

Adult Social Services Overview and Scrutiny Panel

Minutes of the Meeting held on 26 May 2010

Present:

Mr D Callaby
Michael Chenery of Horsbrugh
Mr T Garrod
Mr P Hardy
Mr D Harrison
Ms D Irving
Mr J Joyce

Mr M Kiddle-Morris
Mr S Little
Mr J Shrimplin (Substitute for Mrs J
Mickleburgh)
Mr J Perry-Warnes
Mr N Shaw
Mr A J Wright

Also Present:

Mr D Harwood, Non-Voting Cabinet Member
Mr B Long, Non-Voting Deputy Cabinet Member
Mr B Bremner, County Councillor for the University Division
Mr G Nobbs, County Councillor for the Crome Division
Mrs A Thomas, County Councillor for Long Stratton and Cabinet Member for Children's
Services

Officers/Others Present:

Harold Bodmer, Director of Community Services
Mary Ledgard, Norfolk LINK
Hilda Bullen, Member of the Public
Janet Dugdale, Member of the Public
Julie Brociek-Coulton, Local City Councillor for Sewell Ward, Norwich
Georgina Moles, Friends of the Silver Rooms
Catherine Underwood, Assistant Director, Community and Service Transformation,
Community Services (Adult Social Services)
Hilary Mills, Head of Commissioning and Partnerships, Community Services (Adult Social
Care)
James Bullion, Assistant Director of Community Services – Prevention, Community
Services (Adult Social Care)
Karen Knight, Head of Community Care, Community Services (Adult Social Care)
Debbie Olley, Assistant Director, Safeguarding, Community Services (Adult Social Care)
Sarah Stock, Head of Service, Learning Difficulties Provision, Community Services (Adult
Social Care)
Lorraine Barrett, Head of Localities and Safeguarding, Community Services (Adult Social
Care)

Alan MacKim, Age Concern
Jo Clapham, Voluntary Norfolk
Philip Williams, Mental Health and Substance Misuse Commissioner, Community Services (Adult Social Services)
Approximately 30 Members of the Public who attended day care services at the Essex Rooms and the Silver Rooms (in Norwich) were also in attendance at the meeting

1 Election of Chairman

Resolved –

That Ms D Irving be elected Chairman of the Panel for this meeting.

(Ms D Irving in the Chair)

2 Apologies and Substitute Members Attending

Apologies for absence were received from Miss C Casimir, Mrs M Chapman-Allen, Mrs J Mickleburgh (with Mr J Shrimplin attending as a Substitute) and Mr J Mooney.

3 Declarations of Interest

Ms D Irving declared a personal interest as a Support Member for Housing at Breckland District Council.

Michael Chenery of Horsbrugh declared a personal interest because he had a substantive contract with the Norfolk and Waveney Mental Health NHS Foundation Trust.

Mr A Wright declared a personal interest as a Member of the King's Lynn and West Norfolk Mental Health Forum.

Mr J Perry-Warnes declared a personal interest as a Member of the Friends of Kelling Hospital.

Mr M Kiddle-Morris declared a personal interest as a Member of the Cabinet of Breckland District Council, on the basis that the District Council had responsibilities for day care provision in Thetford.

Mr J Joyce declared a personal interest as the Chairman of Reepham Town Council.

Mr P Hardy declared a personal interest as the Chairman of the Learning Difficulties Working Group.

Mr S Little declared a personal interest as a Norwich City Council Member of the Norwich Access Group for the Disabled and as a Member of several informal groups that had been set up to support users of the Essex Rooms and the Silver Rooms (in Norwich).

4 Urgent Business

There were no items of urgent business.

5 Presentation on Day Services for Adults

The Panel received a presentation from Harold Bodmer, the Director of Community Services, that included the following key points:

- **Transformation of Care Services**

- Transformation involved reviews of Community Care, Learning Difficulty and Mental Health Day Services – reports at today's Panel. Some of these reviews were finished and some were just beginning. It was recognised that this much change caused anxiety.
- Overall expenditure on day services had increased by 10% over the past year – for example an extra £600,000 for older people and people with physical disabilities.

- **Putting People First**

- Building the capacity of communities to provide support to vulnerable people.
- More preventative services for people not receiving formal care services.

- **People in Charge of their Formal Care Plans Managing Budgets if they want them**

- More integrated services between health, care and housing.
- More services that target recovery, reablement, learning and skills, employment and independence.

- **Day Centre Buildings**

- People wanted a mixture of services within day centres and opportunities in the community.
- There would always be a need for buildings that had specialist facilities, but some would need to change to comply with modern regulations and increased frailty and care needs.
- The principle of user and citizen involvement in the running of these buildings was worth looking at.

- **Who Provides?**

- County Council – focusing in helping people to remain independent, complex physical and mental health needs.

- Voluntary Sector providing a mixture of new services.
- Independent companies – need for integrated services with residential settings.
- Housing Sector needs to focus on prevention and helping people stay independent.
- Partnerships
 - Important for a community development approach within localities in Norfolk.
 - Day Opportunities Partnership in Norwich – first of many.
 - Partnerships helps us “bridge” false divides between people funded by social services, people funding themselves and people with low level needs.
 - Partnerships bring more resources to the table.

During the course of discussion the following key points were made:

The introduction of personal budgets was not the driving force behind the proposed changes in in-house day care services. The personal budgets and direct payment process was built on adults feeling that they had a choice as to whether or not to have a cash budget as an alternative to the Council holding the budget and managing services for them in the traditional way.

The County Council had similar eligibility criteria to that of most other Local Authorities. Those who did not meet the criteria of having “critical” or “substantial” needs were offered guidance and information and directed to other organisations that might be able to help.

6 Public Question Time

The Cabinet Member, Mr D Harwood, said that before the start of the meeting he had received a Petition requesting that the Essex Rooms and Silver Rooms (in Norwich) remain open.

The Panel received the following public questions concerning Community Care In-House Day Services:

Hilda Bullen, a user of services at the Silver Rooms in Norwich, asked the following:

“I would like to know why our day centre cannot remain open, because all of us that go there are like one big extended family and this includes the employees”.

Mr Harold Bodmer, Director of Community Services, gave the following reply:

“The County Council has decided that whilst day care is very important for many older people, its own day centres will in future concentrate on meeting the needs of the most vulnerable people, those with dementia or needing reablement. This is because Council run centres are more expensive to run and we want to use these resources for

people in the greatest need. The County Council funds day care in the independent and voluntary sectors to provide vital preventative services to older people who do not need specialist services.

In November 2009, the Council agreed to consult on the impact of this change on its day centres, in particular because the centres provided through the Essex and Silver Rooms are not best suited to meet specialist needs.

The primary reason, therefore, for our wanting to make changes to the Essex and Silver Rooms is because of long-term limitations of the buildings.

As a result of the consultation, however, it is proposed that the service will remain unchanged, with the same staff, the same travel arrangements, referral arrangements, meal arrangements etc. so that people who enjoy being together can continue to attend together. The only difference will be that in time, when suitable local premises are available, the service will be provided from sheltered housing or housing with care scheme lounges. The schemes being considered are listed in the report before the Panel today.

No change will be made until the new service is ready and developed and people who attend the service will be fully involved in planning this. This will mean that both the Silver Rooms and the Essex Rooms will continue as a service but will eventually be provided in more suitable community based buildings. This will allow our staff to continue to provide a service for people who use the existing services”.

The Panel received a supplementary public question from Hilda Bullen who asked the following:

“Will it be possible for users of the Silver Rooms to view the alternatives before they make any decisions?”

The Director gave the following reply:

“Thank you for raising this point. Yes, it will most certainly be possible for service users to view the alternatives. Hilda will be contacted directly about this matter after the meeting”.

Julie Brociek-Coulton, City Councillor for Sewell Ward in Norwich, asked the following question:

“Do you really think that the ladies and gentlemen of the Silver and Essex Rooms would be able to cope with the proposed pensioner roulette situation that you will cause if your plans to close these rooms go ahead. After spending lots of time with the older people it is obvious that to stay at the Silver Rooms is what the members want, what reasoning is there to want to take them out of somewhere that they love and are happy in, when you say you are looking out for their best interests?”

The Director gave the following reply:

“We have outlined the reasoning, in my answer to the first of today’s questions, for how the Council’s plans to concentrate on dementia and reablement services impacts on the long-term sustainability of the Silver and Essex Rooms as day care centres.

We fully recognise the importance of the service provided by the Essex and Silver Rooms and this was emphasised in the consultation. This is why we are proposing that the service continues, with the same staff and enabling people to remain together but in time, with full involvement of the people attending the centres, moving to alternative local premises. The partnership proposed with Norwich City Council and Age Concern, Norwich, will oversee this process and make sure that a local neighbourhood based service is provided.

We are not sure what you mean by “pensioner roulette” but can assure you that people will have a strong say in how the alternative proposals are developed.

We recognise that change is unsettling but we will work with people to make this change in a gradual way.

We do need to balance here the interests of people receiving services today with the needs of people in the future – these proposals maintain the present service but gradually move them to better premises in order to meet where they will expect services to be provided in settings that can meet increasingly complicated needs”.

Georgina Moles, from the Friends of the Silver Rooms in Norwich, made, with the approval of the Chairman, the following statement:

“We have seen the Press Release 8238 and would make the following comments:

(1) We are pleased to see the problems of day centres (Silver Rooms, Essex Rooms and Hempnall) are being addressed but we are distressed as the City and County Councils have not addressed this as a holistic examination of the many issues of concern to the older people to enable independence at home in the community.

(2) The Preventative Roles of Silver Rooms and Essex Rooms: they provide early recognition and skilled assessment is required to assist older people to access early support they require to maintain independence. Sadly, it is well known that so often Social Services and Health are only involved when a crisis occurs. The Silver Rooms and Essex Rooms can offer more to the wider community but must be empowered to do so.

(3) These day centres play a consistent and valued role in supporting often neglected carers with emotional and support and practice advice.

(4) We are further concerned that the alternative proposals are not costed.

(5) There is no recognition that the problems will increase as numbers of the elderly grow.

(6) We recognise the need for a programme to address dementia but this term covers a broad area not always picked up by the Health Service.

(7) There’s no recognition of how the staff will be trained at the proposed “alternative” placements. Recognition of **early** problems need trained individuals if they are to be identified.

(8) The centres are popular – a large group of people use them with great satisfaction. Questions were not asked about the satisfaction of the centres as buildings. The consultation has resulted in nothing new being added to the arguments despite the efforts of management to suggest it has. Frankly, the consultation used was an incompetent waste of public money.

(9) There is no serious mention of carers nor an assessment of how the proposals will benefit them. The approach of the Council is piecemeal. It fails to recognise the multiple needs of the elderly. We propose the following:

- (a) An estimate should be made of the costs of bringing the two centres up to the standards given. NB – there is no identification of alternative accommodation.
- (b) Local community groups can and should be formalised to set up to manage the running of the centres and will be inclusive with users, staff etc. forming them.
- (c) Joint discussions could be held with the Community Teams into the funding arrangements for issues of safety buildings improvements, staff salaries etc. in the current centres. A true partnership shall be set up with the community given a central role.

In summary, there should be no threat of closure of the centres at this stage until these interim arrangements are set up and given a finite time to bed in and be assessed. To do otherwise will destroy community spirit, lead to poor services and be extravagant. At the same time the Council’s consortium with Age Concern should proceed with long-term solutions in the plans. However, it in no way should prevent the community developing the day centres with current facilities being improved. **The final choice of site for the day centre and the services shall remain principally with the service users**; but at this stage we remain unconvinced that voluntary organisations cannot jointly meet the needs of the users”.

In response, the Director gave the following reply:

“We welcome the statement from the Friends of the Silver Rooms and, whilst it is not directly in the form of a question, we would like to comment on the proposals made at Item 9 of the statement. In relation to 9(a), we have estimated the costs as follows:

Essex Rooms

Cost of upgrade:

Kitchen upgrade and canopy works	£25,000
DDA accessibility works	£5,000
Accessible shower	£15,000
Toilet	£8,000
Laundry and sluice room	£12,000
Total	£65,000

Silver Rooms

Cost of upgrade:

DDA accessibility works – ramps, handrails, automatic door entry	£5,000
Accessible shower	£15,000
Toilet	£8,000
Laundry and sluice room	£12,000
Kitchen works	£49,672
Total	£89,672

However, this work will not enable these two centres to meet full expectations because there are structural site facility limitations (for example providing the Silver Rooms with a garden), which means that some improvements will not be possible whatever the cost.

If the centres were to close whilst alternative services are developed (and to invest in them as more general community resources), the costs would be estimated at:

Essex Rooms

Cost of upgrade:

Kitchen upgrade and canopy works	£4,000
DDA accessibility works	£5,000
Toilet	£8,000
Total	£17,000

Silver Rooms

Cost of upgrade:

DDA accessibility works – ramps, handrails, automatic door entry	£5,000
Toilet	£8,000
Kitchen works	£4,000
Total	£17,000

In relation to 9(b), we do agree with the spirit of users becoming involved in the development of services. We do not consider that these sites are suitable for future day care services although we do think that they should continue in community use. We would, of course, want to look, within the partnerships, as to whether, the voluntary sector could play a role in the future delivery of services. For the moment, however, since users of the Silver and Essex Rooms have told us how much they value the staff at both centres, we are proposing to continue them as Council run services to avoid any immediate disruption or change of staffing”.

Janet Dugdale asked the following question:

“Can you confirm that the current users of the Silver Club and the Essex Rooms will be able to use the replacement premises for their day centre purposes and that the eligibility criteria will be adjusted to ensure that the criteria embraces the current users of these two clubs. If new premises are to be provided for these two popular day centres, what will be the capital cost and is there financial provision in the current budget? Is there adequate revenue budget provision to ensure that both clubs

continue to provide a full service to the current users?”

In response, the Director gave the following reply:

“Yes, of course we can confirm this. I can also confirm that there are no changes proposed to existing eligibility criteria. In fact, by moving the centres to sheltered housing schemes, tenants of these schemes, who may not meet this criteria, will be able to join for particular activities, a much wider preventative service.

The revenue budget of £99,730 for the Essex Rooms and £115,560 for the Silver Rooms will be available in full for these alternative services. We do not anticipate any capital costs but could meet a modest capital cost from the Council’s capital budget. The Essex and Silver Rooms will require £154,672 spent on them were they to be retained as long-term day centres and £34,000 in the medium term whilst alternatives are developed”.

Janet Dugdale asked the following supplementary question:

“Is there adequate budgetary provision to ensure that the current clubs at the Silver Rooms and the Essex Rooms in Norwich will continue to operate from different premises?”

In response, the Director gave the following reply:

“The existing revenue budget for the Essex Rooms and the Silver Rooms will be able to be used to provide a similar level of service elsewhere”.

Stephen Little put forward the following question on behalf of Barbara Smith, a local resident:

“Given that it has been statistically proven that upheaval has a detrimental effect on the health and well-being of frail elderly people and those with dementia, how can we be sure that those who attend the Essex Rooms will not be adversely affected both by the planned closure of the facility and the proposal to provide day care in different locations throughout the week?”

In response, the Director gave the following reply:

“Our proposals for alternatives to the Essex and Silver Rooms envisage that the whole service days will be provided in alternative locations and that members of the Essex Rooms and the Silver Rooms will be involved in developing these and these will retain their friendship groups and the same staff establishment. This does not mean necessarily that people will have to attend different locations throughout the week and so limit the disruption to people.

We are proposing therefore that people who attend the Essex and Silver Rooms will be given the opportunity to choose activities as an alternative resource together with friends. We must stress that the managers and staff will be working with these groups to support the transition and everyone’s individual needs will be assessed in this process and full consideration given to how best to support people based on these needs.

Our plan is that the users themselves will be inputting into the transition and therefore hopefully have a sense of “ownership” of the new arrangements. The transition would be initially set up as taster sessions and would need to be evaluated to see the impact upon the group and the individual.

We do recognise that for some people change can be difficult or upsetting, but we will work with individuals to help them have as much control over the changes as possible and to introduce change gradually. We also intend that, by ensuring staff continuity, there will be less uncertainty and more continuity for people”.

Mr Stephen Little, on behalf of Jean Arkeat, asked the following question:

“What are we going to do if we shut and where are you thinking of placing us all?

What is planned for this building if we do close?”

In response, the Director gave the following reply:

“The papers before today’s Panel (and which will be placed before the Council’s Cabinet on 14 June 2010) outline that if agreed we will develop alternatives which see all people (including future users) being provided with a replacement service.

The future use of the buildings has not been planned and will be a corporate decision of the Council (rather than the decision for Community Services). It is possible that whilst these buildings are not considered suitable for increasingly complex day care needs, they could be considered to be used as community services of some kind. We do feel that they should be continued for future community use”.

Mr George Nobbs, leader of the Labour Group at County Hall, speaking on behalf of a service user, asked the following questions:

“I note from the results of your consultation that, to use your own words, “two thirds (64%) had a negative view of the proposals” while only 17% felt (again I use your own words) “mostly positive”. That odd phrase implies that even they weren’t entirely happy. The report goes on to say that “the consultation enabled us to get a good picture of what people value as we develop new services”. Indeed, the whole report is full of telling statements such as this one “the status quo is not considered a viable option” and “there is a consensus among partners that there is not the long-term sustainability of the buildings for specialised services” and yet you say “the consultation and the responses have been taken into account in implementing the Council’s Strategy.

Which leads me to ask: how?

What would the people who you eventually consulted have had to say to get you to not do what you had decided to do months before?”

In response, Mr David Harwood, Cabinet Member for Adult Care, gave the following reply:

“We do recognise that most people in the consultation felt negatively towards the proposals outlined in the previous Cabinet report of 9 November 2009.

The consultation was genuine and we have not come to a conclusion “months ago” as implied in the question. The development work that we have undertaken with stakeholders, including Norwich City Council and Age Concern, to come up with new proposals evidences this. Further evidence is contained in the fact that the original proposal – to provide individuals with alternative services – has changed to provide the same service, with the same staff but eventually from a different setting.

The consultation has provided us with an up to date picture of what people value about these services, especially the companionship and the care. People have not, primarily, valued the buildings above these factors.

We do, therefore, feel that we have taken people’s views into account in implementing our strategy, but we also feel that the strategy is the right approach because it balances their views of people using services today, with the needs of people who will be using services in the future”.

Mr George Nobbs asked the following supplementary question:

“Can the users of community care day services at the Essex Rooms and the Silver Rooms be given an assurance that these centres will not close before the majority of service users are happy to use the alternatives, these alternatives are in place and are operational?”

In reply, the Director of Community Services said that he was happy to give that assurance. He said that before moving to accommodation elsewhere there would need to be a general consensus of opinion amongst the groups using the Silver Rooms and the Essex Rooms that moving elsewhere was the right thing to do.

For the benefit of those in attendance at the meeting, the Chairman said that the Panel had an important role in ensuring that the consultation was fully discussed and that the views of users and stakeholders were passed on to the Council’s Cabinet.

7 Local Member Issues/Member Questions

There were no local Member issues/Member questions.

OVERVIEW ITEMS

The Chairman agreed to take Item 9 on the agenda next; a report concerning the In-House Day Services Proposals following the outcome of the public consultation.

8 In-House Day Services: Proposals Following the Outcome of the Public Consultation

The annexed report (9) by the Director of Community Services was received.

The Panel received a report that set out a summary of the responses to the consultation on proposed changes to the County Council’s in-house day services for older people, including the Essex Rooms, Silver Rooms (in Norwich), and the use of Hempnall Mill.

During the course of discussion, the following key points were made:

- The County Council was aiming to achieve a gradual change towards Council run services that specialised in providing help to people with dementia and reablement needs. The Silver Rooms and the Essex Rooms were unsuitable for meeting these needs.
- Community Services was seeking strategic partnerships to support the future development of community based day care services. One such proposal was to create a Day Opportunities Partnership in Norwich in partnership with Age Concern, Norwich and Norwich City Council.
- It was pointed out that there were also well advanced plans to enter into a long-term partnership arrangement with the Trustees of Hempnall Mill for the use of this site. This partnership arrangement could be used as a model for the development of community base day care services elsewhere in Norfolk.
- The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Services said that the County Council was looking at providing an equitable level of service across Norfolk.
- Plans were being made to create new community based day care services within the communal areas of scheduled housing and housing with care schemes across Norwich. Members said that where this was being proposed, residents of sheltered housing and housing with care schemes should be consulted for their views and offered an opportunity to take part in the new day care services.
- Mary Ledgard (speaking on behalf of Norfolk LINK) said it was important for the consultation process to include the views of carers and the views of the wider community in which the new services would be provided.
- As an exception to standing orders, the Chairman agreed that Dr Ian Gibson could address the meeting.
- Dr Ian Gibson (speaking on behalf of service users) said that he would like to see the Essex Rooms and the Silver Rooms remain in use as a community resource and run in partnership with the voluntary sector. He added that service users would welcome an opportunity to have a say at some stage in the future about what that alternative community use could be.

In reply, the Director said that he welcomed the comments that Dr Gibson had made. A corporate decision of the County Council was required as to the future use of the Essex Rooms and the Silver Rooms. Community Services would, however, suggest that this accommodation should continue to be used for alternative community uses, run by or in partnership with other community based organisations, including those in the voluntary sector.

Mr Stephen Little moved, duly seconded by Mr James Joyce:

To add in as a new Section 4.8 of the report the words –

“The new Day Opportunities Partnership will retain the option of maintaining the Essex

Rooms and/or the Silver Rooms as day care facilities alongside the new community based services if there is found to be sufficient resources and demand. The Partnership will not look to move out of the Essex Rooms and the Silver Rooms for two years and during that time the Partnership will look at the alternatives. Additionally, the County Council will give serious consideration to assisting any offers to run the Silver Rooms and/or the Essex Rooms as community administered day care resources”.

On being put to the vote there were five votes in favour and six votes against, whereupon the motion was declared lost.

Mr James Joyce then moved, duly seconded by Mr Nigel Shaw:

To add in as a new Section 4.8 of the report the words –

“The new Day Opportunities Partnership will retain the option of maintaining the Essex Rooms and/or the Silver Rooms as day care facilities alongside the new community based services if there is found to be sufficient resources and demand. Additionally, the County Council will give serious consideration to assisting any offers to run the Silver Rooms and/or the Essex Rooms as community administered day care resources”.

Upon being put to the vote this motion was agreed nem con.

It was then resolved to put before the Cabinet at its meeting on 14 June 2010 the following three part resolution in respect of the report entitled “Making Your Day – Council-Run – Community Care Day Services Proposals Following Public Consultation”:

- (a) To support the development of a community based approach (as outlined in Section 3 of the report), which will take the existing in-house community care day services into a new partnership agreement, which could apply to all localities.
- (b) To support the development of a Day Opportunities Partnership in Norwich (as outlined in Section 4 of the report).
- (c) To add in as a new Section 4.8 of the report the words: “The new Day Opportunities Partnership will retain the option of maintaining the Essex Rooms and/or the Silver Rooms as day care facilities alongside the new community based services if there is found to be sufficient resources and demand. Additionally, the County Council will give serious consideration to assisting any offers to run the Silver Rooms and/or the Essex Rooms as community administered day care resources”.

It was agreed to consider Item 8 on the agenda next.

9 The Impact of the Review of the Older Adult and Physical Disability Day Service Review on the Voluntary Sector

The annexed report (8) by the Director of Community Services was received.

The Panel received a report that assessed the review of the Older Adult and Physical Disability Day Service Review on the Voluntary Sector.

During the course of discussion, the following key points were noted:

- Catherine Underwood, on behalf of the Director, agreed to provide Mr John Perry-Warnes with details regarding the changes in transport arrangements for people attending centres in the Holt area.
- Community Services was working with Age Concern, Norwich and Age Concern, Norfolk on ways in which they could access funding opportunities to support voluntary sector services.
- It was recognised that Community Services was faced with increasing demands from people with substantial and critical needs who met the Fair Access to Care criteria.
- It was important that Community Services was seen to be continuing to support those with moderate needs.
- Voluntary sector day services had been evaluated on similar principles to those used for in-house day care services.
- Staff employed in day centres where there was a change in service provision would be able to receive specialist training in the care of people with dementia needs.
- With a projected increase in the number of older people in the general population, the number of people with dementia and reablement needs could be expected to rise locally in Norfolk.

The Panel noted the report.

10 Learning Difficulties Day Activities Support (DAS) Review Project Update

The annexed report (10) by the Director of Community Services was received.

The Panel received a report that provided an update on the proposals to review the provision of day activity services for adults with learning difficulties. The report described the main activity within the project work streams and timescales going forwards.

Mr Callaby said that he would be happy to take up any issues in his role as Member Champion for learning difficulties.

The Deputy Cabinet Member said that some of the buildings used to provide services for people with learning difficulties were over 30 years old and no longer fit for purpose.

Members commented that moving to a more decentralised system for providing day activity services for adults with learning difficulties did not necessarily result in a decreased choice of services.

The Panel noted that a forthcoming round of consultation about learning difficulties day activities would focus on gathering the views of people who used the services and their family carers on the proposition that the County Council provided Day Activities Support would concentrate on providing support to those people who were living at home with their family carers and particularly for those people with complex needs. During the consultation the proposals could be significantly influenced and shaped. No policy changes would take place until the Community Services Day Activity Support Project had reported back to the new Community Services Overview and Scrutiny Panel and to the Council's Cabinet with people's views.

The Panel noted and endorsed:

- (a) The strategic thinking underpinning the project.
- (b) The proposed project methodology.
- (c) The proposed work activity (actual and planned).

11 Deferred Items

The Chairman agreed to defer consideration of the Mental Health Residential Care and Day Services report and the Safeguarding annual report until the July 2010 meeting of the Community Services Overview and Scrutiny Panel.

The meeting concluded at 1pm

Chairman



If you need this document in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact Tim Shaw on 0344 8008020 or 0344 8008011 (textphone) and we will do our best to help.