



To: Executive Councillor for Housing (and Deputy Leader): Councillor Catherine Smart
Report by: Head of City Homes
Relevant scrutiny committee: Community Services Scrutiny Committee 16/1/2014
Wards affected: All

SUPPORTING PEOPLE COMMUNITY BUDGETING MODEL FOR OLDER PEOPLE IN THE CITY

Key Decision

1. Executive Summary

- 1.1 The City Council has been invited to work in partnership with the County Council to deliver a district wide support service to all older people in Cambridge. Effectively, this means that the City will not be required to tender for this contract and instead, enter into a Co-Operation Agreement to deliver this service for the next 4 years.
- 1.2 In June 2012, the City Council's Housing Management Board agreed to grant permission to the Director of Customer & Community Services to enter into a contract with the County Council to deliver support to older people in accordance with the County's specification.
- 1.3 As the new co-operation agreement has changed to a tenure neutral support service, consideration now also needs to be given to the proposals by members of Community Services Scrutiny Committee, prior to any decision by the Executive Councillor for Housing.

2. Recommendations

The Executive Councillor is recommended:

- 2.1 To authorise the Director of Customer & Community Services, subject to both financial and operational viability, to enter into a co-operation agreement with the County Council to deliver support services for older people across the district.

3. Background

- 3.1 As mentioned above, in June 2012, the City Council's Housing Management Board (HMB) considered, and the Executive Councillor for Housing approved delegation to the Director of Customer & Community Services to enter into a contract for the provision of support for older people in accordance with the tender specification issued by the County Council.
- 3.2 Since then, in May 2013, the County Council advised each support provider across the city that it intended to let 5 tenure neutral district based contracts for older people's support across the County. This means that successful bidder would provide support to both residents in sheltered housing schemes as well as to those living in their own homes.
- 3.3 In Cambridge, the City Council is the main provider of supported sheltered housing and as such the largest contractor had the County Council tendered the contract. In addition, the City Council has been providing support for older people in the wider community through its 60+ service for 4 years and so are possibly the most experienced landlord and support provider in the city to deliver this new service.
- 3.4 As HMB is constituted to make decisions with regard to council tenants, the decision to provide support in the wider community and to other residents of the City is a matter for Community Services to debate.
- 3.5 In the autumn 2013, the County Council advised, having considered its options that they would not be tendering in either South Cambridgeshire or Cambridge City, but would instead seek to enter into a partnering agreement for the delivery of support services in these two districts where the local authority was also the stock retaining landlord.
- 3.6 The County Council's proposal is to deliver needs based support to the City Council's existing tenants in our sheltered housing (468 properties) and the schemes of 8/9 other providers (233 properties), expanding the service into the community once the transitional period of re-assessment of need has been completed.
- 3.7 The County Council anticipate paying a fixed sum of £180,000 per annum for a 4 year service level agreement, with the potential for the TUPE transfer of two members of staff from the other organisations, which the City Council would seek to be recompensed for in addition

to the proposed service level agreement sum. The City Council currently receives up to £219,630 for the provision of both support and alarm services in its own sheltered housing.

- 3.8 In deciding the appropriateness of whether City Homes should deliver the city wide service, a number of factors need to be considered, including whether the City Council should withdraw from the County's plans and instead provide 'enhanced housing management' services to its own tenants "in house", allowing the County Council to tender the support contract formally. This would mean the City Council withdrawing from the direct provision of support, with a third party provider supporting our tenants. The alternative would be to work with the County Council to deliver a city wide service, which carries risks, but is most in line with our current support model for older people.
- 3.9 Delivering services within the city as proposed by the County Council presents a number of challenges, including the increased risks associated with providing services to a wider client group, the salary costs, and employment liabilities of two staff TUPE transferring to the City Council, uncertainty about the future demand for the service from the wider community and our capacity to meet the demand, given that the HRA cannot subsidise the delivery of services to non-council tenants.
- 3.10 Withdrawing from the provision of support for older people presented several disadvantages, which included not having any control over the level or quality of support for our tenants, the City Council continuing to carry the political / reputational risks associated with whatever new service is delivered, the loss of up to £219,630 per annum in funding for the provision of the service and the likelihood that working relationships at a number of levels within the two organisations could suffer.
- 3.11 If the City Council were to withdraw from providing support for its tenants, a number of other contracts and services, which are integrated into the current service provision, would also then be affected. These include services such as the 24 hour telephone response service which responds to emergency calls from older and homeless people in the city and the out of hours care service presently provided to existing sheltered tenants and those in receipt of a community alarm. As a landlord only, the City Council would not have a need to provide these ancillary services, which also help to contribute to the wider public health agenda in terms of reducing the costs of acute public services such as hospital stays.

3.12 On the whole, the City Council is presently delivering a service very close to that being proposed and subject to both the City and County Councils agreeing how they will respond to increasing demands, an appropriate level of funding for the service and the approach to taking responsibility for risk, particularly with regard to the TUPE staff, the City Council believes that the benefits of delivering this service outweigh the reasons not to. Furthermore, the City Council aims to identify greater opportunities to work in partnership across public services to help increase the efficiency of delivering public services.

4. Implications

(a) Financial Implications

Revenue Costs

- 4.1 The Housing Revenue Account currently receives up to £219,630 in income for the provision of support services to older people in Council owned sheltered housing schemes. The income is received from a combination of Supporting People funding from the County Council (£170,540) and charges levied to residents who receive services, but are not eligible for housing benefit, known as support self-funders (Up to £49,090). The annual sum received from self-funders is reduced by any void periods across the sheltered housing stock.
- 4.2 A decision not to work collaboratively with the County Council in respect of the provision of support services would result in the loss of funding of up to £219,630.
- 4.3 A decision to enter into a joint working arrangement with the County Council would result in income at a minimum of £180,000, with the potential for the City Council to consider to continue to charge support self-funders for services provided in addition to this. It would be necessary for the City Council to ensure that it limited service delivery to the available financial resource, and that the Housing Revenue Account in no way subsidised services delivered to non-HRA residents. This would require ongoing monitoring of both support plans and the staff time spent in specific areas of service delivery.
- 4.4 Further work would be required to ensure that the HRA in no way subsidises services delivered to other city residents, and that users of the service are reasonably recharged, where this is deemed appropriate.

(b) **Staffing Implications**

4.4 The proposal identifies the need for two staff to TUPE transfer to the City Council's employment.

(c) **Equal Opportunities Implications**

4.5 An Equality Impact Assessment is being completed and a copy of the County's EQIA for the new service is attached and marked Appendix A

(d) **Environmental Implications**

4.6 There are no environmental implications.

(e) **Procurement**

4.7 The County Council are procuring this service.

(f) **Consultation and communication**

4.8 Consultation has been carried out as follows:

- The County Council have consulted existing tenants in person at residents meetings and via a FAQ sheet distributed to all. A survey of the needs of Older People conducted by the County has informed their service specifications.
- The City Council has informed its tenants of the county's intentions through the last 12 months via its Tenants Consultation Meetings.
- Staff and union representatives have been fully consulted throughout the process.

4.9 Subject to the recommendations being accepted, an article will be published on the Council's website, and recommended for inclusion in Cambridge Matters. Each tenant will be visited as part of the transitional needs assessment process and the changes explained in full.

(g) **Community Safety**

4.10 It is likely, if the recommendations are accepted that the community safety of older people may increase as officers visit a vast number of older people across the city, assessing their needs and recommending interventions to assist them both in their home and in helping to prevent social isolation in the community.

5. Background Papers

HMB Reports “Supporting People Tender” dated June 2011 and June 2012.

6. Appendices

Appendix 1: County Council EQIA

7. Inspection of Papers

To inspect the background papers or if you have a query on the report please contact:

Author's Name:	Frances Swann
Author's Phone Number:	01223 - 462255
Author's Email:	Frances.swann@cambridge.gov.uk