

Health Improvement Board Meeting
Housing-related support proposals

Monday 20th October 2014, 9.30-11 am,
Oxford Spires Four Pillars Hotel

Minutes of the meeting

1. Welcome by Chairman, District Councillor Mark Booty

Apologies for Absence and Temporary Appointments

Declarations of Interest – see guidance notes attached

The Chairman, Councillor Mark Booty, welcomed all to the meeting.

In attendance: Councillor Mark Booty; Councillor Ed Turner; Councillor Anna Badcock; Councillor Alison Thomson; Paul McGough; Jackie Wilderspin; Val Johnson; Ian Bottomley; Marianne North; Natalia Lachkou; John Jackson; Councillor Judith Heathcoat; Kate Terroni; Stephen Czajewski; Councillor Scott Seamons; Dave Scholes; Shaibur Rahman; Phil Ealey; Melissa Cripps; Jaffa Holland; Lesley Sherratt; Sophie Kendall.

Apologies were received from: Councillor Hilary Hibbert-Biles; Jonathan McWilliam; David Etheridge; Dr Paul Park; Councillor George Reynolds; Ian Davies; Aziza Shafique; Councillor Debbie Pickford; Councillor Roger Cox; Chris Stratford.

Marianne North notified the Chairman that she was authorised to speak on behalf of Cherwell District Council, in the absence of Councillor George Reynolds, Councillor Debbie Pickford and Chris Stratford.

Ian Bottomley attended in place of Dr Paul Park with the authority of the CCG to participate.

2. Housing Related Support Consultation Report –

Introduction and discussion

Natalia Lachkou, Interim Commissioning Lead for Younger Adults

Natalia Lachkou introduced the report, outlining the consultation process and the responses received. The Board were informed that the final report will be made available on the Council website.

The Chairman noted the report and thanked Natalia for the overview.

3. Housing related support services in Oxfordshire: Proposed way forward following the consultation –

Introduction, discussion and decision

Natalia Lachkou, Interim Commissioning Lead for Younger Adults

The Chairman proposed covering sections 2 to 8, returning to a discussion of principles and outcomes and next steps at the end. This was agreed.

Natalia Lachkou introduced each section of the paper, setting out the proposal going forward. The Chairman invited representatives from each District Council to respond in turn, followed by representatives from other stakeholders.

Section 2: Hostels

Oxford City Council

Councillor Ed Turner made the following points:

- Oxford City Council is extremely concerned about the level of reduction, as reflected in its consultation response.
- In light of homelessness increasing, Oxford City's position is that the County Council should have agreed a larger budget.
- Oxford City is retaining and maintaining homeless funding, as set out in its financial plan.

He asked the following questions:

- How is it currently working, when many are unable to access No Second Night Out beds?
- How will minimal rather than no support be paid for?
- Oxford City Council and the Clinical Commissioning Group currently provide additional funding for O'Hanlon House. Oxford City will continue to make this funding available – will the County Council and the Clinical Commissioning Group be doing the same? A joint approach to commissioning these services could be used.

Natalia Lachkou responded:

- Temporary measures are being used as a short-term response to the shortage of beds within the No Second Night Out service. The proposal going forward links the service model to outcomes-based commissioning, which will provide more than the 7 places currently available. The pathway overall currently has 150 bed spaces for adults with a history of homelessness. In the move to outcomes-based commissioning, the funding for low-level, medium-level and high-level provision will be integrated within one service model so that it can be used flexibly to meet needs.
- A joint approach to the design and commissioning of hostel provision with the Districts could be used.

Ian Bottomley responded on behalf of the Clinical Commissioning Group:

- Work is being done to develop outcomes-based contracts. It is important to have one plan to take this work forward. The Clinical Commissioning Group is very committed to this approach. Money from the Mental Health Pooled Budget currently goes into O'Hanlon House. This will continue in the transitional phase, after which it could be jointly commissioned with money from other sources too.

Councillor Scott Seamons added the following question:

- Will the proposed rate for commissioning support be a cap or a benchmark? How will a decision be reached?

John Jackson (Director of Adult Social Services for the County Council and Director of Strategy and Transformation for the Clinical Commissioning Group) responded:

- The proposed rate for commissioning support will be considered as part of the procurement process. The average price for home care in social care is £19 an hour, a key part of which is travelling time; the County Council cannot commit to insisting on the living wage as it would have significant cost implications in this

area. With regards to support provided in hostels, the proposed amount of £18 per hour could allow providers to pay the living wage as they will not have to pay travel time. However, no standard rate will be set as this must be decided by the provider.

Shaibur Rahman added the following point:

- Oxford City is putting in a significant amount of resource throughout the pathway. The additional spaces currently provided within No Second Night Out are currently commissioned by Oxford City.

West Oxfordshire District Council

Lesley Sherratt made the following points:

- West Oxfordshire District Council has similar questions to those already raised by Oxford City.
- West Oxfordshire welcomes the review of No Second Night Out.

She asked the following question:

- Could it be clarified whether the proposal is to reduce hostel funding by the same amount?

Natalia Lachkou responded:

- Yes, the proposal is to reduce hostel funding by the same amount.

Cherwell District Council

Marianne North made the following points:

- Cherwell District Council particularly welcomes the review of No Second Night Out
- Cherwell also particularly welcomes the additional emergency provision in Cherwell.

South Oxfordshire and the Vale of the White Horse District Councils

Phil Ealey made the following points on behalf of both Councils:

- The following are welcomed: the retention of support for Julian Housing; the focus on the right level of support for service users; and the additional emergency bed in South and Vale.

He asked the following question:

- Who would control access to the assessment centre?

Natalia Lachkou responded:

- There is no answer to this yet, as we are at the very early stages of designing the pathway. This will be worked on in partnership, using the available database.

Jaffa Holland added the following question:

- Will the single homelessness pathway just be for those coming via the assessment centre, or will it include those from the Districts who are not eligible for the emergency beds? Will it be just for Oxford City, or the whole of Oxfordshire?

Natalia Lachkou responded:

- These are very valid questions and we have not got the answers at this stage. However the suggestion is that it should be one pathway with multiple entry points and locally available responses.

Jaffa Holland added a further question:

- What will the level of support be within the emergency beds provision?

Natalia Lachkou responded:

- A November meeting of the lead officer group is being planned to pick these issues up.

Other stakeholders

Paul McGough, Public Involvement Network Representative to the Health Improvement Board, asked for more explanation on the assessment centre model, to which Natalia Lachkou responded that she would provide this outside of the meeting. He also expressed his support for the outcomes-based commissioning approach and emphasised the importance of coordinating and integrating support.

Jackie Wilderspin spoke on behalf of the Oxfordshire County Council Public Health directorate, who are commissioning the drug and alcohol services. Whilst they have just let the contract for alcohol and drugs treatment services to a new provider and are therefore not re-commissioning at this stage, they want to be part of any joint commissioning process to ensure services dovetail moving forward.

Recommendation to the Health and Wellbeing Board

The Chairman proposed to recommend to the Health and Wellbeing Board to take the amended proposal forward, but to note the detailed concerns documented in the minutes of this meeting. In particular

- ***Continued concerns about the reductions in available funding expressed by Oxford City Council***
- ***A proposed approach to joint commissioning in future***
- ***The welcome given to the proposed review of No Second Night Out***

This was agreed.

Section 3: Move on accommodation

South Oxfordshire and the Vale of the White Horse District Councils

Phil Ealey made the following points on behalf of both Councils:

- The focus on outcomes is very welcome, moving away from set periods of time to looking at needs.

Councillor Alison Thomson, Vale of the White Horse District Council, added:

- It is welcomed that the County Council has listened to people's responses and has been flexible in amending the proposals accordingly.

Cherwell District Council

Marianne North made the following points:

- Cherwell welcomes the proposals to: speed up move on; work in partnership; and to provide additional resources.

West Oxfordshire District Council

The Chairman Councillor Mark Booty welcomed how the proposal in this section has been amended, reflecting that the consultation responses have been well listened to.

Lesley Sherratt made the following points:

- West Oxfordshire is particularly concerned by the reduction of funding in this service area, with the proposal to reduce units in the district by half.
- West Oxfordshire would like to see provision of beds with low-level support as

part of move-on accommodation – in addition to the number of units proposed for the district.

Councillor Judith Heathcoat (Oxfordshire County Council Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care) responded that she would raise this at the Health and Wellbeing Board.

Other stakeholders

Nothing was added.

Recommendation to the Health and Wellbeing Board

The Chairman proposed to recommend to the Health and Wellbeing Board to take the amended proposal forward, but to note the detailed concerns documented in the minutes of this meeting. In particular

- ***West Oxfordshire asked for the provision of low-level support beds in move-on accommodation to be considered, in addition to the units proposed (in West Oxfordshire).***

Section 4: Community Floating Support

The Chairman stated that this is an extremely important service which if being reduced, will need to be replaced with something else. He asked that the Health Improvement Board be kept updated, throughout the process of commissioning new innovative models of community support.

Councillor Judith Heathcoat responded that *regular updates should be taken to the Health Improvement Board. It was agreed that this be added to the forward plan.*

Oxford City Council

Councillor Ed Turner made the following points:

- Efficiencies have already been achieved in this area and it is not clear how any further will be made. Oxford City's view is that the reduction to this service area needs to be revisited.
- The City Council values this service and is prepared to offer funding accordingly, if this can also be offered by all the Districts and the County Council can maintain its level of funding.

Councillor Judith Heathcoat responded that she would take this forward to the Health and Wellbeing Board.

West Oxfordshire District Council

Lesley Sherratt stated that the proposals in this service area are of major concern to West Oxfordshire and asked the following:

- The proposal of phasing the reduction is welcomed; however it is unclear how this will work in practice as there may not be enough time to learn from the first phase before moving into the second?

Natalia Lachkou responded:

- This issue would be addressed as part of implementation and there will be regular updates to stakeholders.

John Jackson added:

- The procurement process will focus less on services and more on outcomes. We cannot know the outcome at this stage, as we are asking providers to come up

with ideas. The phasing accounts for this process. This is a particularly important area for the County Council and it is committed to ensuring high-quality floating support is available, but provided in a different way.

Cherwell District Council

Marianne North made the following points:

- Cherwell support the phasing approach, however they are also very concerned about the level of reduction in this area.
- Cherwell propose exploring the option of moving money away from the hostels and towards floating support.

South Oxfordshire and the Vale of the White Horse District Councils

Phil Ealey made the following points on behalf of both Councils:

- The concerns about the reduction in this service area are shared.
- South and Vale are willing to work with the other Districts and the Council on how the impact can be minimised.

Jaffa Holland added the following:

- This level of reduction could have negative implications for the intensive end of the pathway.

The Chairman Councillor Mark Booty responded that the recurring problem applies that it is hard to prove this owing to the difficulties of accurately measuring the effects of prevention.

Councillor Ed Turner proposed that as the concern about the level of reductions in this area is shared by all the Districts, a conversation about how funding might be provided should take place at the Health Improvement Board where all the Districts and the County are represented.

Other stakeholders

Stephen Czajewski, representing Thames Valley Probation, added that caution needs to be exercised in this area as reducing floating support could have major negative impact.

Paul McGough proposed that the Social & Community Impact Assessment requires particular scrutiny in relation to the impact of the proposals for this service area. He also sought clarification on the pathway processes, which Natalia Lachkou offered to provide outside of the meeting.

Ian Bottomley, representing the Clinical Commissioning Group, made the following points:

- The Clinical Commissioning Group is particularly concerned about reductions in this area.
- It is likely to impact upon other floating support provision, for example the mental health service which is already over-stretched.
- There is a need to coordinate the approach here and look into what factors put an individual's tenancy at risk; is it their mental health or their drug and alcohol use?

Recommendation

The Chairman proposed to recommend to the Health and Wellbeing Board to take the original proposal forward, but to note the detailed concerns documented in the minutes of this meeting. In particular

- The City Council values this service and is prepared to offer funding accordingly, if this can also be offered by all the Districts and the County Council can maintain its level of funding
- As the concern about the level of reductions in this area is shared by all the Districts and other partners, a conversation about how funding might be provided should take place at the Health Improvement Board where all the Districts and the County are represented.
- Regular updates on the development of the service model and the commissioning process should also be discussed at the Health Improvement Board.
- Cherwell propose exploring the option of moving money away from the hostels and towards floating support. Oxford City Council did not support this.

Section 5: Substance Misuse Services

All Districts accepted this proposal going forward.

Comments made were:

- There needs to be clarification on the proposals as some confusion was evident in the consultation responses.
- Councillor Ed Turner (Oxford City Council) acknowledged and welcomed the contribution made by the County Council Public Health directorate. The Chairman endorsed this on behalf of the Board.

The Chairman proposed to recommend to the Health and Wellbeing Board to take the amended proposal forward, but to note that clarification of the proposal was required.

Section 6: Domestic Abuse Services

Kate Terroni (Deputy Director Joint Commissioning, County Council) informed the Board that a domestic violence strategic lead will be appointed to outline the County Council's strategic vision and oversee a review of what is currently on offer. This will be carried out in an appropriate timescale.

Oxford City Council

Councillor Ed Turner made the following points:

- Oxford City welcome the proposal for a review and hope the timetable for that review will be clarified at the Health and Wellbeing Board.
- Oxford City welcomes this more comprehensive approach.
- It is hoped that the outcomes of the review will be published in time to inform budget setting processes for the County Council. It would also be advisable to have contingency plans in case efficiency savings are not viable.

John Jackson responded:

- This is not just an issue for the County Council; it is only one of a number of organisations funding these services alongside, for example, the police, Districts and so forth. These organisations individually and collectively need to engage in

a review. ***The County Council commits to producing a schedule by the Health and Wellbeing Board.*** The range of organisations involved illustrates the complexity of this area.

Cherwell District Council

Marianne North stated that Cherwell welcomes the review and is committed to participating in it.

South Oxfordshire District Council, Vale of the White Horse District Council and West Oxfordshire District Council agreed with Cherwell's position.

Other stakeholders

Nothing was added.

The Chairman proposed to recommend to the Health and Wellbeing Board to take the original proposal forward, with the addition of requesting a full timetable for the domestic abuse review to be available at the H&WB meeting in November.

Section 7: Overall balance of reduction in funding

Section 8: Social and Community Impact Assessment

In addition to outlining the proposals, Natalia Lachkou informed the Board that it is planned to make the ***next version of the Social and Community Impact Assessment available for the Health and Wellbeing Board in November.*** This was agreed.

Section 1 (principles and outcomes) and overall comments on the proposed way forward

Oxford City Council

Councillor Ed Turner added the following points:

- There is a general question about the next financial year and timescales. Oxford City recommends that the Health and Wellbeing Board addresses this
- The Health Improvement Board should monitor the impact very carefully.
- With pressures increasing, Oxford City does not support a reduction in hostel beds to reallocate resources towards floating support. Both services are needed.
- Whilst Oxford City has engaged positively in the consultation process and will continue to work with partners to minimise the impact of the reductions, it retains the view that the overall budget is not adequate.

West Oxfordshire District Council

Lesley Sherratt made the point on behalf of West Oxfordshire that the assurances about monitoring the impact as the changes come into effect need to be kept.

Cherwell District Council

Marianne North made the following points:

- Cherwell welcomes the additional resources allocated to them.
- Cherwell has contributed many of its own resources to address the shortfall.
- Cherwell will continue to work with all stakeholders to ensure the impact of the reductions is minimised.

South Oxfordshire and the Vale of the White Horse District Councils

Phil Ealey made the following points on behalf of both Councils:

- The changes to the proposals in light of the consultation responses are welcomed.
- They will work with the other Districts to minimise the impact of the funding reductions.
- The Health Improvement Board is a good forum for taking this partnership-working and joined-up thinking forward, with elected representation from across the Districts.

Jackie Wilderspin proposed asking the ***Housing Support Advisory Group to revisit the indicators currently being used and advise the Health Improvement Board whether they are adequate or others should be added. It was agreed to ask the Chairman, Gary Parsons, to take this forward.***

Jaffa Holland added that it is important that work is not duplicated and the implementation planning is kept simple.

Other stakeholders

Paul McGough stated that he welcomes the proposals to work more closely with other partners. His view is that some of the costs should be shifted to mitigate the savings that need to be made. As the Public Involvement Network Representative to the Health Improvement Board, he welcomes opportunities for involvement in reviews, strategic planning and monitoring.

The comments on the overall principles and proposals were noted.

4. Decision on recommendation to the Health and Wellbeing Board, which will have input into the final decision of the County Council Cabinet

The Chairman proposed that the Health Improvement Board recommend to the Health and Wellbeing Board to accept the proposed way forward, but to note the summary of this discussion where more detailed concerns have been raised and actions committed to. He proposed that the minutes and summary be circulated to members, so they can check they agree with the recording of the discussion.

Councillor Ed Turner added the following points:

- There was a strong message about concerns to reductions in floating support
- The domestic violence review was welcomed
- The question of where the pathway opens was raised
- There were slight differences of view, for example Oxford City's concern about the size of the overall envelope and not all of Cherwell's suggestions were shared.

He proposed the following:

- Including the minutes but adding a summary and making it clear that not all members agree.
- To "note" the proposed way forward rather than "endorse" it and recommend it go forward to the Health Improvement Board.

The Chairman Councillor Mark Booty did not support this proposal, and stated that the Health Improvement Board needs to either accept or reject the proposed way forward. He therefore proposed a vote. The majority were in favour of Councillor Mark Booty's proposal that the recommendations are endorsed by the Board, so the motion was carried.

The Health Improvement Board recommends the Health and Wellbeing Board to accept the proposed way forward, but to also note the summary of its discussion where more detailed concerns were raised and actions committed to.

5. Next steps and close

John Jackson proposed the following:

- ***Councillor Mark Booty will present the outcome of this discussion at the Health and Wellbeing Board.***
- ***The Health Improvement Board will be involved in the re-commissioning of community floating support and the domestic abuse review. These items will be added to the forward plan.***
- ***Transition arrangements will be discussed at the Housing Support Advisory Group in the first instance, and will be escalated to the Health Improvement Board where necessary or appropriate.***

These proposals were accepted.

Sophie Kendall, Joint Commissioning, Oxfordshire County Council

Sophie.kendall@oxfordshire.gov.uk

01865 32 8530