

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
SCRUTINY COMMISSION FOR RURAL COMMUNITIES
HELD IN THE
BOURGES & VIERSEN ROOMS, TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH
ON 1 APRIL 2014**

Present: Councillors D Over (Chairman), S Allen, D Harrington, N Sandford and E Murphy

Officers in

Attendance: Adrian Chapman Assistant Director for Communities and Targeted Services
Gary Goose Safer and Stronger Peterborough Strategic Manager
Paul Grubic Assistant Director of Strategic Commissioning
Julian Base Live Healthy Service Manager
Dania Castagliuolo Governance Officer

1. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor McKean, Councillor Lamb and Councillor Sanders. Councillor Allen was Substituting for Councillor McKean.

2. Declarations of Interest and Whipping Declarations

There were no declarations of interest.

3. Minutes of the Previous Meetings Held on 16 December 2013 and 13 January 2014

The Minutes of the meeting held on 16 December 2013 and 13 January 2014 were approved as an accurate record.

4. Scrutiny in a Day Overview Report

The report was introduced by the Assistant Director for Communities and Targeted Services, to provide the Commission with the overview report detailing the outcomes from the joint Scrutiny in a Day event, which was held on 17 January 2014. The event looked at the impacts of welfare reform on communities in Peterborough.

Members were asked to discuss, debate and, refine and finalise their key lines of enquiry and recommendations in order that they could be added to their work programme for the 2014/15 municipal year.

Observations and questions were raised and discussed including:

- Members commented that they felt young families in rural areas were disadvantaged as there was limited one and two bedroom affordable housing available. *The Assistant Director for Communities and Targeted Services welcomed this line of enquiry as something the Commission could add to their work programme for the next municipal year.*
- Members commented that they felt rural communities required better more sustainable transport.

- Members queried whether Parish Councils could take on some responsibilities to help deal with these lines of enquiry. *Members were advised that the Council were keen to investigate this and informed Members that Parish Councils were already offering debt advice to communities.*
- Members were concerned with what would happen when the Parish Grants from the Council were removed next year and suggested this was something that should be addressed early on.
- Members commented that the Scrutiny in a Day event was a very useful event to have, although only two Members from the Commission could attend due to timings. *Members were advised that this issue would be addressed for future events.*
- Members commented that an issue which frequently affected rural communities was isolation.
- *Members were informed that a Group Representatives meeting would be held to create a work programme and these issues could all be included.*

ACTION AGREED

The Commission noted the report and agreed for the assistant Director of Communities and Targeted Services to:

- Circulate a briefing note advising them on what indicatives are in place to help with poverty with regards to Health.
- Investigate the possibility of Parish Councils delivering some services to assist the Council in dealing with the lines of enquiry.

RECOMMENDATION

In light of the new Welfare Reform Act and introduction of 'Spare Room Subsidy', the Scrutiny Commission for Rural Communities was concerned that rural communities did not have enough one and two bedroom social housing properties to allow for young families to remain in their own rural community. The Scrutiny Commission for Rural Communities therefore, recommended to Cabinet that the Housing Strategy was reviewed to take in to consideration their concerns with a view to providing more one and two bedroom social houses.

5. Better Care Fund

The Assistant Director of Strategic Commissioning introduced the report which provided the Commission with information on the development of proposals for use of the Better Care Fund in Peterborough.

The fund which was originally called the Transformation and Integration fund and now known as the Better Care Fund, was not new monies, but represented a change to the way that some NHS budget was allocated, with the explicit intention of integrating health and social care systems and services at a local level.

The vision for health and social care services was as follows:

- To bring together all of the public agencies that provided health and social care support, especially for older people so that:
 - Services could be coordinated such as health, social care and housing.
 - Individual's access to information, advice and support in their communities was maximised.
 - Older people could be helped to live as independently as possible in the most appropriate setting.

To be successful, this transformation would require the contribution of a range of health and social care providers as well as the greater involvement of the community and voluntary sectors.

The Better Care Fund offered an important opportunity to transform the health and social care system and delivery in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough to better meet the needs of a rapidly ageing population and by doing so ease the pressure on the system more generally and enable the health and social care system to provide better services to the whole population of the city.

The future outcome for the Better Care Fund would be an improved service integration, community cohesion and capacity, and to develop better outcomes for the citizens of Peterborough in terms of health and social care delivery. It should also improve the medium term affordability of services in the stretched local health and social care economy.

The Better Care Fund offered a unique opportunity to rethink how a significant amount of public money could be more efficiently and effectively spent.

The model adopted in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough would have the following characteristics.

- A united approach to advice and information on community and public sector services.
- Investment in community capacity to enable people to meet their needs with support in their local community.
- Coordinated and intelligence-led early identification and early intervention.
- An improved approach to crisis management and recovery.

Observations and questions were raised and discussed including:

- Members queried what the terms Telecare and Telehealth were, which were mentioned on page 69 of the report. *The Assistant Director of Strategic Commissioning advised members that this could include simple technology such as a pendant to more complex technology within the home which could be used to reduce accidents and unnecessary hospital admissions.*
- Members queried 'Capital Funding' which was mentioned on page 64 of the report under 3.2 and asked what this related to. *Members were informed that this funding could potentially be for buildings and adaptations through the Disabled Facility Grants- although it had not yet been allocated to any particular area.*
- Members queried how a coordinator would be elected. *Members were advised that resources would be allocated through a pooled budget and a lead coordinator would be elected. The coordinator would be the person with the best potential to deliver the necessary services.*
- Members queried how rural communities would engage with the coordinator once in place and how many service areas would the coordinator have. *Members were advised that this service would be allocated as part of a care package. Community navigators would be offered to support rural communities.*
- Members queried who would be providing mental health services in Peterborough. *Members were informed that some of this would be taken on by the third sector and the Council also had a contract with Cambridge and Peterborough Foundation Trust to provide core services.*
- Members were concerned that there was not enough capacity within the third sector to take on mental health services and ensure that standards were maintained.
- Members queried who was going to coordinate the lead coordinators. *Members were advised that this would depend on who the coordinators were.*

- Members queried who the accountable body for funding was. *Members were informed that the funding would be provided by Peterborough City Council within a Section 75 pooled budget mechanism.*
- Members queried whether there would be a resource fund for extra staff to help avoid elderly people getting admitted to hospital, if not then patients could get missed out. *Members were informed that a certain sum of money had to be spread to ensure services were delivered in the correct way, there were also Electronic Call Monitoring Systems in place to ensure that services were being delivered correctly.*
- Members requested reassurance that funding received would be spent in Peterborough. *Members were reassured that as a Council, Peterborough had to ensure services were maintained and outcomes were delivered and this was carried out by having a performance framework in place.*
- Members queried what provisions were going to be put in place if the Kingfisher Centre was to be closed down, as loneliness was an important issue within rural communities. *Members were advised that the Kingfisher Centre and day centre activities had been subject to a review and an eight week consultation. The desired outcome was to shape services to become more community based. The need for at least one centre for patients with more complex needs had been taken in to consideration, but a decision had not yet been made.*

ACTION AGREED

Members noted the report and requested that an update on this subject was delivered to the Commission next year.

RECOMMENDATION

The Scrutiny Commission for Rural Communities Recommended that the Health and Wellbeing Board reviewed its membership and considered having representation from non-Cabinet Members as well as Cabinet Members.

6. Troubled Families in Rural Communities

The report was introduced by the Safer and Stronger Peterborough Strategic Manager for the Commission to review the process of the Troubled Families Programme (known locally as Connecting Families) in rural localities.

Troubled families were those which had problems and often caused problems to the community around them, putting high costs on the public sector. In December 2011, the Prime Minister launched a new programme to turn around the lives of 120,000 troubled families in England by 2015.

The aims of the Troubled Families Programme were to get children back in to school, reduce youth crime and antisocial behaviour, put adults on a path back to work and bring down the amount of public services currently spent on them.

The Commission was asked to note the contents of the report and the issues contained therein.

Observations and questions were raised and discussed including:

- Members were concerned that by targeting families this may discourage them from seeking help from services. *The safer and Stronger Peterborough Strategic Manager informed the Commission that the Council were committed to doing the right thing with this programme, therefore instead of just carrying out data marketing to obtain fast results they were genuinely working to help as many families as possible.*

- Members queried whether all four criteria had to be met to receive the payment by result. *Members were informed that three of the four criteria were required in order to receive the payment.*
- Members queried how troubled families who were off the radar were identified on the programme. *Members were informed that not every family in need of help could be identified. Families would be recognised due to antisocial behaviour or poor school attendance. Members were advised if they had any concerns regarding families in their wards to submit names and the checks would be carried out to ensure they met the criteria.*
- Members commented that it was easy to identify troubled families in rural communities as they were small close communities. The issue was for rural communities to receive help to deal with these troubled families. The numbers of troubled families in rural communities may have been small but this did not make the issues less important. *Members were advised that this programme was in place to overcome this type issue.*
- Members commented that they thought the programme was very useful as it turned troubled families lives around.

ACTION AGREED

The Commission noted the report on the Troubled Families in Rural Communities.

RECOMMENDATION

The Scrutiny Commission for Rural Communities Recommended that a dedicated connector was recruited to deal with Troubled Families in rural Communities.

7. Public Health

The Live Healthy Service Manager introduced the report, which provided the Commission with an overview of developments being undertaken by Public Health and partners, notably Peterborough Environment City Trust related to local and sustainable food produce.

Local authorities were given renewed responsibility for public health as part of the health and social care reforms introduced in April 2013, alongside a new public health outcomes framework and dedicated funding. The framework set out a vision for public health, desired outcomes and the indicators that would help the Council understand how well public health was being improved and protected. In order to achieve improvements at a local level, not only on how long people live, but also on how well they live at all stages of life, consideration of the many factors that influence public health over the course of a lifetime needed to be understood and acted upon.

At a local level public health working within the local authority had been developing and embedding a range of programmes, services and initiatives aimed at achieving sustainable positive outcomes. Of particular relevance to the Commission was the work that public health was developing related to local and sustainable food.

The Commission was asked to note the information provided within the report and to identify any specific areas it wished to scrutinise in greater depth.

Observations and questions were raised and discussed including:

- Members commented that they were very pleased that this subject was being looked in to as Public Health was a core subject for the Council.
- Members were concerned that schools did not use local produce for school meals.
- Members commented that food projects were a way to get communities to come together.

ACTION AGREED

The Commission agreed for the Live Healthy Service Manager to:

- Attend a meeting of the Task and Finish Group to Review and Develop a Strategy for the Councils Farms Estate.
- Come back to the Committee in future with an update

8. Forward Plan of Key Decisions

The Commission received the latest version of the Council's Forward Plan of Key Decisions, containing key decisions that the Leader of the Council anticipated the Cabinet or individual Cabinet Members would make during the course of the following four months. Members were invited to comment on the Plan and, where appropriate, identify any relevant areas for inclusion in the Commission's work programme.

ACTION AGREED

The Commission noted the latest version of the Council's Forward Plan of key Decisions and requested further information on the following:

- Amendments to the Affordable Housing Capital Funding Policy.
- Strategy for People with Dementia and their Carers.
- S256 Agreement between the Council and Cambridge and Peterborough CCG

The meeting began at 7.00pm and ended at 8.55pm

CHAIRMAN