

# Adults and Safer City Scrutiny Panel

24 November 2015

**Time** 6.00 pm **Public Meeting?** YES **Type of meeting** Scrutiny

**Venue** Committee Room 3 - Civic Centre, St Peter's Square, Wolverhampton WV1 1SH

## Membership

**Chair** Cllr Paula Brookfield (Lab)

**Vice-chair** Cllr Patricia Patten (Con)

### Labour

Cllr Ian Claymore  
Cllr Bishan Dass  
Cllr Jasbinder Dehar  
Cllr Rupinderjit Kaur  
Cllr Linda Leach  
Cllr Lynne Moran  
Cllr Rita Potter  
Cllr Daniel Warren

### Conservative

Cllr Barry Findlay

### UKIP

Cllr Malcolm Gwinnett

Quorum for this meeting is three Councillors.

## Information for the Public

If you have any queries about this meeting, please contact the democratic support team:

**Contact** Deb Breedon  
**Tel/Email** 01902 551250 or [deborah.breedon@wolverhampton.gov.uk](mailto:deborah.breedon@wolverhampton.gov.uk)  
**Address** Democratic Support, Civic Centre, 1st floor, St Peter's Square,  
Wolverhampton WV1 1RL

Copies of other agendas and reports are available from:

**Website** <http://wolverhampton.moderngov.co.uk>  
**Email** [democratic.support@wolverhampton.gov.uk](mailto:democratic.support@wolverhampton.gov.uk)  
**Tel** 01902 555043

Some items are discussed in private because of their confidential or commercial nature. These reports are not available to the public.

Please take note of the protocol for filming, recording, and use of social media in meetings, copies of which are displayed in the meeting room.

# Agenda

## Part 1 – items open to the press and public

- | <i>Item No.</i> | <i>Title</i>   |
|-----------------|--|
| 1               | <b>Apologies</b>   |
| 2               | <b>Declaration of Interest</b>   |
| 3               | <b>Minutes of Previous Meeting</b> (Pages 3 - 14) <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 22 September 2015</li><li>• 10 November 2015</li></ul> |
| 4               | <b>Matters arising</b>   |

### DISCUSSION ITEMS

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 5 | <b>Draft Budget 2016/17</b> (Pages 15 - 24)<br>[To consider the Draft Budget 2016/17 including the related Savings, Redesign and Income Generation Proposals, Financial Transactions and Base Budget Revisions and underlying Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) assumptions that was approved by Cabinet to proceed for formal consultation and scrutiny stages of the budget process, as appropriate, on 21 October 2015.] |
| 6 | <b>Outcome of consultation on the option to move Duke Street to supported living service</b> (Pages 25 - 34)<br>[This report provides Scrutiny Panel with an update on the work carried out with residents and their families of Duke Street residential care home.]  |

# Adults and Safer City Scrutiny Panel

## Minutes - 22 September 2015

### Attendance

#### Members of the Adults and Safer City Scrutiny Panel

Cllr Paula Brookfield (Chair)  
Cllr Ian Claymore  
Cllr Bishan Dass  
Cllr Jasbinder Dehar  
Cllr Rupinderjit Kaur  
Cllr Linda Leach  
Cllr Lynne Moran  
Cllr Patricia Patten (Vice-Chair)  
Cllr Rita Potter  
Cllr Daniel Warren

#### Employees

Deborah Breedon	Scrutiny Officer
Tony Ivko	Service Director - Older People
Karen Samuels	Head of Community Safety
Superintendent Keith Frazer	West Midlands Police

---

## Part 1 – items open to the press and public

*Item No.*    *Title*

- 1 Apologies**  
Apologies were received on behalf of Cllr Barry Findlay
- 2 Declarations of Interest**  
There were no declarations of interest
- 3 Minutes of previous meeting (14.07.2015)**  
The minutes of the previous meeting (14.07.2015) were agreed and signed as a correct record
- 4 Matters arising**  
There were no matters arising
- 5 Reducing Gang Harm Strategy**  
Superintendent Keith Frazer provided a presentation 'Committed to preventing gang related harm and youth violence, Together: 2016-19.'

The Superintendent celebrated the success of the strategy to date in Wolverhampton and outlined key achievements. He indicated that without a strategy in place and excellent partnership working arrangements the reduction of recorded offences, many targeted interventions and development of a community reference group would not have been possible.

The Superintendent presented three case studies:

- Managing the on-going risks
- The changing face of 'gangs'
- Prevention to harm

In each case study the Superintendent outlined the issues and explained how the measures in place and partners were working together.

The Superintendent identified eleven key challenges associated with gang culture and individuals affected by gangs. He referred to better partnership work and how this is improving the prevention of gang related harm and youth violence in the City.

The Superintendent outlined the four 'P's' as follows:

- Prevent
- Protect
- Pursue
- Prepare

He summarised each of the points highlighting that in order to prevent there is a need to protect the community against gangs, fear of crime and gang crimes; a need to identify and enforce against those in gang related activity and a need to identify instances and take early action.

The superintendent identified the objectives of the strategic vision and activities that are key to moving from reducing to preventing.

The Superintendent outlined the strategy consultation process and invited the Councillors to participate in the consultation process.

There followed a period of questions relating to the presentation.

Cllr Bishan Dass referred to the crime reduction figures provided in the presentation and asked if, in addition to guns and knives, a record of other weapons was kept. The superintendent indicated that pointed objects were recorded in the knives category.

In response to a question about risks to women, girls and other elderly people living on their own, the Superintendent informed the Panel that this highlighted the 'fear of crime'. He explained that there may be a high degree of fear of crime for women girls and elderly people but that they are not likely to be the most likely to be directly affected by gang related activity, they are actually the least likely to be affected.

Cllr Ian Claymore asked questions relating to the membership of the community reference group and about young people with mental health issues getting involved in gang activities. In response the Superintendent confirmed that the community reference group are a non-statutory community based group from the locality who report to the local prevention team. He advised that they are able to deal with the lower level activity using intervention measures, he clarified that they are not told

what to do but do have a link into statutory bodies. In relation to youth mental health issues, he advised that currently a number of the Parliamentary committees are looking at youth and mental health provision and that there is some evidence to suggest those young people with mental health issues are more likely to get involved in gang activities.

Cllr Patricia Patten asked what more can be done to prevent people buying weapons on the internet. The Superintendent advised that activities to educate young people in schools and in the wider communities are taking place in addition to wider communication with retailers about age limits and responsibility. He confirmed there is a key drive around education.

Cllr Linda Leach referred to work in her community neighbourhood to provide a knife and gun bin and she asked the Superintendent if in his opinion the bins work. He responded that yes he did and that this was evident by the number of weapons being recovered. He clarified that the demand for weapon bins was driven by the community and that this is a key challenge to get community support and buy in to encourage weapon amnesty.

Cllr Paula Brookfield asked if schools were providing weapon bins. Cllr Jasbir Dehar confirmed that a bin is provided at a secondary school at which she works and that the amount of weapons recovered was surprising. Cllr Linda Leach advised that supermarkets also provide weapon bins.

Cllr Rita Potter asked about the legal status of the cannabis drug. Superintendent Keith Francis advised that cannabis is a banned substance and confirmed that although it had been reclassified it had not been decriminalised.

Cllr Daniel Warren referred to resource cuts to public sector bodies and what impact they would have on the forward plan. He asked the Superintendent if delivery of the strategy would be achievable on today's budget and in the future. He indicated that budget cuts have already had some impact on his Bushbury ward particularly relating to neighbourhood intelligence gathering. The Superintendent noted the concern and advised that the plan would have to be delivered within the parameters of the budget and that this may mean delivering the plan in a different way to that currently presented. He advised that the partners are in the best place to deliver the strategy with the budget they receive from Government. He indicated that the development of the community reference group and use of social media to broaden intelligence flow will provide different ways of intelligence gathering.

Cllr Lynne Moran welcomed the information provided by the Superintendent and highlighted that this is not just a job for the police but for partners and the community. She referred to local concerns about drug related activities in the Whitmore Reans area, the Superintendent agreed to take the issue away and look into it, he indicated that the overall approach in the area may need to be different. Karen Samuels, Head of Community Safety advised that safeguarding is not just a policing matter and this is why it has been built into community strength.

Cllr Jasbir Dehar referred to gangs in secondary schools and asked if the Superintendent can identify where the gangs are. The superintendent indicated that intelligence gathering has improved but that improved links from schools and communities would be helpful to keep intelligence updated and fed into the

partnership. He clarified that all intelligence is important to get a better understanding about where things are. Cllr Pauls Brookfield highlighted that better intelligence will help to target resource to the best place of need.

Cllr Bishan Dass voiced concern about the reduction of resource. The Superintendent advised that reduced resources will have an effect but reassured the Panel that the strategy is built around partnership working and at this time there have not been reductions, but realignment of boundaries. The Head of Community Safety reassured the panel that in the last five years the work relating to gang related activities has progressed a long way and there is a good structure on which to take the strategy forward.

Resolved:

That the presentation be noted and that the comments of the Scrutiny Panel be taken into account as part of the consultation process'

## 6 **The Violence Against Women and Girls Strategy**

Kathy Cole-Evans, Manager, Domestic Violence Forum provided a presentation 'Violence against women & girls (VAWG) strategy 2016-19'. She explained that the name acknowledges the gendered nature of VAWG but that it can be both male and female victims and perpetrators and it addresses additional barriers to help seeking as follows:

- Domestic violence (DV)
- Female genital mutilation (FGM)
- Forced marriage
- Honour based violence
- Sexual violence

She advised that awareness raising events have taken place, including a successful event to look at preventing domestic homicide. All of the additional barriers will be addressed in the new strategy and a series of case reviews will be available in March 2016 and could be shared with the Scrutiny Panel. The VAWG strategy 2012-15 is having impact; 46 actions completed including mainstreaming of specialist roles, improved processes and protocols and awareness raising; there has been increased reporting in the City, DV reporting up 60% (940 incidents) in Wolverhampton alone. In relation to FGM there are no reported cases to police however health organisations are required to report cases which should give an indication of the scale of the problem in Wolverhampton.

The DV Manager advised that the VAWG strategy 2016-19 outlined objectives, outcomes and principles. She clarified that the objectives will lead to the reduction of incidents of violence and to the increased reporting of offences.

The DV Manager outlined the consultation process and highlighted that the 12 week consultation period was an opportunity for the Scrutiny Panel to contribute, either collectively or individually. She advised that the consultation primarily is through electronic questionnaire via a web-link, due to resources; that existing networks, boards and mechanisms were being utilised to cascade information and that some had made a pledge to the new strategy.

The DV Manager confirmed that there is a need to consult with the public, get them on board and to help them understand the law according to the issues. She highlighted the need to work with front line services and ensure they are on-line and aware; the need for schools to report out of the ordinary absences, children who go missing and behaviour change in young females following unexplained absences; GPs to be aware of older females with evidence of FGM as it is more likely for this to run in families and to try to identify communities and bring the community up to speed on issues.

Cllr Paula Brookfield cautioned when identifying communities there is a need to be careful. The panel considered the problems of not tackling some of the intelligence issues and communication and links between schools and health. They considered that in the City, as partners we may know where the problems maybe but there is more to do to raise the general public's awareness through poster campaigns and education, even though there may be cost implications, without it people will not get to know about it.

The DV manager advised that there is funding available some public and some voluntary contribution. She asked the Panel to give consideration to making a pledge to the new VAWG Strategy 2016-19.

Cllr Jasbir Dehal referred to the issue of honour based violence and indicated that often what happens when girls reach a certain age (15) in some cultures the girl is sent away to live with older relatives.

Cllr Bishan Dass welcomed the presentation and information. He recognised the importance and that this was not an easy issue to deal with, especially hard was getting information from the community in relation to forced marriage or honour based violence, he suggested that the community generally comes out to help or sort out the issue.

The panel considered how in a diverse cultural city with so many communities, so many ethnic groups it is very difficult to understand everyone's social backgrounds. Panel considered that there is a need to raise education and awareness in the community that what is acceptable somewhere else is not acceptable here in Wolverhampton and that it is not acceptable under human rights legislation.

Cllr Rita Potter referred to DV and asked what can be done about the scenario where men return home from a football match, they may be drunk or have lost the match but ultimately are violent to their partner. The DV Manager advised that Unite are developing the Council policy about DV, she add that it is advertised through Wolverhampton Wanderer Football Club. She added that any sporting event can trigger DV.

Cllr Rupinderjit Kaur highlighted the increase in the number of first time DV reporting and 'seasonal violence' and saw this as positive. The DV manager advised that there is a need to ensure we do get it right first time as if the volume increases there are not enough services to deal with this.

The Chair thanked Kathy Cole-Evans for her report and open discussion relating to the VAWG Strategy 2016-19 Consultation Process.

Resolved:

1. The Adult and Safer City Scrutiny Panel members pledge support to the VAWG Strategy 2016-19.
2. The Scrutiny Officer to circulate the draft VAWG Strategy 2016-19 strategy and links to the consultation to all scrutiny panel members to consider and complete.

7 **Targeted Youth Support - The Youth Justice Plan 2015-16**

Youth Council members Emma Curran and Emerson Palmer were in attendance at the meeting to ask four questions relating to youth Crime from the Youth Council:

1. We believe that a lot of crime goes unreported. Young people need to feel comfortable to report crimes that they have been victims of crime
2. What support is available to young people who have been victims of crime and how is this information being shared with them?
3. What crimes classify as "anti-social behaviour" and how can we reduce the negative stigma surrounding young people who gather on the streets, making everyone feel safer and improving relationships between young people and communities?
4. What can be done to avoid criminalising young people and delete victimising?

Karen Samuels, Head of Community Safety provided an overview of the report she advised that the report writer Sally Nash, Head of Youth Offending Team (YOT) had responded to the questions in the report that had been circulated with the agenda. The report focus is on the implications of the Youth Justice Plan and the contribution made by the Youth Offending Team to community safety and how that can be supported. She invited Superintendent Keith Frazer in his role of the Chair of the YOT to contribute to Councillors questions.

The Head of Community Safety advised that under the Crime and Disorder Act 1998, each Local Authority Area is required to have in place Youth Offending Team (YOT) arrangements. Central government provides a grant to support Local Justice Services via the Youth Justice Board (YJB). A condition of the grant (£581,100) is the preparation of the Youth Justice (YJ) Plan which highlights performance and key priorities for the future for the area. Karen Samuels highlighted that targeted work helps to avoid victimising all young people.

The Superintendent advised that in terms of the fear of crime (FOC) as a police officer there is often a mismatch of FOC and actual crime. He suggested that there are routes where young people can become victims of crime and that work is on-going to raise awareness; currently working with 'HeadStart' to raise awareness of young people 'Sexting' taking images of themselves to share with others.

Superintendent Keith Frazer responded to further questions from the Youth Council to underline and emphasize what work is being done. Operation Nexus is about targeting activities for young people which have been really successful, work relating to cyber bullying and work with focus on families.

The Youth Council highlighted that there is a lot more drug related crime and contraband alcohol than is known about by authorities. The Superintendent



identified that there are some unscrupulous shop keepers and that prevention aspects and education of young people was paramount.

Ros Jervis, Service Director Health and Wellbeing advised the scrutiny panel how agencies had worked together to counter issues with alcohol, tobacco, drug use and counterfeit goods in an area before the summer. This way of working, to focus on the same group was a better use of resource. She advised of work to develop a 'Tobacco and substance misuse alliance' to gather as much rich intelligence from our communities in this one forum. She said that it would include the youth Council in the forum.

Cllr Paula Brookfield was conscious of the mapping exercise taking place and asked to receive further information relating to fatal contraband and alcohol.

Cllr Rita Potter welcomed this as a quality piece of work using resources to best effect. The Service Director advised that at this time different groups were being pulled together and there would need to be some prioritisation amongst the groups many of which would be legal 'highs'.

Resolved:

1. That the Scrutiny Panel note the corporate implications of the Youth Justice Plan and the contribution made by the Youth Offending team to Community Safety and how that can be supported.
2. That a report be submitted to a future meeting relating to fatal contraband and alcohol.

## 8 **Outcome of consultation on the future of adults short breaks services and Oxley Plus day service**

Kathy Roper, Commissioning Team Manager provided a paper to outline the process and outcomes of consultation that has been undertaken about the future options for:

- Support Plus day service currently delivered from a number of sites across the City including Oxley Day Centre
- Pathways to work service at Bushbury woodcraft centre in Steele Drive
- Adult Short breaks services delivered from two sites in the City

The Commissioning Team Manager highlighted that the consultation around Oxley Day Centre had been positive with service users and their families recognising the proposal focus on better use of resource and integration for their sons and daughters.

In relation to Ernest Bold and Swan Bank short break provision feedback from family carers relating to the consultation is again positive, as long as the quality of service is not compromised. She advised there were some underlying concerns about change. Cllr Rita Potter voiced concerns that the clients had different needs and asked for reassurance that they would get the individual care they require. The Commissioning Team Manager assured panel that the staff will be well versed and trained in supporting them. Staff comments from the consultation were also positive better outcomes for more people whilst contributing to the Councils savings by

achieving value for money. She advised that alternative use was being discussed by the corporate landlord and the landlord for Swan Bank.

In response to an issue raised by Cllr Lynne Moran the Commissioning Team Manager clarified that there had been a printing error and contrary to the newspaper report there would be no staff losses from the proposed changes; a further article would be released to confirm this.

Cllr Patricia Patten asked for further information about use of the GEM Centre in Brick Kiln Lane for overnight stays and was advised that the consultation had shown that families were not keen on the option. She asked if the new premises would be run on a basis where it could respond to family emergencies and was advised that should an emergency occur other families had indicated that they would be happy to change to facilitate the emergency.

Cllr Bishan Dass welcomed the report and indicated that he supported independent living.

Resolved

1. That the All Age Disability In House Provider decommissions the service at Oxley Day Centre and provides the services across the city in community venues which will improve outcomes for individuals.
2. That the All Age Disability service decant from the Oxley site including Oxley Moor House.
3. That the sites are declared surplus by the People Directorate and approximated to the Corporate Landlord to manage as surplus assets and deal with the progression of their future use / disposal.
4. That the All Age Disability In House Provider Service relinquishes its lease with Corporate Landlord for the use of the Pathways to work Site in Steele Drive, Bushbury.
5. That the All Age Disability in-house providers merge the service provision for adult short breaks from the Ernest Bold and Swan Bank sites. The new merged service provision will be delivered from the council owned Ernest Bold site.
6. To note that the item has been considered as a pre-decision scrutiny item and will therefore not be available to call-in once a decision is made by the Executive.

# Adults and Safer City Scrutiny Panel

## Minutes - 10 November 2015

### Attendance

#### Members of the Adults and Safer City Scrutiny Panel

Cllr Paula Brookfield (Chair)  
Cllr Ian Claymore  
Cllr Bishan Dass  
Cllr Jasbinder Dehar  
Cllr Barry Findlay  
Cllr Lynne Moran  
Cllr Patricia Patten (Vice-Chair)  
Cllr Daniel Warren

Cllr Elias Mattu                      Cabinet Member

Tony Ivko                              Service Director - Older People  
Deborah Breedon                  Scrutiny Officer  
Tony Ivko                              Service Director - Older People

---

### Part 1 – items open to the press and public

*Item No.*      *Title*

1                  **Apologies**

Apologies for non-attendance were submitted on behalf of Cllrs Rupinderjit Kaur, Linda Leach and Rita Potter.

2                  **Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest

3                  **Better Care Technology and Strengthening Support At Home**

Cllr Paula Brookfield welcomed Elias Mattu, Cabinet Member, Adults and Anthony Ivko, Service Director Older People to introduce the 'Better Care Technology and Strengthening Support at home' report to Panel.

The Service Director highlighted from the report that the Council is progressing an ambitious development of its services in line with the Care Act policy drivers. The objective being to intervene and support people earlier, reduce, defer and delay the need for more intensive support by having better information and alternatives of less intensive care to help people be as independent as possible.

He advised that Cabinet had approved five recommendations in July 2015 which are an integral part of the transformation of older people's services, from 'care home to care at home' and that the report before the Panel provided the outcomes of the

consultations and actions to mitigate risks associated with the recommendations, advised of the progression and development of 'Better Care Technology and of work with Wolverhampton Homes (WH) and discussions with statutory agencies to explore a collaborative approach for the delivery of Better Care Technology offer.

The Service Director informed the Panel that the public consultation events had been carried out but had not been well attended and that a petition signed by 5,637 residents had been received at Council and a discussion had taken place regarding concerns raised. He advised that concerns raised during the consultation process had been detailed in the report.

The Scrutiny Panel raised a number of concerns relating to the following:

- The quality of service provision being maintained by private sector providers.
- The commitment to long term residents maintaining friendship groups
- Social workers capacity to maintain regular visits
- Carers also need some support

The Service Director advised that 98% of services were already delivered by the care sector and quality is monitored and inspected by the Care Quality Commission (CQC). Cllr Elias Mattu, Cabinet Member Adults indicated that of the 72 beds in the residential facility there were 10 full time residents and that the cost of running the facility is high. He informed the Panel that the cost of private sector care is less than half the price per bed.

In response to concerns about the long term resident groups he clarified that a commitment had been given at the Council meeting that every effort would be made to maintain friendships groups. He advised that there was enough capacity for a group of four and six people together.

Cllr Patricia Patten highlighted the need to address concerns and reassure individuals about the changes, the Service Director advised that there is a Social Worker allocated for each resident in the homes, the social worker will support them through change. He confirmed that all carers and residents will be fully involved. The Cabinet Member informed the Panel that the Care Act and Better Care Technology are the crux of safeguarding for adults moving forward. He emphasized that Unison comments will be taken into account and that in addition to the new accommodation being more cost effective the facility will be better and modern. The Service Director highlighted that this option can increase reablement by between 27,000 - 40,000 hours per annum. He advised that for respite care there will be flexibility of choice and sufficient capacity for individuals to be in the area of choice and for individuals to book direct to the home of their choice. He clarified that this will be achieved by block booking beds across the City for each day of the year.

In response to questions about the responder service to be provided by the Fire Service the Panel were advised that the Fire Service has for a number of years, provided visits to homes to check and install fire detectors; the fire service will highlight any concerns for the safety of an individual to the Council.

The Chair, Cllr Paula Brookfield asked whether the places currently available were to be type specific. The Service Director advised that that individual needs are known and that a brokerage team checks bed availability weekly. He indicated that there

would be a clear pathway where the Council is an enabler, and to be clear that there are ways or reassurance and re-enabling to help individuals who may feel isolated.

The Service Director referred to the assistive technology visit for the Panel planned in January 2016 and that at the visits councillors would see a range of technology, interactive and passive that help people in their homes. He advised that the hands on technology also supports carers and gives confidence to the individuals offering peace of mind that there is someone available to contact, something to remind them when it is time to take tablets or a pressure pad mat to turn on a light.

Cllr Lynne Moran voiced concerns that 'the new technology may not work for people with dementia who may only relate to a person'. The Chair welcomed the technologies ability to help carers and people with dementia, she indicated that people with dementia may revert back to first language or forget how to use technology as part of their condition and that some individuals with specific needs may not be able to comprehend modern technology. She asked how we can demonstrate that people will have a comprehensive service and that individuals do not fall between the cracks. The Service Director listed the following points:

- Reablement hours
- New technology
- Social Workers working at constituency level
- Better Care Fund is supporting the development of integrated teams

He advised that the Council aims to spend more to support people living in their own home and if and when they need more care they will move to a nursing home, better care technology will help this to happen.

Cllr Barry Findlay asked about the timetable for de-commissioning and how the introduction of 'telecare' dovetails into the timetable. The Cabinet Member and Service Director advised that a programme for changes will be prepared following approval by Cabinet. The Chair and Panel sought reassurance that the Scrutiny Panel would have opportunity to review the timetable before the plan is moved forward.

Cllr Daniel Warren referred to recent issues with hospital bed discharge targets and was advised that the hospital and adult services have daily contact and know every person moving home or into hospital first thing in the morning.

The Service Director advised that the number of people moving into acute care is on average 270-330 per day. However for the last three months this figure is up to 360 per day putting pressure on admissions to hospital. He clarified that the Royal Wolverhampton Trust (RWT) and Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) work closely with the Council regarding flow of people in and out of hospital, home and care homes. He informed the Panel that there is an integrated team based in the hospital, nurses, social workers / physician and one manager and that the discharge team are unique in that they are the only team to have dual access to patient record.

Panel voiced concerns that the cost of the service will go up as a result of the planned national minimum wage / living wage increase. The Service Director acknowledged that living wage increases are a concern but that it has to be addressed

The Chair referred to the issues highlighted around compliance and inspection. She identified the need to seek assurance that there is some sort of contract for the services provided. That they are fully transparent, that carers and service users understand what they do, what to expect and who to contact if the service is not compliant. The Panel considered how CQC could monitor this level of care and suggested that monitoring would be needed.

Cllr Patricia Patten enquired if something about carers pay level and the quality of training should be a requirement of the contract for services. The Service Director welcomed the suggestions and agreed that any contract would include specifications such as training.

The Chair thanked the Cabinet Member and Service Director for presenting to and responding to the Panel.

Resolved:

That the Adult and Safer City Scrutiny Panel support the proposals contained in the report, subject to agreement to proceed by Cabinet, that:

- The technology used is accessible for all those who are vulnerable
- The implementation planning is properly coordinated to prevent gaps in care arising and keep the focus on keeping people safe
- The implementation plan is monitored and reported on to Councillors
- There is sufficient capacity to monitor the quality of care and assurance systems for compliance with care standards
- That sufficient capacity is developed to meet the increasing demographic pressures
- Sufficient Social Work capacity is maintained to monitor the on-going needs of our vulnerable people and respond to changes in their care needs
- Assurances can be built in on the quality of training for contracted services providing care to our vulnerable people

# Adults and Safer City Scrutiny Panel

24 November 2015

<b>Report title</b>	Budget Review - Draft Budget 2016/17	
<b>Cabinet member with lead responsibility</b>	Councillor Elias Mattu Adults	
	Councillor Sandra Samuels Public Health and Wellbeing	
<b>Wards affected</b>	All	
<b>Accountable director</b>	Keith Ireland, Managing Director	
<b>Originating service</b>	Strategic Finance	
<b>Accountable employee(s)</b>	Mark Taylor	Director of Finance
	Tel	01902 554410
	Email	Mark.Taylor@wolverhampton.gov.uk
<b>Report to be/has been considered by</b>		

---

## Recommendation(s) for action or decision:

The Panel is recommended to:

1. Provide feedback to Scrutiny Board for consolidation and onward response to Cabinet on the Draft Budget 2016/17, in particular those elements that are relevant to this Scrutiny Panel, including specifically:
  - a. the Savings, Redesign and Income Generation Proposals summarised at Appendix A.
  - b. the Financial Transactions and Base Budget Revisions summarised at Appendix B.

- c. other underlying assumptions to the 2016/17 Draft Budget as detailed at Appendix C.
2. Approve that the Scrutiny Panel response be finalised by the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Scrutiny Panel and forwarded to Scrutiny Board for consideration.



## **1.0 Purpose**

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to seek the Panel's feedback on the Draft Budget 2016/17 including the related Savings, Redesign and Income Generation Proposals (referred to herein as Savings Proposals), Financial Transactions and Base Budget Revisions (referred to herein as Base Budget Revisions) and underlying Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) assumptions that was approved by Cabinet to proceed for formal consultation and scrutiny stages of the budget process, as appropriate, on 21 October 2015.

## **2.0 Background**

- 2.1 At its meeting on 21 October 2015, the Cabinet considered the Draft Budget for 2016/17. Cabinet approved this as the basis for budget consultation and scrutiny over the forthcoming months.
- 2.2 The Cabinet report identified that due to the uncertain financial future, a full update of the MTFS 2016/17 – 2018/19 would only be conducted once the Spending Review and the Provisional Local Government Finance Settlement have been announced on 25 November and mid-December 2015 respectively.
- 2.3 The Cabinet report recommended that Savings Proposals amounting to £14.1 million in 2016/17 proceed to the formal consultation and scrutiny stages of the budget process. The Savings Proposals that fall within the scrutiny remit of this Panel are shown at Appendix A.
- 2.4 The Cabinet report further identified that £7.1 million of Base Budget Revisions be incorporated into the 2016/17 Draft Budget. The Base Budget Revisions that fall within the scrutiny remit of this Panel are shown at Appendix B.
- 2.5 Included at Appendix C are other underlying assumptions that impact on the 2016/17 Draft Budget, that fall within the remit of this Panel, for example inflationary, demographic and pay related pressures.
- 2.6 It is important to note that any savings proposals approved as part of prior year budget setting processes have already been scrutinised and approved by Cabinet and are therefore, already included in the MTFS.
- 2.7 As detailed in the Cabinet report, the 2016/17 Draft Budget will be considered by Scrutiny Panels during the November/December round of meetings and the feedback from those meetings will be reported to Scrutiny Board on 15 December 2015, which will consolidate that feedback in a formal response to Cabinet on 13 January 2016. The feedback provided to Scrutiny Board will include questions asked by Panel members, alongside the responses received. These arrangements have been endorsed by the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Scrutiny Board. Cabinet will take into account the feedback from Scrutiny Board when considering the final budget setting report in February 2016, for approval by Full Council in March 2016.

2.8 In order to limit the volume of paper used as part of the budget reporting process, the Cabinet report has not been appended to this covering report. Panel members are instead requested to bring their copy of the 2016/17 Draft Budget report, which was circulated with the 21 October 2015 Cabinet agenda. Detail of all the Council's individual savings proposals, including the latest to be considered by Cabinet on 21 October 2015, can be found on the council's website at:  
<http://www.wolverhampton.gov.uk/budgetsavings>

### **3.0 Proposals relating to the work of this Panel**

3.1 Included in the Draft Budget strategy are savings proposals and base budget revisions relating to the remit of this Panel. These are listed at Appendices A and B. The Panel is requested to provide and record its comments on these proposals, for submission to Scrutiny Board and then Cabinet.

3.2 In addition to commenting on these specific proposals, the Panel may also request additional information or clarification in relation to the budget and MTFs. Any such requests will be noted separately, either for consideration by the Panel at a future date, or for information to be forwarded to the Panel members concerned.

### **4.0 Financial implications**

4.1 The financial implications are discussed in the body of the report, and in the report to Cabinet. [MH/16112015/G]

### **4.0 Legal implications**

5.1 The legal implications are discussed in the report to Cabinet. [TS/13112015/A]

### **5.0 Equalities implications**

5.1 The equalities implications are discussed in the report to Cabinet.

### **6.0 Environmental implications**

6.1 The environmental implications are discussed in the report to Cabinet.

### **7.0 Human resources implications**

7.1 The human resources implications are discussed in the report to Cabinet.

### **8.0 Schedule of background papers**

9.1 Draft Budget 2016/17, report to Cabinet, 21 October 2015

**Savings, Redesign and Income Generation Proposals by Cabinet Portfolio**

**Adult Services**

<b>Details</b>	<b>Cabinet Member</b>	<b>Directorate</b>	<b>2016/17 £000</b>	<b>2017/18 £000</b>	<b>2018/19 £000</b>
<p><b>Reshaping of Older People Services</b> (Further details have been provided in the 'Better Care Technology and Strengthening Support at Home' report presented to Cabinet on 22 July and 11 November 2015)</p> <p>Progress the prior approval for the transformation of community based services and the creation of a new community offer, with the delivery and development extended and enhanced reablement and other services, including telecare, to support people to live independently in their own homes.</p> <p>Progress the prior approval of the formal consultation process on the proposal to decommission services at Merryhill House and Nelson Mandela House and transfer to external market providers.</p> <p>Progress the prior approval of the formal consultation process on the proposal to decommission services at Woden Resource Centre and re-provide high dependency day care in the external market through a</p>	Councillor Elias Mattu	People	(820)	-	-

**Savings, Redesign and Income Generation Proposals by Cabinet Portfolio**

<b>Details</b>	<b>Cabinet Member</b>	<b>Directorate</b>	<b>2016/17 £000</b>	<b>2017/18 £000</b>	<b>2018/19 £000</b>
personalised approach. Progress the prior approval of the pursuit of the externalisation of community reablement and the commissioning of a specialist dementia reablement service.					
<b>Restructuring of the Library Service *</b>	Councillor Elias Mattu	People	(500)	-	-
<b>Move Warstones Office Base (completion of 2013/14 savings proposal)</b>  Warstones is currently used as an office base for an internal service, the Assessment and Care Management Team, and also used by six community groups. We have explored other options for this building but have been unable to find a sustainable option. The proposal is to relocate the Assessment and Care Management Team and support the groups to relocate to other local community venues.	Councillor Elias Mattu	People	(35)	-	-

\* Full details to be reported to Cabinet separately.

Financial Transactions and Base Budget Revisions

Adult Services

Details	Cabinet Member	Directorate	2016/17 £000	2017/18 £000	2018/19 £000
<p><b>Early achievement of existing savings proposal – Learning Disabilities Assessment and Care Management Care Packages</b></p> <p>Early achievement of existing savings proposal (0074) -Learning Disabilities Assessment and Care Management- Care Packages.            The proposal will achieve savings in care packages across Learning Disability Assessment and Care Management. This will be achieved through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- a robust programme of review of high cost residential and nursing placements, both in and out of City</li> <li>- increased use of assistive technology</li> <li>- promoting independence</li> <li>- increased value for money initiatives</li> <li>- increased and targeted commissioning</li> </ul>	Councillor Elias Mattu	People	(350)	350	-

Financial Transactions and Base Budget Revisions

Details	Cabinet Member	Directorate	2016/17 £000	2017/18 £000	2018/19 £000
<p><b>Efficiency saving from the relocation of the Independent Living Service</b></p> <p>Realisation of £29,000 saving as the result of reduction in rent from the relocation of the Independent Living Service to Racecourse Road Industrial Estate.</p>	Councillor Elias Mattu	People	(29)	-	-
<p><b>Drawdown of one off grants for Adult Services</b></p> <p>As a result of grant funding being available it is possible to reduce the net costs of the service for 2016/17 without impacting on service delivery.</p>	Councillor Elias Mattu	People	(2)	2	-

Financial Transactions and Base Budget Revisions

Public Health and Wellbeing

Details	Cabinet Member	Directorate	2016/17 £000	2017/18 £000	2018/19 £000
<p><b>Further review of utilisation of Public Health funding - Community Safety, Resilience, Healthier Schools</b></p> <p>It is proposed that the Community Safety team, the Resilience team and the Healthy Schools team are fully integrated into the Public Health &amp; Wellbeing service and resourced (both staffing and running costs) from the public health allocation.</p>	Councillor Sandra Samuels	People	(652)	-	-

### 2016/17 Draft Budget Assumptions

<b>Budget Growth</b>	
<b>Budget Pressure</b>	<b>2016/17 £000</b>
<b>Adults &amp; Safer City</b>	
National Living Wage (July 2015 adjustments)	1,533
Adult Social Services Demography/Demand/Transition	1,000
<b>Total Adults &amp; Safer City</b>	<b>2,533</b>



# Adults Scrutiny Panel

## 24 November 2015

<b>Report title</b>	Outcome of Options Appraisal – Duke Street	
<b>Cabinet member with lead responsibility</b>	Councillor Elias Mattu Adults	
<b>Wards affected</b>	All	
<b>Accountable director</b>	Linda Sanders, People	
<b>Originating service</b>	Commissioning (Disabilities & Mental Health)	
<b>Accountable employee(s)</b>	Kathy Roper Tel Email	Commissioning Team Manager 01902 550975 Kathy.roper@wolverhampton.gov.uk
<b>Report to be/has been considered by</b>	Strategic Executive Board Cabinet	13 October 2015 11 November 2015

---

### Recommendation(s) for action or decision:

Scrutiny Panel is recommended to:

1. Agree the implementation of option 2, to de-register Duke Street bungalows as residential care and to change the registration to supported living with the potential of Wolverhampton Homes becoming the landlord subject to further work and discussions taking place and the council commissioning an alternative provider to deliver the care element. A period of TUPE would apply to this option.

### Recommendation(s) for noting

2. Scrutiny Panel is recommended to note the indicative timescales to complete the work to move to a supported living service and maximise potential savings.

## **1.0 Purpose**

- 1.1 This report provides Scrutiny Panel with an update on the work carried out with residents and their families of Duke Street residential care home. This followed the initial consultation on the future of the service, carried out between December 2014 and February 2015. Duke Street bungalows is a residential care home for adults with a learning disability.
- 1.2 The report sets out the costed options appraisal for Duke Street if we were to de-register it as a residential care home and re-register it as a supported living service.
- 1.3 The report sets out an indicative action plan to progress the project.

## **2.0 Background**

- 2.1 The Duke Street Bungalows are a council run residential home for up to 20 adults with profound and multiple learning disabilities (pmlD). It is made up of three detached bungalows and is situated in Wednesfield in the North of the City. At present there are 18 residents at Duke Street.
- 2.2 In December 2014, a 12 week consultation began on the future options for service delivery. Cabinet were presented with the outcome of the consultation in March 2015 and agreed that further work should be carried out with the residents and their family members. Cabinet approved a fully costed option appraisal be prepared and presented back to Cabinet with a view to moving to a supported living model as soon as possible.
- 2.3 The Cabinet report of March 2015 agreed that work should begin to support families to understand why a supported living model was being considered for Duke Street and to gain the views of the residents.
- 2.4 In general the residential care model can be described as providing a 'one size fits all' approach to the provision of care. In any one residential care home, every person living there is likely to have different individual support needs. Regardless of these varying support needs, the cost of care will usually be dependent on the cost of a place in a home rather than the actual cost of care and support needed.
- 2.5 Supported living is a concept that was developed as an alternative to institutional residential care for people with learning disabilities. Supported living is not a prescriptive model of service design and can look very different for different people. For one person it may be a few hours support a week to live alone in a rented flat, for another it may be round the clock support to live in a home they own, and for others it may be a shared house with friends and support to meet individual needs. For the current residents at Duke Street the Council recognise the need for 24 hour care and support.
- 2.6 Improving a person's choice and control is the most important outcome that supported living must achieve. This includes having security of tenure in their chosen accommodation and some choice over how their care is provided.

### **3.0 Current Situation/discussions**

- 3.1 A social worker was appointed to carry out the assessments of all the residents at Duke Street to ensure a consistent approach was applied. The social work assessments were supported where possible by family members and additional information gathered by an independent empowerment organisation (see 3.5). The aim of these assessments was to ensure that a fuller picture of each resident, their wants and views was captured to help assess the level of support that they would need if a decision is taken to move to supported living. The assessments have formed part of the Equality Analysis work and will be used to develop individual support plans for each resident moving forward under this model.
- 3.2 The social work assessments identified that the residents had a level of need that means they require care and support throughout a 24 hour day because:
- The complex health needs of the residents means they all require 1:1 support when accessing the community
  - ten of the residents require 1:1 support for personal care
  - eight people require 2:1 support for personal care
  - For building based activities a staff ratio of 1: 2 is needed for 17 of the residents whilst one resident requires 1:1 support.
- 3.3 It is recognised that the residents of Duke Street have profound learning disabilities and several have complex health needs which will require the same level of care and support in either a residential or supported living model moving forward. The use of assistive technology has the potential to improve outcomes and provide more dignity and privacy however the residents will still need their staff teams to carry out the majority of daily living tasks.
- 3.4 A number of themes were identified by the social worker during the reviews. People wanted to partake in more activities and there appeared to be a lack of a person centred approach to the care plans. People were worried about potential changes in accommodation. Existing relationships with staff are viewed as being very important and families felt that staff are doing their best for the residents. The period of uncertainty that has existed since the initial consultation has created anxiety for the residents and their families.
- 3.5 Changing Our Lives, an independent empowerment organisation who specialise in working with people with learning disabilities, were commissioned to support the residents to have their voice heard and to provide the Council with a report of their findings. Changing our Lives developed an individual profile of each resident with their likes and dislikes and the key 'must haves' in any future service. These profiles assisted the social worker in their review of each resident's needs. As a result of this work some key themes have emerged which reveal that the quality of people's life at Duke Street is in some ways institutionalised, and people are limited in the extent to which they are supported to achieving ordinary life outcomes. Some of the reasons for this appear to include shortcomings in the way people are supported and the model of support in place.

- 3.6 Work has been completed to look at the known costs for delivering a supported living service at Duke Street, it identified the Housing Benefit and additional benefits residents could be eligible for and would need if the service moved to a supported living model. The Housing Benefit levels are indicative at this time and cannot be confirmed until an application is made.
- 3.7 The social work assessments enabled the commissioner to calculate the one off costs for additional support that the residents would need to move to a supported living model of care including the need to go to the Court of Protection for most residents.
- 3.8 Commissioners have held a number of meetings with a group of the residents family members to understand the concerns they may have about the proposals. The family members have the best interest of the residents at heart and have wanted to be part of the process to ensure the best outcomes. Whilst they would prefer that the residential model at Duke Street remain unchanged, families have worked with commissioners to develop a service specification, and are committed to working with the Council at all stages in the process, for example supporting the Council to identify a housing provider experienced in delivering high quality supported living services, to ensure that Duke Street bungalows can be used to deliver a supported living model. They are also willing to be part of the evaluation process to find a care provider who has a good record for providing person centred care and support.
- 3.9 The Care Quality Commission (CQC) has been approached to understand the timelines and requirements for de-registering and re-registering of Duke Street. CQC estimate that from the time of receiving the application to approval being given a provider should allow a minimum of twelve weeks.
- 3.10 CQC did not express a view about what changes, if any, they would require to the building if the service was registered as supported living. The new application for supported living would require a new statement of purpose for supported living that demonstrated how residents would have a clear choice of how care was provided and ensuring that appropriate tenancies were in place.

#### **4.0 Options Appraisal**

- 4.1 Two supported living options have been evaluated. With the largest cost in delivering services being staff costs, at the time of The Transfer of Undertakings (Protection of Employment) Regulations 2006 (TUPE) transfer no significant savings are accrued. It is possible following the period of the initial contract (timeframe described in the contract) to achieve further savings by renegotiating the contract value.
- 4.2 The model of supported living that would be pursued for the residents of Duke Street would be a shared home with around the clock care, ensuring that the level of support does not diminish.

#### **Option 1:**

To de-register the service, change the registration to supported living with a Registered Social Landlord (RSL) becoming the landlord and the council continuing to deliver the care and support.

The 2015/16 controllable budget (before savings) for the Duke Street as a residential home is £1.5 million. The costs of option 1 are summarised below. This would give a full year savings of £303,000.

<b>Option 1</b>	<b>Forecast Costs (£000)</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Staffing (restructured)	1,220	Savings from restructure for S/living
Service Costs	30	
Rent	77	Forecast cost of Rent
Housing Benefits (HB)	(107)	HB contributions based on indicative calculations
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,220</b>	

#### Benefits;

- It Improves independence choice and control
- It is in line with best practice
- It will maintain current domestic arrangements / friendships
- Housing Benefits and additional residents benefits will provide alternative funding routes reducing the budget commitment
- It responds to families concerns that the quality of the service will deteriorate if it is externalised.

#### Risks;

- Deprivation of Liberty (Dols) and Best Interest Assessments will lead to Court of Protection applications being made. Delays in the Court hearing applications may impact on timeline and introduces further costs
- CQC inspection following receipt of application could lead to delays in making service fit for purpose
- The revised cost model taking into account assumed levels of Housing Benefit contribution and additional resident's benefits does not deliver the level of savings identified.

#### Option 2

To de-register, change the registration to supported living with the potential of Wolverhampton Homes becoming the landlord subject to further work and discussions taking place and the council commissioning an alternative provider to deliver the care element. A period of TUPE would apply to this option.

The 2015/16 controllable budget (before savings) for the Duke Street as a residential home is £1.5 million. The costs of option 2 are summarised below. It is estimated that the full year effect of the savings after a period of TUPE protection would be in the region of £378,000.

<b>Option 2</b>	<b>Forecast Costs (£000)</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Staffing	1,145	Estimated costs after period of TUPE
Service Costs	30	
Rent	77	
Housing Benefits (HB)	(107)	HB contribution based on indicative calculations
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,145</b>	

### **Benefits**

- It will improve independence choice and control
- It is in line with best practice
- It will maintain current domestic arrangements / friendships
- HB and additional residents benefits will provide alternative funding routes reducing the care purchasing budget commitment
- Additional savings are made once the period of TUPE has ended.

### **Risks**

- Dols/ Best Interest Assessments will lead to Court of Protection applications being made. Delays in the Court hearing applications may impact on timeline and introduces further costs
- CQC inspection following receipt of application leads to delays in making service fit for purpose
- TUPE transfer of staff risk mitigation plan does not give potential care providers sufficient confidence to bid
- Savings identified not delivered in timescale originally required
- Legal challenge from family relatives concerned that the process is flawed.

## **5.0 Implementation Plan**

5.1 There are a number of actions required to move the project towards a successful conclusion, an implementation plan has been developed. Close project management will be needed to pull the various work streams together to achieve the projected transfer date. The work to achieve the recommendation and transfer to an external RSL and care provider would be delivered as indicated below:

**Delivery of an external supported living service December 2015 – Nov 2016**

<b>Work streams</b>	<b>timeline</b>	<b>Actions</b>
Asset transfer /management	Dec 2015- March 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree transfer of Duke St residential homes to provider</li> <li>• Agree lease/ownership terms</li> <li>• management arrangements</li> <li>• set rents</li> <li>• Void Cover</li> <li>• Agree nominations right process</li> <li>• Agree asset up-grade (phased process)</li> </ul>
Residents	Dec 2015- April 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Complete Best Interest Assessments</li> <li>• Initiate the Court of Protection/Dols application</li> <li>• Commission external support to Work with families/advocates to develop support plans</li> <li>• Work with Welfare Rights to apply for housing benefit claims</li> </ul>
Tender for new care provider	Dec 15- Feb 16 ( 8 wks + Christmas break)  March-May 2016  June- July 2016 August 2016 August 2016  August –October 2016   Nov 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development of due diligence tender pack</li> <li>• Tender Exercise</li> <li>• Evaluate/permission to award</li> <li>• Award</li> <li>• Link in with external support planning and families to finalise support plans</li> <li>• TUPE discussion period for staff (3 months)</li> <li>• Agree and set up Service Level Arrangement agreement with Housing Provider</li> </ul> <p>New service operational</p>
CQC	August 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop new statement of purpose for service with new provider</li> <li>• Application to de-register residential service(care provider)</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Application to register as supported living(care provider )</li><li>• CQC inspection (assuming this is required)</li><li>• CQC issue new registration</li></ul> <p>New S/Living service operational</p>
--	--	---

## 6.0 Risk associated with implementation plan

6.1 The following potential risks could arise:

- 6.1.1 The need to make applications to the Court of Protection could impact on the timeliness of implementation and introduces further costs. In order to mitigate this risk, the Court of Protection costs and implementation process have already been identified. It is understood that as long as the required Deprivation of Liberty and Court applications have been made, the Council will be able to continue the de-registration and re-registration process ensuring that due process has been followed in line with the Mental Capacity Act 2006 and it has been agreed that it is in the 'best interests' of the residents.
- 6.1.2 The registration of the new service will require a Care Quality Commission (CQC) inspection following the receipt of the application. Current work with providers indicates that this process takes a minimum of 12 weeks. Commissioners will work closely with CQC to manage the process and minimise this risk.
- 6.1.3 External providers have voiced concern over the potential pension and redundancy liabilities associated with a TUPE transfer of the current staff team. A full due diligence information pack containing pension actuarial and redundancy information will be included as part of the tender notification.
- 6.1.4 Potential providers may feel unable to utilise the site given the limitations of its current configuration. An estimate on the potential cost of a refit at Duke Street has been obtained from the council's internal quantity surveyors.
- 6.1.5 The complexity of the process could mean that savings are not delivered within the timescale originally required. A robust project management and escalation process will be implemented to support the change management process.
- 6.1.6 The families of the current residents at Duke Street have expressed concern about the proposals, and could seek to make a legal challenge. Over recent months officers have been meeting with family members. Regular meetings have been taking place to explain the process and the implications for each resident. Legal advice has been sought throughout the process.

## 7.0 Financial implications

7.1 The 2015/16 controllable budget for Duke Street (before savings) is £1.5 million.



- 7.2 The Medium Term Financial Strategy includes savings proposals totalling £3.1 million by 2016/17 for the implementation of reduced-cost delivery models for disability in-house provision.
- 7.3 A move to supported living will produce potential savings of £303,000 for Option 1 and £378,000 for Option 2 (after an agreed period of TUPE protection). To test the viability of the savings for Option 2 formal market testing will be carried out to confirm there is interest in the market and to confirm that the predicted savings will be achieved.
- 7.4 Costings quoted in this report are based on initial market testing and the number of proposed hours to be delivered, however when compared to benchmarking costs against other neighbouring local authorities these savings appear to be realistic. The actual cost of the contract will form the basis of the negotiation with any successful provider.
- 7.5 One off additional costs of £32,000 has been identified to ensure that the Council follows statutory requirements to provide best interest/Dols applications and Court of Protection orders to support the residents with the transfer to a supported living model. This one-off cost will be funded from the savings identified in year 1.
- 7.6 The actual costs associated with the TUPE transfer are unknown but will be considered and resolved as part of the contract negotiations with the selected provider. [AS/30102015/F]

## **8.0 Legal implications**

- 8.1 There are legal implications associated with this report. A contract would be required between City of Wolverhampton Council and the RSL, a new care and support provider would need to be tendered for and contracted with, and any change of provider or external outsourcing of the service would likely bring about the transfer of staff, subject to the provisions of the Transfer of Undertakings (Protection of Employment) Regulations 2006 ("TUPE"), as later amended.
- 8.2 Applications to the Court of Protection will be needed in some instances. These are required for all adults assessed as not having capacity to make a decision about changes to their living arrangements.  
[RB/22092015/B]

## **9.0 Equalities implications**

- 9.1 Equality analysis (EA) has been undertaken, using the individual community care assessments and the personal profiles developed for each resident. The analysis indicates that there is the potential for differential impacts to be felt by some of the residents should a decision to move to a supported living model be approved. A bespoke individual action plan will be developed for every resident to describe the steps the Council are taking to minimise these impacts.

## **10.0 Environmental implications**

10.1 There are no environmental implications associated with this report.

## **11.0 Human resources implications**

11.1 There are human resource implications associated with this report as it recommends a restructure of the service and a transfer under TUPE regulations. This will be completed in line with human resource policies and procedures.

## **12.0 Corporate landlord implications**

12.1 There are corporate landlord implications as there is an option to transfer the building to a Registered Social Landlord, taking it out of the corporate landlord portfolio. Should this report be approved a further report will be prepared for Cabinet Resources Panel seeking approval for said transfer to take place.

## **13.0 Schedule of background papers**

13.1 Outcome of consultation on the future of In House Services March 2015.