

DONCASTER METROPOLITAN BOROUGH COUNCIL  
OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

THURSDAY, 18TH JANUARY, 2018

A MEETING of the OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE was held at the COUNCIL CHAMBER - CIVIC OFFICE, DONCASTER on THURSDAY, 18TH JANUARY, 2018 at 11.00 AM

PRESENT:

Chair - Councillor Kevin Rodgers

Councillors Jane Kidd, Andrea Robinson and Paul Wray

Invitee: - Paul O'Brien

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

Patrick Birch - Programme Manager (Commissioning and Contracts)  
Steve Mawson - Chief Financial Officer and Assistant Director of Finance  
Peter Dale - Director of Regeneration and Environment

		<u>ACTION</u>
37	<u>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE.</u>	
	Apologies for absence were received from Councillors John Healy, Richard Allan Jones and Neil Gethin.	
38	<u>TO CONSIDER THE EXTENT, IF ANY, TO WHICH THE PUBLIC AND PRESS ARE TO BE EXCLUDED FROM THE MEETING.</u>	
	None	
39	<u>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST, IF ANY.</u>	
	Councillors Jane Kidd declared a nonpecuniary interest in Agenda Item No.5 by virtue of being employed by an association that provides services for those with disabilities.	
40	<u>PUBLIC STATEMENTS.</u>	
	Mr Doug Wright made a public statement which related to Item 6. OSMC Workplan. Reference was made to reductions that had been outlined in the national budget, through the joint commissioning agreement underpinning the Doncaster Place Plan.	

Mr Wright felt that there had been a lack of scrutiny around the whole joint partnership arrangements in Doncaster that will be in shadow form from April 2018. He made reference to today's agreement of the Ernst and Young report about the future of the Accountable Care System specifically referring to Doncaster Council, the Health and Wellbeing Board, its governance arrangements and other aspects with stakeholder and overview etc.

Mr Wright raised concern that in 2016 Sustainable Transform Plan identified a £571m Health and Adult Social Care group area deficiency that needed to be bridged. He reported that the claimed cost of delivering will be £139.5m for Doncaster and that this figure had not changed since 2016. Reference was made to the Mayor expressing concerns about the financial aspect of this and potential areas that could be considered including smoking obesity or emergency services.

Mr Wright also felt that there had been no comprehensive scrutiny or analysis undertaken of what was going to happen from April 2018. He expressed concern that the joint scrutiny health committee hardly ever met, and then chose to meet in places such as Matlock. It was asked for it to be reconsidered as to how this affects future running. It was acknowledged that it was a complex area with a budget that will include cuts to the Better Care Fund

In response, Members were reminded that this had been taken to Cabinet indicating the plans for the year ahead and would return to Cabinet in April 2018 with additional detail. It was acknowledged that it was very important for this to be done correctly in Doncaster and that partners were on board. It was added that some areas had the potential to be considered regionally or that budgets may be pooled with partners.

It was acknowledged that it was about shifting the emphasis to be more about hospital commissioning. Members were informed that such specifics were being worked on at the moment including developing relations with community and providers. It was explained that this was a debate that will happen nationally, and it was been shared that the savings needed will not only be achieved through making cuts. Some of the issues faced were referred to and included homelessness, looking at a more flexible housing strategy and being around reduced presentation at Accident and Emergency. It was noted that positive discussions were being undertaken with partners regarding work in areas where the Council knows it can progress together with partners

It was acknowledged that any decisions would need to go to Council in order to make a full change and involve scrutiny as appropriate. It was acknowledged that there will be less resources going forward whilst trying to maintain better services for citizens in the borough.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY CONSIDERATION OF THE MAYOR'S BUDGET PROPOSALS 2018/19-2020/21.

The purpose of this report was to give further consideration to the Mayor's draft Budget proposals 2018/19 – 2020/21 and develop a formal response. The Committee's response will enable the Mayor to take account of these when presenting her proposals to Council on 5th March, 2018.

**Adult Social Care**

Members were informed that it was about maximising what individuals could do for themselves. It was recognised that figures had reduced over the last couple of years as for most there were better alternatives as well as being beneficial for the budget.

It was explained that there was an ambition to support the living wage and to offer uplifting salary rates. It was explained that this approach would support the effective delivery of services, and provide additional money for demographics as there were a higher number of people in need of support. It was further added that there would be more investment in those services that promoted independent living. It was recognised that although it was challenging, it was achievable with an intention to continue to bring those numbers further down.

It was explained that there were 105 individuals at working age, living within a residential provision. Members were informed that work was being undertaken closely with those people; making best interest assessments and recognising that some could be based within supported living instead of residential.

Supported Living - In respect of savings made, it was explained that supported living provided assistance to 300 people who received 45 hours of support per week. It was emphasised that moving forward was about strength based thinking, providing investment and setting up individuals in more independent settings and working on that alternative.

Housing Related Support Service – It was acknowledged that this would be a challenging area with the Council and its partners reviewing its (discretionary) housing related support services, with a view to the transition of current service users to more appropriate forms of support. It was explained that there were currently 12 related contracts covering areas such as mental health, children, homelessness and learning disabilities. It was commented that many of the contracts were considered to be quite traditional in approach and that with some services being delivered for less money, there needed to be a great deal of work undertaken in order to be more efficient. It was noted that new ways of working were being investigated for the benefit of the people concerned in addition to releasing the necessary savings.

Day Services Work – It was explained that this service was being modernised to give service users better choice and control with more options. It was recognised that far less people were now going to day centres.

Intermediate Care – It was acknowledged that good work had been undertaken and this had the potential to deliver some good benefits.

Direct Payments – It was explained that direct payments were retendering their money management services and looking at keeping bureaucracy to a minimum and help people make their own choices.

Commissioning - Concern was raised as to how strongly the Council was trying to commission services that were based primarily in the Borough (as opposed to a national contractor who offers sub-contracts) and it was questioned whether there was an adrift to large service organisations. It was felt that savings were made on the ground with those who undertake crucial frontline services. It was commented that some of the larger organisations were offering Social Worker equivalent roles for less than £20,000.

It was stressed that it was about commissioning not outsourcing using a strength-based approach and that the Council could no longer afford to deliver the same level of services. It was stated that new providers needed to think differently about how they achieved this. It was expressed that there was a need to understand people's individual situations and what further support or intervention they might need. It was felt that it was about building people's understanding as well as considering alternatives through looking at what local providers can deliver.

Concerns were raised that there was a dilution of skill when services exited out of the authority to providers who it was felt did not deliver the same quality. Members were of the opinion that the Council should be investing more locally and developing a sector which will prove vital in the long term. Members were informed that Powers of General Competency could be used with health colleagues to establish some sort of appropriate locality based model. Members were informed that potential problems around voluntary and community capacity to help deliver this new model needed to be monitored and that further consideration was needed to see what could be procured by the Council. It was shared that further work needed to be done around voluntary and community sector and that it had been recognised by the Team Doncaster Partnership that work needed to be undertaken more consistently.

It was agreed that more could be done although progress had been made looking at alternative delivery models for day services, looking to contract locally for transport to day services.

Concern was raised where members of staff were being transferred on wages to be later cut to a minimum wage and pension. Members were assured that the Council wanted providers to honour the living wage.

It was challenged by a member of the Committee, what was being spent on consultancy and agency staff. It was commented that the Council's priorities should be about bringing services back in-house rather than commissioning out services. It was responded that there were particular areas where it was difficult to recruit for consultants and agency staff where required.

It was commented that conditions could be built into contracts such as employing locally and building in those local perspectives.

### **Regeneration and Environment**

In response to how the Regeneration and Environment was tackling its reported £1 million overspend, an outline was provided of the following contributing factors and future steps;

Waste and Recycling – It was explained that this was a one-off cost and one of the greatest contributors towards this overspend projected to be £576k due to unplanned contract extension costs.

Schools Catering – It was noted that this was currently at £368k due to reduced income related to the lower margins created when schools convert to academies. It was outlined that a number of academies during the year had chosen to use a preferred provider rather than the Council. It was acknowledged that the Council needed to be more competitive and that opportunities were being explored although there were no guarantees. It was questioned whether there could be more of a challenge of existing contracts prior to providers moving to new ones.

Market – Members were informed that this was as a result of vacant stalls with a reduction of £253k income and that additional funding had been used to offset that. It was explained that this was a reflection of what was happening nationally with fewer people visiting into the town centre. Members were told that investment was being used to provide a different type of offer with new opportunities to be completed October 2018.

Town Centre – Members were reminded of the investment taking place within the town centre with capital projects commencing 2018/19 that may attract more people into the town centre. It was outlined that Doncaster would be marketed more as a place and destination to visit with 4 to 5 key events taking place in addition to those provided by St. Leger Homes Doncaster.

Public Building Maintenance –It was expressed that it was difficult to

get the right trades people to do progress the work and therefore people are brought in on short term contracts.

Bereavement – This was identified in part due to repairs to Doncaster Minster paths and the demolition of the bungalow at Rose Hill at a cost of £36k. In addition, additional funding was needed for the maintenance of cemeteries to meet a reasonable standard.

Fleet Replacement Programme – This is expected to underspend by £1 million mainly due to slower than expected vehicle replacement which has created underspends against budgets used for the repayment of borrowing and interest.

Asset Disposal and Lettings – It was acknowledged that this was currently behind schedule and work was being undertaken to progress it. It was commented that disposing of an asset at the best price was not always necessarily the only option available and that interesting work on tenders with community outcomes were finding an innovative way to look at assets. It was also explained that following the refurbishment of Colonnades, there had been a lack of initial take-up; however, it was reported that private sector companies and partners had now accommodated vacant floors which would result in additional income.

Collapse of Carillion – Members were informed that Carillion was involved in the construction of FARRRS jointly with Tarmac. Members were assured that following the collapse of Carillion, work would continue with the remaining contractor and that there may be a slight project delay but no money would be lost.

Members were assured that the Council will do what it can to safeguard contracts when tendering in the future.

### **Finance and Performance**

Business Rates – It was explained that as a result of the revaluation, rateable value's for our area decreased and rates payable also decreased, but Doncaster's top-up grant had increased to compensate. It was further added that some valuations had changed again and the top up grant will be adjusted again, although these figures were not known yet. It was acknowledged that Doncaster was doing well and would continue to do so as long as service demand was properly managed and it was not tasked by government with services that were growing.

Council Tax – Members were informed that the majority of properties in Doncaster were below Band D and the authority was therefore not comparatively the same as other authorities. Reference was made to the importance of increasing income by raising the Council Tax, Social Care "precept" and other income from fees and charges. It was

	<p>reflected that council tax and business rates were both adequate but that there were risks associated with actions the Government was taking. It was recognised that it was a balancing act that impacted on residents within the Borough.</p> <p>It was shared that in time the Councils funding arrangements would be self-sufficient and that there would be less government support. With that, it was recognised that the status of the local economy was fundamental.</p> <p>In respect of Private Financed Initiatives, Members were informed that there were 2 schools at no cost to the tax payer and the waste PFI at Manvers (with both at no cost to the taxpayer).</p> <p>It was acknowledged that 2020/21 was an unknown with uncertainty being presented with the spending review, Fairer Funding Review and a reset on business rates due during that time.</p> <p>RESOLVED:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I. That the Mayor’s draft budget proposals be accepted and the Chair undertakes to provide a formal written response.</li> <li>II. To include the following within the Committee’s formal written response; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) When looking to reshape services, in particular, commissioning, contracting and subcontracting, that the Council has regard to recommendations from evidence formed as a result of the Communities and Enterprise Overview and Scrutiny domestic abuse review.</li> <li>b) That when considering the commissioning of Adult Social Care services, that the Council use their General Powers of Competency to create a cooperative and mutual model for localised delivery with health partners.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
42	<p><u>OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY WORK PLAN 2017/2018 - JANUARY 2018</u></p>	
	<p>The Committee considered the Scrutiny Work Plan, noted the current position and work to be undertaken by the Committee and Panel’s for the remainder of the 2017/18 Civic Year.</p> <p>RESOLVED: that the report, be noted.</p>	