
Cabinet

7th January 2014

Name of Cabinet Member:

Cabinet Member (Health and Adult Services) - Councillor Gingell

Director Approving Submission of the report:

Executive Director, People

Ward(s) affected:

All

Title:

A Bolder Community Services – outcome of consultation on service changes

Is this a key decision?

Yes – the proposals within the report contain financial implications in excess of £500k and will affect all wards in the City.

Executive Summary:

The People Directorate was formed on 2 September 2013 bringing together what was previously the Community Services Directorate along with Children and Young People Services, forming the biggest directorate within the Council.

As part of its budget setting process for 2013/14 the City Council set challenging financial targets for what was then the Community Services Directorate. This required the Directorate to save £3m in 2013/14, rising to £8m in 2014/15 and then £15m in 2015/16 as well as contributing to other cross cutting corporate targets. These savings targets were on top of managing existing budgetary pressures, which, when added together increases the total savings to £22.5m by 31 March 2016. These targets need to be delivered in order for the City Council to deliver a balanced budget.

To meet the challenges faced by what was the Community Services Directorate, the 'A Bolder Community Services' (ABCS) programme was established which has membership from key stakeholder organisations including Health, Police, and the voluntary sector. This programme was established in October 2012 and oversaw the development of a number of project areas to deliver the savings required for 2013/14 and 2014/15.

The savings target of £3m for 2013/14 was based on a series of efficiency projects and the delivery of activity that had already received the required approvals. In order to deliver the £8m savings target for 2014/15 a wide ranging set of proposals were made to Cabinet. If the proposals were to proceed to implementation they would result in some closures, reductions and changes in Council services. The consultation took place between 27 August 2013 and 15 November 2013.

This report and associated appendices deals with the consultation outcomes, the identified impacts of the proposals and makes a set of recommendations for Cabinet to consider.

Recommendations:

Cabinet is requested to:-

1. Consider any comments from the Health and Social Care Scrutiny Board (5) following their consideration of matters contained within this report at their meeting on 18 December 2013.
2. Note that the two petitions submitted on this matter have been considered as part of the consultation process.
3. Note the outcomes of the consultation and, having taken into account the resulting equality impacts and the updated Equality and Consultation Analysis in Appendices 1 – 13 of this report, approve the implementation of the proposals detailed in (a) to (j) below:-
 - (a) Reduce funding to Age UK, Carers Centre, Grapevine and Alzheimer's Society by a 22.5% for each organisation with effect from 1 April 2014 and issue new three year grant aid agreements to these organisations empowering them to use resources flexibly to deliver good outcomes for their respective groups.
 - (b) Implement reductions for Housing Related Support by taking an individual approach for each organisation. The arrangement for each organisation to be agreed by 1 April 2014 and implemented by 1 July 2014. Consideration of specific impacts to be delegated to the Executive Director (People) and Cabinet Member (Health and Adult Social Care).
 - (c) Cease care at Jack Ball House and George Rowley House Housing with Care schemes and relocate service users to other Housing with Care schemes within the City.
 - (d) Close the Day Centres for Older People at Risen Christ and Frank Walsh House and relocate service users to Gilbert Richards.
 - (e) Relocate the Day Centres for Adults with Learning Disabilities at Curriers Close and Watcombe Centre to Frank Walsh House.
 - (f) Establish a specialist provision for service users at Brandon Wood Farm following further planning work.
 - (g) Provide transitional funding to Risen Christ luncheon club to support the centre to make the financial and service adjustments required to continue longer term.
 - (h) Retain the weekend dementia day service provided at the Maymorn Centre.
 - (i) Support the proposal to develop a Reablement Strategy with the Clinical Commissioning Group and the offer of six-month initial funding to enable the Aylesford to continue while the strategy work is completed.
 - (j) Close the in-house Home Support Short Term Service with a target date of 1 July 2014.

List of Appendices included:

Appendix One – Project Proposal, Housing Related Support
Appendix Two – ECA, Housing Related Support
Appendix Three – Project Proposal. Housing with Care
Appendix Four – ECA, Housing with Care
Appendix Five – Project Proposal, Day Opportunities and Transport
Appendix Six – ECA, Day Opportunities and Transport
Appendix Seven – Project Proposal, Information, Advice and Lower Level Support
Appendix Eight – ECA, Information, Advice and Lower Level Support
Appendix Nine – Project Proposal, Aylesford
Appendix Ten – ECA, Aylesford
Appendix Eleven – Project Proposal. Home Support Short Term Service
Appendix Twelve – ECA, Home Support Short Term Service
Appendix Thirteen – Overarching Impact Analysis

Background papers:

None.

Other useful documents:

13 August 2013 – A Bolder Community Services, Coventry City Council Cabinet

Has it been or will it be considered by Scrutiny?

Yes

Although this particular report is not being considered by Scrutiny, the Health and Social Care Scrutiny Board (5) received an interim update on the Consultation on 5th November 2013 and a further update on the outcome of the Consultation at their meeting on 18th December 2013.

Has it been or will it be considered by any other Council Committee, Advisory Panel or other body?

No

Will this report go to Council?

No

Report title:

Community Services with the People Directorate– consultation on service changes

1. Context (or Background)

1.1 The People Directorate was formed on 2 September 2013 bringing together what were previously the Community Services Directorate and the Children and Young People Service. This new People Directorate excludes the Education and Inclusion service.

1.2 On 26 February 2013, Cabinet set the City Council's budget which included a number of required savings totalling £63m. This included challenging financial targets for what was then the Community Services Directorate to save £3m in 2013/14, rising to £8m in 2014/15 and £15m in 2015/16. In addition, the Directorate is required to contribute to other cross cutting corporate targets including an additional £2m contribution to the corporate procurement review in 2014/15. This, together with managing existing budgetary pressures, increases the required total to £22.5m by 31 March 2016. These targets need to be delivered in order for the City Council to deliver a balanced budget.

1.3 The 'A Bolder Community Services Programme'

1.3.1 In order to manage these challenges over the three year period, the 'a Bolder Community Services' (abcs) programme was established which was led by the Community Services Directorate with involvement from key stakeholder organisations. The abcs programme is part of the wider 'A Bolder Coventry' programme which involves and impacts on all Directorates and residents of Coventry. The abcs programme board has continued to meet.

1.3.2 The abcs programme is underpinned by four strategic principles. These are:

a. *Continuous Improvement*

Driving further efficiency from current arrangements through either different ways of working and/or ensuring resources are used effectively.

b. *People will be expected to do more for themselves*

The Directorate will not be able to continue with the same level of activity and range of services and still deliver the required savings. This will mean that people will be required to use their own resources for support to a greater extent than has previously been the case.

c. *People will be as independent as possible for as long as possible.*

If people do require intervention from Community Services then this will increasingly focus on providing short term, or one off support, to remove or reduce the requirement for a longer term intervention.

d. *We will only provide ongoing support to the most vulnerable people when they need it.*

Ongoing support will increasingly be targeted at the most vulnerable people, these being people with particularly complex needs and those for whom the Directorate has a responsibility but do not have the resources to arrange support through other means.

1.3.3 The continued applicability of these principles across the newly formed People Directorate will need to be considered as part of the work in developing the new directorate.

1.4 Delivering the Required Savings 2014/15

1.4.1 In response to the Council setting budget and the required saving targets on 13 August 2013 City Council Cabinet approved a consultation period covering six areas of activity undertaken by the Community Services Directorate. This consultation period ran from 27 August 2013 to 15 November 2013. These proposals were aligned with the four principles of the abcs programme as described above in section 1.5. These proposals identified savings of £6m which, if delivered as described would bring the total savings achieved by Community Services to £10m for 2014/15. This was in excess of the £8m required for 2014/15 due to the scale of the overall three year saving requirement combined with the possibility that, following consultation, some variations to proposals may be appropriate which could impact on the savings that could be achieved.

1.4.2 Prior to developing proposals for formal consultation, in January 2013 a series of engagement sessions were undertaken with staff, Trade Unions, partnership forums, partner organisations and the voluntary sector. The intention of these sessions was to outline the challenges facing the Council and Community Services Directorate and seek ideas and suggestions as to how these challenges could be met.

1.4.3 Following these engagement sessions a number of proposals were developed and shared with stakeholders over the period from April 2013 to June 2013 as a pre-consultation. These sessions have influenced the further development of the proposals that were then taken into formal consultation following Cabinet Approval on 13 August 2013.

1.4.4 This report and associated appendices details the outcome of the consultation and makes recommendations on proposals to be implemented. Each of the proposals consulted upon in each of the six areas of activity are outlined in section 2, below.

1.5 Preparing for 2015/16 and beyond

1.5.1 The proposals consulted on and the recommendations arising from the consultation are far reaching and result in significant impacts to Council services and jobs. The proposals, if implemented, will achieve savings of approximately £10m and will not leave any individual that meets the City Council's eligibility criteria for Adult Social Care without support.

1.5.2 In spite of the significance of the proposals contained in this report there is still much more to do to deliver the overall savings target for the People Directorate and manage pressures on existing budgets.

1.5.3 In order to meet these challenges the abcs programme will be superseded in April 2014 by a single programme covering the whole of the People Directorate. Approvals will be sought for the progression of this programme as appropriate.

1.6 Petitions Received

1.6.1 During the consultation two petitions were received from Coventry MIND, one e-petition and one written. In addition a written petition was received from Age UK and the Carers' Centre. Following closure of the consultation a further e-petition was received from Age

UK and the Carers' Centre. This petition is also dealt with in the report as it is in relation to the consultation proposal.

1.6.2 Petition One - E-petition and Written Petition - Reconsider 60% cuts in Housing Related Support

1.6.2.1 E-petition - We object to the proposed 60% cuts for Housing Related Support as this will have a detrimental effect on those with poor mental health. There will be no support for these people in the community, and they will struggle to manage their mental health on a daily basis. Often people with mental health issues become ill very quickly, thus needing easily accessible regular support. People with mental health issues need this vital support, and without it there will be a greater impact on statutory services, which already struggle to cope with demand. Please reconsider the implications of the proposed reductions. 138 signatures were received.

1.6.2.2 There were three versions of the written petition that were submitted as one by Coventry MIND. In total 1,736 signatures were received for the written petitions. The petitions were as follows:

1.6.2.3 1) We hereby sign this petition in objection to the proposed 60% cuts in 2014 for Housing Related Support. We are objecting to this as it will have a detrimental effect on those with poor mental health. There will be no support for these people in the community, and they will struggle to manage their mental health on a daily basis. Often people with mental health issues become ill very quickly, thus needing easily accessible regular support. People with mental health issues need this vital support, and without it there will be a greater impact on statutory services. Please consider the implications of the proposed reductions.

1.6.2.4 2) We should reduce the stigma behind depression and pull together strategies and resources to support it – Do you agree? If yes, sign below.

1.6.2.5 3) We as service users at Coventry and Warwickshire Mind hereby sign this petition in objection to the proposed 60% cuts in 2014 for housing related support. We are objecting to this as it will have a detrimental effect on our mental health. We will have no one to support us in the community, and although we are in the service working towards independence, it can take many years for us to achieve anything. We are people with severe mental health issues, and we struggle to manage our mental health on a daily basis, and often become ill very quickly, thus needing support on a regular basis is vital to us as many of us do not have a social network or family to support us. Please consider the implications of the proposed reductions.

1.6.2.6 In total 1,874 signatures across both e-petition and written petitions were received relating to this proposal.

1.6.2.7 In light of the feedback received during the consultation, including the petition, a revised proposal has been recommended that does not require the application of a 60% cut in funding for all organisations. By taking an approach based on the vulnerabilities of the groups concerned and the organisations ability to make funding reductions it is considered that this petition is responded to appropriately.

1.6.3 Petition Two – Age UK and Carers Centre – Opposition to Community Services Review Proposals

- 1.6.4 E-petition “We the undersigned request Coventry City Council to consider the long term impact to vulnerable people caused by the proposed cuts to Age UK Coventry and the Carers’ Centre in the Community Services Review. We believe that the proposed cut to Contact & Connect, the Information and Advice Service for older people, and support for carers will leave more people in crisis and increase overall costs for the council. We therefore urge the council not to make the proposed cuts to these services.” This petition is not due to end until 5th January 2014 and as at the time of writing had 316 signatures.
- 1.6.5 Written petition – Petition regarding the proposed funding cuts to local Community Services. We the undersigned request Coventry City Council to consider the long term impact to vulnerable people caused by the proposed cuts to Age UK Coventry and the Coventry Carers’ Centre in the Community Services Review. We believe that the proposed cut to Contact & Connect, the Information and Advice Service for older people, and support for carers will leave more people in crisis and increase overall costs for the council. We therefore urge the council not to make the proposed cuts to these services. 458 signatories received. At the time of writing a total of 774 signatures have been received for both written and e-petitions.
- 1.6.6 In light of the feedback received during the consultation, including the petition, it is possible that the reduction in voluntary sector capacity will have an impact on older people and carers. Through entering into longer term agreements with the organisations affected and enabling them to operate in a manner that allows resources to be deployed in the most effective way to support people in Coventry some of the potential impacts should be mitigated.

2. Options considered and recommended proposal

- 2.1 The consultation analysis for each individual proposal is contained within the appendices to this report along with the accompanying Equality and Consultation Analysis. Cabinet will read these papers in their entirety. The summaries below do not provide a comprehensive treatment of all the issues raised during the consultation but highlight those considered most significant.
- 2.2 Following conclusion of the consultation the comments received in respect of each proposal were collated and analysed. The impact of each proposal on service user groups and an overall impact of the proposed changes were considered and an overarching Impact Analysis was completed. This analysis was then used to form a view on whether the existing proposal should proceed as described, be varied in the light of the consultation feedback and impacts or withdrawn. The following sections summarise this for each proposal with full information included in the appendices.
- 2.3 Targeting Housing Related Support on the Most Vulnerable
- 2.3.1 In reading the section please refer to:
- Appendix One – Project Proposal, Housing Related Support
 - Appendix Two – ECA, Housing Related Support
- 2.3.2 *Proposal Summary*
- 2.3.2.1 The proposal was to decommission all services funded through Housing Related Support (formerly Supporting People) with effect from 1 April 2014 and implement transitional arrangements for a 1 year period to manage risk. The specific areas consulted on are detailed in Appendix One.

2.3.3 *Summary of Consultation Response*

- 2.3.3.1 During the consultation it was suggested that a funding reduction totalling 60%, if applied uniformly across all service areas would impact disproportionately on some groups, particularly those with Mental Ill Health. A number of organisations consulted described how where this type of funding had reduced elsewhere they were able to mitigate the effect by increasing the use of Housing Benefit, increase service charges or absorb the cost into other overheads and continue to provide the service.
- 2.3.3.2 Individuals that would be affected by the proposal indicated the value of current services in supporting them to remain independent and if it was withdrawn they could experience impact on well-being, may become unwell and require other services.
- 2.3.3.3 The introduction of a criteria for the allocation of funding form part of the consultation, however, feedback was that this would be counter-productive and that organisations are better placed to make decisions on support using their experience and expertise as opposed to the application of a rigid criteria.
- 2.3.3.4 In order to make reductions organisations will need to vary their service provision except for where there is an alternative funding stream at an equivalent level.

2.3.4 *Summary of Impact Analysis*

- 2.3.4.1 Within the population that would be affected by this proposal there are protected groups of age, ethnicity, disability and gender.
- 2.3.4.2 The proposal would impact on 23 organisations and approximately 1,800 people who currently receive support through this funding.
- 2.3.4.3 The reduction would reduce capacity to support people and although it is accepted that the people who access this support are generally not eligible for Adult Social Care should the support be withdrawn entirely it is possible that some people may become eligible. Particular responses were made during the consultation in respect of Adults with Mental Ill Health.
- 2.3.4.4 For some organisations, where they are Registered Social Landlords, effects could be mitigated through increasing use of other funding streams such as Housing Benefit, whereas others, who receive relatively small levels of funding could absorb costs within their organisations and continue to provide a service. Others could make savings by implementing a different and more cost effective service model such as floating support so that the same numbers of people could be supported albeit with less support per person.

2.3.5 *Consideration of the Consultation*

- 2.3.5.1 Sufficient evidence was put forward to demonstrate that there are different levels of vulnerabilities across service user groups and that organisations will be able to take different approaches in light of their individual circumstances and therefore a blanket approach would not be the most effective way of delivering savings and mitigating impacts.
- 2.3.5.2 Although the majority of people who currently receive support have not been assessed as meeting the City Council's eligibility for Social Care, which is currently critical and substantial the Council should still be mindful of the impact on individuals of withdrawing

- or reducing support leading to them potentially requiring more intensive support later in life.
- 2.3.5.3 Alternative funding sources for Older Peoples Registered Social Landlords have been identified during the consultation, including Housing benefit. A number of organisations have approached Housing Benefit to access this alternative funding stream. The City Council should support this course of action.
- 2.3.5.4 Where organisations change their delivery model as a result of funding reductions new agreements will be entered into to reflect these revised arrangements.
- 2.3.5.5 The feedback regarding the application of criteria for access was considered to be an ineffective way of managing resources that would be difficult to implement and manage with little if any benefit for people that are supported.
- 2.3.6 *Proposal Following Consultation*
- 2.3.6.1 Implement reductions for Housing Related Support by taking an individual approach for each organisation. The arrangement for each organisation to be agreed by 1st April 2014 and implemented by 1st July 2014. Consideration of specific impacts to be delegated to the Executive Director (People) and Cabinet Member (Health and Adult Social Care). No organisation will be able to continue in their existing contractual terms and conditions. Changes will be made taking into account alternative funding sources and risks associated with vulnerability of service user groups affected.
- 2.4 Improving the Quality of Housing with Care Accommodation
- 2.4.1 In reading this section please refer to:
- Appendix Three – Project Proposal. Housing with Care
 - Appendix Four – ECA, Housing with Care
- 2.4.2 *Proposal Summary*
- 2.4.2.1 The proposal was to decommission the care and support provided at Jack Ball House and George Rowley House due to these being older bedsit style accommodation. The proposal contained a second stage to close further housing with care schemes as new capacity became available.
- 2.4.3 *Summary of the Consultation Response*
- 2.4.3.1 During the consultation there was a clear emphasis on the impact of moving older people and that this needed to be managed very sensitively. There was also an acknowledgment that the standard of accommodation was not of a good standard but the care provided was considered to be very good.
- 2.4.3.2 In respect of the second stage of the proposal more clarity was requested in that should people move at this point they would want some assurance that they would not have to move again as the result of future proposals that are currently unclear.
- 2.4.3.3 Whitefriars Housing have been working closely with the Council throughout the consultation. The future use of Jack Ball House and George Rowley House was raised during the consultation. Whitefriars Housing have confirmed they will examine the long term options for Jack Ball House and George Rowley House in view of their future investment strategy.

2.4.4 *Summary of Impact Analysis*

- 2.4.4.1 Within the population that would be affected by this proposal there are protected groups of age, ethnicity, disability and gender.
- 2.4.4.2 14 service users are at Jack Ball House at the time of writing of which 7 have requested social work support to re-locate. At George Rowley House 18 people remain, none of whom have requested support to move. There were 26 vacancies across Housing with Care in the City at the end of consultation. In order to mitigate impacts on individuals should the proposal proceed careful planning of moves involving families, relatives and carers should take place.
- 2.4.4.3 Should existing service users move from the schemes as a result of the proposal Whitefriars will look to alternative uses so as to avoid the Community Cohesion risks associated with empty buildings.

2.4.5 *Consideration of the Consultation*

- 2.4.5.1 The City Council has previous experience of managing moves to other facilities as a result of previous decisions to close facilities and this experience will be used to ensure moves are well planned and sensitively managed. The fact that there is capacity to relocate existing service users to other facilities indicates that people would have a degree of choice over alternative care arrangements.
- 2.4.5.2 In respect of the second stage of the proposal should the Council consider ceasing care provision at other schemes this would be consulted on separately.

2.4.6 *Proposal Following Consultation*

- 2.4.6.1 Cease the provision of care and support at Jack Ball House and George Rowley House with a target date of 1st July 2014. Maintain the second element of the proposal as an intended direction of travel but consult further on specific proposals as they emerge.

2.5 Focusing Day Opportunities and Transport to Promote Independence and support the most vulnerable

- 2.5.1 In reading this section please refer to:

- Appendix Five – Project Proposal, Day Opportunities and Transport
- Appendix Six – ECA, Day Opportunities and Transport

2.5.2 *Proposal Summary*

- 2.5.2.1 The proposals for day opportunities contained four elements 1) to consolidate Older People Day Opportunities from three sites to one 2) move two Learning Disability Day Opportunities to one site (Frank Walsh House) 3) Cease weekend and bank holiday provision at the Maymorn Dementia Day Centre and 4) Remodel Brandon Wood Farm to a more specialist centre.

2.5.3 *Summary of the Consultation Response*

- 2.5.3.1 During the consultation the issues that arose in respect of older people were the need to ensure that the requirements of service users from Black and Minority Ethnic groups are appropriately considered should the service from Frank Walsh House move to Gilbert

Richards Centre. For Risen Christ the issues mainly surrounding the close links between the Day Centre and the luncheon club and the risks that if the people using the day centre moved to Gilbert Richards Centre that this would risk the viability of the luncheon club which, if it was to close, would reduce community connections.

- 2.5.3.2 For the two Learning Disability Centres the limitations of the existing provision at Curriers Close and Watcombe Centre were recognised in the consultation and the potential benefits of moving to a more centrally based centre were positively received. There was however some concerns raised about the increased risks for individuals from being in a busier place in a busier part of town.
- 2.5.3.3 For Maymorn Centre the issue of alternatives were a focus of the consultation where, although the numbers of attendees are currently low, should the service cease to be provided this would require replacement care. As Maymorn provides the only dementia day service operating at weekends the suitability of any alternative service was a significant concern.
- 2.5.3.4 The proposal for Brandon Wood Farm to be remodelled as a more specialist centre. The general response to the consultation was that those affected would need to remain closely involved as plans became clearer especially with regard to alternative support if existing service users could no longer attend.

2.5.4 *Summary of Impact Analysis*

- 2.5.4.1 Within the population that would be affected by this proposal there are protected groups of age, ethnicity, disability and gender.
- 2.5.4.2 At the end of the consultation 91 service users attended Curriers Close and Watcombe Centre and 32 service users attend either the day service at Risen Christ or Frank Walsh House. Although all of these people can continue to receive a service at either Gilbert Richards Centre (Older People) and Frank Walsh House (Learning Disabilities) the implementation needs to be planned in conjunction with family carers to ensure transport arrangements are effective and the needs of minority groups current at Frank Walsh House are met should the service move.
- 2.5.4.3 The proposal would have significant impacts on older people with dementia that required support at weekends as Maymorn is the only dementia day service in the City. This would have an immediate impact on current service users and family carers and a longer term impact of those for whom the service would not be available in the future.

2.5.5 *Consideration of the Consultation*

- 2.5.5.1 With effective planning it is possible to close day centres and relocate to alternative provision. The City Council has done this previously, most recently in 2012 with the closure of St Thomas and Samuel Hayward day centres.
- 2.5.5.2 There are risks to the luncheon club should the day service move from Risen Christ. Although it is not a City Council responsibility to fund this type of provision there are risks to community connections and therefore consideration should be given to providing some transitional funding for Risen Christ with the expectation that this becomes self-sufficient after a transitional period.
- 2.5.5.3 In respect of the Maymorn Centre the numbers of people that attend the weekend service are low; this is however the only weekend day service in the City and the availability of alternative support at the weekend was a major concern of those

consulted. Should the weekend service close the costs of alternative arrangements would significantly impact on savings realised and prevent other people with dementia, as a growing group, from accessing support in the future.

2.5.6 *Proposal Following Consultation*

2.5.6.1 The proposals with regard to the re-location of services for Older People and Adults with a Learning Disability should proceed. In consideration of the luncheon club at Risen Christ some transitional funding for 18 months should be provided to enable the centre to make the adjustment required. The proposal to close the dementia weekend service at Maymorn should not proceed.

2.5.6.2 The proposal in respect of Brandon Wood Farm should be progressed following further consideration and more detailed planning.

2.6 Targeting Adult Social Care Information, Advice and Support

2.6.1 In reading this section please refer to:

- Appendix Seven – Project Proposal, Information, Advice and Support
- Appendix Eight – ECA, Information, Advice and Support

2.6.2 *Proposal Summary*

2.6.2.1 The proposal put forward in the consultation was to make a number of funding reductions across specific areas of activity in the voluntary sector currently provided by four organisations. The specific areas consulted on are detailed in Appendix One.

2.6.2.2 The funding reductions should the proposals proceed would total £120k across Coventry Carers' Centre, Age UK, Grapevine and the Alzheimer's Society. In the pre-consultation stage following feedback from these organisations each organisation assembled the proposals that were put out to consultation.

2.6.3 *Summary of consultation response*

2.6.3.1 During the consultation it was suggested that the reduction would reduce available support and that such reductions could have a detrimental effect on the City as it may result in people presenting at statutory services sooner. It was also suggested that the implementation of the proposal would have a disproportionate impact in relation to the savings to be achieved. Particularly it was suggested that a small saving at this point could result in significant longer term cost impacts as a result of reducing levels of available support. The provision on longer term funding agreements with the City Council for five years would assist in mitigation of impacts through providing a level of funding stability.

2.6.4 *Summary of Impact Analysis*

2.6.4.1 Within the population that would be affected by this proposal there are protected groups of age, ethnicity, disability and gender.

2.6.4.2 The mitigation of negative effects is detailed in Appendix Two and although effects can be mitigated through reducing a number of different service elements as opposed to ceasing any one area of provision this does not mitigate the effect of the reductions in service capacity. In addition, the presence of other information outlets is only part

mitigation as other services would be non-specialised and information based rather than advice.

2.6.5 *Consideration of the Consultation*

2.6.5.1 The organisations impacted on by the consultation suggested specific areas that may be impacted on as a result of a reduction in funding. These areas were outlined in the consultation. In order to mitigate some of the impact upon the organisations, and therefore the individuals affected, and to allow them to plan a sustainable service three year grant aid agreements will be offered to those affected to give some stability of funding in the medium term. These new agreements will be operated in a manner that allows the affected organisations to use resources in the most effective way to support people of the City as opposed to being held to very prescriptive conditions. Although five year agreements were requested this is too long a period in light of the pace and scale of public sector change.

2.6.6 *Proposal Following Consultation*

2.6.6.1 Implement the reduction to funding from 1 April 2014 and enter into three year Grant Aid Agreements which give added flexibility for organisations to use remaining resources to provide effective preventative support.

2.7 Realigning Reablement Responsibilities - Aylesford

2.7.1 In reading this section please refer to:

- Appendix Nine – Project Proposal, Aylesford
- Appendix Ten – ECA, Aylesford

2.7.2 *Proposal Summary*

2.7.2.1 The proposal concerned consulting with the Clinical Commissioning Group regarding the funding of the centre as it supports both health and social care. The impacts of closure were also consulted on so that if funding could not be sustained the impacts were properly understood prior to making any decision to close.

2.7.3 *Summary of the Consultation Response*

2.7.3.1 The Aylesford provides support that both enables hospital discharge, and reduces the need for ongoing care and support through delivery of reablement services. During the consultation a number of positive comments were received from staff and people that had used the service supporting how valued the service was.

2.7.3.2 A number of people indicated their support for the City Council consulting with the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) regarding the funding of the centre.

2.7.3.3 Acknowledging the value of the Aylesford across Health and Social Care the Clinical Commissioning Group engaged positively in the consultation and have agreed to make funding available for six months from 1 April 2014 to enable the Aylesford to continue and the production of a reablement strategy for the City. This work will form part of the Transformation Integration Programme between the City Council and Health.

2.7.4 *Summary of Impact Analysis*

2.7.4.1 Within the population that would be affected by this proposal there are protected groups of age, ethnicity, disability and gender.

2.7.4.2 Should the Aylesford close there would be impacts in the ability of the City Council and its health partners to support people appropriately on discharge from hospital and reduce the requirement for ongoing health or social care support. Part of this impact could be mitigated by other services; however, these may not currently be appropriate as an alternative in order to sufficiently mitigate risk.

2.7.5 *Consideration of the Consultation*

2.7.5.1 The proposal by the Clinical Commissioning Group to fund the Aylesford initially for a period of six months should be welcomed as this recognises the value of the Aylesford across both Health and Social Care.

2.7.5.2 Subject to the outcome of the reablement strategy work it may be appropriate to bring further future proposals with regard to the Aylesford.

2.7.6 *Proposal to be Implemented*

2.7.6.1 The offer of six months initial funding to enable the development of a new strategy for reablement should be supported by the City Council and consideration not given to closure at this point.

2.8 Remodelling Home Support Reablement in Coventry and ceasing in-house provision - HSSTS (Home Support Short Term Service)

2.8.1 In reading this proposal please refer to:

- Appendix Eleven – Project Proposal. Home Support Short Term Service
- Appendix Twelve – ECA, Home Support Short Term Service

2.8.2 *Proposal Summary*

2.8.2.1 This proposal concerned the closure of the in-house home support reablement service and the purchasing of this service externally. The proposal also concerned the re-modelling of reablement in Coventry across Health and Social Care.

2.8.3 *Summary of the Consultation Response*

2.8.3.1 During the consultation the majority of responses were received from staff and trade unions around the risks of not providing a service in-house, the fact that care jobs in the independent sector have less favourable terms and conditions than City Council jobs and those efficiencies could be made by service changes.

2.8.3.2 In the course of the consultation some staff members, supported by their Trade Unions, submitted proposals as to how the service could deliver savings to remain in-house. These included proposals around grading, travel arrangements and management structures.

2.8.3.3 Health colleagues recognised the high cost of the current service but were concerned that should the service close this would reduce reablement capacity across the City that would place increased pressure on other health and social care resources.

2.8.4 *Summary of the Impact Analysis*

- 2.8.4.1 As the service is provided on a short term basis existing service users would not be required to move to other providers as a direct result of the closure of this service.
- 2.8.4.2 Closing the service without alternative capacity elsewhere would have a negative impact due to restricting the opportunity for people to benefit from a period of reablement in order to reduce long term reliance on Health and Social Care
- 2.8.5 *Consideration of the Consultation*
 - 2.8.5.1 Work is underway to produce a reablement strategy for Coventry to provide a reablement service that meets the needs of health and social care.
 - 2.8.5.2 Although proposals were put forward by staff and trade unions to make savings these would not reduce the costs of the service to a comparable level with the independent sector. For example, the cost of the in-house service is £40 - £50 per hour whereas support in the independent sector is in the region of £12.00 - £13.00 per hour.
 - 2.8.5.3 As the nature of the service is short term there is not a static group of people that would be affected, however consideration needs to be given to making a similar service available for people going forward. Commissioning this jointly with Health would recognise the benefits of reablement across Health and Social Care.
- 2.8.6 *Proposal to be Implemented*
 - 2.8.6.1 It is proposed that the in-house service closes to a target date of 1st July 2014.
 - 2.8.6.2 While the reablement strategy work is completed existing City Council framework contracts will be used to purchase reablement home support for health and social care.

3. Results of consultation undertaken

- 3.1 The consultation undertaken between 27 August 2013 and 15 November 2013 was extensive and covered the proposals around six areas of activity currently undertaken by the City Council.
- 3.2 The consultation was public and covered the whole series of consultation proposals. In order to support stakeholders in understanding the detail of the proposals, the consultation was undertaken in a variety of ways depending on the target audience.
- 3.3 A combination of methods were used to consult including on-line and paper based in a survey format, with a generic set of questions for each proposal. The survey was available throughout the twelve weeks on the City Council website and internally on Beacon (intranet). The consultation was available in ten different languages, including Punjabi, Gujarati, Mandarin and others.
- 3.4 Staff, Trade Unions, service users, families, carers, service providers, and voluntary sector organisations were invited to take part in and had the opportunity to contribute to the consultation through the methods outlined.
- 3.5 A range of consultation meetings and drop-in sessions were held for each of the different stakeholder groups. During consultation meetings involving groups, organisations and individuals, people were asked to encourage other interested parties to participate in the consultation and share their views. People were also reminded that they could contribute to the consultation on as many occasions as they wanted to.

- 3.6 Paper copies of the consultation proposals and the consultation survey were made available to all groups, service users, carers, family members on request, and made available in all seventeen libraries across the city, in Civic Centre 1, and Council House receptions. Pre-paid envelopes were made available if required.
- 3.7 Over the period of consultation approximately 90 consultation meetings were held, 1,000 people were spoken to, 536 survey responses were completed, 8,500 people were directly contacted and over 2,000 website hits were received. As a number of different projects were being consulted on the nature of responses varied considerably and are outlined for each project in the attached appendices.
- 3.8 A number of organisational responses were received both on the programme overall and on specific proposals. These included responses from organisations such as Healthwatch Coventry, West Midlands Fire Service, Coventry and Rugby Clinical Commissioning Group, Coventry and Warwickshire Partnership Trust, Coventry University and from a number of organisations directly affected by the proposals.
- 3.9 Feedback from all consultation discussion was recorded and analysed throughout the process. This information was used to inform an interim report that was issued part way through the consultation process.
- 3.10 It is clear from the consultation that most people who responded were not in support of the proposals. This was borne out in the comments received in the course of consultation meetings and more specifically evidence through the survey where the majority of people disagreed with the proposals. Many individuals recognised the immense challenges facing the City Council and although did not agree did comment positively on the approach taken by the City Council in being honest about the financial position and speaking to people about this through consultation.
- 3.11 During the consultation people were given the opportunity to put forward alternative options for how savings could be made. Although some alternative proposals were received they did not meet the level of savings required by the financial targets.

4. Timetable for implementing this decision

- 4.1 If decisions were made to implement any or all of the proposals they will be implemented as early as possible in 2014.
- 4.2 Due to the range and complexity of proposals identified, full implementation will not be achieved until the summer of 2014.

5. Comments from the Executive Director, Resources

- 5.1 Financial implications
- 5.1.1 This report seeks approval to implement a set a proposals following consultation to deliver the savings required from the previous Community Services Directorate.
- 5.1.2 When fully implemented these proposals are expected to deliver the savings s described in table one below.

Table One – Forecast Savings from Proposals

Title - Project	Forecast Savings £m
Info and Advice	0.12
Housing Related Support	1.50
Reablement – Aylesford	0.90 (dependent upon outcome of review)
Reablement – Home Support Short Term Service	1.70
Day Opportunities and Transport	0.50
Housing with Care	0.40
Electronic Call Monitoring	0.40
Total Revenue Savings	5.52

- 5.1.3 Due to the differing implementation dates relating to the various proposals, it is expected that £4.5m worth of savings will be achieved within 2014/15 with the full year effect taking place the following year. The delivery of these savings is required for the City Council and the Directorate to deliver a balanced budget.
- 5.1.4 The City Council Budget for 2013/14 is £268.4m net (excluding schools), which already takes into account the savings required for this year. Of this, the Community Services Directorate Budget for 2013/14 is £99.5m.
- 5.2 Legal implications
- 5.2.1 The proposals outline a number of significant changes to the way in which the People Directorate delivers services to the population of the city, whilst continuing to comply with its statutory responsibilities.
- 5.2.2 Public authority decision makers are under a non-delegable ongoing duty to have due regard to the need to 1) eliminate discrimination, 2) advance equality of opportunity and 3) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic (Public sector equality duty – s 149(1) Equality Act 2010).
- 5.2.3 The relevant protected characteristics are age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex, and sexual orientation.
- 5.2.4 Decision makers must be consciously thinking about these three aims as part of their decision making process with rigour and with an open mind. The duty is to have “due regard”, not to achieve a result but to have due regard to the need to achieve these goals. Consideration must be given to the potential adverse impacts and the measures (if any) that are available to minimise any discriminatory effects.

- 5.2.5 Cabinet members must therefore ensure they read all papers to enable them to assess the risk and extent of any adverse impacts and the ways in which such risk may be eliminated.
- 5.2.6 “In short, the decision maker must be clear precisely what the equality implications are when he puts them in the balance, and he must recognise the desirability of achieving them, but ultimately it is for him to decide what weight should be given in light of the relevant factors”.

6. Other implications

6.1 How will this contribute to achievement of the Council's key objectives / corporate priorities (corporate plan/scorecard) / organisational blueprint / Local Area Agreement (or Coventry Sustainable Community Strategy)?

The Council Plan sets out the city's vision for Coventry, which is ‘Coventry proud to be a city that works...’

The proposals contained within this report contribute to the Council's vision and objectives as follows:

...for jobs and growth...although the proposals will see a reduction in City Council jobs employment opportunities will be created through externally commissioning services.

...to support and celebrate our young people...the proposals contained within this report focus on support to Adults as delivered by the previous Community Services Directorate, however, the newly formed People directorate will create opportunities for how Children and Adult services can work together.

...to protect our most vulnerable residents...one of the focusses of the abcs programme is supporting the most vulnerable. The proposals contained within this report are aimed at ensuring the Directorate can continue to support the most vulnerable and reducing other areas of services will support the delivery of this.

6.2 How is risk being managed?

Risk management plans are in place for each of the projects. The monitoring of these risks, along with actions to mitigate, takes place through the abcs programme board. The risks associated this programme of work are included on the corporate risk register.

6.3 What is the impact on the organisation?

The recommendations to either decommission and/or reorganise services will mean that a number of City Council staff are affected by these proposals. The proposals will result in a mix of post deletions, job changes, changes to work locations and some variations to working hours.

The most significant impact is in relation to post deletions as the proposals in relation to the Home Support Short Term Service, Housing with Care and Day Opportunities would result in the deletion of approximately 150 occupied posts. Of these posts 140 are occupied by part time female workers. As the Clinical Commissioning Group has agreed with the City Council to fund the Aylesford from reablement monies, initially for six months from 1 April 2014 to 30 September 2014, the 40 posts at the Aylesford will not be affected at this time.

A number of strategies will be put in place in order to mitigate the impact of post deletions on staff. For example 44 Early Retirement/Voluntary Redundancy applicants already exist within Internally Provided Services and Adult Social Care as a result of the Council's previous ER/VR programmes. In addition there are potentially a further 8 to 10 redeployment opportunities which exist on the Council wider bumped opportunities list all of which would create redeployment opportunities for a number of staff displaced by these proposals.

Should recommendations be approved discussions will take place with Trades Unions about the proposals for implementation. This will include plans to minimise the adverse impact on employees as far as possible through further VR applications, vacancy management and redeployment, and by reviewing existing temporary contracts, and agency usage. Individual meetings will take place with all affected employees and implementation will be managed in accordance with the City Council's change management agreement, the Security of Employment Agreement.

The implementation plan will include a range of initiatives which will be designed to support affected employees through the process of change also and to support them in finding suitable alternative employment either within or outside of the Council.

6.4 Equalities / EIA

During the consultation process, the Equality and Consultation Analyses were further developed so that final decisions can be made based on available knowledge of known impacts. Due to the scale of changes required, all negative impacts cannot be removed or mitigated.

An overarching Impact Analysis has been completed and is included at Appendix Thirteen. This includes a description of the impact on staff as well as people that use services.

6.5 Implications for (or impact on) the environment

The proposals to reduce the number of day centres and therefore transport routes to centres is likely to reduce the number of City Council vehicles on the road.

6.6 Implications for partner organisations?

There are implications for partner organisations within many of the proposals. These include:

Voluntary Sector:

Voluntary sector organisations will be impacted upon including Alzheimer's Society, Age UK, Carers' Centre, and Grapevine, Coventry MIND, as well as a number of Registered Social Landlords, e.g. Whitefriars, Orbit, Midland Heart Housing.

Health:

The Clinical Commissioning Group is directly impacted by the proposals in respect of Home Support Short Term Service and the Aylesford.

Report author(s):**Name and job title:**

Pete Fahy, Assistant Director, People Directorate

Directorate:

People Directorate

Tel and email contact:

Mail to: Peter.Fahy@coventry.gov.uk

Tel: 024 7683 3555

Enquiries should be directed to the above person.

Contributor/ approver name	Title	Directorate or organisation	Date doc sent out	Date response received or approved
Contributors:				
Mark Godfrey	Deputy Director	People	23/11/13	10/12/13
Sara Roach	Deputy Director	People	23/11/13	10/12/13
Linda Sanders	Interim Assistant Director	People	23/11/13	10/12/13
Simon Brake	Assistant Director	People	23/11/13	10/12/13
Cat Parker	Executive Project Manager	People	23/11/13	10/12/13
Marc Greenwood	Programme Delivery Manager	People	23/11/13	10/12/13
Michelle McGinty	Head of Involvement and Partnerships	People	23/11/13	10/12/13
Nigel Hart	Communications Officer	Chief Executives	23/11/13	10/12/13
Marion O'Brien	Human Resources Manager	Resources	23/11/13	10/12/13
Lara Knight	Governance Services Team Leader	Resources	5/12/13	11/12/13
Names of approvers for submission: (officers and members)				
Finance: Ewan Dewar	Finance Manager, Community Services	Resources	23/11/13	10/12/13
Legal: Julie Newman	Senior Solicitor	Resources	23/11/13	10/12/13
Director: Brian M Walsh	Executive Director	People	23/11/13	13/12/13
Members: Councillor A. Gingell	Cabinet Member (Health and Adult Services)	-	6/12/13	17/12/13

This report is published on the Council's website: www.coventry.gov.uk/councilmeetings