



Health and Wellbeing Board

Friday 16 February 2018

PRESENT:

Councillor Inglis, Hull City Council (Board Chair)
 Dr. Dan Roper, Chair, NHS Hull Clinical Commissioning Group (Board Deputy Chair)
 Dr Amy Oehring, NHS Clinical Commissioning Group
 Councillor Gwen Lunn, Portfolio Holder for Public Health, Prevention & Safeguarding Adults, Hull City Council
 Councillor Dorton, Hull City Council
 Councillor Pantelakis, Hull City Council
 Julia Weldon, Director of Public Health and Adults, Hull City Council
 Alison Barker, City Adults Social Care Manager, Hull City Council

IN ATTENDANCE:

Neil Daynes, Procurement Manager, Hull City Council
 Ben Hanson, Housing Strategy Programme Leader, Hull City Council
 Martyn Fisher, Projects and Commercial Lawyer, Hull City Council
 Antony Spouse, Scrutiny Officer, Hull City Council

APOLOGIES:

Councillor Bridges, Hull City Council
 Councillor Tock, Hull City Council
 Councillor Fareham, Hull City Council
 Karen Marshall, NHS Hull Clinical Commissioning Group
 Alison Murphy, Director of Children and Young People and Families Services, Hull City Council
 Emma Sayner, Chief Finance Officer, NHS Clinical Commissioning Group
 Emma Latimer, Chief Officer, NHS Hull Clinical Commissioning Group
 Dr James Mould, NHS Hull Clinical Commissioning Group
 Chief Superintendent Phil Ward, Humberside Police
 Chris Jewesbury, Head of Health and Justice Commissioning, NHS England

Minute No.	Description/Decision	Action By/ Deadline
33.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</p> <p>No declarations of interest were received in regard to the following agenda items.</p>	
34.	<p>HOUSING RELATED SUPPORT</p> <p>The City Adult Social Care Manager introduced the report and explained that it addressed four main areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budget envelope • Delivery model • Single point of access • Procurement route 	

The Board discussed:

- i. Hostel provision for people aged 21 or younger; research that showed young people were more likely to succeed in smaller units; the proposals to limit hostel provision for young people to 8 unit facilities; whether a size limit should be applied across the contract with a view to improving outcomes; if some providers would simply divide larger buildings into a series of smaller units and whether that could be legislated against; how the report outlined the preference for smaller hostel units but did not recommend a maximum limit.
- ii. The feedback received as part of the consultation process; how from a practical point of view it would not be possible to close a large hostel with immediate effect; the role market shaping would play in determining the final model; the fact many larger providers were themselves not happy with the current approach and wanted to move to smaller sized units; the suggestion that the shift would probably take two years as the market shaping and service specification began to impact.
- iii. The service specification and whether we needed to be more specific in order to ensure we got the smaller units we desired; the need to ensure supply could meet demand; the fact HRS only accounted for 50% of the available support and the fact providers could decide to pursue other funding options; the need for a flexible system;
- iv. The people who had been living in the city centre squat and the fact their comments appeared to favour a 'Housing First Approach' over hostel provision; an acknowledgement that the HRS service specification needed to provide clarity in order to protect both the Council, and service providers going forward.
- v. Why Adult Social Care was leading the procurement process; whether the contract should sit with Housing and Neighbourhood Services; the historic issues which had led to the current position.
- vi. The timing of the commissioning process and whether the Housing Related Support Contract should be being re-commissioned at this stage given that central Government was considering devolving the supported housing budget to local authorities; the suggestion that if the funding change happened, the Council would have responsibility for all the housing benefit money, and we would not need to build safeguards into the service specification; the suggestion that the Council should have extended the current contract and continued to work with all providers ahead of the Government's decision.
- vii. The welcome increase in floating support which went some way to addressing past funding cuts; the need for the policy to focus on outcomes not financial savings; whether floating support had been too specialised; the value of the emergency accommodation and how it had been utilised; the fact that many providers operated without HRS funding and other funding streams which showed what could be done; the value of hindsight in regard to past funding decisions.

- viii. Whether the Government was likely to proceed with a new funding framework given the pressures it was currently facing;
- ix. Local Housing Allowance (LHA), LHA Exemptions and the concern that the exemptions were making it difficult for people receiving support through HRS to find employment and remain in accommodation; the distinction between HRS and other funding streams; the need for the Council to be aware of the funding position and the possibility that the supported housing budget could be devolved to local authorities.
- x. Support for the introduction of a 'Single point of access' alongside a recognition that it would be challenging and would not be easy to implement; the suggestion that some people, particularly young people might be reluctant to access the service; the need to ensure the new 'Single Point of Access' benefitted everybody, including service users and service providers.
- xi. The fact that the purpose of the 'Single Point of Access' was two-fold, it would provide support to service users but it would also enable partners to collect essential intelligence; the intelligence would be used to develop the service as well as ensuring the contract was delivering the expected outcomes
- xii. If there was enough supporting information to make the case for a 'Single Point of Access'; confirmation that the Council would work with the successful providers to develop the model; the need to ensure everyone understood how the new model would work.

Councillor Dorton asked for it to be recorded that he did not support the proposals outlined in section 6.15 of the report 'Registered Social Landlord Registration' and the intention to save £1.7 million by requiring all supported housing providers to register as a 'registered social landlord'. He believed that the proposals would have a negative impact on smaller local providers who would have to sign up to a complicated regulatory framework when it was quite possible the Council would be able to develop its own framework in a year's time. He felt the change would compromise the quality of local provision and he believed the Council needed to be bold, hold its nerve, and prioritise outcomes over short term financial gain.

- xiii. The proposals regarding 'Registered Social Landlord Registration', the pros and cons, the broader picture, and need to ensure the HRS contract prioritised outcomes over savings.
- xiv. The likely impact of Universal Credit and whether the new system would be flexible enough to meet any additional demand; confirmation that the system would be flexible and would develop over time, but a significant increase in demand would require a whole system response.
- xv. Whether the new model would support those people who were sleeping in shop doorways; confirmation that the new model would help people who did not feel safe in hostel accommodation and would benefit from an alternative pathway.

	<p>xvi. The high level of hostel provision in the City and the hope that an increase in floating support would deliver improved outcomes, and perhaps in time, lower the demand for hostel beds.</p> <p>xvii. The need to have the evidence base to support the recommendations and the shift to smaller size hostel provision; how we might influence those housing providers who were not part of the HRS contract with a view to ensuring all providers were following good practice and delivering high quality services.</p> <p>xviii. The relationship between HRS and the Homelessness Strategy.</p> <p>Agreed:</p> <p>a) The Board supported the proposal to retain the current budget level of £3.7 million (recommendation 2.1).</p> <p>b) That in relation to recommendation 2.2, and following the suggestion that financial responsibility for supported housing could be devolved to local authorities, the Board highlighted the value of pursuing a long term whole system approach, and questioned the merits of transferring any elements of the budget in the short term.</p> <p>c) The Commission supports the recommended delivery model outlined under Option 2b but recommends that the service specification clearly outlines the preference for smaller units, and places a limit on bed numbers, reinforcing the aims and objectives of the new model.</p> <p>d) The Board supports the proposals to establish a ‘Single Point of Access’, but asks Cabinet to recognise the need for the new function to be flexible and responsive so it can meet service user needs.</p> <p>e) The Board also wishes to emphasise the essential role the Single Point of Access will play in intelligence gathering, with a view to shaping services, and ensuring the contracted outcomes are being delivered.</p>	<p>(a-e) Cabinet</p>
<p>35.</p>	<p>EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC</p> <p>The Board discussed the request to exclude the press and public for the next item.</p> <p>Agreed:</p> <p>a) The in accordance with the provisions of Section 100(A) (4) of the Local Government Act, 1972, the public (including the Press) be excluded from the meeting for the following item, on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in (28-31) paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act information relating to the financial and business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information).</p>	

36.	HOUSING RELATED SUPPORT (EXEMPT APPENDIX) The Board considered the exempt appendix which outlined the proposed maximum tariffs. Agreed: a) The Board notes the proposed tariffs and the intention to ensure the cost structure is fair and sustainable.	(a) Cabinet
------------	--	--------------------

Start: 12.30 p.m.
Closed: 13.40 p.m.