

# AGENDA

## Health & Social Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Date: **Monday 14 December 2015**

---

Time: **2.00 pm**

---

Place: **Council Chamber, The Shire Hall, St. Peter's Square,  
Hereford, HR1 2HX**

---

Notes: Please note the **time, date** and **venue** of the meeting.

For any further information please contact:

**Ruth Goldwater, Governance Services**

Tel: 01432 260635

Email: [ruth.goldwater@herefordshire.gov.uk](mailto:ruth.goldwater@herefordshire.gov.uk)

---

If you would like help to understand this document, or would like it in another format, please call Ruth Goldwater, Governance Services on 01432 260635 or e-mail [ruth.goldwater@herefordshire.gov.uk](mailto:ruth.goldwater@herefordshire.gov.uk) in advance of the meeting.

# **Agenda for the Meeting of the Health & Social Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee**

**Chairman**  
**Vice-Chairman**

**Councillor PA Andrews**  
**Councillor J Stone**

**Councillor ACR Chappell**  
**Councillor PE Crockett**  
**Councillor CA Gandy**  
**Councillor DG Harlow**  
**Councillor JF Johnson**  
**Councillor MD Lloyd-Hayes**  
**Councillor MT McEvelly**  
**Councillor PD Newman OBE**  
**Councillor A Seldon**  
**Councillor NE Shaw**  
**Councillor D Summers**

## AGENDA

	Pages
<b>1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> To receive apologies for absence.	
<b>2. NAMED SUBSTITUTES (IF ANY)</b> To receive details of any Members nominated to attend the meeting in place of a Member of the Committee.	
<b>3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</b> To receive any declarations of interest by Members in respect of items on the Agenda.	
<b>4. MINUTES</b> To approve and sign the minutes of the meeting held on 17 November 2015.	9 - 16
<b>5. SUGGESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC ON ISSUES FOR FUTURE SCRUTINY</b> To consider suggestions from members of the public on issues the Committee could scrutinise in the future.  <i>(There will be no discussion of the issue at the time when the matter is raised. Consideration will be given to whether it should form part of the Committee's work programme when compared with other competing priorities.)</i>	
<b>6. QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC</b> To note questions received from the public and the items to which they relate.  <i>(Questions are welcomed for consideration at a Scrutiny Committee meeting so long as the question is directly related to an item listed on the agenda. If you have a question you would like to ask then please submit it <b>no later than two working days before the meeting</b> to the Committee Officer. This will help to ensure that an answer can be provided at the meeting).</i>	
<b>7. TASK AND FINISH GROUP: REVIEW OF PROVISION OF SHORT BREAK AND RESPITE SERVICES FOR CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES</b> To consider the findings of the scrutiny task and finish group and to recommend the report to the executive for consideration.	17 - 38



## **PUBLIC INFORMATION**

### **Public Involvement at Scrutiny Committee Meetings**

You can contact Councillors and Officers at any time about Scrutiny Committee matters and issues which you would like the Scrutiny Committee to investigate.

There are also two other ways in which you can directly contribute at Herefordshire Council's Scrutiny Committee meetings.

#### **1. Identifying Areas for Scrutiny**

At the meeting the Chairman will ask the members of the public present if they have any issues which they would like the Scrutiny Committee to investigate, however, there will be no discussion of the issue at the time when the matter is raised. Councillors will research the issue and consider whether it should form part of the Committee's work programme when compared with other competing priorities.

#### **2. Questions from Members of the Public for Consideration at Scrutiny Committee Meetings and Participation at Meetings**

You can submit a question for consideration at a Scrutiny Committee meeting so long as the question you are asking is directly related to an item listed on the agenda. If you have a question you would like to ask then please submit it **no later than two working days before the meeting** to the Committee Officer. This will help to ensure that an answer can be provided at the meeting. Contact details for the Committee Officer can be found on the front page of this agenda.

Generally, members of the public will also be able to contribute to the discussion at the meeting. This will be at the Chairman's discretion.

(Please note that the Scrutiny Committee is not able to discuss questions relating to personal or confidential issues.)

# The Public's Rights to Information and Attendance at Meetings

## YOU HAVE A RIGHT TO: -

- Attend all Council, Cabinet, Committee and Sub-Committee meetings unless the business to be transacted would disclose 'confidential' or 'exempt' information.
- Inspect agenda and public reports at least five clear days before the date of the meeting.
- Inspect minutes of the Council and all Committees and Sub-Committees and written statements of decisions taken by the Cabinet or individual Cabinet Members for up to six years following a meeting.
- Inspect background papers used in the preparation of public reports for a period of up to four years from the date of the meeting. (A list of the background papers to a report is given at the end of each report). A background paper is a document on which the officer has relied in writing the report and which otherwise is not available to the public.
- Access to a public Register stating the names, addresses and wards of all Councillors with details of the membership of Cabinet and of all Committees and Sub-Committees.
- Have a reasonable number of copies of agenda and reports (relating to items to be considered in public) made available to the public attending meetings of the Council, Cabinet, Committees and Sub-Committees.
- Have access to a list specifying those powers on which the Council have delegated decision making to their officers identifying the officers concerned by title.
- Copy any of the documents mentioned above to which you have a right of access, subject to a reasonable charge (20p per sheet subject to a maximum of £5.00 per agenda plus a nominal fee of £1.50 for postage). Agenda can be found at [www.herefordshire.gov.uk/meetings](http://www.herefordshire.gov.uk/meetings)
- Please note that filming, photography and recording of meetings is permitted provided that it does not disrupt the business of the meeting.
- The reporting of meetings is subject to the law and it is the responsibility of those doing the reporting to ensure that they comply.
- Access to this summary of your rights as members of the public to attend meetings of the Council, Cabinet, Committees and Sub-Committees and to inspect and copy documents.

## **HEREFORDSHIRE COUNCIL**

**SHIRE HALL, ST PETER'S SQUARE, HEREFORD, HR1 2HX.**

### **FIRE AND EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE**

In the event of a fire or emergency the alarm bell will ring continuously.

You should vacate the building in an orderly manner through the nearest available fire exit.

You should then proceed to the Assembly Point which is located in the car park at the front of the building. A check will be undertaken to ensure that those recorded as present have vacated the building following which further instructions will be given.

Please do not allow any items of clothing, etc. to obstruct any of the exits.

Do not delay your vacation of the building by stopping or returning to collect coats or other personal belongings.





HEREFORDSHIRE COUNCIL

**MINUTES of the meeting of Health & Social Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee held at Council Chamber, The Shire Hall, St. Peter's Square, Hereford, HR1 2HX on Tuesday 17 November 2015 at 10.00 am**

**Present:** Councillor PA Andrews (Chairman)  
Councillor J Stone (Vice-Chairman)

**Councillors:** ACR Chappell, PE Crockett, DG Harlow, EPJ Harvey, EL Holton, JF Johnson, MD Lloyd-Hayes, MT McEvelly, PD Newman OBE, A Seldon and NE Shaw

**In attendance:** Councillors H Bramer (Cabinet member contracts and assets), JM Bartlett, WLS Bowen, J Hardwick, TM James, PM Morgan (Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet member health and wellbeing), GJ Powell (Cabinet member economy and corporate services), AJW Powers, PD Price (Cabinet member infrastructure), P Rone (Cabinet member transport and roads), EJ Swinglehurst, A Warmington and SD Williams

**Officers:** Chris Baird (Assistant director commissioning and education), Richard Ball (Assistant director commissioning), Ben Baugh (Democratic services officer), Jo Davidson (Director of children's wellbeing), Sukhdev Dosanjh (Assistant director commissioning), Geoff Hughes (Director of economy, communities and corporate), Paul Meredith (Assistant director safeguarding and early help), David Penrose (Democratic Services Officer), Peter Robinson (Director of resources), Josie Rushgrove (Head of corporate finance), Prof Rod Thomson (Director of public health) and Claire Ward (Deputy solicitor to the council people and regulatory). Also in attendance were Paul Deneen (Chair of Healthwatch Herefordshire) and Jane Melton (Director of engagement and integration, 2gether NHS Foundation Trust).

**35. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillors CA Gandy and D Summers. Apologies had also been received from the Leader of the Council, Councillor AW Johnson.

**36. NAMED SUBSTITUTES**

Councillor EL Holton substituted for Councillor CA Gandy and Councillor EPJ Harvey substituted for Councillor D Summers.

**37. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

No declarations of interest were made.

**38. MINUTES**

The minutes of the previous meeting were received.

**RESOLVED:** That the minutes of the meeting held on 22 September 2015 be approved as a correct record.

### 39. QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

The Chairman drew attention to the supplement to the agenda and read out the question received from Ms Caith Dye. The Chairman, noting the response provided by officers, questioned the timescale for the launch of the Wellbeing Information and Signposting for Herefordshire (WISH) service; reference was made to a presentation at the [9 June 2015](#) meeting that identified August 2015 for the public launch. The Assistant director commissioning advised that it had been the intention to locate the service in the Hereford Library and Museum but the building had been closed due to asbestos related issues. It was reported that work was in progress to identify suitable alternative premises before the end of November 2015 and there would be 'pop-up' outreach arrangements around the county. The Chairman requested that local ward members be kept informed about developments.

In response to a query from a committee member, the Chairman advised that there would not be an opportunity for a supplementary question from the public on this occasion.

*[Note: An overall presentation, [Financial planning assumptions 16/17 - 19/20](#), was published in a supplement to the agenda and was given to members of both scrutiny committees at this meeting. For the purpose of these minutes, the key points have been separated into the relevant agenda items below.]*

### 40. CORPORATE PLAN 2016-20

The Deputy Leader advised the committee that the corporate plan 2016-20 set out the overarching policy framework within which decisions would be taken and resources allocated. The Deputy Leader said that the achievements during the last plan period included: £49m of savings and balanced budgets during times of austerity; significant private sector investment and success with the Old Market development; substantial investment in the county road network; and the adoption of the Herefordshire Local Plan Core Strategy.

The corporate plan key priorities were identified as follows:

- Enable residents to live safe, healthy and independent lives.
- Keep children and young people safe and give them a great start in life.
- Support the growth of our economy and the number of people in work.
- Secure better services, quality of life and value for money.

The Assistant director commissioning reported that work would continue on the corporate plan, taking into account any comments from the scrutiny committee, and would be considered by Cabinet in January 2016 for onward recommendation to Council in February 2016. The plan had been informed by the [Priorities and budget consultation](#), the evidence base of [Understanding Herefordshire](#), and the level of available funding.

**RESOLVED: That the draft corporate plan 2016-20 be noted.**

### 41. BUDGET AND MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY (MTFS) – DRAFT PRIOR TO GOVERNMENT FUNDING ANNOUNCEMENT

The Director of resources presented slides 1 to 10 of the overall presentation, the principal points in relation to the budget and MTFS included:

1. The council's net budget 2015/16 was £142m, with over half of the expenditure would be on adults' wellbeing (£53.2m) and children's wellbeing (£22.1m).
2. It was projected that, as a consequence of the government's continuing austerity measures, £32m of further savings would be required to 2019/20. Whilst the authority could take confidence from the savings achieved to date, the situation was becoming more challenging given the efficiencies already removed from the budget.
3. The presentation addressed the question 'why doesn't spending reduce by the savings target?', with reference made to inflation arising from the costs of the living wage, pensions costs, national insurance, demographic pressures, and capital financing costs; it was estimated that the base budget would reduce to £128m by 2019/20.
4. The current savings proposals identified £28m of savings over the next four financial years but there would be a £4m shortfall in 2019/20. The government's Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR), to be published on 25 November 2015, would provide more detail to inform the projections going forward.
5. Public consultation during summer 2015 on the savings proposals prioritised the sale of the council's smallholdings estate and the introduction of on street parking charges, with the least popular option being the reduction of customer services and libraries. In light of this, savings to customer services and libraries had been adjusted over a longer period and discussions would continue with the public and town and parish councils with a view to maintaining levels of service at a reduced level of subsidy.

The Head of corporate finance presented slides 11 to 18, the key points included:

6. The presentation addressed the question 'how did you work out grant reductions?' by providing a summary of the trends in government funding over the three years 2013/14 to 2015/16.
7. Reference was made to a graph issued by the Office for Budget Responsibility which showed how the government intended to reduce public spending and, with the protection of NHS, education and international development, illustrated the extent of the pressures on the 'other' segment which included local government.
8. It was reported that the dedicated school grant, whilst ring-fenced in cash terms at £96m, would face increasing inflationary cost pressures, estimated to add at least 15% to school costs over the next five years.
9. Government departments had provisionally agreed to average cuts of 30% in current funding over the next three years.
10. It was assumed that government funding would reduce by 12% per annum but the CSR would provide more clarity around the basis of the assumptions.
11. Further detail was provided about the assumptions made in relation to formula or revenue support grant, locally retained business rates, business rates top up, and new homes bonus grant.

12. Forecast net budget for the years 2014/15 to 2019/20 showed a reduction from £146m down to £128m, with revenue support grant reducing from £36m to £2m over this period; recent announcements indicated that the council would not receive revenue support grant in 2019/20.
13. The council had been advised that it could expect to retain 100% of business rates by 2019/20 (currently 49%) but the current distribution method would be retained and the measure would be fiscal neutral. Furthermore, any additional funding was likely to be offset by further responsibilities and services to be devolved to local government.

The Chairman invited members to comment and ask questions on the elements relevant to the remit of the committee, the principal points are summarised below.

A committee member asked about the most crucial areas, where actuals had not performed to budget, and the contingency in place. The Director of resources commented on the difficulties for all councils to predict demand-led social care requirements and provided an overview of the contingency and reserves included in the budget.

A committee member made a number of observations, including:

- i. The proportion of expenditure on children's wellbeing and adults' wellbeing was likely to increase.
- ii. There had been improvements in the earlier identification of children's safeguarding issues.
- iii. Referring to the section 75 agreement between the council and the CCG, concern was expressed about the lack of clarity about pooled budgets for future years.
- iv. In light of recent events in Paris, government spending on security could increase in the CSR, potentially with implications for other budgets.
- v. The expected savings in social care were considered optimistic.

The Assistant director commissioning advised that it was assumed nationally that the level of funding for adult social care would continue and, although guidance was awaited from government, a refresh of the section 75 agreement was being undertaken by the partners with the intention of transforming the system and making the most out of the available funding; based on the previous timeline, it was anticipated that the position for 2016/17 would be known by February 2016. It was acknowledged that, in view of recent statements by the Secretary of State, pooled budget arrangements were likely to increase going forward.

A committee member commented on work he had undertaken with support from officers on the true costs of rural isolation and quoted correspondence from the Head of corporate finance which identified that the current funding formula continued to reflect inadequately the extra costs of providing services across rural areas. Reference was also made to the gap in business rates received per head of population compared to some urban areas. The committee member said that it was difficult to improve matters for the 25% of residents that lived in sparsely populated areas given current funding arrangements and it was possible that increasing numbers of people would enter hospital and then the social care system. The committee member considered that the council and its partners should be more vocal about the situation and lobby government departments to ensure that rural populations received fairer treatment. In response, the

Deputy Leader said that the points were well made and the administration would continue to discuss resource issues and the implications of the CSR with both local MPs.

A committee member noted that mental health was a particular concern in the county and commented on the contribution made by Citizens' Advice Bureaux in signposting residents to relevant services, adding that grants to such organisations should be explored further. The Assistant director commissioning recognised the need for the council and its health partners to facilitate community resilience and develop solutions which reduced demand on statutory services. The Deputy Leader said that mental health was given high priority in the health and wellbeing strategy and the results of work undertaken on procurement would be reported to the committee in due course.

A committee member, drawing attention to paragraph 24 on page 33 of the agenda, questioned whether 'adults demographic pressures' should continue to be presented as new or additional pressures. The Director of resources advised that the section set out the pressures in total and should have provided more narrative to explain that the approved MTFS had taken anticipated growth in adult social care into account but there were new pressures in terms of the government's plans to introduce a national living wage which would impact on the supply chain; the report to Cabinet would be updated accordingly. In response to a further question, the Director of resources advised that, whilst demand remained difficult to predict, adults' wellbeing had spent within budget during 2014/15 and was on target to spend within budget for 2015/16. The Director of children's wellbeing added that population statistics were regularly updated and suggested that scrutiny committee members might wish to consider the approach to forward planning.

The committee member, noting the level of overspending in children's safeguarding, questioned how members were to be assured that the authority would be in a position to deliver its savings plans. Concern was expressed that budgets in previous years had been presented as balancing and had been put forward as being achievable but, as each year went by, change programmes were not delivered. The member added that, in the context of the cuts already made or agreed, there was limited room to offset overspends through reductions in other areas. In response, the Director of resources made a number of comments, including:

- a. It was his responsibility to recommend a budget to members that he considered deliverable.
- b. He said that the authority had performed exceptionally well in terms of overall change programmes.
- c. The budget in 2014/15 had been delivered, with some underspend.
- d. In terms of the current year, the majority of change programmes were delivering in budget.
- e. There had been pressures in safeguarding which had been picked up early in the year and budgets had been recast going forward.
- f. It was reiterated that it was very difficult to predict demand in children's safeguarding and this was national issue, with many councils overspending in a greater proportion.
- g. A lot of work had been undertaken with the service to rebase the budget; savings of over £1m had been anticipated for next year but £0.5m had been added back into the budget. Officers were confident that savings could be made and better

outcomes achieved; reference was made to the higher level of success than expected with residential placements.

- h. The draft MTFS recognised that children's safeguarding was relatively expensive compared with statistical neighbours and, whilst this would take time to address, additional resources had been put into the change programmes to help deliver the strategy.

The Director of children's wellbeing said it was important to note that, up to the last financial year, children's services had been within budget. In those areas where it was difficult to manage demand, there had been significant pressures in the last two years for many authorities. There was clarity about the areas of overspend and the majority of change programmes were being delivered, albeit some had not kept pace with demand. Parallels were drawn to the position in adults' wellbeing in terms of working with partners and ongoing funding issues. It was noted that the county experienced similar challenges to urban areas but did not receive the same level of funding and access to services was more problematic in rural areas. The scrutiny committees were invited to continue to work with the directorate on its strategies and savings plans.

A committee member emphasised that her points should not be construed as being unsympathetic or overly critical but concern remained that, given the experience of previous years, the budget might not be truly reflective of the costs and timeframes needed to deliver certain change programmes and savings. Furthermore, it would become increasingly difficult to meet unscheduled and unplanned pressures in year from other service areas. The tenfold increase in the number of responses to the budget consultation was welcomed and attention was drawn to respondents' support for an increase in council tax above 2% to protect services and defer savings. The Chairman suggested that this be explored as part of the subsequent General overview and scrutiny committee debate. The committee member reiterated the proportion of expenditure on adults' wellbeing and children's wellbeing.

The Chairman proposed a recommendation noting the savings required and ongoing demand pressures in both adults' wellbeing and children's wellbeing. A committee member proposed a recommendation in relation to rural sparsity. Another committee member proposed a further recommendation in relation to recognising the risks in the community arising from the changes being made. Some members commented on the contingency and risk management considerations already addressed in the papers.

There was a short adjournment whilst the recommendations were circulated to the committee. The resolution below was then agreed.

**RESOLVED: That the following be forwarded to Cabinet as the committee's response:**

- a. **The committee notes that a further £10m has to be saved from the financial year 2015-16, and notes particularly the savings required in both adults' and children's wellbeing, both areas in which demand is increasing;**
- b. **the committee especially notes that children's wellbeing already has a £1.7m overspend and that although plans are in place to reduce overspend in 2017, implementation will prove problematic without a reduction in services;**
- c. **the committee recognises that no account has been made within central government funding for the rural sparsity of the population of the county; and**



[Draft pending approval at the next scheduled meeting]

- d. **the committee recognises the considerable financial and social risks in the community associated with the pressures the council are putting on families and carers of all ages.**

The meeting ended at 11.30 am

**CHAIRMAN**







<b>Meeting:</b>	<b>Health and social care overview and scrutiny committee</b>
<b>Meeting date:</b>	<b>14 December 2015</b>
<b>Title of report:</b>	<b>Task and finish group: Review of provision of short break and respite services for children with disabilities</b>
<b>Report by:</b>	<b>Task and finish group (Chairman: Councillor J Stone)</b>

## Classification

Open

## Key decision

This is not an executive decision.

## Wards affected

County-wide

## Purpose

To consider the findings of the scrutiny task and finish group and to recommend the report to the executive for consideration.

## Recommendation(s)

THAT:

- (a) **the committee considers the report of the task and finish group: review of provision of short break and respite services for children with disabilities, in particular its recommendations, and determine whether it wishes to agree the findings for submission to the executive; and**
- (b) **subject to the review being approved, the executive's response to the review including an action plan be reported to the first available meeting of the committee after the executive has approved its response.**

## Alternative options

1. The committee can agree, not agree or can vary the recommendations. If the

Further information on the subject of this report is available from  
Governance Services on (01432) 260088

committee agree with the findings and recommendations from the review, the attached report will be submitted to the executive for consideration. It will be for the executive to decide whether some, all or none of the recommendations are approved. Any changes to the recommendations should be made having regard to the evidence available.

## **Reasons for recommendations**

2. The committee commissioned a task and finish group to review the provision of short break and respite services for children with disabilities. The report of the task and finish group, enclosed as Appendix 1, is submitted for consideration and approval by the committee.

## **Key considerations**

3. The task and finish group was set up as a direct result of concerns raised by the parents of service users to Members about short break provision and the possibility of the closure of the facility at No.1 Ledbury Road at a meeting of the health and social care overview and scrutiny committee on 22 July 2015. It was agreed at that meeting that a task and finish group be commissioned.
4. The task and finish group was established to review the current short breaks provision and determine whether this was meeting the needs of children and families as intended as well as reviewing the communications and plans for services in the light of the changes taking place at No.1 Ledbury Road.
5. At the meeting of Council held on 25 September 2015, it had been resolved that in view of the vision contained within the children and young people's plan that children and young people grow up healthy, happy and safe within supportive families and carers, the executive be asked to:
  - a) commit to the retention of the option for families and young people to access professionally staffed respite care in Herefordshire and beyond;
  - b) honour its obligations to actively involve parents/carers and children at all stages of any change programme; and
  - c) consider the recommendations from the task and finish group.
6. The appended report identifies 17 recommendations arising from the findings of the task and finish group

## **Community impact**

7. If the committee agrees with the findings of the task and finish group, the report will need to be considered by the Executive and, depending on their decision, community impact will need to be assessed.

## **Equality duty**

8. If the committee agrees with the findings of the task and finish group, the report will need to be considered by the executive and, depending on their decision, equality and human rights issues will need to be assessed.

## **Financial implications**

9. If the committee agrees with the findings of the task and finish group, the report will

---

Further information on the subject of this report is available from  
Governance Services on (01432) 260088

need to be considered by the executive and, depending on their decision, the financial implications of any of the recommendations will need to be assessed.

## **Legal implications**

10. If the committee agrees with the findings of the task and finish group, the report will need to be considered by the executive and, depending on their decision, the legal implications of any of the recommendations will need to be assessed.

## **Risk management**

11. If the committee agrees with the findings of the task and finish group, the report will need to be considered by the executive and, depending on their decision, the risk management implications of implementing any of the recommendations will need to be assessed.

## **Consultees**

12. The consultees are detailed at section 4.4 of the appended report. Whilst the No.1 Ledbury Road facility is located within central ward, short break and respite provision is not ward specific.

## **Appendices**

Appendix A – Task and finish group report: Review of provision of short break and respite services for children with disabilities

## **Background Papers**

None





# **Task & Finish Group Report**

**Review of provision of short break  
and respite services for children  
with disabilities**



## **Review of provision of short break and respite services for children with disabilities - review Report**

### **Chairman's foreword**

- 1.1 The health and social care overview and scrutiny undertook to do a short, spotlight review of the short break and respite service provision for children with disabilities in the county. This was intended to help determine whether it was meeting the needs of children and families, as well as to review the communications and plans for services in the light of the changes taking place at No. 1 Ledbury Road.
- 1.2 In carrying out the review, the task and finish group conducted face to face interviews and also visited No. 1 Ledbury Road. Whilst the group understands that the council is currently assessing whether there are any gaps in the service provision in respect of the available short break options, it is apparent that parents of service users are concerned as to what alternative services will be available. Effective communication is key in this regard and it is therefore imperative that information is not only shared with parents and service users in respect of the potential different models of service provision, but also that their needs and concerns are included as part of the commissioning.
- 1.3 It is hoped that this review will provide essential information to help inform the future plans for these essential services. These recommendations are hopefully self-evident and in many cases already in the process of being implemented by the executive. There may be other recommendations that could be suggested and Herefordshire Council, Wye Valley NHS Trust and Herefordshire Clinical Commissioning Group should look to consider these and where appropriate implement them in the coming months.
- 1.4 I would like to thank my elected member colleagues who made up the group, for their assistance and support in the completion of this task. Thanks also to the people we interviewed in undertaking this review including officers from Herefordshire Council, Wye Valley NHS Trust, Herefordshire Clinical Commissioning Group and Crossroads Care short breaks. I would particularly like to thank parents of service users for all of their inputs. The candour of all these contributors to our thoughts and questions has proved to be very helpful in coming to our conclusions.
- 1.5 Finally, our sincerest thanks go to both David Penrose and Steve Hodges for their support in undertaking this task and finish review.

Councillor John Stone, December 2015  
Chairman of the Task and Finish Group

## **2 Executive Summary**

- 2.1 The task and finish group (the 'group') has considered a significant amount of evidence and this report summarises and focuses on those matters identified in the scoping statement for the review.
- 2.2 Short breaks are part of a continuum of services which support disabled children and their families. They include the provision of day, evening, overnight and weekend activities for the child or young person, and can take place in the child's own home, the home of an approved carer, or in a residential or community setting.

## **3. Composition of the Group**

- 3.1 Members of the group were councillors:  
J Stone, Chairman & Vice-Chair of Health and Social Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee  
M Lloyd-Hayes  
ACR Chappell  
PE Crockett
- 3.2 Lead officer, Steve Hodges
- 3.3 Democratic services officer, David Penrose

## **4 Context**

### Why did we set up the group?

- 4.1 The group was set up as a direct result of concerns raised by the parents of service users to members about short break provision and the possibility of the closure of the facility at No. 1 Ledbury Road at a meeting of the health and social care overview and scrutiny committee on 22 July 2015. It was agreed at that meeting that a task and finish group be commissioned.
- 4.2 The group was established to review the current short breaks provision and determine whether this was meeting the needs of children and families as intended as well as reviewing the communications and plans for services in the light of the changes taking place at No. 1 Ledbury Road.
- 4.3 At the meeting of Council held on 25 September 2015, it had been resolved that in view of the vision contained within the children and young people's plan that children and young people grow up healthy, happy and safe within supportive families and carers, the executive be asked to:
- a) commit to the retention of the option for families and young people to access professionally staffed respite care in Herefordshire and beyond;
  - b) honour its obligations to actively involve parents/carers and children at all stages of any change programme; and
  - c) consider the recommendations from the task and finish group.

### What were we looking at?

- 4.4 The health and social care overview and scrutiny committee considered and adopted a scoping statement for the group. The scoping statement is attached as appendix a.



### Who did we speak to?

4.5 During September and October 2015, the group convened meetings and visits to gather as much background information and to seek as many views as possible. In doing this, the group spoke to the following people:

- Parents of service users using No. 1 Ledbury Road (who are also involved in the Save No. 1 Ledbury Rd Campaign Group):
  - Parent A
  - Parents B & C
  - Parents D & E
- Parent of a child using the buddying service:
  - Parent F
- Clare Smeeth, Crossroads Care short breaks provider: buddying service
- Alison Talbot-Smith (head of clinical outcomes and service transformation), Herefordshire Clinical Commissioning Group
- Integrated Family Health Services, Wye Valley NHS Trust:
  - Vanessa Lewis (service unit director)
  - Dr Sally Stucke (consultant paediatrician)
  - Emma Allen (interim business manager)
- Staff within children's wellbeing directorate, Herefordshire Council
  - Jo Davidson (director for children's wellbeing)
  - Chris Baird (assistant director, education and commissioning)
  - Paul Meredith (assistant director, safeguarding and family support)
  - Deb Owen (head of service for children with disabilities)
  - Sue Rogers (service manager for children with disabilities)
  - Philippa Granthier (head of service for commissioning)
  - Richard Watson (commissioning lead)
- Cllr J Lester (cabinet member, young people & children's wellbeing)
- Mr Richard Aird OBE, headteacher of Barrs Court Special School and Mrs Karen Aird, assistant head (circa 2003-13)

### What did we read?

4.6 The group was provided with background information to undertake this review.

### How did we engage with people?

4.7 The group conducted face to face interviews and also visited No. 1 Ledbury Road and met with staff and clients.

## 5. **Key themes**

5.1 The following key questions were identified:

- What is the statutory basis for the council and other partners to provide short breaks and respite service?
- What is the local policy position on the provision of short breaks and respite services?
- What are the resources available for the provision of support to children with disabilities?
- What has gone well in the provision of short breaks and respite services?
- What could be improved?
- What engagement activity has taken place, including in relation to the future of No. 1 Ledbury Road, and what could be improved?
- What assurance is there that suitable alternative provision will be available for families that currently access No. 1 Ledbury Road?
- In the light of recent short term closures, what is the current position of No. 1 Ledbury Road?

What is the statutory basis for the council and other partners to provide short breaks and respite service?

### 5.2 **Investment in short breaks – Aiming High for Disabled Children (AHDC)**

In October 2006, parliamentary hearings on services to disabled children found evidence for the positive impact of short breaks for families with disabled children and identified a lack of access to these services as the main cause of unhappiness with service provision for families with disabled children. The government responded to these findings with the Aiming High for Disabled Children: Better Support for Families report, part of the 2007 Comprehensive Spending Review. This committed £340 million revenue funding between 2008-11 to transform Local Authority services for disabled children, with £280 million specifically allocated to expand the types of short break service available and increase accessibility to disabled children, young people and their families. This grant was intended to make provision for an additional 40,000 short breaks between 2008-11.

#### **The short breaks statutory duty**

The Children and Young Persons Act 2008 inserted a new sub-paragraph into paragraph 6(1) of Schedule 2 to the Children Act 1989, so that this paragraph now reads:

‘Every local authority shall provide services designed— (a) to minimise the effect on disabled children within their area of their disabilities; (b) to give such children the opportunity to lead lives which are as normal as possible; and (c) to assist individuals who provide care for such children to continue to do so, or to do so more effectively, by giving them breaks from caring.’ The duty on Local Authorities to provide breaks from caring is to provide breaks intended not only to avoid crises but to support parents to care ‘more effectively’.

This dual purpose for short breaks is expanded on in the regulations made under the new duty, being the Breaks for Carers of Disabled Children Regulations 2011. The central aspects of the 2011 Regulations include:

Local authorities must not only consider the needs of parent carers who are at crisis point, but must also ‘have regard to the needs of those carers who would be able to provide care for their disabled child more effectively if breaks from caring were given to them to allow them to undertake education, training or any regular leisure activity, meet

the needs of other children in the family more effectively, or carry out day to day tasks which they must perform in order to run their household' (regulation 3).

Local authorities must provide, 'a range of services which is sufficient to assist carers to continue to provide care or to do so more effectively' (regulation 4). These services must include a range of:

- day-time care
- overnight care
- educational or leisure activities for disabled children outside their homes, and
- services available to assist carers in the evenings, at weekends and during the school holidays

Local authorities are required to publish a short breaks services statement (regulation 5), which must set out details of:

- the range of services provided in accordance with regulation
- any criteria by which eligibility for those services will be assessed, and
- how the range of services is designed to meet the needs of carers in their area.

The short breaks duty requires provision of a range of short breaks which give disabled children the same opportunities to play and socialise that other children experience, while allowing their parents to provide care more effectively through having a break from caring. *Although the duty under regulation 4 is to provide the range of services 'so far as is reasonably practicable', this means that a local authority is not free to reduce funding for short breaks and prioritise other services without having regard to due process.*

### **The short breaks duty – contained in para 6(1)(c) of the Children Act 1989 and the Breaks for Carers of Disabled Children Regulations 2011**

This duty requires the provision of a wide range of short breaks that is sufficient to meet local need. To comply with the duty local authorities will need to know how many disabled children live in their area, what their level of need for short breaks is likely to be and what services are available and will then need to assess whether the available services are sufficient to meet the anticipated need. Many Local Authorities have chosen to comply with the short breaks duty by providing breaks on a 'non-assessed' basis – i.e. a certain level of break is available when a minimum level of need is shown without any detailed assessment. This is good practice though not required by law; what is required is that any eligibility criteria governing access to any type of short break are published so that families can understand them. The new SEND Code of Practice (at para 4.44) requires that these criteria, which must be included within the Short Breaks Services Statement, are published alongside the 'Local Offer' which is a central plank of the reforms introduced by the Children and Families Act 2014.

### **Section 2 of the Chronically Sick and Disabled Persons Act ('CSDPA') 1970**

The CSDPA 1970 is the legal duty which creates the individual right to short break services for some disabled children. Although the CSDPA 1970 duty is complex, its essence is that it requires local authorities to provide services (or direct payments) to meet needs where it is 'necessary' to do so. In deciding whether it is 'necessary' to meet a disabled child's needs, a local authority is entitled to take account of its resources, which means the threshold for when it is 'necessary' to provide a service may be higher when there is less funding available to the local authority. However once it is accepted that it is necessary to meet a child's needs by providing (for example) a short break service, then that service must be provided, but it is not regardless of cost. *The local authority has duties to consider the efficient use of resources in all of its considerations. The issue is balancing how to meet eligible, assessed need, within the resources available.*

The way in which a local authority should determine whether it is necessary to meet a disabled child's needs through the provision of short break services is by undertaking an assessment pursuant to section 17 of the Children Act 1989 and the Working Together to Safeguard Children statutory guidance. Disabled children are all children 'in need' under Children Act 1989 section 17(10)(c) and (11) and so are entitled to a social work assessment under the Working Together guidance on request.

### **Section 27 of the Children and Families Act 2014**

This new duty, in force from September 2014, requires every local authority to consider the extent to which the social care (and educational) provision is sufficient to meet the needs of children and young people in its area. Much like the short breaks duty discussed above, this requires the local authority to know: (1) what the level of need for short breaks is in its area; and (2) whether these needs are being met through the provision of sufficient short breaks.

### **Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR)**

The provision of short breaks is a central way in which the state fulfils its obligation to respect the family and private life rights of disabled children and their family members under Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights. These rights are informed by the other relevant international conventions, including the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC) and the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UNCRPD). In particular, article 19(b) of the UNCRPD requires a range of community support to be provided to disabled children (and adults) and Article 23 of the UNCRC calls for 'special care' for disabled children. Most powerfully, Article 3 of the UNCRC requires the best interests of children (including disabled children) to be 'a primary consideration' in all decisions taken affecting them. This means that disabled children's interests must be considered first and can only be overridden if all other factors outweigh them.

### **Equality Act 2010**

Firstly, Local Authorities and providers of short break services are required to make 'reasonable adjustments' to their policies, procedures and practices to promote access to short break services for all disabled children. While cost is a relevant factor in deciding whether it is 'reasonable' to make an adjustment, if it is 'reasonable' to change the way a short break service is provided then the cost of doing so cannot be passed on to the family. Secondly, the Public Sector Equality Duty under section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 requires Local Authorities to have 'due regard' to a series of specified needs relating to disabled children (amongst other protected groups) when carrying out their functions. The need which is most relevant to short breaks is the need to advance equality of opportunity for disabled children. Local Authorities must take this need into account in all their decision making, including decisions about how much funding to allocate to short break services.

*In addition to the above, there may be other statutory duties that are relevant to health and therefore to the Wye Valley NHS Trust (WVT) and Herefordshire Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG)*

**Recommendation 1: That a communication is sent to all elected members reiterating that all councillors have a duty of care**

What is the local policy position on the provision of short breaks and respite services?

- 5.3 The council has a duty to secure and provide a range of short breaks and the commissioning prospectus and activity from 2012 secured a wider range of options than was previously available. The council and its partners recognises that short breaks or respite care can be offered in a variety of ways and different settings.
- 5.4 As regards fostering, the group noted that there was a recruitment drive in place to recruit specialist foster carers due to the fact that specialist skills would be required to deal with the needs of some children with disabilities for overnight respite care. It is the intention of the council to have 6 foster carers available.
- 5.5 *The group is very concerned about the difficulties of not only recruiting potential foster carers, but also ensuring that they receive appropriate, continuous training. The Group is also concerned about the potential high costs of making necessary amendments and alterations to family homes, for example, wet rooms, hoists, door widening.*

**Recommendation 2: That specialist foster carers are made aware of the potentially refundable cost involved in adapting their properties were they to cease foster caring.**

What are the resources available for the provision of support to children with disabilities?

- 5.6 The policy of the council and of the CCG is to support the most vulnerable people and is focused around partnership working with service users and providers and making the best use of resources across the diverse communities in Herefordshire. Priorities that would help deliver these aims included the improve user and carer choice and control about how their needs are met, and a collaborative commissioning process to stimulate a diverse local market and ensure services were developed and improved in response to local needs. A commissioned continuum of short breaks provision was at the heart of this, together with a pooling of resources across partner agencies to prevent overlap and support best value.
- 5.7 The council's has a budgeted commitment of £450k pa for short-breaks, care packages, overnight respite at Ledbury Road and overnight fostering which is set out below.

	£ 000
<b>Daytime short breaks</b>	
Playdays and 1:1 buddying contracts	240
<b>Care packages</b>	
Individual care packages	30
<b>Overnight Respite</b>	
Ledbury Road	60
<b>Respite Fostering</b>	
Short breaks overnight fostering	120
<b>Total committed spend</b>	<b>450</b>

The council commitment to No. 1 Ledbury road is £60k pa which is supplemented by funds from the CCG.

**Recommendation 3: That appropriate outcomes and measures regarding short breaks and respite services are incorporated into Herefordshire Council's corporate plan under the priority: Keep children and young people safe and give them a great start in life.**

### What has gone well in the provision of short breaks and respite services?

- 5.8 *In visiting No. 1 Ledbury Road, the group noted the expert level of care being provided and witnessed at first hand the high levels of interaction between clients, families and staff. The group acknowledge the complexities of the care being provided and the difficulties that this may present in a domestic or foster care setting.*
- 5.9 The group found that the short breaks packages offered by Crossroads care had been well received by service users and the parents of service users. The company was a not for profit wellbeing care provider and offered a buddying service for children up to the age of 18, including those with complex needs. Clients were referred to Crossroads by GP's and social workers.
- 5.10 The group received evidence from Parent F, the parent of a service user who is accessing services provided by Crossroads care. It was explained that the buddying system had enabled their child to access facilities in the community which they would have otherwise been unable to do on their own. Examples included craft clubs, the cinema and even bowling. Parent F has two other children and as well as providing their child with a fun support session, buddying also provided family members with respite. Their only criticism of the service was that staff shift patterns meant that there was not always the continuity of care that would be preferred.

**Recommendation 4: That the council looks to increase the use of buddying, also giving consideration to whether an in-house buddying care model might be more suitable than the present arrangements.**

### What could be improved?

- 5.11 The group found that the future of No. 1 Ledbury Road could have been better explained to the parents of service users in 2012/13. However, the social care service had not been operating effectively for some time and as a result there needed to be up to date assessments and plans for all children in the county, which was dependent on having sufficient staff of the right skills. This had been a challenge for Herefordshire for a while, but recent investment and work had strengthened the team. Assessments were now being carried out and were due to have been completed by the end of October 2015. These assessments would inform what services should be discussed with parents to meet their needs, as well as the needs of their child.
- 5.12 Concerns were raised about the anomaly of No. 1 Ledbury Road functioning as a short break facility when it was actually registered as a children's hospital and managed as an extension of the Children's Ward at Herefordshire County hospital. It was therefore registered under the CQC, not Ofsted. Mr Aird felt that its registration sent the wrong message regarding the care that was required by these children. Children did not go to No. 1 Ledbury Road because of their health needs, but in order to provide a respite break for their families. The facility should provide a social experience for these children, but struggles to do so as a children's hospital.

**Recommendation 5: That consideration be given to re-designating No. 1 Ledbury Road as a short breaks facility, rather than as a children's hospital. This may afford No. 1 Ledbury Road more flexibility in that they could employ social care rather than medical staff.**

**Recommendation 6: That the council, the CCG and the WVT ensure that No. 1 Ledbury Road remains open and jointly funded whilst the re-designation process is undertaken.**

What engagement activity has taken place, including in relation to the future of No. 1 Ledbury Road, and what could be improved?

- 5.13 The group believed that the council, the CCG and the WVT had not fulfilled their obligations to involve the parents and carers of services users from the outset of the process, and expressed concern over the nature of the consultation that had been undertaken with parents and carers regarding the proposed changes of service. The date on which the last child was referred to No. 1 Ledbury Road was in November 2013 and referrals were suspended in February 2014. Those children already accessing No. 1 Ledbury Road continued to do so with their needs being reviewed as part of ongoing social care and medical assessments, as appropriate. The group considered that the engagement process had been flawed and the way that consultation had been undertaken had been ineffective. *The group is not satisfied with the explanations as to why the parents were not better informed by the council, the CCG and the WVT.*
- 5.14 The group received evidence which showed that from summer 2015 onwards, much work had been undertaken by all three partner organisations to ensure that communications were much more joined up. For example, the FAQs on the council's website were being regularly updated with input from all three partners. Regular meetings had also taken place with the Save No. 1 Ledbury Rd group and with the Friends of No. 1 Ledbury Rd. Meetings had also taken place with staff at No. 1 Ledbury Road as well as with social care staff.
- 5.15 However, officers from all three partners acknowledged and agreed that it had been a systems mistake not to fully engage with all service users before any announcement had been made in July. Since then the council, the CCG and the WVT had created the opportunity to meet jointly with the parents of users, and whilst some were content to consider alternative provision, a number were supportive of the Save No. 1 Ledbury Road campaign. The WVT had been open and transparent about the reduction in service provision and had made clear the difficulties of retaining staff in a service which at present decisions have yet to be made by all parties with regard to the nature of a contract from April 2016.
- 5.16 It was noted that parent carers had been written to on a number of occasions as part of the procurement process, and that Herefordshire Carers Support and Parent Carers Voice had both been involved in this process. It was understood that most families of service users were registered with these organisations. Engagement was ongoing as of October 2015, but as the process that was underway was, by its nature slow, there had been little new to say to parents who were getting frustrated as a result.
- 5.17 The communication process prior to summer 2015 had not been effective. Parents of service users were clear that they had only found out about the proposed closure of No. 1 Ledbury Road in July, although they had been aware of ongoing discussions regarding service redesign. No mention had been made to parents of the possibility of closure.

**Recommendation 7: That regular assurance is provided to the health and social care overview and scrutiny committee and Healthwatch in respect of the provision of short breaks and respite services across the county.**

**Recommendation 8: That the reinstatement of referrals to No. 1 Ledbury Road is implemented with immediate effect.**

**Recommendation 9: That monthly meetings continue to be held by the council, the CCG and the WVT in order to keep the children and parents presently accessing the service appraised of future plans for the service.**

**Recommendation 10: That a councillor be appointed to sit on the board of the WVT as a Non-Executive director in order to help improve communications between partner organisations.**

**Recommendation 11: That an action plan is agreed between all partners in respect of the implications and potential closure of No. 1 Ledbury Road.**

What assurance is there that suitable alternative provision will be available for families that currently access No. 1 Ledbury Road?

- 5.18 The group had been informed by both the CCG and WVT that a service would be maintained until the end of the financial year. However, it had been made clear that the service would cease at some time thereafter. *The group is concerned that it has received no details of a 'Plan B'.* It was acknowledged that the timescales would present individual difficulties for families as some were dependent on the No. 1 Ledbury Road service, having received it for many years. It was suggested that families would need to take active responsibility to fully engage with new ways to receive care and be willing to accept alternative services.
- 5.19 The group learnt of concerns of parents of service users that the proposed fostering service would neither meet the needs of all children and nor would it provide the social experience of meeting others that No. 1 Ledbury Road did. It was pointed out to the group that these were very vulnerable children who were not able to speak for themselves. *The group felt that No. 1 Ledbury Road offered security, as well as peace of mind for service users and parents that a foster carer would be unable to.*
- 5.20 The group has been told that the council is assessing whether there are any gaps in the service provision in respect of a range of short break options that are already available, and should that be the case, further provision will be identified and consulted on to ensure it meets statutory requirements prior to contracting and commissioning new services.

**Recommendation 12: That information is communicated effectively to parents and service users in respect of the potential different models of service provision.**

**Recommendation 13: That the needs and concerns of parents and service users are included as part of the commissioning of any new services.**

**Recommendation 14: That consideration is given to whether there are other suitable residential facility settings within Herefordshire that could provide respite care.**

In the light of recent short term closures, what is the current position of No. 1 Ledbury Road?

- 5.21 It is hoped that new arrangements put in place will help ensure that WVT has the right staff to manage the service safely. The group were also informed that a service would be maintained until the end of the financial year.
- 5.22 WVT considered No. 1 Ledbury Road to be an expensive and outmoded model of care, but one that could be remodelled. The strength of the service lay in its staff, who had the required skills to operate as foster carers should they be prepared to do so. The foster care model could be more appropriate for some children, creating an environment alternative to a residential building and better preparing children for adult life.

**Recommendation 15: That for each action, a clear timeline is agreed and produced by the council, the CCG and the WVT. The associated impacts upon current service users should also be considered. This information should also be shared with Healthwatch.**



**Recommendation 16: That a more entrepreneurial approach is taken at No. 1 Ledbury Road to offer a wider range of chargeable services, thus improving its financial viability.**

Fostering Service

- 5.23 In Herefordshire Council's published answers to FAQs regarding No. 1 Ledbury Road, it was stated that: The council is investing £190k in the family-based respite carer service, which from January 2016 is expected to deliver respite care to provide 1,200 nights a year for 16 local families. The group noted that this would mean each of the 6 respite carers would need to be able to provide care for at least 2, in some cases 3, children with complex needs. If each child maintained their current allocation for short breaks (one night in the week and one weekend a month) a respite carer providing care for 3 separate children would be providing care for 3 nights during the week in addition to 2 nights (and days) of the weekend i.e. 5 nights and 2 days a week for three weeks out of four and 3 nights for the fourth week.
- 5.24 In furthering its proposal to provide alternative respite arrangements for children who currently attend No. 1 Ledbury Road, the council's advert for short breaks carers suggests that 'anyone' can be a short breaks carer; subject to assessment for suitability, training and development. They could be single; have no upper age limit and could continue to hold down a job whilst providing care to all these children with complex needs and disabilities. *The group felt that the council needed to gain a better understanding of exactly what can be involved in caring for the most vulnerable and complex children, which might provide a clearer understanding of why residential overnight respite provision such as No. 1 Ledbury Road was so important to the parents of service users.*

**Recommendation 17: That foster carers interested in providing short break respite care for disabled children receive their training in No. 1 Ledbury Road, in order to fully appreciate the demands and responsibilities they would be taking on.**

6 Summary of Recommendations

<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Details</b>
1	That a communication is sent to all elected members reiterating that all councillors have a duty of care.
2	That specialist foster carers are made aware of the potentially refundable cost involved in adapting their properties were they to cease foster caring.
3	That appropriate outcomes and measures regarding short breaks and respite services are incorporated into Herefordshire Council's Corporate Plan under the priority: Keep children and young people safe and give them a great start in life.
4	That the council looks to increase the use of buddying, also giving consideration to whether an in-house buddying care model might be more suitable than the present arrangements.
5	That consideration be given to redesignating No. 1 Ledbury Road as a short breaks facility, rather than as a Children's Hospital. This may afford No. 1 Ledbury Road more flexibility in that they could employ social care rather than medical staff.
6	That the council, the CCG and the WVT ensure that No. 1 Ledbury Road remains open and jointly funded whilst the redesignation process is undertaken.
7	That regular assurance is provided to the Health and Social Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee and Healthwatch in respect of the provision of short breaks and respite services across the county.
8	That the reinstatement of referrals to No. 1 Ledbury Road is implemented with immediate effect.
9	That monthly meetings continue to be held by the council, the CCG and the WVT in order to keep the children and parents presently accessing the service apprised of future plans for the service.
10	That a Councillor be appointed to sit on the Board of the WVT as a Non-Executive Director in order to help improve communications between partner organisations.
11	That an action plan is agreed between all partners in respect of the implications and potential closure of No. 1 Ledbury Road.
12	That information is communicated effectively to parents and service users in respect of the potential different models of service provision.
13	That the needs and concerns of parents and service users are included as part of the commissioning of any new services.
14	That consideration is given to whether there are other suitable residential facility settings within Herefordshire that could provide respite care.
15	That for each action, a clear timeline is agreed and produced by the council, the CCG and the WVT. The associated impacts upon current service users should also be considered. This information should also be shared with Healthwatch.
16	That a more entrepreneurial approach is taken at No. 1 Ledbury Road to offer a wider range of chargeable services, thus improving its financial viability.
17	That foster carers interested in providing short break respite care for disabled children receive their training in No. 1 Ledbury Road, in order to fully appreciate the demands and responsibilities they would be taking on.

## Appendix A

### Health and Social Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee

#### Task and Finish Group – Review of provision of short break and respite services for children with disabilities

Title of review	<b>Review of provision of short break and respite services for children with disabilities</b>
Scope	
Reason for enquiry	<p>Following concerns raised to members about short break provision the enquiry is established:</p> <p>To review the current short breaks provision and determine whether it is meeting the needs of children and families as intended.</p> <p>To review the communications and plans for services in the light of the changes taking place at No. 1 Ledbury Road.</p>
Links to the corporate plan	<p>The review contributes to the following objective's contained in the Herefordshire corporate plan and other key plans and strategies:</p> <p><b>The services covered by this review directly contribute to the council's corporate priorities with particular relevance to those underlined below:</b></p> <p><b>Our vision</b></p> <p>Herefordshire - a place where people, organisations and businesses work together within an outstanding natural environment, bringing about sustainable prosperity and wellbeing for all.</p> <p>Our priorities are to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Keep children and young people safe and give them a great start in life</u></li> <li>• <u>Enable residents to live safe, healthy and independent lives</u></li> <li>• Invest in projects to improve roads, create jobs and build more homes</li> </ul> <p>and to achieve our priorities we need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Encourage individuals, communities and organisations to do more for themselves and for their local area</u></li> <li>• <u>Radically reduce the costs, breadth and level of services we provide</u></li> <li>• <u>Ensure the services that we do provide are cost effective</u></li> </ul> <p>Specifically, the corporate plan objectives pertinent to this review are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• People are physically and mentally healthy and stay healthy for longer</li> <li>• Outcomes for children and young people improve</li> <li>• There is increased equality of opportunity and access, to reduce inequality in health &amp; wellbeing outcomes</li> <li>• People are able to take more responsibility for themselves (includes making healthy choices &amp; focus on prevention)</li> <li>• People are active in their communities and look out for the more vulnerable so they can live independently</li> <li>• Public services are prioritised to support those in need of services to maintain their independence or stay safe</li> </ul> <p>In addition the new Children and Young People's Plan 2015-2018 includes a specific priority to improve outcomes for children with a disability and this will be achieved through the children with disabilities transformation programme.</p>

Summary of the review and terms of reference	<p>Summary: This review is to consider the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• current provision of short break and respite care in the county.</li> <li>• proposed closure of No. 1 Ledbury Road</li> <li>• issues surrounding the consultation process that had been undertaken with parents of service users and other stakeholders to inform the provision of services.</li> </ul> <p>Terms of Reference:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This Task and Finish Group is made up of councillors from the Health and Social Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee.</li> <li>• It will focus on the provision of short breaks and respite for children with disabilities at No. 1 Ledbury Road.</li> <li>• The Group will consider the specific questions detailed below and hear evidence from witnesses.</li> <li>• The findings and recommendations of the Group will be written in a report to be presented back to the main Committee</li> <li>• The council, Herefordshire Clinical Commissioning Group and Wye Valley NHS Trust will consider the recommendations at their review meeting in December 2015</li> </ul>
What will NOT be included	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Individual cases or details of children currently using 1 Ledbury Road services</li> </ul>
Potential outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Greater understanding of the decision taken by different parties to establish the range of short break and respite services available.</li> <li>• Recommendations to improve the engagement and communication with parents and children and young people</li> <li>• Reassurance that the needs of children and their families have been fully considered</li> </ul>
Key Questions	<p>To consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What are the resources available for the provision of support to children with disabilities?</li> <li>• What has gone well in the provision of short breaks and respite services?</li> <li>• What could be improved?</li> <li>• What engagement activity has taken place, including in relation to the future of 1 Ledbury Road, and what could be improved?</li> <li>• What assurance is there that suitable alternative provision will be available for families that currently access 1 Ledbury Road?</li> </ul>
Cabinet Member	Cllr J Lester (Children's and Young Peoples Wellbeing)
Key stakeholders / Consultees	<p>Herefordshire Clinical Commissioning Group Wye Valley NHS Trust Herefordshire Council Parents of children who access short break and respite services Children and young people who access short break and respite services Councillors Providers of short break and respite services including schools, particularly special schools</p>
Potential witnesses	<p><b>Parents of service users</b> Parent A, a parent of a child currently using Ledbury Road and also a parent representative Parents using a range of short breaks and respite services</p> <p><b>Herefordshire Clinical Commissioning Group</b> Dr Alison Talbot Smith</p> <p><b>Providers of services:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Wye Valley NHS Trust</b> Emma Allen (Business Manager, Integrated Family Health Service)</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Other provider services.</b> Crossroads Buddying Service</li> </ul> <p><b>Herefordshire Council</b> Jo Davidson, Director of Children's Wellbeing Chris Baird, Assistant Director Education and Commissioning, Children's Wellbeing Directorate (CWB) Paul Meredith, Assistant Director, Safeguarding and Family Support, CWB Deb Owen, Head of Service for Children with Disabilities, CWB Sue Rogers, Service Manager for Children with Disabilities, CWB Philippa Granthier, Head of Service for Commissioning, CWB Richard Watson, Commissioning Lead, CWB</p>
Research Required	<p>Historical context of services for children with disabilities and short breaks and respite care Commissioning activity documentation Decision reports by the council, WVT and CCG Implementation plans Equality impact assessments and reviews Engagement and consultation evidence, including requirements for statutory consultation on any change to a service Financial information</p>
Potential Visits	<p>Visit to 1 Ledbury Road – WVT to provide suitable dates. Visit to another short breaks provider – details TBC</p>
Meetings	Meetings to be held in private
Publicity Requirements	Publication of Review and its Recommendations

Outline Timetable (following decision by the Committee to commission the Review)	
<i>Activity</i>	<i>Timescale</i>
Confirm approach, Terms of Reference, programme of consultation/research/provisional witnesses/meeting dates	14 August 2015
Collect current data available for circulation to Group for first meeting of the Group	3 September 2015
First Task and Finish Group meeting	10 Sept 2015
Site Visits	17 Sept 2015
Additional meetings	Late September
Present final report to Overview & Scrutiny Committee	17 November 2015
Present options/recommendation to Cabinet Member (to inform the December review with CCG /WVT)	3 December 2015
Cabinet Member response/decision	January 2016
Monitoring of implementation of agreed recommendations: Report to Overview and Scrutiny Committee Further report to Overview and Scrutiny Committee	21 March 2016 Summer 2016

Group Members	
<b>Chair</b>	Cllr J Stone
<b>Support Members</b>	Cllr M Lloyd-Hayes
	Cllr ACR Chappell
	Cllr PE Crockett
<b>Support Officers</b>	Steve Hodges
	David Penrose

