

COMMUNITY & ADULT SERVICES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

2 NOVEMBER 2016

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

35 : APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence received.

36 : DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

A declaration of interest was received from Councillor Sanders in respect of Item 5. Councillor Sanders declared a personal interest as a family member is in receipt of Direct Payments for Domiciliary Care.

37 : MINUTES

The minutes of the Community and Adult Services Scrutiny Committee held on 5 October 2016 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairperson.

38 : COMMUNITY SAFETY

The Chairperson welcomed Councillor Daniel De'Ath, Cabinet Member for Skills, Safety, Engagement and Democracy to the meeting.

The following officers and witnesses were also in attendance and welcomed to contribute to the discussion and answer Members' questions:

Joseph Reay, Head of Performance & Partnerships, Stephanie Kendrick- Doyle, Community Safety Manager, Louise Bassett – Partnership Delivery Team Leader, Ellen Curtis (OM Landlord Services), Will Lane (OM Neighbourhood Services (Shared Regulatory Services), Carl Davies, Prevent Co-ordinator, Superintendent Stephen Jones – South Wales Police, Chief Inspector Daniel Howe – South Wales Police, David Bents – South Wales Fire & Rescue Services, Conrad Eydmann, Head of Substance Misuse Strategy & Development, Cardiff & Vale University Health Board, Angela Stephenson, Strategic Partnership & Planning Manager, Cardiff & Vale University Health Board, Victoria Harris, Head of Local Delivery Unit for Cardiff & Vale, Wales Community Rehabilitation Company and Mark Brace Assistant South Wales Police & Crime Commissioner.

The Chairperson explained how the structure of the questioning would take place, namely in the following sections; current arrangements, operational effectiveness, anti-social behaviour, community cohesion and future arrangements. The Chairperson invited questions and comments from Members;

Current Arrangements and Operational Effectiveness

- Members asked how the Governance arrangements differed from previously and what implications this had. The Cabinet Member stated that the main governance vehicle was the safer and cohesive programme board, so there was no real change in what was being done there, and therefore no disconnect. Witnesses stated that they considered arrangements had improved, with better partnership working, keenness to align priorities through the Police and Crime plan and Public Service Board.
- Members asked if there were any problems with duplications or any issues with the forums; and were advised that the forums were different which allowed for focus on strategic issues and then also local issues, so a monitored strategy but operational on the ground. Officers added that the approach was in transition to ensure consistency it was important to take what was working, checking the understanding of value added and taking that to the new arrangement; which was open to all partners.
- Members noted that the main mechanism for decision making in the Council is the Cabinet, and were concerned that this sits outside of that and sought assurance that the governance was cohesive. Officers stated that it was, the Leader is the chair of the board and the Chief Executive is also on the board, this gives synergy and the opportunity to be fully aligned.
- Members asked if governance arrangements that were in place were robust enough to keep the City safe; Officers stated that it was a key priority to develop Safer Cardiff, this couldn't be allowed to slip even in times of austerity; confidence was needed in priority areas where it was possible to deliver and add value more in partnership than individually.
- Members noted that the partnership has statutory responsibilities regarding engaging and consulting with communities and asked how these would be delivered; and were advised that this was done through Ask Cardiff Survey, Partners have direct access to community groups and consultation and intelligence adds to the data collected. It was also noted that partners have contributed through the What Matters Strategy, through micro consultations such as Compass Survey in relation to Anti-Social Behaviour and PACT.
- Members asked what the difference was between highlight and intelligence reports and noted that the board would need composite performance data. Officers advised that this was being worked on; the data reports a broad range of criminal activity which was all useful but not all relevant; officers are focussing on outcomes and understanding the differences being made in partnership that couldn't be made alone and showing the outcomes that prove we are making a difference.
- Members asked what the differences were between incidences and offences; and were advised that incidents were all that were reported and offences were if a crime was found at source.
- With regard to Domestic Abuse, Members considered it would be useful to have information as to where crime was recorded and how many of these went on to

successful convictions; this would show what difference was being made. Members also noted the apparent lack of exploitation recorded and wondered if something was being missed collectively. Members were advised that all recorded crime data on Domestic Violence was tested robustly and data would stand up to scrutiny. With regards to exploitation, lots of work was being commissioned on this, there are a number of live investigations ongoing which would be addressed, highlighted and intelligence developed.

Anti-Social Behaviour

- Members noted that the Council carries out many roles including landlord and asked how the board interacts with registered social landlords with problem tenants. Officers explained that the primary element of ASB was noise, the Council has close relations with social landlords; noise is often associated with other problems such as alcohol abuse so officers work with other teams closely to address, including Health ensuring care plans focused on ensuring accommodation is retained. Forums and groups discuss case reviews and there are also problem solving groups that the Police and social landlords are invited to attend; at a higher level there are also Quality of Life meetings which takes into account mental health, addiction etc.
- Members noted that neighbourhoods all have very different issues and that these are reflected in Neighbourhood Partnership Action Plans, but how are city Wide strategic issues addressed and the City kept safe, particularly in times of austerity? Officers explained that it was a thematic issue, the nature of ASB means that different responses are needed; local response are needed to resolve at neighbourhood level, the more community led the better. Officers noted the importance of involving the community in developing solutions to ASB.
- Members asked about how partners worked together to resolve ASB issues in owner occupied and private rented sector which do not involve social housing tenants. Officers advised that the Police take the lead role but that there are less established protocols in these areas, with higher evidence levels required for injunctions etc.
- Members asked for an update on community triggers and were advised that it was currently being rolled out to local authorities.
- Members noted the importance of involving schools and further education establishments, including using facilities in school holiday time, and also noted the importance the Schools Community Police Officers and youth volunteers play in respect of the prevent agenda, ASB and CSE.

Community Cohesion and Future Arrangements

- With reference to the Prevent agenda, Members asked how the partnership was going with the Home Office targets, and were advised that things were challenging but improving; the Home Office and Welsh Government join up was very important strategically; Cardiff hasn't had the experiences of Channel like other parts of the UK but Cardiff has 25/30 partners all involved when an individual is identified as going down the extremism route; all at no cost unless

specialists are needed. Members also noted the involvement of the Mosques and social media training for Imams.

- Members asked for an update on the Domestic Homicide Review (DHR) referred to in the Safer and Cohesive Partnership Board Cohesion report. Officers explained that it was facilitated by the Communities area; DHR's were unpredictable by nature, new cases were coming through and given full significance.
- Members asked if there was a standard definition for Community Cohesion which the work programme flows from. Officers explained that they work to the Welsh Government definition, under that there is the action plan with 7 key priorities; Hate Crime/Human Trafficking/Asylum Seekers/Refugees & Migration/Policy Development/Community Tensions/Gypsy & Travellers. Officers were working with the Welsh Government Interim Action Plan for 1 year due to the elections and hoping for 3 year plans going forward; there are separate delivery plans for the Vale and Cardiff as they experience different issues.

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 2 November 2016 and to convey the observations of the Committee when discussing the way forward.

39 : DOMICILIARY CARE

The Chairperson welcomed Councillor Susan Elsmore – Cabinet Member Health Housing and Wellbeing; Tony Young Director Social Services and Amanda Phillips Assistant Director Adult Services to the meeting.

The following witnesses were also in attendance to welcomed to contribute to discussions and answer Members' questions: David Francis – CSSIW Regional Director, Bernard McDonald – CSSIW Area Manager Cardiff, John Cushen and Phil Harding, Cardiff & Vale Parents Federation, Kirsty Best – Director, Absolute Care and Huw Owens – Director, Bluebirds Cardiff South.

The Chairperson invited the Cabinet Member to make a statement in which she placed great importance on the issue and stated that the essential test was the quality of care Cardiff provides.

The Chairperson invited questions and comments from Members and explained that given the scope of the item, she would be structuring the questioning by the main areas committee wished to explore, namely capacity, sustainability and contingency planning, quality, cost control, and future plans.

Capacity, Sustainability and Contingency Planning

- Members noted that CSSIW had reflected on a number of arrangements around Wales on a different basis and it would be interesting to hear from providers what type of approach had been the most conducive to enable capacity; a provider stated that capacity had been a huge issue and it was now important to attract people to work into the sector and to extract

efficiencies on the sector; it was also noted that providers had looked at the geographical approach, some clients were reluctant to change staff, there were examples of different companies visiting next door to another, it would need to be started afresh.

- Members noted that bids aren't received for all types of packages, it hasn't generated the hoped for capacity in the market and wondered if there was a way this could be fixed. Officers stated that they were looking at a new model which included locality and that some providers present had been part of that forum; the gaps could be bridged with ICF funds; they were launching a campaign to attract workers into the Cardiff workforce; homecare had been part of the locality project in Llanishen so there were opportunities for efficiencies to be made.
- Members asked if it was accepted that the current model was not working even though it had sounded positive at the start, and that locality based was the way to go forward. Officers explained that it had delivered what was intended such as service receipting and transparency, but there were still improvements to be made. It was a hybrid approach with technology to procure and engage the market in a different way; there were improved relations within the sector now also.

The Director added that concerns had been addressed in the inspection, it was important to keep what was good, build on relations, understand respective positions. The locality approach needed testing, but nothing was ruled out or in and it was impossible to pilot every model. Officers stated that it was important to note that the Domiciliary Care market was fragile nationally, the matrix had not contributed to destabilising the market, the issues were the cost of care and attracting people into the sector.

Providers stated their views and said that the matrix was not to blame, it had been a new system with new ways of doing things, teething problems had been experienced but once they were used to the system it had been easier to service receipt etc. They added that the issue was not Cardiff specific but a National one.

Officers highlighted that the licence for matrix/ Adam runs out in November 2018 and that alternatives are being explored. A bridging team is being established using ICF funding to help with Winter pressures.

The Cabinet Member added that it was a Wales wide issue that needed Wales wide solutions.

Mr Francis stated that people using services was at the heart of the issue, there was no one way or easy way of addressing the issue, sudden changes affect the market directly; Cardiff had made the brave decision to use a dynamic purchasing system, fears had not been realised and good relations had been established between providers and commissioners, this gave a big tick for transparency and when providers had withdrawn they were able to cover calls, 97% of calls had been found a contract. With regard to Price, ADAM means that there is no central procurement driving down prices, it allows for overtime and builds a profile.

Representatives from the Parents Federation stated in relation to carers pay that there was a risk of losing skills and expertise through the constant erosion of salaries, with supermarkets offering better pay there was not going to be the longevity and commitment from staff.

- Members asked if there was evidence of any demand management initiatives to address capacity and ensure that the limited capacity is used most appropriately. It was stated that rates of Domiciliary Care varies from Council to Council and Cardiff was at the high end; timely reviews are very important, packages could be reduced if people received regular reviews; it is hard to get an outcome based approach, there was an opportunity for creative contracting.
- Members asked how significant the reablement approach still is. Officers explained that demand management statistics at the first point of entry, the threshold is as lean as it can be, people need to be supported at home for as long as possible and practical. Reablement was something that officers wanted to enhance and extend the CRT offer for older people, lots of people who go through CRT don't need care packages.
- Members asked with regards to Direct Payments, whether they are having to be topped with peoples own resources to get the care needed. It was stated that there was still some misunderstanding of how people can use Direct Payments, for instance day/night care and respite care. Providers stated that they are aware of clients who do top up to meet the rates; Direct payments are blocked at £11.96 per hour and some services can be up to £17.60 per hour.
- Members considered that there was a need to re-envisage the system, rebalance with more nursing care and look at ICF and cross transfer between Health and Social Care; the Cabinet Member stated that this was something that was being looked at, costs need to be rebalanced but it wouldn't be easy to address.

Quality

- Members referred to Annual Reviews and outcome focussed approach and asked how quality was measured to make sure that needs are met. Officers explained that the split between price and quality was 50/50; previously outcomes were measured at the beginning of the process they have now moved to a later stage at review stage where the service user needs are better known. Assessment/Care Plan – the review function has changed and is now more timely.
- Members asked if there were many calls that were under 30 minutes; officers advised that there was a low percentage, they regularly monitor the 15 minute calls from a quality perspective.
- Members asked for thoughts on zero hour contracts; Witnesses stated that staff mainly prefer them, research had shown that only 2% of staff wanted contracted hours as they enjoyed the flexibility zero hour contracts provided;

the job was 24/7 and it provided flexibility to share early and late shifts as well as week day and weekend shifts.

Cost Control

- Members asked what more could be done to control costs; officers stated that Cardiff pays well compared to other core cities in Wales and that there was a process in place to look at costs of care packages.
- Members referred to the single bid and asked if this was included in the prices; officers explained that providers were worried that it would reduce costs so agreement had to be sought from all to make the charge; there were still 2 providers outstanding; officers explained that the cost was for the life of the care package. A witness stated that they promote single bids as it stops unviability in the long term.

Future Plans

- Members asked that given the current projected overspends in budgets, that quality can't be compromised and that all services need to be delivered, what would be the key priorities to deliver the essentials. Officers explained that demand needed to be appropriately managed and as quality can't be compromised then efficiencies needed to be found, therefore effective monitoring was more important than ever; it was important to look at sustainable models, set up workshops with providers, look at thematic approaches and best practice. It was also important to recognise that there were increasing costs in Domiciliary Care and a significant pressure bid had been submitted. The Director added that the population in need was growing and was more complex, better relations within the sector were needed; it was a question of what society was prepared to pay for Care; the Cabinet Member had been involved in round table discussions and work with the WLGA.

Witnesses stated that work had also been undertaken with parents and unpaid carers; it was important to look at recruitment and retention for work force planning.

- Members discussed the transition from Child to Adult social services and officers explained that with 8000 service users, personal contact could not be made with all, as happens with children; some vacancies exist in the service area however not all applicants are the quality that is needed. The Director stated that ICF funding of £2.4m had recently been secured to help with the transition from Children to Adult social services

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 2 November 2016 and to convey the observations of the Committee when discussing the way forward.

40 : BUILDING MAINTENANCE FRAMEWORK PRE-DECISION SCRUTINY

The Chairperson welcomed Councillor Susan Elsmore – Cabinet Member Health Housing and Wellbeing, Sarah McGill Director of Communities, Housing and Customer Services, Jane Thomas Assistant Director Communities, Housing & Customer Services and Sue Bartlett Operational Manager, Community Maintenance Services to the meeting.

Committee were advised that any questions in relation to information contained within Appendices 5 & 6 of the report should be kept until the meeting goes into closed session as they contain information of the kind described in paragraph 16 of Part 4 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972.

The Chairperson invited the Cabinet Member to make a statement in which she said that this was an important issue and she hoped that Members felt confident in the process that was being undertaken.

Members were provided with a presentation which included information on the Background to the Current Framework; Current Framework Summary; journey to date; Lessons Learnt/Action Plan; 3 Options for Consideration; Preferred Option for Disabled Adaptations; Tender Process and Timescales.

The Chairperson thanked officers for the presentation and invited questions and comments from Members:

- Members referred to the exemptions being mentioned in the report and asked why painting and boilers had been left out. Officers explained that the list had actually been updated since the report had been distributed and that painting had now been added to the general framework; other areas that were considered specialist would go directly to the contractors to offer best value for money.
- Members considered the presentation very helpful and wanted to give credit to the work already undertaken particularly in relation to Voids.
- Members asked for clarification on the apportionment of value for each section and were advised that it is based on estimated spend.
- Members asked about the rationale regarding some work being done on geographical area and then also specialists coming in too and asked how the Council manages that; officers advised that they would always be run separately and be planned; the new process would mean better visibility and would hopefully address previous issues of main contractors not properly managing sub-contractors and lack of communication.
- Members asked if there were enough contractors to make it viable and were advised that there were; a supplier forum had been held and 75 different contractors had attended.
- Members noted the well acknowledged problems with capacity of main contractor and asked what would happen if 1 of the 3 contractors couldn't attend a job and the other 2 were working to capacity; officers stated that they

would have the option of recruiting or taking on the job themselves if absolutely necessary; officers considered it manageable.

- Members asked that now the process was tighter whether there would be penalties if problems occurred; officers explained that there would be, and these would be used to encourage good performance too.
- Members asked how the 3 geographical areas were determined; officers advised that they had broken the City into 3 areas taking into consideration access roads, numbers of properties etc.
- Members asked if it was possible to write into the contracts that the Council had to have full details of all sub-contractors; officers advised that yes Contractors would have to provide this information.
- With reference to Disabled Adaptations, Members referred to the 7 lots and asked what evidence/information there was to ensure that this was the right number of lots and that geographical was not the appropriate option; officers explained that they had looked at lots of options, it was important to find the right balance but still add value for money while dealing with peaks and troughs in demand.

The meeting went into closed session to discuss information contained in Appendices 5-6 of the report which were exempt from publication because they contain information of the kind described in paragraph 16 of Part 4 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972.

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 2 November 2016 and to convey the observations of the Committee when discussing the way forward.

41 : COMMITTEE BUSINESS

At the Committee meeting on 16 September 2015 Members discussed how they wished to deal with future reports concerning committee business, such as correspondence reports and work programme reports. Members decided to combine these within an overarching Committee Business report.

This report provided the Committee with the latest update on correspondence. The Committee received copies of correspondence sent and received in relation to matters previously scrutinised by this Committee. Members noted that the only outstanding responses were from the last meeting.

Members noted that there would be an opportunity to feed into the Scrutiny Review process; there would be a draft report going to Policy Review and Performance Scrutiny Committee in January; which would then go to Constitution Committee and Council in February in order to review recommendations for the new administration.

The Principal Scrutiny Officer outlined the work programme; Members noted the additional item 'Suspending the right to buy – pre decision report' and considered that an email brief to Scrutiny Committee members be provided.

Members were advised that Cabinet meeting on the 10th November 2016 would have a report on budget proposals; therefore, this information would be in the public domain for a six-week consultation.

Members noted the topics due to be considered at the forthcoming scheduled meetings.

RESOLVED: To note the Committee Business Report.

42 : DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the Community and Adult Services Scrutiny Committee was scheduled for 7th December 2016 at 5.00pm in CR4, County Hall, Cardiff.

The meeting terminated at 9.20 pm