

**Council**

20 October 2016

**Agenda Item 38**

Brighton &amp; Hove City Council

**Subject:** **Single Homeless and Rough Sleeper Accommodation & Support Services Remodelling & Tender - Extract from the proceedings of the Housing & New Homes Committee Meeting held on the 21 September 2016**

**Date of Meeting:** **20 October 2016**

**Report of:** **Executive Lead for Strategy, Governance & Law**

**Contact Officer:** Name: **Caroline DeMarco** Tel: **29-1063**  
E-mail: [caroline.demarco@brighton-hove.gov.uk](mailto:caroline.demarco@brighton-hove.gov.uk)

**Wards Affected:** All

**FOR GENERAL RELEASE*****Action Required of Council***

To receive the item referred from the Housing & New Homes Committee for information.

**Recommendation:**

That the Council notes the report.

**BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL****HOUSING & NEW HOMES COMMITTEE****4.00pm 21 SEPTEMBER 2016****COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL****MINUTES**

**Present:** Councillors Meadows (Chair); Councillor Hill (Deputy Chair), Mears (Opposition Spokesperson), Gibson (Group Spokesperson), Atkinson, Bell, Druitt, Lewry, Miller and Moonan.

**PART ONE****23 SINGLE HOMELESS AND ROUGH SLEEPER ACCOMMODATION & SUPPORT SERVICES REMODELLING & TENDER**

- 23.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director Adult Services which detailed the proposed remodelling and retendering of services to meet the changing needs of homeless people, target resources, and improve the outcomes of this section of the population. The re-modelling proposal included commissioned accommodation and support services for homeless people and rough sleepers; and Hostel accommodation and support services which are directly provided by Brighton & Hove City Council. The report was presented by the Head of Commissioning Contracts and Partnerships and the Commissioning & Performance Manager.
- 23.2 Councillor Mears commented that it was important that the Housing & New Homes Committee had a report back on this matter. She noted that page 99 acknowledged that a sit up bed was a chair and stressed that the Committee had never seen a proper breakdown of the £10 million which had come over from Supporting People.
- 23.3 In response to questions from Councillor Mears it was confirmed that officers would be happy for outcomes to be reported back to the Committee. Staff at New Steine Mews had asked about the possibility of putting in a bid and had been given the link to the website should they decide to make a bid. A great deal of work needed to be carried out at Glenwood to re-model the service. The building would need to be fit for purpose and more work needed to be carried out on the model before going out to tender.
- 23.4 Councillor Druitt referred to the reference on page 95 to the new model providing improved outcomes for individuals and better value for money. He commented that this was getting people to do more for less. He referred to the changing demand for services, and asked what examples could be given where services were currently failing, and what the council was looking for the new model to achieve.

- 23.5 It was explained that the tender was weighted towards quality. Officers had identified gaps in the services which they were trying to fill. The intention was to improve outcomes, and extensive work had been carried out exploring good practice with other local authorities.
- 23.6 Councillor Druitt asked why the current system could not address these matters without a remodelling exercise. Officers explained that it was necessary to go out to tender. A smaller trauma informed women only service was required and there was a need to tender for medium support. The proposals included work around older drinkers and people with dependency and physical health issues.
- 23.7 Councillor Moonan welcomed the re-modelling. With regard to the women only service there would be a greater emphasis on assessment work and focus on older people. She was pleased to see more flexibility within the pathways. There would be peer support and life skills work and multi-agency working. She was pleased to see user involvement but disappointed there were fewer beds. The proposals were about outcomes and targeting work where it was needed.
- 23.8 Councillor Lewry asked for more information about page 103, paragraph 4.5 - Feedback from staff and trade unions. The Head of Commissioning, Contracts and Partnerships explained that she had met with staff at Glenwood Lodge and New Steine Mews and had held two meetings with the unions. Some staff were anxious about tendering to an outside source, whilst others welcomed the changes. There was a mixture of views but generally staff were anxious.
- 23.9 Councillor Miller expressed concern about the loss of bed numbers. He asked what work was being carried out to avoid clogging up the system. He noted that one lease was longer than the tendering length.
- 23.10 It was explained that officers were working with Estate Services regarding the lease of New Steine Mews. A low support service had recently been commissioned. This was about people having access to services and having a large network and resource groups. Move on was a big issue, and officers were working with colleagues across the council on this issue. The proposals had included an element for move on in the tender.
- 23.11 Councillor Gibson stated that it would be hard to improve the service if it was being cut. Staff at Glenwood and New Steine Mews had told him that they could not bid as they were not solvent. He could not support 2.6 of the recommendations (to Policy, Resources & Growth Committee) that the directly provided (in-house) services which are identified in Section 4 of this report be included within the tender for the new accommodation and support model. With regard to moving on, there was a need to move people on smoothly and efficiently. Councillor Gibson expressed concern that there would be less accommodation to offer people. The housing allocation plan might be an opportunity to unblock the system.
- 23.12 Councillor Gibson quoted the minutes of the last meeting as set out on page 10, paragraph 7.10 "An evaluation of the pilot programmes suggested Housing First can deliver savings of up to £15,000 a year". Housing First was a way of unblocking the system, to enable people to move on to appropriate accommodation.

23.13 Councillor Gibson proposed the following amendment which was seconded by Councillor Mears:

To add an additional recommendation at 2.5 as follows and re-number existing recommendation 2.5 and all subsequent recommendations (2.5 as 2.6, 2.6 as 2.7, 2.7 as 2.8, and 2.8 as 2.9):

2.5. 'That the service remodelling also include the expansion of Housing First provision, a way of funding this devised by capturing the savings this approach yields, with surplus savings being reinvested in additional service provision'.

23.14 The Chair asked for advice about the financial implications of the amendment. The Executive Director, Economy, Environment and Culture explained that the true financial implications for this particular report were not known. It was unclear how the new model would work locally. To include the amendment in the recommendations would cause problems. The Committee could ask that Housing First be looked at in the future but it was difficult to agree a recommendation without understanding the financial implications.

23.15 The Senior Lawyer stated that the Committee should not take a decision which has financial implications without an officer report.

23.16 Councillor Moonan stated that Housing First worked. It did save money in the wider context, as would all the other hostels. The whole service provided wider savings.

23.17 The Assistant Director, Adult Social Care informed members that he was happy to bring back a report on the expansion of Housing First, however, there were financial implications and there was a need to know what they were. There would be a need for a separate report on the expansion of the Housing First model.

23.18 The Executive Director, Economy, Environment and Culture suggested that a way forward was for a report to be brought back to the Committee on Housing First which would look at the financial implications of expanding provision.

23.19 Councillor Hill asked officers what the implications of the amendment would be. The Senior Lawyer stated that there were practical implications for procurement, if the process was delayed a few cycles. The Commissioning & Performance Manager stated that all contracts ran out in March 2017. There needed to be procurement and it had reached the stage where officers needed to move on with the re-modelling.

23.20 Councillor Gibson emphasised that Housing First was relevant to this pathway. He agreed that it might be best to take the report on Housing First to the next committee meeting. Councillor Gibson confirmed that he was withdrawing the wording of his previous amendment and was proposing the following (seconded by Councillor Mears):

New recommendation 2.4 (for the Housing and New Homes Committee).

'That a report be brought to the next Housing & New Homes Committee on the expansion of Housing First provision, a way of funding this devised by capturing the

savings this approach yields, with surplus savings being reinvested in additional service provision’.

23.21 Councillors voted on 2.1 to 2.3 and the amendment at 2.4 and these were unanimously agreed.

**23.22 RESOLVED:-**

- (1) That the information provided within the report to remodel and procure accommodation and support services for single homeless people and rough sleepers be noted;
- (2) That the commissioning and procurement plans from October 2016 should be aligned with priorities within the Rough Sleeping Strategy 2016, the Council’s Housing Strategy 2015, the Homelessness Strategy 2014-19, and the Council’s priorities for the integration of social care and health through Better care;
- (3) That ASC Commissioning be delegated authority to review the infrastructure, including the working groups that support services for single homeless people and related strategies;
- (4) That a report be brought to the next Housing & New Homes Committee on the expansion of Housing First provision, a way of funding this devised by capturing the savings this approach yields, with surplus savings being reinvested in additional service provision.

**28 ITEMS REFERRED FOR FULL COUNCIL**

28.1 The following items were referred to Full Council on 20 October 2016, for information.

- (a) Councillor Hill referred Item 20 – Rent Smart Partnership Agreement;
- (b) Councillor Gibson referred Item 23 – Single Homeless and Rough Sleeper Accommodation & Support Services Remodelling and Tender.

