



## Adult Social Care Committee

Minutes of the Meeting Held on Monday, 08 October 2018  
at 10:00am in the Edwards Room, County Hall, Norwich

### Present:

Mr B Borrett (Chairman)

Mr T Adams

Miss K Clipsham

Mrs S Gurney (Vice-Chair)

Mr D Harrison

Mrs B Jones

Mr J Mooney

Mr G Peck

Mr W Richmond

Mr M Sands

Mr H Thirtle

Mr B Watkins

Mrs S Young

### 1. Apologies

1.1 No apologies were received.

### 2. Minutes

2.1 The minutes of the meeting held on 03 September 2018 were agreed as an accurate record and signed by the Chairman.

### 3. Declarations of Interest

3.1 Mr H Thirtle declared an "other interest" under item 12, "Living Well" related to his property portfolio; disabled people lived in two of the units he owned.

### 4. Urgent Business

4.1 There were no items of urgent business discussed.

### 5. Public Question Time

5.1 No public questions were received.

### 6. Local Member Questions / Issues

6.1 No local member questions were received.

### 7. Executive Director's Update

7.1 The Executive Director of Adult Social Care updated the Committee on:

- Work by Cllr Brociek-Coulton to develop the Carers' Charter for Norfolk, which would be presented at the next meeting of Full Council on 15 October 2018
- Extra winter money announced by the Secretary of State at a recent Conservative Party Conference; this one-off funding would be to help the NHS free up beds and was likely to have conditions attached. Norfolk would receive approximately £4m

from the funding; the Executive Director of Adult Social Services welcomed this but felt it was not a substitute for sustainable medium-term funding for social care

- The findings of the Adult Social Care peer review; the review had found services were safe, with good collaboration with NHS colleagues. There was more work to do with transfers of care and developing a “home first” culture. A report and plans from this would be brought to a future Committee meeting
- Social Care recruitment had not changed over the past month; social work vacancies were at 39 full time equivalent and vacancies for occupational therapy had stayed the same, but there was low use of agency workers. Work had started on recruitment of apprentices for social work; 10 would be recruited at first

- 7.2.1 The Executive Director of Adult Social Services **agreed** to send information to Mrs B Jones about the size of the waiting list for the SCCE (Social Care Centre for Expertise).
- 7.2.2 The Autism Strategy had been reviewed by the Autism All Age Partnership Board; they would sign it off before it went to the Health & Wellbeing Board and Adult Social Care Committee in early 2019.
- 7.2.3 Recruitment to social work vacancies continued to be promoted including by targeting people at events, working with universities and through raising the profile of Norfolk.

## **8. Chairman’s Update**

- 8.1 The Chairman updated the Committee on:  
Findings from the peer review; the peers had found political leadership to be strong and consistent and he thanked the Committee for their role in this  
His attendance at STP (Sustainability and Transformation Partnership) meetings since the Committee last met; he noted the challenges of bodies working together to focus on patients / residents. An update would be given at the next Health and Wellbeing Board meeting
- 8.2 There was concern raised about the delay in bringing the Autism Strategy to Committee. The Chairman noted that co-production could cause timescale delays as other bodies had their own timetables to meet; he pointed out that the Autism All Age Partnership also had an interest in getting the strategy in place

## **9. Update from Members of the Committee about internal and external bodies that they sit on**

- 9.1 Mrs B Jones had attended meetings of the Norfolk and Norwich association of the Blind, the first Pride event for disabled people, and a Making It Real Group meeting.
- 9.2 Mr M Sands had attended a meeting with the Chair of the Trust for Bowthorpe workshops; at the meeting, concerns were discussed about the level of financial support trainees were given to attend workshops. In response to the question, the Director said that there should be no reason for any change in the support trainees were given.
- 9.3 Mrs S Young:
  - Had attended a Board Meeting of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital Trust who had a robust programme of improvements planned
  - Was involved in the “Falls Prevention Strategy”, now called “Healthy Aging”, to address the risk of falls, frailty and loneliness in the elderly and put in place strategy for prevention. A hackathon was planned for November
- 9.4 Mr H Thirtle visited Centre 81, who ran day care for people in Yarmouth; they had re-identified their ambitions and core values and now focussed on providing good quality,

9.5 affordable training and good quality care for disabled people in the Yarmouth area.

The Vice Chair:

- Had attended the NorseCare awards on behalf of Norfolk County Council
- Would be a judge for the Norfolk Care Awards in November 2018
- Was planning with Officers a Making It Real group meeting for November
- As local Cllr for Hellesdon had given a talk to the Salvation Army about welfare and access to care

9.6 Mr T Smith would circulate a written update to the Committee following a meeting he was due to attend later in the week.

## **10. Adult Social Care Finance Monitoring Report Period 10 (January) 2017-18**

10.1.1 The Committee considered the financial monitoring report based on information to the end of August 2018, showing variations from the budget, progress against planned savings and a summary of the use of the improved better care fund (iBCF).

10.1.2 The Finance Business Partner, Adult Social Services, reported that the business risk reserve at paragraph 2.10 was not forecast at that time to be needed with risks anticipated to be mitigated in-year; there was a related “invest to save” which could draw down £150,000.

10.2 Officers responded to queries from Members:

- The Finance Business Partner, Adult Social Services, clarified that 13,000 service users were being supported at the time; the number had steadied after a decrease in recent years, projections going forward were different for each service and demand management would not necessarily be met through service user reductions in all cases. For some services, such as services for people with mental health needs, there was unlikely to be a reduction in service users, but different approaches would lead to reductions in the average cost of packages of care.
- Teams responsible for purchase of care had developed recovery plans to focus actions to manage within the agreed budget. Some savings may not be made in the planned timescale. Mitigation included increase in income through more shared care packages with health organisations and closer working with clients which had led to more contributions towards care
- The Executive Director of Adult Social Services confirmed that trusted assessors were funded through the iBCF. They were in hospital teams to act on behalf of independent care providers as a point of contact and to assess people’s readiness to move back into a care environment
- Personal budgets were provided to meet a person’s needs, therefore some “wants” may not be able to be provided for; this was recognised as an area of difficulty
- It was confirmed that estimates for the NorseCare inflation gap could be a challenge as assumptions had to be made early in the year, which can lead to variations against the budget
- The Finance Business Partner, Adult Social Services, reported that there was no backlog for achieving the financial assessments for service users. For various reasons, some people did not disclose all their benefits which could lead to complaints later; the overall number of complaints to the ombudsman were small
- In response to a concern that assessment facilitators were not in Mental Health Hospitals, the Executive Director of Adult Social Services replied that all primary care services could hold mental health cases. Dedicated Mental Health initiatives were shown in the report
- The Director of Integrated Commissioning confirmed that the 6 extra mental health beds created were to support people coming out of hospital before returning home

- Mrs B Jones was concerned that some providers were unwilling or didn't provide appropriate services for people with Mental Health issues to spend their personal budget. The Director of Integrated Commissioning asked for examples so this could be followed up
- The Director of Integrated Commissioning confirmed that additional staff under the new service from "Together" was for an integrated housing community for mental health support, provided at an earlier stage in people's lives; supported housing remained for people with long term issues
- The Executive Director of Adult Social Services confirmed that Norfolk County Council did not have a scheme which punished or rewarded senior managers' pay if targets were or were not met
- The announcement by the Prime Minister that austerity would end was raised and queried whether the Committee would look again at how to help those in greatest need if funding became available. The Chairman agreed that it was the role of the Committee to protect the vulnerable people of Norfolk and whilst the fun was welcome, he noted that one-off funding was not a substitute for long term funding from Government and would have to be used carefully to mitigate against future budget gaps

- 10.3 With 8 votes for and 5 abstentions the Committee **RESOLVED** to **AGREE**
- a) The forecast outturn position at Period 5 for the 2018-19 Revenue Budget of a £1.990m overspend
  - b) The planned use of reserves totalling £6.038m, which was below the original level agreed

## 11. Risk Management

11.1 The Committee received the risk report with risks shown on an exception basis; since the last meeting the risk register had been reviewed by the Senior Management Team and the Risk Management Officer.

11.2 Officers responded to queries from Members:

- Concern was raised about RM14247 (Failure in the Care Market) being rated Amber. The Director of Integrated Commissioning reported there was a national shortage of nurses; there had been a loss in nursing beds and an increase in residential beds as nursing beds had converted to residential. Norfolk had appropriate resource in the market and Norfolk County Council were working with the CQC (Care Quality Commission) so Officers felt this risk could be rated Amber
- A Member raised the issue of Burnham House, which the CQC had rated excellent, being proposed for closure; the Chairman clarified that the home was run by NorseCare who had put this proposal forward and he suggested Members fed comments into their consultation
- In relation to risk RM023 (failure to respond to changes to demography, funding & Government policy, with particular regard to Adults Services) a Member asked how well Adult Social Care tracked policies, trends and forecasts; the Executive Director of Adult Social Services felt Officers understood demography and demand very well and confirmed there was a detailed demand management model in place.
- In relation to RM13926, (failure to meet budget savings) a Member asked why it had been necessary for Operational teams to create in-year recovery plans to address the forecast overspend; the Executive Director of Adult Social Services replied that these would help to ensure the department mitigated against the risk of being further overspent in 2018-19. In further support of this, an Assistant Director of Hospital Systems would help reduce Delayed Transfers of Care
- It was noted that RM14237 (Deprivation of Liberty Safeguarding (DoLS)) was red;

the Assistant Director of Social Work confirmed that the Council understood the risk caused by backlog of this work and had adopted e-DoLS to help them take on the high-priority cases. All Councils were awaiting the ruling on DoLS and the Mental Capacity Act Amendment Bill, which should pass through the House of Commons by March 2019; Norfolk's DoLS policy was in line with other Councils'

- The Executive Director of Adult Social Services noted that the Green Paper should now also contain proposals for young disabled people
- The importance of instructing staff at failing care homes such as Gorselands about DoLS was queried; the Director of Integrated Commissioning confirmed that staff had been working with this home and continued to do so

- 11.3 With 8 votes for, 3 against and 2 abstentions the Committee **RESOLVED** to:
- a) **AGREE** to the closure of Risk RM019
  - b) **AGREE** to the change in the title and description for Risk RM023
  - c) **AGREE** to the increase in the target risk score from 6 - 9 for Risk RM14247 for the target likelihood of meeting the risk by the target date
  - d) **NOTE** Adult Social Services' input into Risk RM022 which was on the corporate Risk Register

## 12. Living Well – Homes for Norfolk

- 12.1.1 The Committee considered the report outlining the strategy for a range of housing options to help people maintain independence and have appropriate supported housing available in the right locations, at the right time and with the right characteristics to support the department fulfil its vision of keeping people independent
- 12.1.2 The Director of Integrated Commissioning reported that the project would run over five years; money had not been allocated to each year as Officers wanted providers to approach them with proposals. The programme was a proactive response to the risk of the private housing sector not providing enough accommodation.
- 12.2.1 Members discussed the positives this project would provide for older people by giving alternatives for those who did not wish to go into a care home.
- 12.2.2 The Director of Integrated Commissioning confirmed that housing schemes would be developed with a bespoke business case and mixed tenure; this meant social care would use some of the units while others would be for market rent or shared ownership. Work carried out had found that more care was needed around market towns. A detailed strategy had been developed showing the need for care and homes across Norfolk. If unaffordable care or care outside the strategy area was proposed, the Council could choose not to support it.
- 12.2.3 The Director of Integrated Commissioning reported that Officers were looking at the principles for a housing programme for younger people; it had been suggested that it may not be cost effective to subsidise working age accommodation.
- 12.2.4 The Chairman applauded the scale and ambition of the project, developed as a direct result of the strategy adopted by the Committee,
- 12.3 The Committee unanimously **AGREED**:
- a) To set up a housing programme to encourage and speed up the delivery of extra care housing in Norfolk:
  - b) On privately owned land, setting up a capital contribution process to support the development of extra care housing.
  - c) On publicly owned land, following the most appropriate process when bringing forward extra care schemes. This may include the establishment of a

developer/provider framework or individual procurement process depending on the source of the land and stakeholders involved.

- d) To fund programme costs of £150k per year
- e) To **RECOMMEND** to the Policy and Resources Committee that Norfolk County Council funds capital investment up to £29m over the life of the programme

### 13. Strategic and Financial Planning 2019-20 to 2021-22

- 13.1.1 The Committee received the report giving an update on the Committee's detailed planning to feed into Norfolk County Council's budget process for 2019-20 and Adult Social Care Committee's specific proposals for savings for developing options agreed at the Committee's meeting in September 2018 to be considered and recommended to Policy and Resources Committee.
- 13.2.1 A Member raised concern about the minimum income guarantee being amended in line with government guidance and the impact this would have on peoples' independence and social inclusion.
- 13.2.2 Some Members were concerned about what they perceived as being cuts being described as savings, and about these cuts to Adult Social Care department budgets.
- 13.2.3 The Chairman responded to these concerns that the Committee had a duty to use the funds they were given to the best effect for the people of Norfolk; as the demographic increased, demand would continue to increase.
- 13.3
  - 1) with 8 votes for, 4 against and 1 abstention, the Committee **RESOLVED** to **CONSIDER** the continuing progress of change and transformation of adult social care services
  - 2) with 8 votes for and 5 against, the Committee **RESOLVED** to **NOTE** the Council's latest budget assumptions and pressures, including revised council tax planning assumptions, and the resulting revised forecast budget gap of £45.322m, which had been updated by Policy and Resources Committee to reflect the latest available information and following Service Committee input in September 2018 (paragraph 4.3 and table 1 of the report)
  - 3) with 8 votes for and 5 against the Committee **RESOLVED** to **APPROVE** the proposed savings for the 2019-20 budget round for recommendation to Policy and Resources Committee in October (table 6 of the report), in particular confirming those savings that were recommended to require consultation as set out in paragraph 6.4
  - 4) with 8 votes for, 4 against and 1 abstention, the Committee **RESOLVED** to **CONSIDER** the key areas of risk in relation to 2019-22 budget planning for the Committee's budgets, including any extra/more pressures and the robustness of existing planned savings as set out in table 4 of the report, **NOTING** that any changes may impact on the overall budget gap and would require extra/more offsetting savings to be found
  - 5) with 8 votes for, 4 against and 1 abstention, the Committee **RESOLVED** to **AGREE** the budget planning timetable (section 7 of the report)

The meeting finished at 11.27

**Mr Bill Borrett, Chairman,  
Adult Social Care Committee**



If you need this document in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact 0344 800 8020 or Text Relay on 18001 0344 800 8020 (textphone) and we will do our best to help.