

# Executive Decision Report

---

Review of Adult Social Care  
Non-Statutory Support Services  
(Previously known as Housing  
Related Support/Supporting  
People)

Date: 7<sup>th</sup> January 2014

Lead Director: Tracie Rees

---

## Useful information

- Ward(s) affected: All
- Report author: Caroline Ryan
- Author contact details: 454 2394
- Report version number: V19

## 1. Summary

- 1.1 The Executive gave approval in May 2013 to consult on proposals to remodel the Adult Social Care (ASC) Non-Statutory Support Services (previously known as Housing Related Support/Supporting People) to deliver the required savings as set out in the budget setting process.
- 1.2 Housing Related Support (HRS) delivers non-statutory support to a range of vulnerable adults in the City. It offers low level support that helps to support people to live independently. Existing eligibility for services is based upon whether a person is in receipt of housing benefit.
- 1.3 The current budget is £2.4 million per year, has been reduced to £1.7 million per year, requiring a remodelling of Housing Related Support to continue to provide support, whilst saving of £710k. This means the existing services cannot continue.
- 1.4 A statutory consultation exercise ran from 19<sup>th</sup> August to the 20<sup>th</sup> November 2013 and sought views on:
  - To move to generic model of 'non-statutory' floating support to service users assessed as needing low level support.
  - To stop funding community alarms and wardens services in sheltered housings schemes.
- 1.5 Views were sought on the proposed new model (see appendix 1 Methodology and consultation report of the statutory consultation) for:
  - Alarm only services (for people living in Registered Social Landlord (RSL) accommodation)
  - Sheltered Support (for people living in RSL sheltered accommodation)
  - Supported Housing Support (for people living in RSL accommodation)
  - Floating Support (support in peoples own home)
- 1.6 After considering the consultation findings, this report seeks the Executive's approval to introduce a new model, which is different to the original proposals. This is outlined in section 3.
- 1.7 This new model will still deliver the required efficiency savings and address the concerns raised during the statutory consultation exercise.

## 2. Recommendations

- 2.1 The Executive is asked to approve:
  - a. An amendment to the original proposal as a consequence of the statutory consultation as detailed at Option 3.

3. Options for consideration:
- 3.1 The options considered as part of the remodelling exercise included:
- 3.2 Option 1 – To continue with the current service deliver model.
- Advantages – The existing services will continue and service users will be unaffected.
- Disadvantages - This is not an option because the current model operates beyond its financial limits.
- 3.3 Option 2 – To implement the original proposal to move to generic model of ‘non-statutory’ floating support to service users assessed as needing low level support within their own homes. To stop funding community alarms and wardens services in sheltered housings schemes and again to move to a generic model of non-statutory ‘floating’ support.
- Advantages – The new model provided an opportunity to personalise services and would have offered better value for money.
- Disadvantages – Through the consultation process, service user expressed concern about the impact of the original proposals, especially relating to the loss of the community alarm system and the on-site support in sheltered and supported housing. An amended set of proposals has been developed to respond to the main concerns expressed through the consultation, whilst still meeting the required efficiency savings.
- 3.4 Option 3 – Changed proposal following statutory consultation. This is summarised below.
- 3.5 Alarm only provision:  
Original proposal:
- To stop paying the cost of alarm only services
  - Current costs £16,500
  - Supporting 130 service users (older people / people with a physical or sensory disability) living in Registered Social Landlord (RSL) accommodation
- Changed proposal following consultation
- To continue to pay for alarm only services of £16,500
  - Continue to fund existing 130 service users
  - To stop paying for new service users
- 3.6 Sheltered Housing Support:  
Original proposal:
- To only provide support to those assessed as eligible (lower than statutory Adult Social Care (ASC) criteria)
  - To no longer fund the cost of the alarm service or warden service
  - Current costs £493,000

- Continue to support an estimated 661 service users (older people) eligible for support – this would be floating support for those living in RSL accommodation for those assessed as in need under new eligibility criteria and in receipt of welfare benefits

Changed proposal following consultation

- To provide core on-site support e.g. a warden for up to 15 hours per week per site
- To stop funding the alarm service
- To provide individuals with additional floating support if they meet the assessment criteria and are in receipt of a welfare benefit
- New cost £330,200 (saving 163k)
- It is anticipated that 661 service users (older people) will continue to be eligible for support, this is likely to be a mixture of on-site warden support and floating support

### 3.7 Supported Housing Support

Original proposal:

- To stop providing core on-site support
- To only provide floating support to those assessed as in need under new criteria and in receipt of welfare benefits
- Current costs £955,700
- Supporting 114 service users (people with Learning Disabilities or Mental Health problems) living in RSL accommodation

Changed proposal following consultation

- To continue to provide some core on-site support only e.g. supported housing worker for up to 5 hours per person per week
- To provide individuals with additional floating support if they meet the assessment criteria and are in receipt of a welfare benefit
- New cost £330,200 (saving £625,500k)
- Supporting 114 service users (people with Learning Disabilities or Mental Health problems)

### 3.8 Floating Support i.e. a support worker visiting people at home

Original proposal:

- To introduce an assessment process to determine need
- Current costs £949,500
- Supporting 241 service users (Learning Disabilities, Mental Health, HIV-AIDs/Physical Disability) living in different types of tenures across the city

Original proposal remains unchanged

- It is estimated that a saving of £77k will be made through more cost effective contracting
- Therefore 241 service users (people with Learning Disabilities or Mental Health problems HIV-AIDs/Physical Disability) will continue to receive support, if assessed as in need under new criteria and in receipt of welfare benefits

## 4. Outcome of the Consultation Exercise

- 4.1 A total of 1146 customers were written to advising them of the proposals. There were letters specific for each sector (sheltered housing, alarms, supported housing and floating support). This offered people an opportunity to:
- attend a focus group during the consultation period
  - complete a questionnaire
  - and provided them with a fact sheet
- 4.2 Aside from the individual contact we put in place a consultation telephone helpline, which people rang to:
- book places at focus group meetings
  - complete questionnaires over the telephone
  - to get general support and guidance throughout the consultation exercise.
- 4.3 Finally a consultation web page was created allowing people to register their comments / views on the consultation proposals.
- 4.4 A reminder to register comments, complete questionnaires or attend focus groups was sent out via the sector to customer's midway through the process.
- 4.5 The overall response rate from those affected was 64% and is summarised below (table 1).

Sector	Total Users	Responses	Response %
Community Alarms	130	102	78%
Floating Support Service	241	99	41%
Sheltered Housing	661	418	63%
Supported Housing	114	105	92%
Online Survey	N/A	14	N/A
<b>Total</b>	<b>1146</b>	<b>741</b>	<b>64%</b>

Table 1

- 4.6 During the consultation a number of interest groups were targeted including the Forum for Older People, Carers Forum and the 50+ Network to note any comments or concerns and for these to be considered.
- 4.7 Meetings were held in response to direct requests from a range of schemes including John Woolman House, Self-Funders across Sheltered Housing and Harrison Court. These comments were fed into the consultation report.
- 4.8 Two petitions were submitted to the Council during the consultation period. The petitions have come from those affected by the proposal for sheltered housing customers, friends, family and the general public. The petitions campaigned for continued Leicester City Council funding to provide sheltered housing support.
- 4.9 A full methodology and consultation report of the statutory consultation provides a detailed breakdown, analysis and records of focus group meetings (see appendix 1). Responses to this proposal were drawn from the questionnaires, focus group meetings, letters, web consultation pages, petition submissions and

phone calls.

#### Headline findings

- 4.10 The consultation process gathered a wide range of responses from customers who receive alarm services (in alarm only and sheltered housing) sheltered housing support services, supported housing and floating support services, providers of service and other interested stakeholders.
- 4.11 It was clear from the majority of those who responded that people did not want services to change and wanted the Council to continue funding the provision. Service users and their families expressed concern about the potential loss of regular support and/ or potentially having to pay for the alarm service, which provides reassurance. A large proportion felt that it unfairly affected some of the most vulnerable members of society.

#### Alarm only provision

- 4.12 The main theme from alarm customers was that this service provides critical reassurance. It also offers a safety net and there was concern about likely financial hardship if they had to pay the costs. There were concerns raised about the loss of service and officers reassured customers that the proposal was to end the subsidy not to close the alarm service. The service benefits RSL tenants, where there is no other on-site support. The existing contract provides funding for up to 171 service users, however, on average there are 130 users at any one time. The RSL's have confirmed that the numbers using the service has been static over the last 12 months.

#### Sheltered Housing Support

- 4.13 The main theme from sheltered housing customers was that the proposal for support would leave older people vulnerable; it doesn't support ageing well and would destroy the sheltered housing model. It was also stated that the proposals were at odds with the Older Persons Charter, whose main theme is to improve the quality of life of older people.
- 4.14 It was noted that an unintended consequence of the proposal was that it penalised self-funders who would be left without service (estimated at 42 across the city).

#### Supported Housing

- 4.15 The main themes from supported housing customers, carers, family members and the sector was that this proposal had created great anxiety. The nature of support currently is on-site and consistent and there is concern the proposal won't offer the same level of reassurance, which helps to keep people well and participating in the community.

#### Floating Support

- 4.16 The main themes from floating support customers, families, carers and the sector was very similar to that of supported housing. There was concern about having to manage money, concern they may lose their tenancy if they didn't have support. A number welcomed the opportunity as it would enable them to take control and tailor the support to meet their identified outcome. The model will mitigate where possible against the concerns raised.

## 5. Details of Scrutiny

- 5.1 Discussion has taken place with Contracts and Assurance on the proposed procurement options
- 5.2 Discussion has also taken place with the ASC Transformation Team on the proposed models.
- 5.3 Discussions have been on-going about the proposals with both Finance and Legal Services.
- 5.4 The management of this project is reported to the Transformation Programme Board.
- 5.5 The ASC Prevention Board has overall responsibility for the project, regular reports and updates are provided to offer direction on the future model of service.
- 5.6 The report has been presented to ASC Leadership and at Lead Member briefings.

## 6. Financial, legal and other implications

### 6.1 Financial implications

#### Independent Living Support Financial Implications

There is a requirement to reduce expenditure against these services by £710k. Whilst some reductions in expenditure have been achieved in the current year, these are small in comparison with the £710k budget reduction. Re-designing the service is clearly required in order to deliver the necessary savings.

The revised proposals outlined in this report would reduce expenditure by £710k. Appendix 2 gives an indication breakdown of future expenditure under the proposals, which are summarised below:

Community Alarms	£16,500
Sheltered Housing (Core) (excluding alarms cost)	£330,200
Supported Housing (Core)	£375,500
Floating Support	£872,300
Assessment Team	£110,200
	£1,704,700

For those who receive floating support services, the process of assessment and allocation of money will be critical to the financial sustainability of the model. Care must

be taken to ensure that, through the appropriate application of eligibility criteria, funding does not run out mid-year and is directed to those individuals who will benefit most.

Further work will need to be undertaken to establish the extent to which TUPE will affect the indicative future cost of the service.

Stuart McAvoy, Adult Social Care Accountant – 37 4004

## 6.2 Legal implications

### Contract and Procurement

6.2.1 In procuring the services through any of the options specified above, the Public Contracts Regulations 2006 (as amended) will apply and a tender process will have to be carried out by Leicester City Council. In addition to this, a more modern, robust and up to date service contract is required to cover the terms and conditions relating to the provision of the services. On-going legal advice should be obtained as and when required.

Adeola Sonola, Legal Services 37 1492

### Employment Law Implications

6.2.2 Depending on the option pursued it may be possible that the Transfer of Undertakings (Protection of Employment) Regulations 2006 (“TUPE”) may apply. It is advised that Legal Services are consulted throughout this process to ensure that the Council complies with its legal obligations and any risk to the Council is minimised.

Hayley McDade, Legal Services 37 1431

## 6.3 Climate Change and Carbon Reduction implications

6.3.1 This report does not contain any significant climate change implications and therefore will not have a detrimental effect on the Council’s climate change targets.

Chloe Hardisty (Senior Environmental Consultant, Ext 372252)

## 6.4 Equality Impact Assessment

6.4.1 The revised proposal aims to promote increased self-sufficiency to those living in sheltered and supported housing over time, by providing assessed time limited support services and a core level of on-site support that would reduce concerns raised during consultation on the original proposal.

6.4.2 Consultation feedback identified both positive and negative impacts for current and future users – both types of impacts relate primarily to the protected characteristics of age and disability.

6.4.3 Positive impacts identified were the promotion of choice through a person



centred (assessment) approach. Negative impacts identified were the loss of current services and their potential effect on residents' quality of life, fear/anxiety of some that they could lose their tenancies should their health deteriorate, and general uncertainty about undertaking assessments that would determine their need and service received. Self-funders felt they would be left without any service.

6.4.4 As mitigating action against these negative impacts, the service proposes to engage with current residents as early as possible to explain the assessment process and work with current providers to support that process. The service will also prioritise the review and reassessment of floating support service users to avoid potential stress caused by any delays.

Irene Kszyk, Corporate Equalities Lead 37 4147

6.5 Other Implications (You will need to have considered other implications in preparing this report. Please indicate which ones apply?)

6.5.1 If the revised core model is approved discussions would need to take place with landlords of accommodation if the core model was approved.

7. Background information and other papers:

8. Summary of appendices:

Appendix 1 – Methodology and consultation report of the statutory consultation

Appendix 2 - Calculation of Future Expenditure on Independent Living Services

9. Is this a “key decision”? Yes

10. If a key decision please explain reason

10.1 It potentially will:

- Result in the Council making savings which are, significant having regard to the Council's budget for the service or function to which the decision relates
- It effect communities living or working in two or more wards in the City
- Reductions in recurrent revenue expenditure and savings of over £0.5m p.a. would be achieved
- The extent to which the decision is likely to result in substantial public interest

## Appendix2-CalculationofFuture ExpenditureonIndependentLiving Services

Total Available Budget      £1,704,600

Community Alarms	£16,484	To continue within current funding amount
------------------	---------	---

Sheltered Housing (Core)	£330,174	<p>Based on an assumed number of hours of support being made available each week at each scheme. In practice, given that each individual scheme supports very different numbers of people, there would be a need to adopt a different mechanism for allocating resources.</p> <table style="width: 100%; margin-top: 10px;"> <tr> <td style="width: 80%;">Number of Schemes</td> <td style="text-align: right;">34</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Assumed No. of Core Hrs per week per Scheme</td> <td style="text-align: right;">15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Assumed Hourly Rate of Support</td> <td style="text-align: right;">£12.45</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Total Annual Cost</b></td> <td style="text-align: right; border-top: 1px solid black;"><b>£330,174</b></td> </tr> </table>	Number of Schemes	34	Assumed No. of Core Hrs per week per Scheme	15	Assumed Hourly Rate of Support	£12.45	<b>Total Annual Cost</b>	<b>£330,174</b>
Number of Schemes	34									
Assumed No. of Core Hrs per week per Scheme	15									
Assumed Hourly Rate of Support	£12.45									
<b>Total Annual Cost</b>	<b>£330,174</b>									

Supported Housing (Core)	£375,492	<p>Based on an assumed number of hours of support being made available per person each week. In practice given that each individual scheme supports different numbers of people, there would be a need to adopt a different mechanism for allocating resources.</p> <table style="width: 100%; margin-top: 10px;"> <tr> <td style="width: 80%;">Number of People</td> <td style="text-align: right;">116</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Assumed No. of Core Hrs per week per person</td> <td style="text-align: right;">5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Assumed Hourly Rate of Support</td> <td style="text-align: right;">£12.45</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Total Annual Cost</b></td> <td style="text-align: right; border-top: 1px solid black;"><b>£375,492</b></td> </tr> </table>	Number of People	116	Assumed No. of Core Hrs per week per person	5	Assumed Hourly Rate of Support	£12.45	<b>Total Annual Cost</b>	<b>£375,492</b>
Number of People	116									
Assumed No. of Core Hrs per week per person	5									
Assumed Hourly Rate of Support	£12.45									
<b>Total Annual Cost</b>	<b>£375,492</b>									

Assessment Team	£110,179	<p>Based on the following assumed staffing numbers:</p> <table style="width: 100%; margin-top: 10px; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 30%;"></th> <th style="width: 10%;">FTE's</th> <th style="width: 10%;">Grade</th> <th style="width: 20%;">Cost per FTE (Incl on-costs)</th> <th style="width: 10%;">Total Cost</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Team Manager</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0.5</td> <td style="text-align: center;">8</td> <td style="text-align: right;">£38,102</td> <td style="text-align: right;">£19,051</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Access Worker</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2.5</td> <td style="text-align: center;">6</td> <td style="text-align: right;">£29,843</td> <td style="text-align: right;">£74,608</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Admin Worker</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0.5</td> <td style="text-align: center;">4</td> <td style="text-align: right;">£23,040</td> <td style="text-align: right;">£11,520</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Running Costs</td> <td style="text-align: center;">-</td> <td style="text-align: center;">-</td> <td style="text-align: center;">-</td> <td style="text-align: right;">£5,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: right; border-top: 1px solid black;"><b>£110,179</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		FTE's	Grade	Cost per FTE (Incl on-costs)	Total Cost	Team Manager	0.5	8	£38,102	£19,051	Access Worker	2.5	6	£29,843	£74,608	Admin Worker	0.5	4	£23,040	£11,520	Running Costs	-	-	-	£5,000					<b>£110,179</b>
	FTE's	Grade	Cost per FTE (Incl on-costs)	Total Cost																												
Team Manager	0.5	8	£38,102	£19,051																												
Access Worker	2.5	6	£29,843	£74,608																												
Admin Worker	0.5	4	£23,040	£11,520																												
Running Costs	-	-	-	£5,000																												
				<b>£110,179</b>																												

Floating Support Services	£872,271	Remaining amount for distribution based on assessments of need, and the maximisation of outcomes for customers.
---------------------------	----------	---

Total Future Expenditure      £1,704,600

