding smoking and alcohol in pregnant mothers, officers stated that:

- Statistics on smoking are based purely on answers given to midwives and that no data was collected regarding drinking during pregnancy.
- The most recent trends relating to alcohol related illnesses across the city were worsening and that this was an area of concern for Public Health.

Members questioned officers on whether it was perhaps necessary to budget for exceptional placement cases within the Adult Social Care system, with one particular case costing over £200k and whether the two home closures could have been budgeted for. The Officer stated that York is not unique in this area and that all authorities will experience cases in which they have an individual who has highly complex care needs. With regards to the home closures, Officers stated that the two homes that had closed agreed to the council's cost of care, so the authority was paying them at the normal rate. The budget had been affected this year as a consequence of trying to find homes for the people who had been displaced, which came at an increased cost to the Council. Officers assured Members that there had been constant communication with the independent care sector regarding the agreed cost of care and that capacity would be helped in the future with the major development with the Older Person's Accommodation Programme.

Members were also questioned on the impact of 7 day working for social workers in hospitals and whether an effect had been seen with relation to Delayed Transfers of Care (DTOC). Officers stated that there should always be caution in trying to predict improvements in DTOC statistics as they are so volatile and can depend on a multitude of factors. However the qualitative feedback implied that social worker presence across the weekend had been a benefit for families and had begun to spread cases out across the week, rather than a backlog on a Monday.

In response to Member questions on statistics regarding dementia, Officers stated that the figures were based on estimates of prevalence nationally. Members questioned whether dementia prevalence was uniform across the nation and officers suggested that perhaps colleagues from Public Health England would be better placed to explain how the national prevalence was calculated and offered to take this up on behalf of the committee and report back.

Members asked officers why there had been a delay in delivering savings in the Supported Living for Learning Disability customers and who had taken the decision to delay. Officers highlighted that it was not a decision to delay but that it had taken longer than expected to bring together intelligence of the associated costs of this service and how they could be delivered more efficiently. Officers also stated that the savings would be made but just not within this financial year, noting that in any area where an individual's care is being scrutinised, decisions must be taken very carefully.

Finally, officers also responded to a question from a member of the public regarding the £10 million that has been given to build more council houses, including when will they be available and whether they would be for rent, without the option to buy, as rent to buy had dramatically reduced the number of council housing stock. The following answer was read out on behalf of the Assistant Director for Housing and Community Safety.

“The Housing Development Programme will deliver over 600 homes in a 5 year period at various sites around the city. The type of property will be decided on a site by site basis however typically the tenure mix will be 60% market sale and 40% affordable. The affordable will be half social rent and half for affordable home ownership product (such as shared ownership). The tenants of the social rent properties will have the right to buy, however for the first 15 years the authority will be able to recover its costs. By selling properties for market sale, the authority will be able to generate sufficient receipts to ensure that the programme is sustainable in the long term. The first site to be developed is Lowfield Green, starting in February. The Council will be building 140 homes and there will also be 19 ‘Community build’ homes and 6 ‘self build’. A report was presented to the Executive in January 2019 that provides further information”

## **76. Safer York Partnership Bi-Annual Report**

Members received the bi-annual report outlining the work that has been delivered through the Safer York Partnership. The Head of Community Safety highlighted some key areas of the report and opened the discussion for Member questions.

Members were interested to know how successful the operation had been to reduce discarded needles in the city centre. Officers stated that it had been quite some time since any discarded needles had been reported in the City Centre. It was also noted that the close joint working between the BID rangers and the Authority had been a key factor in this improvement.

In response to Member questions regarding the busking and associated acts of Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB), officers stated that there had been an increase in evening buskers and large groups ‘high jacking’ buskers’ microphones and causing disruption. However, work had begun with a group of buskers and businesses to produce a code of conduct for busking in the city centre. It was noted that any curfew on busking would be difficult to enforce legally and a more

reasonable approach was necessary, dealing with individual issues as and when they occur.

Members asked a number of questions regarding dog fouling, fly tipping and the potential use of covert surveillance to catch perpetrators. Officers stated that uniformed officers have a difficult task in this respect as perpetrators will often stop or not do the action when a uniformed officer was present. However, it was noted that the best way to challenge this was for the community to provide information to the authority and subsequently non-uniformed officers can be deployed in areas at the correct times. Officers also stated that the option of using covert CCTV (as a local authority) was more complicated and resource intensive than it may seem from the outside however work had progressed on this front and it was a potential addition in the not too distant future.

Officers promised to provide the committee with further information regarding statistics of cyclists who have been penalised for not having lights on their cycles, as they did not have the information to hand.

In response to Member questions regarding counter-terrorism, officers noted that the bollards in place around the city centre are not for counter-terrorism purposes. The process for putting in more physical security capable of preventing a dangerous vehicle was well underway and was currently being consulted on.

Members were interested to hear more about statistics regarding County Lines and associated Violent Crime. Officers highlighted that it was a difficult piece of analysis, due to the way in which data was recorded, to conduct and that they felt the best use of their resources was to attempt to tackle the issue as best they can.

Finally, Members and Officers discussed the best way to put out more positive messages to the public in regard to the safety of the city centre for residents, highlighting the good work that has been done in this area.

## **77. Update Report on Integration of Health and Adult and Social Care**

Members received a report introducing the approach the Health and Social Care integration to help support an initial discussion. The Assistant Director for Joint Commissioning introduced the report, highlighting some challenges and areas of progress and invited questions from Members.

Members were interested to know whether there were examples of joint budgets within our system as this would be the main indicator of progress from an integration perspective. The Assistant Director of Joint Commissioning highlighted her role is the embodiment of joint working and joint budgets as is the Better Care Fund, with both jointly funded by the Council and CCG. The officer stated that they are making progress and there are many areas of work where we are working in partnership with colleagues from different organisations. The officer also stated that the authority will continue to be challenged to bring more budgets and projects into joint management.

The officer added that the Better Care Fund is the main way in which budgets are aligned and this year that is worth more than £17 million, however nationally, Council's and the CCG's still need to be accountable for that expenditure. The officer also highlighted examples in Local Area Co-ordination and Community Facilitation of the progress that is being made in this area, noting that there had been reductions in the numbers of people that might need a care assessment. It was also noted that many of the performance indicators are now showing as neutral, where as previously they were negative.

Members were in agreement that this should be an area in which a future committee begins a review and it was also suggested that a development and training day could be provided to help Members understand this issue in more detail.

Officers suggested that perhaps the committee could take a closer look into information sharing and digital technology and the issues associated with that, noting that the breadth of experience from Members may well help a review in this area.

The Director of Health, Housing and Adult Social Care offered to follow up on a question from the Chair regarding whether an option of a joint Chief Executive between the CCG and the Local Authority had been considered in York, as has been seen elsewhere in the Country.

## **78. Update on Joint Health Scrutiny Meeting NYCC, LCC & CYC**

A correction was made to the agenda, noting that it was Leeds 'City' Council and not Leeds County Council.

Members who attended the meeting informed the committee that they had had the opportunity to represent York's Community and articulated the issues around the in-patient facilities at Harrogate.

The Committee put on record their concern that the decision not to build an in-patient facility in Harrogate might make sense to Tees, Esk and Wear Valley's (TEWV) organisational boundaries, however there are still concerns on the potential effect this may have on York residents not being able to access in-patient facilities when needed.

One member made the point that the Chief Executive of TEWV had been confident at a previous meeting of the estimation of beds needed and that this should be recognised.

Members also made clear their disappointment at the decision by NHS Property Services to offer out Bootham Park Hospital to the highest bidder despite the hard work of many to try and retain the asset. The committee were keen to encourage the new committee to continue to work alongside NHS Property Services and the successful bidder to get the best for York residents. It was also noted by some Members that this was a direct consequence of the government's decision on how NHS property services are to act in such circumstances and that it was a missed opportunity for the communities in York.

Cllr P Doughty, Chair

[The meeting started at 5.30 pm and finished at 8.10 pm].

This page is intentionally left blank