

Public Document Pack

Statutory Joint Scrutiny Committee

Thursday, 10 August 2006 4.00 p.m.
Town Hall, Runcorn

AGENDA

Item No.	Page No.
1. AGENDA	1 - 10

In accordance with the Health and Safety at Work Act the Council is required to notify those attending meetings of the fire evacuation procedures. A copy has previously been circulated to Members and instructions are located in all rooms within the Civic block.

This page is intentionally left blank



St. Helens Council



Warrington Borough Council



Town Hall, St. Helens, Merseyside, WA10 1HP
Telephone 01744 456110 (Tina Molyneux)

Agenda

STATUTORY JOINT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE 5 BOROUGH PARTNERSHIP NHS TRUST

Proposals Relating to Improving Services for Adults with Mental Health Needs in Halton, St. Helens and Warrington

Date: Thursday, 10 August 2006 Time: 4.00 p.m. Venue: Runcorn Town Hall
Hall Heath Road
Runcorn, Cheshire WA7 5TN

Membership

Halton 3 Councillors Cargill (Chairman), Inch and Loftus
St. Helens 3 Councillors Bowden (Vice Chairman), McGuire and Stephanie Topping
Warrington 3 Councillors Banner, Hoyle and Johnson

Item	Title	Page
1	<u>Apologies for Absence</u>	
2	<u>Minutes of the meeting held on 20 July 2006</u>	1
3	<u>Declarations of Interest from Members</u>	<i>Verbal Report</i>
4	<u>Presentation by 5 Boroughs Partnership NHS Trust</u>	5
5	<u>Further Action and Further Information required following Presentation</u>	<i>Verbal Report</i>

5 BOROUGH PARTNERSHIP NHS TRUST PROPOSALS RELATING TO IMPROVING
SERVICES FOR ADULTS WITH MENTAL HEALTH NEEDS IN
HALTON, ST. HELENS AND WARRINGTON

Minutes of the meeting of this Committee held on
20 July 2006

(Members Present) Halton Council

Councillors Cargill, Inch and Loftus

St. Helens Council

Councillors Bowden, McGuire and Stephanie Topping

Warrington Council

Councillors Banner, Hoyle and Johnson

(Also Present)

Halton Council

Martin Loughna, Service Development Officer Health
Audrey Williamson, Operational Director, Adults of a Working Age

St. Helens Council

Tina Molyneux, Senior Democratic Services Officer
Carole Swift, Service Manager Carers and Scrutiny
Rob Vickers, Acting Assistant Director Vulnerable Adults
Mike Wyatt, Assistant Director Performance & Business Support

Warrington Council

Brian Magan, Overview & Scrutiny Co-ordinator, Warrington Council
Roger Millns, Head of Service, Mental Health, Learning Disabilities &
Corporate Social Services
Alison Williams, Overview and Scrutiny Officer

1 APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN

- * **Resolved that Councillor Cargill be appointed Chairman.**

Councillor Cargill here took the Chair.

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the Committee.

2 APPOINTMENT OF VICE CHAIRMAN

- * **Resolved that Councillor Bowden be appointed Vice Chairman.**

3 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

It was reported that no apologies for absence had been received.

STATUTORY JOINT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

4 TERMS OF REFERENCE

A report was submitted which detailed the Terms of Reference of the Committee as follows:

1. To establish statutory joint committee to scrutinise proposals from the 5 Boroughs Partnership NHS Trust to improve services for people with mental health needs in the boroughs of Halton, St Helens and Warrington.
2. To undertake the scrutiny of the proposals in accordance with the Local Authority (Overview and Scrutiny Committees Health Scrutiny Functions) Regulations 2002, and the Directions to Local Authorities (Overview and Scrutiny Committees, Health Scrutiny Functions) July 2003.
3. To complete a report outlining the statutory committee's views of the proposals and to make recommendations to the 5 Boroughs Partnership NHS Trust where relevant.
4. To monitor the Trust's responses to the report and agree mechanisms for the ongoing monitoring of future changes to mental health services.

It was reported that Knowsley Council had been invited to join the Committee, however no formal response had been received to date.

- * **Resolved that the Terms of Reference be agreed.**

5 TIMESCALES

A verbal report was given to Members on the timescales for the consultation process.

A letter was tabled from the 5 Boroughs Partnership NHS Trust regarding the proposed extension of consultation for the Statutory Partner Organisations as follows:

1. 24 August 2006 - Formal public Consultation to end as planned, with the exception of the Local Authorities and PCTs as key partners in the affected boroughs of Halton, Knowsley, St Helens and Warrington.
2. By 31 August 2006 - Mental Health Strategies to provide a report to the Trust of the key messages arising from the consultation, these to be reported to the Trust's Board at its next meeting on 7 September 2006. This would be a factual and summary report. The 5 Boroughs Partnership NHS Trust would not take recommendations to change or approve the model of the Board at that stage.
3. 1 September 2006 - the Mental Health Strategies report to be made available to key statutory partner organisations.
4. By 15 September 2006 - Key partner organisations to consider the consultation outcome report plus the work relating to the impact assessment and any additional information accrued during the consultation period and provide the Trust with a formal response to consultation. This timescale should also help to accommodate the Joint Overview and Scrutiny process that had recently been agreed between Halton, St Helens and Warrington Local Authorities.

5. The Trust Board to convene an extraordinary public meeting to consider and arrive at a decision on the proposals/options described in 'Change for the Better' and any amendments consequent to taking account of the responses made in the consultation.

The letter stated that the proposed extension to the consultation deadline was recognition that the phased implementation of any agreed changes (following the consultation) would be delayed to a December start date. This would be supported by full project management arrangement and the involvement of key partner agencies.

- * **Resolved that the report be noted.**

6 MEMBERSHIP OF COMMITTEE AND SUBSTITUTION

A verbal report was given to Members on the Membership of the Committee and Substitution.

The Committee discussed the possibility of nominated substitutes taking into consideration the tight timescales and the dates of future meetings set. Following a vote it was:

- * **Resolved that the names of two nominated substitutes from each of the three local authorities, Halton, St. Helens and Warrington be submitted to Tina Molyneux, Senior Democratic Services Officer, St. Helens Council.**

7 IMPACT ASSESSMENTS OF PROPOSALS

A report was submitted which informed Members of the Impact Assessments of Proposals for Halton, St. Helens and Warrington.

Rob Vickers, Acting Assistant Director Vulnerable Adults (St Helens), Roger Millns, Head of Service, Mental Health, Learning Disabilities and Corporate Social Services (Warrington) and Mike Wyatt, Assistant Director, Performance and Business Support (St Helens) were present to answer questions for Members.

The Committee discussed the impact assessments of proposals.

- * **Resolved that the report be noted.**

8 ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION BY COMMITTEE

A report was submitted which outlined issues identified with the 5 Boroughs NHS Trusts proposals relating to the development of services for adults with mental health needs. The issues identified were in relation to:

- (i) Impact on Service Users and Carers
- (ii) Financial Information
- (iii) In-Patient Beds
- (iv) Access to Services

STATUTORY JOINT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

- (v) Impact on Council Services
- (vi) Consultation Processes
- (vii) General Points.

The Committee discussed the report and requested the following issues to be included:

- Members requested that the 5 Boroughs Partnership NHS Trust use language which is familiar and understandable to the Committee.
- The general lack of awareness of the consultation process
- Alcohol detoxification for Older People
- Training of Staff
- Clarity relating to services provided in Helsby and Frodsham, and how this will impact on services and resources in the other boroughs
- Issues relating to cross subsidy
- Clarity regarding the services provided for the money ring-fenced from individual authority's budgets.

*** Resolved that:**

- (1) the report be noted;**
- (2) the amendments be included in the report as per the discussion of the Committee; and**
- (3) the report detailing the concerns of the Committee be forwarded to the 5 Boroughs Partnership NHS Trust week commencing 24 July 2006 and circulated to the Members of the Committee. This would include a specific request that the 5 Boroughs Partnership NHS Trust focus on the points raised in the report when they present to the Committee on 10 August 2006.**

9

DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

It was agreed that the meeting scheduled to be held on 3 August 2006 should be cancelled.

*** Resolved that the Committee meet on the following dates:**

- (1) 10 August 2006**
- (2) 24 August 2006**
- (3) 7 September 2006**

-oOo-

Issues for Consideration by Statutory Joint Scrutiny Committee

Improving Services for Adults with Mental Health Needs

5 Boroughs Partnership NHS Trust

1. Purpose

The purpose of this report is to outline initial issues identified with the 5 Boroughs NHS Trusts proposals relating to the development of services for adults with mental health needs.

2. Impact on Service Users and Carers

- 2.1 The reports referred to would seem to indicate a tightening of eligibility criteria across mental health services. This is likely to be as a result of the decrease in in-patient beds. The model is not clear about the impact that this will have for services users and carers in the Boroughs. The model is also unclear about any arrangements to ensure the safety and effective risk management of issues relating to individuals through the transition of services.
- 2.2 There are concerns about the possible impact on other aspects of 5 Boroughs work, notably the Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services, where there is no clarity in the proposals outlined.
- 2.3 The Committee is concerned that the proposals do not properly meet the needs of a number of specific groups including:-
- ♦ Older people with functional mental health needs
 - ♦ People with dual diagnosis i.e. drug and/or alcohol and mental health problems
 - ♦ People presently living in secure environments
 - ♦ People with personality disorders
 - ♦ Young people aged 16-17 years
- 2.4 The Committee also has concerns about the proposals to mix inpatient settings for older people and younger adults. The Committee believes that this is contrary to acknowledged good practice. The Committee is also concerned that people under the age of 18 may be admitted to adult wards.
- 2.5 There are concerns about the impact on alcohol services for adults and older people, the proposals contain a reduction of allocated beds for alcohol detoxification.

3. Financial Information

- 3.1 The proposals in the plan are not supported by robust financial data. It is not possible to identify the financial impact on services in the 3 Boroughs and the Committee believes that until this issue is addressed it will not be possible to complete the scrutiny exercise.

- 3.2 There are a number of concerns in relation to financial issues which are not clear in the proposals, including details of the impact of the £1m savings identified from back office functions and the £2.6m savings from cost releasing efficiency savings which are not clearly stated in the proposals.
- 3.3 The model of care seems heavily reliant on significant capital investments in the Resource and Recovery Centres (RRCs). There is no clarity about the likelihood of this funding or contingency plans should the funding not materialise.
- 3.4 There is no clarity in relation to transitional resources. A significant shift in the type of services provided is likely to lead to the need for transitional resources to be invested, which will facilitate shifts in services.
- 3.5 There are concerns about the workforce implications and, in particular, the impact on recruitment and the basis for decisions about filling posts.
- 3.6 The Committee is particularly concerned that Ashton, Leigh and Wigan do not appear to be properly factored in to the recovery plans. The Committee acknowledge a statement that they are not included in the process but feels that there is a lack of clarity about the financial impact of this.
- 3.7 The committee would like to know what the budget is for atypical drugs and a comparison of spend in each borough.
- 3.8 There are concerns about the impact on out of borough placements. What are the current arrangements for joint placement?
- 3.9 Project management, funding for this and process. Will partners have a place on the project board?
- 3.10 Future funding priorities given the pace of Government change we may have to look at a different model in the future. How can we resolve this?
- 3.11 The Committee would like reassurance that finance invested by individual Boroughs remains within that Borough and is not used to subsidise other boroughs.

4. In-Patient Beds

- 4.1 There is some confusion in the various documents about the number of in-patient beds. The Committee has concerns about the level of service for people who would have been utilising these in-patient beds, particularly in the light of the described over occupancy.
- 4.2 The Committee were concerned that the proposals relating to inpatient beds do not include psychiatric intensive care.
- 4.3 The impact on Council services, particularly the impact on the infrastructure currently in place and the type of accommodation required in each Local Authority given the planned bed reduction.

5. Access to Services

- 5.1 The Committee is concerned about proposals to develop access and advice centres within each borough, as a single gateway to specialist mental health services. Based on the information provided, the Committee believes that further thought should be given to access to mental health services being from within Primary Care and other tier 2 services.
- 5.2 The Committee are disappointed that the RRC model seems mainly focused on 9.00 a.m. to 5.00 p.m. services and the details of other out of office services are sparse. The Committee would welcome further information about staffing levels and implications for Council services out of hours.
- 5.3 The committee would like a comparison of Assertive Outreach Services – what currently exists and what will be required.

6. Impact on Council Services

- 6.1 The Model of Care refers to the impact on Council services including social care, however, the Committee were concerned that detailed information was not available.
- 6.2 The committee are unclear as to the future functioning of community mental health teams and how they will operate under the proposed model of care.
- 6.3 The committee are concerned about the impact on Council day services given the proposal to close day units.

7. Consultation Processes

- 7.1 The committee are concerned that there was some evidence that the consultation processes did not appear to be thorough and adequate.
- 7.2 The panel appreciate the extension of the timescale in relation to the Statutory Joint Scrutiny Committee, but feel that the timescales for the public consultation and the fact that they will still end on 24 August did not allow proper time for the full and proper involvement of service users, carers and staff.
- 7.3 The committee are concerned that publicity relating to the consultation process did not appear to be thorough and adequate, and there seemed to be a general lack of awareness amongst key professional groups and the public about the consultation process.
- 7.4 The committee felt that some of the language used in the consultation events made it difficult for people to properly understand the issues.

8. General Points

- 8.1 The committee felt that some general points were worthy of further consideration. These include:-

- ♦ The lack of clear links with existing commissioning strategies for adults of a working age and older people.
 - ♦ The proposed Model of Care does not cover all recommendations of the scrutiny exercise “scrutiny of hospital discharge services for St Helens residents with mental health problems”.
 - ♦ The focus on carers within the proposed Model of Care seems weak and carers issues do not appear to have been properly addressed.
 - ♦ The need for a clear and robust training programme for staff at all levels to support the proposed changes.
- 8.2 Governance and accountability arrangements – how will the new model fit with current agreements?
- 8.3 Relationship with West Cheshire PCT - currently Halton provides a service to residents in Helsby and Frodsham. The committee requires further details about how this will be managed and financed in the future.

The contact officer for this report is Mike Wyatt, Assistant Director, Performance and Business Support, St Helens Council, Adult Social Care and Health, Gamble Building, Victoria Square, St Helens WA10 1DY. Telephone 01744 456550.