

ADULT SOCIAL CARE AND COMMUNITIES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

MINUTES of a meeting of the Adult Social Care and Communities Scrutiny Committee held on Tuesday 24 September 2019 at the Members' Room - Shire Hall, Gloucester.

PRESENT:

Cllr Stephen Hirst	Cllr Carole Allaway Martin
Cllr Iain Dobie	Cllr Terry Hale
Cllr Jeremy Hilton	Cllr Andrew Gravells
Cllr Steve Robinson	

Substitutes:

In attendance: Sarah Scott, Director Public Health
Mark Branton, Deputy Director Adult Social Care
Wayne Bowcock, Chief Fire Officer
Philip Williams, Lead Commissioner Communities and Infrastructure
Alexis Newport, Parking Manager
Paul Yeatman, Independent Chair, Gloucestershire Safeguarding Board
Jennifer Taylor, Lead Commissioner - Public Health
Steve O'Neill, Outcome Manager, Public Health, PWC Hub
Stephen Bace, Lead Democratic Services Officer
Bob Lloyd Smith – Gloucestershire Healthwatch
Cllr Tim Harman, Cabinet Member for Public Health and Communities

Apologies: Cllr Shaun Parsons
Cllr Phil Awford

1. APOLOGIES

See above.

2. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the meeting held on the 11 June 2019 were agreed as a correct record.

The minutes of the meeting held on 13 August 2019 were agreed as a correct record.

The minutes of the Joint meeting with Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 30 July 2019 were agreed as a correct record.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No additional declarations.

4. DRUG AND ALCOHOL BRIEFING

- 4.1 Sarah Scott, Director of Public Health introduced the report with further information provided by Jennifer Taylor, Lead Commissioner - Public Health and Steve O'Neill, Commissioning Manager Drug and Alcohol services. The report summarised the recent context for adult (18+) drug and alcohol treatment services in Gloucestershire as well as the current activity and performance and key priorities for the coming year. Some case studies had been provided to show the complexity of the service.
- 4.2 Gloucestershire County Council Public Health was responsible for commissioning the drug and alcohol treatment recovery services for adults. Improving outcomes from drug and alcohol services was a condition of the Public Health grant. Since 1 January 2017 the service had been provided by the national organisation Change, Grow, Live (CGL). This contract included a budget reduction from £5.9m per year to £5.1m, as well as the scope to better integrate services, delivering more than the previous service had. This had resulted in a new service model in Gloucestershire that had seen higher caseloads and increased group work. There had been a reduction in fixed hub with a greater emphasis on outreach work across the County.
- 4.3 The primary performance measure which was reported to scrutiny was:
- Proportion of adult alcohol misusers who had left treatment successfully
 - Proportion of all opiate users who have left treatment successfully, not representing in six months
 - Proportion of all non-opiate users who have left treatment successfully, not representing in six months
- 4.4 Although Gloucestershire saw a dip in treatment completions following recommissioning, the service was now performing well against national comparators. The upturn in performance that was shown in early-mid 2018 had been sustained and was beginning to plateau at its current level. Members understood that there was a wide range of performance across the country and discussed how close certain performance measures were to being in the top quartile of comparator local authorities, for example successful completions of opiate users.
- 4.5 Demand for services at the front door remained high for both alcohol and drug treatment with 2,569 people accessing services in 2018/19. The treatment

population was not evenly distributed across the county with nearly two thirds residing in Gloucester and Cheltenham.

4.6 Areas of focus going forward:

- Harm reduction including spread of MSRA
- Understanding impact of alcohol use on the hospitals
- Work with CCG, 2gether trust – effective support for those with mental health and drug and alcohol services

4.7 One member stated that she welcomed the improvement that had been shown following the dip in performance during the transition phase. She asked where assessment took place in the system and who referred individuals into it. It was explained that self-referral was the main entry point. Assessment took place in the hubs mainly, but there was some outreach that took place in districts to find a more convenient location. It was clarified that the three week measure was from the self-referral to treatment so the assessment took place in that window.

4.8 It was explained that there were good links between CGL and 2gether Trust in terms of working with people who have co-existing mental health conditions. Members were referred to the case studies which provided examples of the complex work being carried out.

4.9 One member explained that in America there was a lot of media coverage on opioids and he asked whether this was a problem in Gloucestershire. In response it was explained that due to a number of factors this was not a 'crisis' in Britain but that there was clearly an issue around opioids. The CCG were doing some work on this and a recent report was published by Public Health England (PHE).. It was suggested that further information be provided to members once available.

ACTION Jennifer Taylor

4.10 One member welcomed the geographical breakdown of the data within the paper. In response to his questions it was explained that the data was being closely examined to set the future direction of the service, particularly at the stage where it would need to be recommissioned.. One member raised the issue of those clients coming back into the system as opposed to new clients. It was explained that this was the nature of addiction that individuals could be referred multiple times. A deep dive exercise of the data would help to identify which individuals were new clients. Members would receive an update of this work in six months time.

ACTION Jennifer Taylor

4.11 There was some discussion regarding 'County Lines' and the impact of drug dealing; members wondered how information was provided to and from the police, without compromising the integrity of the service. In response it was explained that there was good communication with the Police. While County Lines did not equate to a significant amount of individuals accessing the service, the real concern was regarding the strength of the drugs being dealt and the impact on people accessing them. The Police would also refer individuals for help where they were engaged in

County Lines. One member asked whether people who were homeless received support with drug and alcohol problems. It was confirmed that they were a group who special efforts were made to reach.

- 4.12 It was questioned, what efforts were being made to draw people into the service. It was explained that the contract involved a number of aspects that involved partners to help reach those that perhaps did not want to be reached. So far those attempts had not generated a need that the service was not resourced to meet.
- 4.13 Members were provided with details of the approach being taken by the 'Blue Lights Project' pilot which was an assertive multi-disciplinary team that looked to get individuals into treatment and access to support.

5. PARKING REVIEW

- 5.1 Philip Williams, Lead Commissioner, Communities and Infrastructure and Alexis Newport, Parking Manager, gave a presentation on the GCC Parking Strategy. This strategy included consideration of the Local Transport Plan, the Air Quality and Public Health Strategy, Climate Change considerations, Electric Vehicle infrastructure, as well as the new parking enforcement contract and countywide parking review programme. It was explained that transport system supported all of society including the most vulnerable. In addition transport emissions had a big impact on those demographic groups.
- 5.2 Through a competitive procurement process, Marston had been commissioned as the new parking enforcement contract. A lot of functions had been brought back in-house. Income exceeded costs in relation to parking enforcement so this was then put back into the transport budget as was a requirement due to the County Council being the Local Highways Authority.
- 5.3 Members received information on previous parking reviews and were shown a timetable of the parking reviews taking place in 2019 through October 2021. It would take around 5 years to complete all the reviews. Reviews had previously focused on the Cheltenham area and the Council was now on the second phase of reviews which focussed much wider across the county. A priority assessment was undertaken, some areas hadn't been reviewed in some years and so these were the areas being prioritised.
- 5.4 At this stage of the review, survey data was being gathered. Members were taken through the scheme up to October 2021 and provided with an update of work to engage with the local members and parish and town councils. Further information was provided on the consultation and collaboration process to ensure good governance. For each TRO proposed due regard would be considered.
- 5.5 The Resident parking policy was implemented in 2009, which introduced policy surrounding resident and business permits, carers permits (free of charge), visitors vouchers, waivers and hotel permits. All on street charges were increased on 1

Minutes subject to their acceptance as a correct record at the next meeting

April 2019 in order to align with off street charges and the cost of local bus travel. Increased flexibility was introduced through pay per minute.

- 5.6 New guidance was put in place for Blue Badge holders. It wasn't clear what impact that would have at this early stage. Members were provided with statistics around blue badges, detailing that 10,427 badges had been issued in between June 2018 and June 2019 with 23 cases of fraud.
- 5.7 Arle Court park and ride was provided as an example of an innovative system with private and public collaboration with the aim to reduce park and walkers to allow park and ride use. There had been a 20% increase in bus travel. The use of technology was particularly important in this system with an electronic bus validation interface.
- 5.8 One member asked whether there were still parking permits available for electric vehicles and asked how many had been bought and the charges relating to this. The information would be provided.
ACTION Alexis Newport
- 5.9 One member suggested that there was a political choice to the where in the budget and how income from parking could be used. He suggested a number of areas where money could be reinvested such as cycling. In response it was explained that the income had to be reinvested into highways, transport or the environment. The net surplus from parking equated to less than one tenth of the overall budget for highways, transport and the environment. Decisions had to be made as part of the budget discussions as to how that income was allocated.
- 5.10 One member expressed disappointment that parking around schools had not been addressed in the presentation. He outlined that the Police spent a great deal of time solving issues caused by poor parking around schools, including working with the local member. It was explained that a new travel team had been created as well as the launch of the cycle strategy. Work was carried out with all schools in Gloucestershire to give them the materials and support to promote this. Work in this area to help individuals walk or cycle to school could help reduce those parking pressures.
- 5.11 In response to a question it was recognised that there was frustration around the time it took to change traffic orders. The team that carried out that work had been moved in-house. This was an area of work that required extra resource and this would be under consideration during the budget process. One member commented that in the past the terms and conditions for parking enforcement officers had been an issue. It was explained that staff retention had been a problem in the past and that part of the recommissioning of the contract in this area had focussed on ensuring quality over cost.
- 5.12 There was some discussion around parking charges with one member questioning whether they would be raised again. He was concerned that families who were not wealthy would be stretched by further increases. In response it was stated that the Council's policy was to align these charges with off-street charging. Some districts

had put their charges up and there was a danger that the current rates were undercutting them. No decisions had been taken but it was suggested that many residents would like to see their schemes reviewed.

- 5.13 One member asked questions regarding consideration of parking at pre-application stage and gave the example of an upcoming planning consideration for a Cheltenham School. In response it was explained that the officers could not comment regarding that particular application as it was to be considered by the Planning Committee.
- 5.14 In response to a question it was clarified that for residents wishing to have permits it was helpful to have the support of the community, potentially through a parish or town council.

6. GLOUCESTERSHIRE SAFEGUARDING ADULTS BOARD ANNUAL REPORT

- 6.1 Paul Yeatman introduced the Annual Report. He had been in post 5 years as independent chair which was a joint appointment between the police and Clinical Commissioning Group. The overall purpose of the report was to give confidence and reassurance to the public and leadership of the organisations involved that the Safeguarding Adults Board was committed to and was capable of discharging its role.
- 6.2 Members were informed that calls could now be made by professionals to a Safeguarding Adults Team Advice Line. Professionals could call this line to receive advice on whether or not to raise a safeguarding concern. There had been 4,119 calls. The line was being reviewed to ensure it was fit for purpose. The number of safeguarding concerns raised was 2,077.
- 6.3 GSAB had commissioned one Safeguarding Adults Review and one local Learning Review. Members were provided with some detail regarding a 2017 incident which was the subject of a Serious Case Review.
- 6.4 Six roadshows were held across the County, with two in Gloucester, two in Cheltenham, one in the Forest of Dean and one in Cirencester. The theme had been domestic abuse. In March 2020, six more roadshows were planned with a focus on the voluntary community sector.
- 6.5 As part of the priorities for the board it was explained that there was a need to raise awareness of safeguarding and promote the welfare of vulnerable adults. In relation to those high risk individuals with complex needs, a high risk behaviour policy had been introduced, focussed on getting partners around the table to plan appropriate support and protection for that individual. In addition work was being undertaken with partners in children's services to support individuals who were transitioning into adulthood.

Minutes subject to their acceptance as a correct record at the next meeting

- 6.6 Members discussed the fact that Gloucestershire was an 'importer' of individuals with Learning Disabilities who had places in a number of homes. It was explained that it was the responsibility of the local authority who placed the individual in a home to meet that cost. There were other costs though associated with health needs that the individual might have.

7. ANNUAL PUBLIC HEALTH REPORT

The item was deferred to next meeting.

8. DIRECTOR PUBLIC HEALTH REPORT

- 8.1 Sarah Scott, Director of Public Health, introduced the report.
- 8.2 Members noted the detail within the report regarding Accommodation Based Support services to help provide support for the most vulnerable. The Committee recognised the partnership working in place. Members commented that the recent visit to the homeless hubs had been very informative and helpful.
- 8.3 The Committee welcomed the information on the armed forces covenant. One member commented that the newsletter represented a snapshot and understood that there was a great deal of work being undertaken in this area.

9. DIRECTOR ADULT SOCIAL CARE REPORT

- 9.1 Mark Branton, Adult Social Care, introduced the report outlining the concerns around the reassessments of individuals within a timely period. He explained that it was recognised that for some individuals their needs have not significantly changed and so a light touch review was carried out. This would not meet the criteria set out nationally and impacted performance figures. There were still difficulties in ascertaining what proportion had been seen and so work was being carried out in this area. In the team, there were a significant number of people on maternity leave and vacancies. There was a programme in place to fill vacancies.
- 9.2 One member asked that if a client who was in a care home was only requiring a light touch reassessment was that an indicator that they had gone into care too soon. In response it was explained that now there was a reduction in number of people going into care but, before that work had been carried out, people used to go in too soon, particularly around dementia.

10. CHIEF FIRE OFFICER REPORT

- 10.1 Wayne Bowcock, Chief Fire Officer, introduced the report. He provided an update on the HMICFRS Inspection explaining that concerns had been raised regarding fire protection capacity and how the Service evidenced the risk based inspection programme. Bullying harassment and previous concerning leadership behaviours were still present but there was cautious optimism from staff. There would be a re-inspection over 3 days from 20 November 2019 looking over the evidence in the areas identified. It was recognised that culture change does not happen over night and the inspection team would be looking for signs of improvement.
- 10.2 GFRS had started a six week period of consultation with trade unions, staff and stakeholders on 5 August 2019. Members queried what additional resources the Service would require through the Medium Term Financial Strategy bid. It was explained that additional posts would be asked for and any amount would also need to cover the issues around national pensions. Members requested that a report go to the Committee outlining the request and to get the input of scrutiny members.
- ACTION** **Wayne Bowcock**
- 10.3 One member referred to the potential tension within the service of ensuring that there was enough experience alongside training requirements. It was explained that between now and 2022 there would be a number of leavers and with that a great deal of experience would be lost. Traditionally the number of incidents had provided on the job training for Firefighters, but a reduction in those incidents meant that additional training needed to be put in place. There was a balance between preventative work and the training required to make sure Firefighters had the skill set required.
- 10.4 It was explained that the Fire College was used as required when particular courses were available.
- 10.5 There was some discussion around the additional responsibilities firefighters had around co-responding and cardiac care. Members understood the national discussions around the terms and conditions of a firefighter. In Gloucestershire firefighters continued to volunteer for this role and the Chief Fire Officer would not be asking them to stop putting themselves forward. It was recognised that GFRS did not have a high proportion of firefighters in the Fire Brigades Union.
- 10.6 With regards to Skillzone, a targeted approach had been taken to allow free entry for those schools that had a high percentage of pupils from high deprivation backgrounds.

CHAIRMAN

Meeting concluded at 12:40pm

Minutes subject to their acceptance as a correct record at the next meeting