

## COMMUNITY & ADULT SERVICES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

15 FEBRUARY 2016

Present: County Councillor McGarry(Chairperson)  
County Councillors Carter, Lomax, Magill and Sanders

### 64 : APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillors Ali Ahmed, Ralph Cook and Chris Davis.

### 65 : DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Declarations of interest were received from Councillors Lomax and Sanders.

Councillor Lomax declared a personal interest as he lives in sheltered accommodation provided by Cardiff Council.

Councillor Sanders declared a personal interest as she arranges domiciliary care for a family member.

### 66 : MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 20 January 2016 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairperson.

### 67 : DRAFT CORPORATE PLAN AND BUDGETARY PROPOSALS 2016/17

The Chairperson advised that the report provided Members with an opportunity to consider those items contained in the draft Corporate Plan and draft Budgetary Proposals that fall within the responsibility of the Committee. These would be considered by Cabinet on 18<sup>th</sup> February, prior to being considered by the whole Council on 25<sup>th</sup> February. The meeting would be structured with an overview first, followed by budget proposals being considered by portfolio.

#### Draft Corporate Plan and Budgetary Overview 2016/17

The Chairperson welcomed Councillor Hinchey (Cabinet Member – Corporate Services and Performance), Christine Salter (Section 151 Officer, Corporate Director – Resources), Allan Evans (OM, Service Accountancy) and Edward Janes (Cardiff Research Centre) to the meeting.

Members were provided with a presentation on the Draft Corporate Plan and Budgetary Overview 2016/17.

The Chairperson thanked the Cabinet Member and Officers for the presentation and invited questions and comments from Members:

- Members sought clarification on what was meant by ‘shape of later years’ proposals and themes’. Officers clarified that there had been a reshaping base budget exercise undertaken over the last few years, to see how far

away from the statutory minimum service delivery the council was whilst remaining financially sustainable; this work had been split into these headings and the finding from the work would be released in time.

- With reference to the Capital Programme, Members asked how far borrowing could go before paying back became a concern and asked what the debt versus income ratio was. Officers stated that the ratio is monitored; they understand the prudent and repayable debt balance into the future; Cabinet were conscious that they cannot increase borrowing by very much. Members needed to be aware of the local affordability indicator, however there was no red flag to be worried about at the present time.
- Members asked for clarification of what proportion of the All Wales social services settlement of £21m would be allocated to Cardiff. Officers explained that it is 10% however Cardiff has made this up to £3.5m.
- Members discussed the Corporate Plan and asked for further information on measuring progress, descriptors, recognising the work of the third sector, deliverability of budget savings put forward for 2016/17 and the figure of capital receipts for this year. Officers stated that there was better diligence this year and more of a focus on planning the service with proposed cuts; more with detailed planning status means that they are much more certain of deliverability for 2016/17. With regards to Capital receipts, Officers stated that the end of March was the timeline, but progress was in the right direction, there was 1 piece of land yet to be signed off but when it is they will have over achieved capital receipts; going forward there was the schools programme to consider.

The Chairperson thanked Officers and the Cabinet Member for their contribution and for their answers to Members questions.

#### Economic Development and Partnerships

The Chairperson welcomed Councillor Phil Bale (Leader, Economic Development and Partnerships), Sarah McGill (Director of Communities, Housing and Customer Services), Christine Salter (Section 151 Officer, Corporate Director – Resources) and Allan Evans (OM, Service Accountancy) to the meeting.

Members were provided with a presentation on Neighbourhood Regeneration, which included information on the Capital Programme – General Fund.

The Chairperson thanked the Cabinet Member and Officers for their contribution to Committee and invited questions and comments from Members:

- Members asked what the read across was between the Corporate Plan and What Matters – deliverability of outcomes. The Leader stated that there was a new Head of Performance in place now and it was important to communicate to the public how the Council performs. The Plan on a Page had been produced but a further summary was needed showing how outcomes effect citizens. Officers added that the What Matters Refresh was being undertaken with all of the Council's partners as there was a need to show individuals how connections are made back to What Matters.

- Members asked how the Neighbourhood Regeneration Scheme worked whereby ward Members can propose schemes. Officers explained that Members put forward priorities across the City in a very transparent way. The Leader added that this was done a few years ago; it was also difficult to select schemes with a three-year window. It was important to keep Members informed as Members local priorities can change over a three-year period. The Leader stated there was a need to think about how to update and refresh the scheme.
- Members discussed Invest to Save in relation to the Maelfa shopping centre and asked why it was separated out of the Capital Spend. The Leader explained that a phased approach of delivery had been taken to get the scheme up and running; the corporate view was to purchase retail units in order to get income from them, i.e. invest to save. This would also enable an element of control when working with the community and tenants, getting a good mix of retail units for longevity. The rents that come in from the rental units will fund the Corporate Financing of £1m.
- With reference to savings line 62, Members asked if there was justification of moving from Capital Spend. Officers explained that staff costs can then be charged back and this was a legitimate charge. The Leader added that the Capitalisation of posts onto projects carries the risk of funding the capital to fund the posts.

The Chairperson thanked Officers and the Cabinet Member for their contribution and for their answers to Members questions.

#### Community Development, Co-operatives and Social Enterprise

The Chairperson welcomed Councillor Peter Bradbury (Cabinet Member - Community Development, Co-operatives & Social Enterprise), Neil Hanratty (Director Economic Development), Christine Salter (Section 151 Officer, Corporate Director – Resources) and Allan Evans (OM, Service Accountancy) to the meeting.

The Cabinet Member was invited to make a statement in which he said that this was an interesting area; the Hub roll out was underway and all were due to be completed; also the Taxi Marshalls now came to this committee.

The Director stated that in relation to Savings Proposal 76 - Taxi Marshalls, there would be no changes at all to the service; the onus had been put on the service area to find ways of funding the services and officers were exploring ways of doing this through BID, Sponsors and income from digital advertising. It was noted that there would be no reduction in the service at all this year.

The Chairperson invited questions and comments from Members:

- Members sought clarification that all Taxi Marshalls would remain and working the same amount of hours. The Director confirmed that this was correct and that it would be included in the BID as an area for private contribution; he was committed to keeping the service at the same level.

- Members noted that on the employee spreadsheet against the Taxi Marshall saving, it was stated that 3 FTE; s would be deleted. The Director stated that this was an error and that no posts were being deleted.
- Members discussed how Taxi Marshalls assist the police in reducing anti social behaviour and whether the Council has a statutory duty to do this. The Cabinet Member stated that the responsibility lies with the Police but the Council has a moral duty to assist with this.
- Members discussed the use of Public Realm in Queen Street/St. Mary Street and were concerned about the impact on disabled and visually impaired people. The Director stated that there was not a planned increase in the areas to be used but to increase the number of times throughout the year when it is used.

The Chairperson thanked Officers and the Cabinet Member for their contribution and for their answers to Members questions.

### Health, Housing and Well Being

The Chairperson welcomed Councillor Susan Elsmore (Cabinet Member - Health, Housing and Well Being), Sarah McGill (Director of Communities, Housing and Customer Services), Tony Young (Director of Social Services), Jane Thomas (Assistant Director Communities and Housing) and Amanda Phillips (Interim Assistant Director Adult Social Services), Christine Salter (Section 151 Officer, Corporate Director – Resources) and Allan Evans (OM, Service Accountancy) to the meeting.

The Chairperson invited the Cabinet Member to make a statement in which she thanked Committee for the opportunity to discuss the budget on what was a very broad portfolio. The Cabinet Member stated that she was determined to increase transparency, planning and attention to detail; partnership working across directorates and addressing challenges; she added that there was a lot of work to do.

The Chairperson invited questions and comments from Members:

- With reference to the Corporate Plan, Members considered that the desired improvements in this area could be told more strongly in the opening section of the Plan so this is clearer; that proposals/commitments could be shown more clearly how they fit together and that measurement baselines could be set out so that they don't have to be looked for at the back of the Plan.
- Members considered Improvement Objective 2.1 and noted that there were a different number of measures on different pages; the Director advised that there are new measures that have no benchmark as yet. He added that the links between the commitments and measures could be stronger but they had not wanted to overburden the plan. Members made reference to Dementia Friendly, Members couldn't see how this was measured; the Director stated that this would be in the implementation plan rather than a statistical measure and would be reflected in the Directorate Delivery Plan.

- Members noted that the savings proposals this year are smaller and more modest than previously and sought assurance that with reference to the commissioning service, the saving proposal had been subject to more analysis than last year. The Cabinet Member assured Members that there was now better due diligence, the proposals were more robust and realistic. The Director also noted that Governance arrangements were in place; there was an Adults Services Commissioning Board, which challenged Officers regarding the robustness of savings proposals; it was noted however that there are lots of variables as the service is dealing with people receiving packages of care.
- Members made reference to 'writing off' previous savings that had not been achieved and sought further information on this. Officers advised that this had only been done for savings that were unachievable, they were still chasing those that could be and still needed to be achieved.
- With reference to the Alarm Receiving Centre, Members suggested that service users could receive a phone call per day to check that they are ok. Officers stated that this already happens on a daily basis, this is provided for all those that are signed up to use the Telecare Service. Officers also noted that a unique selling point of the service, visits to home, has resulted in a decrease in ambulance calls.
- Members discussed Direct Payments and noted the importance of protecting vulnerable Adults from financial abuse by criminals and asked how vulnerable adults were being safeguarded. Officers advised that the Local Safeguarding Adult Board had been established, which was looking at financial abuse with good partnership arrangements in place with the Police and other organisations.
- Members discussed consultation, samples and results and considered that there was inconsistency on how these were reported back, so caution should be used on this; particularly with regard to the different approaches used re Day Opportunities Strategy Consultation.
- Members wanted to commend the work that gone on and the huge improvements that had been made this year. Members sought further information on what the £21m All Wales settlement was being spent on. Officers advised that there was £3.5m on investments, the settlement had eased pressures, money needed to be dedicated to preparing for the act and work to be done to respond to demographic growth. It was also noted that it was important to recognise the large outstanding savings from 14/15 and 15/16. Members sought clarification on what savings had been written off and were advised that £2.3m of unachievable savings had been written off.
- Members made reference to the 4 FTE's being lost with reference to line 61 reablement and asked where the posts were being lost from. Officers stated that there was a decrease in supervisors in domiciliary care; it was noted that it was important to make the best use of grants and to not be entirely dependant on the market for domiciliary care provision; there would be investment and off setting of costs.

- Members noted that Direct Payments contract was extended until March 2017 and asked how savings were going to be made this year. Officers clarified that the contract was extended until January 2017, its linked to how long it takes to recommission the service and adjust to the new arrangements; there would be a smooth three-month delivery in this year which is what the saving is based upon. Officers added that as Direct payments increase, there is an effect on domiciliary care costs; there are also efficiencies to be found where people have been on the books for over 12 months; as the fee for start-up costs would not need to be paid.
- Members asked how health colleagues were being brought on board; the Cabinet Member stated that she has had clear discussions with the Health Board and Vale colleagues including Cabinet Members and the Chair of the Health Board; there was an open truthful and robust dialogue as it was important that funds that should come to a local authority does so rather than go to health inappropriately. Officers added that officers now challenge the Local Health Board to ensure that primary health needs measures are in place and that by law these should be funded by Health. The Cabinet Member commended the work being done and stated that the challenge being executed was making a difference.
- Members sought clarification on where the savings are in the Day Opportunities Strategy. Officers explained that the closing of Gabalfa Day Centre and the Hub being developed accounted for most of the savings; there would be a change in investment from Oldwell Court to Grand Avenue, however there was an issue with timing in that the current users of Oldwell Court were able to continue using the service until no longer required, before the reinvestment into Grand Avenue for hoists etc. can be started.

Members clarified that the £250k already saved was from the closure of Gabalfa Day Centre and asked for further information on the loss of 11 FTE's. Officers explained that some staff went on Voluntary Severance when the centre closed and other savings came from vacancies.

- Members asked if capacity at Grand Avenue is exceeded would the service be reduced or would service users be referred back to Oldwell Court. Officers stated that they have looked at the demand and used assessment and population index to determine the likely demand. Officers believed that Grand Avenue would accommodate people with moderate to high need (with the additional hoist facility) and that Fairwater and Minehead centres would accommodate low to medium need; officers believed that this would meet the demand needs however a fully integrated service may be needed in the future. The Director added that models are based on predictions and are not exact, there may be an increase in demand; if individuals are assessed with needs that the local authority cannot meet then they would be referred to other partner providers as there was a statutory obligation to meet their needs.
- Members made reference to line 139 and asked if the £1m saving was achievable. The Director stated that it was right that it was targeted although it was challenging. Officers added that there were 30 lines included in the one source and that officers were being challenged on a 1 to 2 weekly basis.

The Chairperson noted that it was difficult to scrutinise this when the information was not in front of them and asked what was included in the 30 lines. Officers stated that the information could not be in the public domain at this time.

- Members asked about the links between pressures and risks and about the resilience of the domiciliary care market. The Cabinet Member stated that this was being looked at nationally; the Director added that consultation was out at the moment, so there was a shift in policy; all calls would be a minimum time of 30 minutes; it was a national issue of low pay/value of work; work was being done to stimulate the market locally; officers added that CRT was being enhanced to respond to challenges.
- Members referred to the Act and local authorities' regional responsibility towards prisoners. It was clarified that it would be Cardiff's responsibility; In-Reach still happens and that there were two Officers within Cardiff prison mapping demand.
- Members made reference to the Disabled Facilities Grant Investment and asked if this would speed up processes. Officers stated that it would eventually; these were quite often long term projects; there would be peaks that would have to be dealt with due to the stop that was previously on. Members welcomed the investment and noted that previous issues had been partly to do with framework contracts; there was some concern over the management of growth, supervision of building work and that the money goes to the adaptations rather than the business margins. Members asked about the checks that were in place when the family contributes towards the cost and chooses the builder. Officers explained that there was a team that checks the adaptations when they are completed, this applies even when people manage the building work themselves; there was a need to measure and monitor and check that costs don't go up excessively.
- With reference to the Supported People Spending Plan, Members asked for clarification on what services were underused. Officers explained that the reference was for floating support services; there were a small number which would be realigned but with no issues for service users.
- Members sought assurance that the spending plan without the overall Commissioning Plan would be acceptable; Officers stated that due to Welsh Government timelines it was still being developed so there was room to influence the detail and it should be acceptable to include the spend plan on this basis.

The Chairperson thanked Officers and the Cabinet Member for their contribution and for their answers to Members questions.

#### Skills, Safety, Engagement and Democracy

The Chairperson welcomed Councillor Dan De'Ath (Cabinet Member –Skills, Safety, Engagement and Democracy), Joseph Reay (Head of Performance and Partnerships), Christine Salter (Section 151 Officer, Corporate Director – Resources),

Allan Evans (OM, Service Accountancy and Dave Holland (Head of Regional Regulatory Services) to the meeting.

The Chairperson invited the Cabinet Member to make a statement in which he said that they are set to meet all the savings. In relation to CCTV in the City it was stressed that there were 220 in the City and the savings related to cameras that do not currently work. It was also noted that BID would be asked to contribute to the costs of Operation Mistletoe.

The Chairperson invited questions and comments from Members:

- Members asked how confident Officers were that they would get contributions by December 2016 as the Night Time Levy could not be in place by then and the BID cannot fund existing services. The Cabinet Member stated that there would not be a gap in funding; he was confident that the BID would be successful as people in the trade recognise that this is the direction of travel; it happens across the UK and has improved cities.
- Members asked if this contribution from BID would fund Operation Mistletoe. The Cabinet Member stated that it would, there was an element of risk but he was assured by people in the business community that it would come through and that there would be elements of Community Safety in the BID. Members noted that it was a relatively small saving and the business community were being expected to pay for it when they already pay business rates and asked who actually votes on the BID. The Cabinet Member explained that businesses vote on the BID; MOSAIC and the Chair of Licensees have indicated that the appetite for it is good and that it is only a modest contribution that is being asked for.
- Members noted the Corporate Plan Objective two mentions domestic violence but that domestic violence isn't mentioned in the measure section and sought clarification on this. The Cabinet Member stated that it was based on recommissioning and that it would be looked at in the future.
- Members noted that Trafficking was not mentioned in the Corporate Plan and the Cabinet Member advised that it comes under What Matters. Members were concerned that people would not know this; the Cabinet Member conceded and said that the Corporate Plan is meant to be concise. Officers added that Trafficking is not visible in the Regulatory Services Plan but staff are trained and its becoming mainstreamed into their work.
- With regard to Regulatory Services Savings, Members asked what impact there is on services when savings are made. Officers stated that they articulate what the service does, what are the core services and what are Authority specific. There would be £600k savings from management rationalisation to protect the front end of the service; there has been a refocus on grades of posts within the service; there was a move towards increasing income and officers were confident they would make the savings.
- Members asked why the savings were categorised as Red/Amber if confidence was so high. Officers explained that it was uncharted territory at the moment, the structure needed to be populated and services needed to



be sold; 30% of the savings predicated on raising income, Officers were confident it could be found but until it was identified it remained as Red/Amber risk category.

The Chairperson thanked Officers and the Cabinet Member for their contribution and for their answers to Members questions.

AGREED – That, the Chairperson on behalf of the Committee writes to relevant Cabinet Members, Directors and officers thanking them for attending the Community and Adult Services Scrutiny Committee on 15 February 2016 and to convey the observations of the Committee when discussing the way forward.

68 : DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the Community & Adult Services Scrutiny Committee is scheduled to take place on 2 March 2016 at 5.00pm in CR4, County Hall.