



Rutland County Council

Catmose Oakham Rutland LE15 6HP.
Telephone 01572 722577 Facsimile 01572 75307 DX28340
Oakham

Minutes of the **MEETING of the PEOPLE (ADULTS & HEALTH) SCRUTINY PANEL** held in the Council Chamber, Catmose, Oakham, Rutland, LE15 6HP on Thursday, 2nd February, 2017 at 7.00 pm

PRESENT:

Mr G Conde	Mr N Begy
Miss R Burkitt	Mr W Cross
Mr R Gale	Mr A Mann
Mr C Parsons	Mrs L Stephenson
Miss G Waller	

APOLOGIES: Mr M Sandys

ABSENT:

OFFICERS PRESENT:

Dr T O'Neill	Director for People
Mr M Andrews	Deputy Director for People
Mr J Faircliffe	Housing Strategy and Enabling Officer
Ms K Kibblewhite	Head of Commissioning
Mr M Loran	Senior Environmental Services Manager
Ms S Newton	Commissioning Officer
Mrs S Ramsay	Corporate Support Officer
Mr K Silcock	Administration Assistant

IN ATTENDANCE:

Mr R Clifton	Portfolio Holder for Adult Social Care and Health
Mr P Burnett	Independent Chair, Leicestershire and Rutland Safeguarding Adults Board
Mrs J Fenelon	Healthwatch Rutland
Mr A Wright	Spire Homes

551 RECORD OF MEETING

The minutes of the meeting of the People (Adults and Health) Scrutiny Panel held on the 1 December 2016, copies of which had been previously circulated, were confirmed and signed by the Chair.

552 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No Declarations of Interest were received.

553 PETITIONS, DEPUTATIONS AND QUESTIONS

No petitions, deputations or questions were received from members of the public.

554 QUESTIONS WITH NOTICE FROM MEMBERS

No questions were received from members.

555 NOTICES OF MOTION FROM MEMBERS

No notices of motion were received from members.

556 CONSIDERATION OF ANY MATTER REFERRED TO THE PANEL FOR A DECISIONS IN RELATION TO CALL IN OF A DECISION

No matter was referred to the Panel for a decision in relation to call-in of a decision in accordance with Procedure Rule 206.

557 DRAFT BUSINESS PLAN PRIORITIES 2017/18 OF THE LEICESTERSHIRE AND RUTLAND SAFEGUARDING ADULTS BOARD (LRSAB)

Report No. 38/2017 was received from the Independent Chair of the Leicestershire and Rutland Safeguarding Adults Board.

The Chair invited Mr Paul Burnett, Independent Chair, Leicestershire and Rutland Safeguarding Adults Board (LRSAB) to give a brief overview on the Draft Business Plan Priorities 2017/18

During discussion the following points were noted:

- a) Mr Burnett advised that Information sharing was now an Assurance Priority, having moved from the Leicestershire and Rutland Local Safeguarding Children's Board (LRLSCB) & LRSAB Joint Development Priorities. This was due to the process being revised and reviewed the previous year to reflect learning. The move had been signed by all agencies and the Board were now looking to see successful implantation going forward. The priority covered organisations inside and outside the authorities areas, specifically to ensure those families who have moved across boundaries were still protected.
- b) Members asked if there was a budget implication. Mr Burnett advised that the total budget is £450,000 and that Rutland's contribution is £55,000 the contributions are made on a pro rata basis. This amount has been fixed for the last six years. Possible future contributions may be sought from schools or charging for events delivered in schools.
- c) The Better Care Fund's (BCF) drive was to enable those needing care to stay in their own homes, the risk for safeguarding was that in the past there had been under reporting of safeguarding issues due to reliance on the

public to recognise and report issues. Awareness of safeguarding issues, including alerting individuals to self-refer should they recognise issues themselves, needed to be raised. There was also a risk of abuse from professionals visiting service users in their own homes, Mr Burnett was aware of number of cases of this in the past year.

- d) A Multi Agency Audit was in place which looked at cases and the quality of both the assessment and record keeping. Current Provision in this also required a lead professional to be identified for each case.

558 HOME CARE: RECOMMISSIONING - SERVICE USER AND PRACTITIONER PERSPECTIVE

Report No. 28/2017 was received from the Director for People.

Mr Clifton introduced the report, detailing the paper set out feedback from a number of channels, users and user surveys, a provider event and a carer event which Councillor Clifton and Councillor Waller attended. Feedback and comments from the panel would be shared to help development the final model for commissioning.

During discussion the following points were noted:

- a) Many providers did not respond to the invitation issued, however the event was well attended by those in Rutland. Providers are still able to provide feedback during the process.
- b) Ms Kibblewhite advised that time was being spent collating feedback and developing options for the model, the favoured options would be presented to the April meeting. A two month period of soft market testing with potential providers, giving them the options and asking for feedback will allow for a more detailed modelling. Mr Begy requested a completion timeline to be added to the report.
- c) Adequate training of care staff was a national problem and not specific to Rutland, it was noted that there was a responsibility to shape the marketplace through this re-commissioning to ensure properly trained staff were on the frontline. Miss Waller noted that the training required needed to be more specific to the needs of the service user, generic NVQ training, for example, may not prepare a carer to deal with complex cases such as those suffering with dementia.
- d) Mr Andrews noted that the Care Quality Commission (CQC) require a certain level of staff training, there was a need to find the right balance of for Rutland. Many of the issues recognised are things that are innate in the way the model is delivered, which is national. There were more innovative ways being used in Scandinavia and Wales, money was being used in different ways. There was a need to show a more stable career path for carers and an increase in the value placed on the work they do.
- e) Ms Newton noted that the authority did not necessarily have access to details of self-funded service users, in order to include those in the

consultation the survey had been distributed in libraries and doctors surgeries.

- f) Miss Waller noted from the staff feedback that not all staff were aware of whistleblowing issues and safeguarding. Ms Newton advised that care staff felt that the policies were long winded took a significant time to read. Officers had made clear to all providers that some of their staff were unsure of procedure and that providers need to ensure all staff have read the policies and that subsequent checks have been carried out with service users to make them aware of procedures should they need them.
- g) Mrs Burkitt noted that some service users wanted continuity of care to absolve isolation and that service providers were not always able to do this properly. High staff turnover was a contributory factor to this and that it could be unsettling for service users if carers regularly changed. It was noted that better pay and training would help with staff retention.
- h) The Chair summed up saying that the opinion of the majority of panel members was that officers look at different models with risk and cost assessment. He asked that they not shy away from a model that may seem expensive and that all options were brought to the panel.

-----oOo-----

Ms Newton left the meeting following consideration of this item.

-----oOo-----

559 SOCIAL VALUE POLICY

Report No. 30/2016 was received from the Director for People, the report introduced the new Social Value Policy for Rutland County Council for Comment.

During discussion the following points were noted:

- a) Members noted that Rutland had one of the lowest unemployment rates in the country, however the report did not detail what type of unemployment this was, for example over 55's or youth unemployment.
- b) The aim of the report was not to introduce new policy but to have a corporate policy to formalise the procedure across the council and in line with legislation.
- c) That the examples in the framework were suggestions of things that may be considered in procurement, officers agreed to look at alternative examples should members wish to do so.
- d) Officers agreed to review the draft policy to provide more clarity and reflect the current priorities on the corporate plan and how social value may promote those.

-----oOo-----

Mr Loran and Mr Faircliffe joined the meeting at 8.30pm

-----oOo-----

Report No. 25/2017 was received from the Director for People.

Fuel Poverty was identified as an issue by the Housing and Homelessness Strategy, it was agreed that this panel would consider fuel poverty as part of the Scrutiny Poverty Project.

During discussion the following points were noted:

- a) Many properties and some villages in the county were wholly without a mains gas supply. Spire Homes, who manage social housing stock in the County, worked with the Council to install gas and subsequently central heating in some properties in Oakham. Where this was not possible they had upgraded the existing electric heating provision.
- b) Improvements to insulation could be limited where a property had listed building status or was in a conservation area.
- c) Members asked if installing gas in villages with no supply was possible. Mr Faircliffe advised that Government policy was for expansion of the gas network but the degree of inconvenience and difficulty in doing so may be an issue. It was agreed that this would be followed up by Scrutiny Commission who were taking the project forward.
- d) Mr Loran advised members of a scheme being piloted by Peterborough City Council (PCC) at no cost to the authority. The scheme was being funded by energy companies and the pilot runs to June 2017. It was looking at alternative ways to share advice on energy switching amongst other issues. If PCC made 600 referrals to the scheme it would secure government funding for the scheme to continue for a further four years, at this time other authorities could join the scheme and share the benefits. Mr Loran had expressed an interest on behalf of Rutland.
- e) Members asked if grants would be available as a result of referrals through the PCC scheme. Mr Loran advised that the schemes aim was to advise on efficient use of energy and identifying the right supplier, if a referral identified a household issue such as damp then that household could be referred for funding, possibly from the Better Care Fund, to reduce the impact of fuel poverty. Other grants may be available as a result of legal obligations on energy suppliers to create such schemes.
- f) Members noted that publicity surrounding initiatives and help around energy switching, fuel poverty and other issues was mainly internet based. It was felt that this was not sufficient as not all households had access to the internet. Officers were reminded of the Energy Action for Rutland scheme which had offered households and energy audit to identify potential areas of cost saving. Miss Waller advised that she had promoted this service and households who had taken part praised the service highly and reported that as their houses were warmer, they were now more comfortable.
- g) That the statistics on fuel poverty could be flawed, for example: a well-insulated, energy efficient property with a low household income could still

- be in poverty but would not be included in the statistics due to the energy requirements being low. Conversely, rural solid wall properties would fall into the statistics possibly having high energy requirements but many have a higher household income and fuel bills would not result in residual income being below the poverty line.
- h) Members asked the representative from Spire Homes if he could provide numbers of those in social housing in fuel poverty. Mr Faircliffe advised that statistics from work on the Housing and Homelessness Strategy showed that 92% of Spire Homes properties were in energy performance band D or above.
 - i) Mr Wright from Spire Homes advised members that although Spire Homes could ask tenants for information there was no obligation on tenants to supply it. Without knowledge of household income or fuel costs it was not possible to ascertain any properties in fuel poverty. He also advised members that if officers visited a property which was in poor condition and there were particular concerns, then Spire had a safeguarding procedure which would be invoked, a report would be given to him as manager for review and if necessary he would refer to the Council. If money was the issue then Spire had an officer to provide guidance in this regard. Energy costs did not attract financial assistance from government sources in the same way as council tax might.
 - j) Members requested details on properties that Spire still thought required energy upgrades to see if a way of assisting the project could be sought through the Scrutiny Poverty Project.
 - k) Mrs Stephenson expressed concerns on how concerns could be raised with Spire by tenants. When the housing stock was transferred from the Council to Spire the Rutland Housing Board was formed to enable information to be shared and issues raised, she asked for consideration to be given for this to be re-instated.

-----oOo-----

Mr Parsons left the meeting at 9pm

-----oOo-----

561 SCRUTINY PROGRAMME 2015/16 & REVIEW OF FORWARD PLAN

The panel reviewed the Forward Plan

562 ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS

There was no other urgent business.

563 DATE AND PREVIEW OF NEXT MEETING

Thursday, 6 April 2017 at 7pm

Proposed Agenda Items:

Director of Public Health: Annual Report

Q3 Performance Monitoring Report

Q3 Financial Management Report

External Provider Quality Assurance Report

Poverty in Rutland – Development of White Paper

Progress Update for the Re-Commissioning of Homecare Services in Rutland

---oOo---

The Chairman declared the meeting closed at 9.35 pm.

---oOo---