



Leicester  
City Council

Minutes of the Meeting of the  
ADULT SOCIAL CARE SCRUTINY COMMISSION

Held: TUESDAY, 16 JULY 2019 at 5:30 pm

P R E S E N T :

Councillor Joshi (Chair)  
Councillor March (Vice Chair)

Councillor Batool  
Councillor Kaur Saini

Councillor Thalukdar

Councillor Khote  
Councillor Kitterick

In Attendance

\* \* \* \* \*

**1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies were received from Ruth Lake. Those present were informed Councillor Kitterick would join the meeting at a later time.

**2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Cllr Joshi declared an Other Disclosable Interest in that his wife worked for the Reablement Team in Leicester City Council.

In accordance with the Council's Code of Conduct, the interest was not considered so significant that it was likely to prejudice the Councillor's judgement of the public interest. Councillor Joshi was not therefore required to withdraw from the meeting during consideration and discussion of the agenda items.

**3. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

AGREED:

1. That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Adult Social Care Scrutiny Commission held on 19<sup>th</sup> March 2019 be confirmed as a correct record.
2. Information on Norton House would be circulated to Commission Members

3. An update on the Learning Disabilities Strategy and employment opportunities to be brought to a future meeting.

#### **4. TERMS OF REFERENCE**

AGREED:

That the Terms of Reference for the Adult Social Care Scrutiny Commission be noted.

#### **5. MEMBERSHIP OF THE ADULT SOCIAL CARE SCRUTINY COMMISSION 2019/20**

AGREED:

That the membership for the Adult Social Care Scrutiny Commission for 2019/20 be noted.

#### **6. DATES OF MEETINGS FOR THE ADULT SOCIAL CARE SCRUTINY COMMISSION 2019/20**

Members were asked to note the meeting dates of the Adult Social Care Scrutiny Commission for the 2019/20 municipal year scheduled as follows:

16 July 2019  
10 September 2019  
29 October 2019  
17 December 2019  
4 February 2020  
31 March 2020

All meetings to commence at 5.30pm.

AGREED:

That the meeting dates of the Adult Social Care Scrutiny Commission for 2019/20 be noted.

#### **7. PETITIONS**

The Monitoring Officer reported that no petitions had been received.

#### **8. QUESTIONS, REPRESENTATIONS AND STATEMENTS OF CASE**

The Monitoring Officer reported that no questions, representations or statements of case had been received.

#### **9. DEMENTIA STRATEGY: ACTION PLANS**

The Strategic Director Social Care and Education submitted a report to update the Scrutiny Commission on the development and implementation of the Joint Social Care and Health Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Dementia Strategy 2019 to 2022.

Bev White, Lead Commissioner, was present and provided the following additional information.

- A dementia forum will be established and meeting in September around the time of World Alzheimer's Day to further develop the implementation plan. Details of the meeting would be sent to Commission Members.
- The strategy covers Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland (LLR) and will run for three years.
- There are five workstreams – the Supporting Well workstream falls to the City Council to deliver and is led by Bev White.

In response to Members' questions and requests, the following was noted:

- There was no statutory duty to complete a Dementia Strategy, but it was considered good practice and important locally to ensure resources were pooled in a constructive manner to provide the best level of care for dementia patients.
- A demographic breakdown of the 116 responses to the consultation on the strategy would be circulated to Commission Members.
- A General Practitioner (GP) recording template had been developed to reflect particular needs of people presenting with dementia, and had been adopted by the majority of GP practices. The presentation delivered to the Programme Board would be circulated to Commission Members for information.
- Micheal Smith (Healthwatch Leicester) stated that work undertaken with Healthwatch England and the CCG on engaging with dementia patients and carers would be shared with the Lead Commissioner.
- Good support was received from the Housing Department who have recruited large numbers of Dementia Friends which helps raise awareness of dementia generally. Also, a number of customer services staff had become dementia friends.
- The city had a high rate of diagnosis which is positive in then allowing people to seek support. Dementia is not exclusively an older persons' condition. The city had worked very hard with the CCG to raise the profile of dementia, particularly via primary care services.
- With regards to the action to contribute to a review of dementia training, it had arisen through feedback around the quality of personal care, particularly those in residential care. A review of training had commenced, and once available training was mapped out and its success evaluated, then it would be possible to develop recommendations.
- Care staff received a mixture of training. For those commissioned by the Council, there would be specific dementia training: on the job, in the workplace and external, and some before joining, but all staff were required to reach a certain level of care which was checked through contract monitoring arrangements. It was noted that family carers did not necessarily receive training but information and support is available to them through the commissioned support service.
- The placement of some dementia patients was still sometimes a challenge,

particularly around those with behaviour challenges and was being looked at across LLR.

- The city did not reflect the national picture, and no-one sat waiting in hospital if they were ready for discharge and had dementia. Patients would be moved into a temporary setting until a permanent position could be found, or a package would be developed so they could return home.
- There were a number of voluntary services, memory cafes, Alzheimer's Society, Age UK amongst others that offered services, and were a good source of support, advice and information to people.
- An Alzheimer's Society memory walk would take place on Sunday 22<sup>nd</sup> September.

Cllr Kitterick arrived at the meeting at 18.13pm. There were no declarations of interest made.

AGREED:

1. That the report be noted.
2. Details of the dementia forum meeting to be sent to Commission Members.
3. A demographic breakdown of the 116 responses to the consultation on the strategy would be circulated to Commission Members.
4. A presentation delivered to the Programme Board would be circulated to Commission Members.
5. Micheal Smith to share Healthwatch England work on dementia with ASC Officers
6. A report would be brought back to the Adult Social Care Scrutiny Commission meeting on 17<sup>th</sup> December 2019, along with the Action Plan.

## **10. EXTRA CARE HOUSING UPDATE INCLUDING PLANNED SCHEMES**

The Strategic Director Social Care and Education submitted a presentation setting out the plans and modelling schemes for Extra Care Housing and is attached to the minutes for information.

Tracie Rees, Director Adult Social Care and Commissioning delivered the presentation and the following additional points were made:

- Introduced in 2014/15, Extra Care had to be put on hold during Government consultation.
- The two schemes would provide a total of 155 1 and 2 bed apartments and was another option to provide vulnerable people with independence in a supported living environment. The Care Quality Commission were supportive of the approach and design of the buildings.
- Hamelin Road would be a two-storey building with 75 flats. Planning permission had been approved.
- Tilling Road would also be a two-storey building with 80 flats and planning permission had also been approved. Both sites would have on-site cafés to encourage the local community to use the buildings.

- Extra care being developed in the city was different and would be for people over the age of 18 (and not 55).

The Chair said the news was warmly welcomed.

In response to Members' questions and observations, the following was noted:

- Places for People Group Ltd. had had mixed reviews but had done some good work to support vulnerable people. . Only those that had adult social care needs would go into the scheme. The contract monitoring would ensure that that the landlord adhered to good quality care and contractual agreements.
- Concern was raised over the size of the developments and how the design would safeguard the mixed ages of vulnerable adults. Abbey Mills was given as an example of how a mix of ages, and the care and support provided worked. The size of the development also brought in a community element because of the scale. A landlord managed the site, and care was delivered by a range of providers to the individual service user. Members asked for more detail on how the sites would be managed and support to be provided. Information on onsite care provision would be provided to Commission Members when available.
- There were mechanisms in place to support individuals to ensure they were not taken advantage of. Residents would also have a tenancy agreement which gave them added security. There had been no incidences at Danbury Gardens or Abbey Mills that had not been brought to the attention of Adult Social Care. It was explained that Danbury Gardens did have a few teething problems at its inception, as would be expected in a development of its size, but it has proved to be a good model of care for the people residing there.
- Ashley House is a private company and is providing the majority of the finance to develop the two schemes. The housing management would be provided by Places for People and as a Registered Provider it will enable people to claim the higher rate of Housing Benefit.
- Extra Care stemmed from sheltered housing with additional care and filled the gap between sheltered housing and residential care. Within extra care there was a range of facilities, for example, café, restaurant, cinema, but were dependent on where they were located.
- The schemes would be monitored 24/7 to support residents that required that level of support.
- At the time of the original proposal in 2014, public consultation took place around both sites.

The Chair recommended that with the fine example of Danbury Gardens and Abbey Mills, which functioned well and the people who lived there supported, and the local amenities in the area which promoted independence, that Members visit the venues. The Strategic Director Social Care and Education to arrange site visits of the venues if required.

AGREED:

1. That the presentation be noted.
2. Information on onsite care provision (management and support)

- to be provided to the Commission Members when available.
3. It was recommended that Members visit Danbury Gardens and Abbey Mills – the Strategic Director Social Care and Education to arrange if required.

## **11. BROKERAGE TEAM MONITORING REPORT**

The Strategic Director Social Care and Education submitted a report which updated the Scrutiny Commission on the implementation of the Brokerage Service and details of its achievements and performance in the first six months of operation.

The Strategic Director Social Care and Education introduced the update report which outlined the changes on how care packages for domiciliary care and residential care was arranged, which was now a centralised process.

Andy Humpherson, Group Manager Contracts & Assurance, presented the report and the following additional points were made:

- The service was responsible for securing residential care placements and domiciliary care for a range of vulnerable adults eligible for Adult Social Care support.
- Over the winter period the Service had not seen any deterioration in the support provided.
- The Service had been in operation for six months and had a positive start.
- An example on how there were some difficulties in gathering market intelligence was Asian Lifestyle services for older persons. The Team were currently keeping a log of issues.

In response to Members' questions, the following information was provided:

- Adult Social Care had concluded a huge exercise and consultation on residential care fee rates, had finished fee negotiations and refreshed bands.
- Individuals in residential care would not be moved without due regard and an appropriate place to go and would ensure it was appropriate and not to the detriment of the individual. All moves are discussed with the individual and/or family members as appropriate. Data on moves and reasons for them would be provided to Commission Members.
- The brokerage system did not take out the social workers input for assessing need against criteria. The social worker still liaised with the individual/families/carers and would then hand over to the Brokerage team to source the identified service. The team would then go to providers, and if there were complex needs, would speak with families, social workers, etc. to discuss what would be provided.
- The Brokerage Team knew who had availability and capacity because of their connection with suppliers.
- The Service was working well with positive feedback. There was internal performance monitoring to demonstrate that what the Service was doing was effective and efficient. Members requested the future reports include

service user feedback, and to provide a timeline for new services.

The Chair thanked the officer for the report and requested an evaluation report be brought to a future Commission meeting in six months.

AGREED:

1. That the report be noted.
2. Data on those who had been moved out of residential care and the reasons for doing so to be provided to Commission Members.
3. That an evaluation report be brought to a future meeting of the Commission in six months.

## **12. ADULT SOCIAL CARE INTEGRATED PERFORMANCE REPORT: QUARTER 4**

The Strategic Director Social Care and Education submitted and presented a report to the Commission which brought together information on various dimensions of adult social care performance in the final quarter of 2018/19. Members of the Commission were asked to note the areas of positive achievement and areas for improvement as highlighted in the report, to comment on the content and format of the report to inform the development of reporting for 2019/20 to meet the Commission's requirements.

Steven Forbes, Strategic Director Social Care and Education presented the report, and the following additional points were made:

- 78% of services users said their quality of life had improved very much or completely as a result of support and services – the aim was to improve the ASCOF 'quality of life' score.
- Most local authorities had the challenge of safeguarding individuals. Completion of safeguarding enquiries within 28 days was the Authority's own benchmark and target, but there but there was no time limit to conclude a safeguarding case and outcomes.
- The Department spent £104million on budget and transferred £5.8million to reserves a year in advance.
- There was a £5million growth pressure every year, and without further funding the Service would be in crisis next year. It was suggested that when the Government's Green Paper was released, a Scrutiny Review might be beneficial and of interest to the Commission.
- Workforce data for Q3 and Q4 was not available as the service moved from one IT system to another but would be available in future reports.
- Overall the number of older persons under new contacts only went up by seven people, though it was reported there was an increasing demand of medical help for people of working age.

Councillor Russell, Deputy City Mayor Social Care and Anti-Poverty, asked for the report to be re-formatted to show tolerance levels to provide a sense to Members of how service provision and outcomes changed. Members also requested displays of data using bar / pie charts would also assist. Members

were asked to provide the Deputy City Mayor with suggestions for the re-working of the document. Councillor Kitterick offered to look at the document.

The Strategic Director Social Care and Education asked Members to provide him with suggestions of what they would like to see in the document.

Members observed that under non-statutory targets, a quarter of people's needs were not being met and queried what plans were in place to bring the figure down. It was noted that the primary duty of the Department was to safeguard individuals, and Section 42 of the Care Act 2014 was the threshold for a safeguarding investigation. Some responsibility was devolved to NHS partners. Measures were different across Adult and Children's Departments.

Members noted that three measures in ASCOF were not adequately supporting carers, and what more could be done to support them. It was noted that carers eligibility was introduced in 2015 as a national issue, and the Department was confident the threshold was applied.

Members noted that 78% service users said quality of life had improved, therefore 22% felt the same or worse. The Strategic Director Social Care and Education there was a necessary discussion to be had on why things improve / didn't improve, but factors could include what issues a person presented with initially.

The Chair thanked the Strategic Director Social Care and Education for the report.

AGREED:

1. That the report be noted.
2. A regular report be received at future meetings of the Scrutiny commission.
3. ASC to invite Scrutiny Members and Micheal Smith (Healthwatch Leicester) to a reference group to test the new format of report.

### **13. WORK PROGRAMME**

Members were asked to note and comment on the Adult Social Care Scrutiny Commission work programme.

AGREED:

1. Scrutiny Policy Officer to add items from the Manifesto related to the work of this commission.
2. To complete a scoping document for a review into the Adult Social Care Workforce care to look at training / workforce gaps.
3. ASC to circulate the National minimum data set to commission members.



**14. ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS**

There being no other items of urgent business, the meeting closed at 8:20pm