
By: Angela Slaven, Director, Youth and Community Support Services.

To: Commissioning Body

Subject: Delivering the Savings Proposal – Impact Assessment

Classification: Unrestricted

Summary. The Commissioning Body asked the Core Strategy Group to assess its preferred option against its least preferred option to implement the savings required in 2012/13. The Core Strategy Group undertook that task and this report sets out the findings in relation to options one and two, and recommends option two as the least impactful to the majority of districts and boroughs, and the majority of service types.

1.0 Introduction

1.1 The Kent Supporting Programme took a report to the Commissioning Body following the confirmation of the allocation of resources from the Kent Revenue Formula Grant allocation. This presented the Commissioning Body with the considerable challenge of achieving a planned saving of £7 million between 2011 and 2013. The challenge has been initially softened by the retention of the reserves accumulated from the earlier ring fenced allocations. This provides an opportunity to deliver the required savings within a planned programme allowing for a period of notice being given to providers to prepare for the adjustment to the commissioning budget and to ensure that any impact on service users is managed and supported.

1.2 The Programme budget will need to reduce its overall expenditure to just over £25 million by 2012/2013. The Commissioning Body is required to deliver savings of £7 million over the next two years. The County Council requires the Programme to achieve savings of at least £3 million in 2011/12 and £4m in 2012/13. The Programme is proposing to make savings of £3.5 million in 2011/12 and £3.5 million in 2012/13, the savings in 2011/12 will be offset by the utilisation of £3.2 million of reserves. The Commissioning Body will need to ensure the delivery of £7 million of savings in 2012/13. This report sets out the action necessary to achieve the level of savings and aims to provide a detailed appraisal of the required activity and impact of a reduction in the funding allocation.

1.3 This report addresses the impact of the savings and the implications for the twenty one client groups across the Programme as reflected in the services where the client groups tend to cluster. It addresses the impact of the savings on the districts and boroughs. It should be noted that short term supported housing is accessible to anybody eligible who lives in Kent and in this context is demand led. The impact of the savings on short term supported housing is a specific challenge for all local authorities in Kent, and not just the hosting

authority. This is because short term supported housing does not have a local connection applied to it and is ostensibly open to anyone in Kent who is considered to require supported housing. This is further reinforced by the work of the Joint Policy and Planning Board (Housing) in relation to shared protocols, the move on strategy, and the reconnection policy (all of which are monitored by the JPPB (H)). The exceptions apply to people escaping domestic abuse and offenders.

1.4 The figures provided in this report set out a detailed assessment of the implications of option one and option two. Option One will deliver a 22% cut in funding across all services. Option Two is designed to deliver a more strategic approach to delivering the savings which maintains the financial viability of the vast majority of services, and honours the overall strategic direction of the Programme.

2.0 The Impact Assessment for Option One and Two in Relation to the Districts and Boroughs.

2.1 The first element of the impact assessment is to look on balance at whether or not option one or option two advantages or disadvantages districts and boroughs in relation to inward investment into their localities. Option one is more beneficial overall to Ashford Borough Council, Maidstone Borough Council, Sevenoaks District Council. The other districts and boroughs within Kent are benefited by Option Two.

2.2 The Supporting People Programme has sought to address the concerns that have been raised about the overall viability of alarm services by increasing the proposed weekly payment from the original £0.50 to £0.90. This will enable a service user to access a call centre and to have their line tested remotely. It should also enable quality standards to be maintained. There will be detailed discussions with providers to agree a specification which can be met in the light of the proposed reduction from £1.50 to £0.90.

2.3 It should be noted that there is already an impact in 2011/12 relating to the non-renewal of district and borough based floating support. This further reinforces the need to maintain the investment levels proposed within Option Two into the future if at all possible.

2.4 From the perspective of the districts and boroughs the recommendation remains that Option Two should be agreed, it delivers the strategic priorities and reinforces the overall direction of travel that the Programme is taking in relation to the Five Year Strategy.

3.0 The Impact Assessment for Option One and Two in Relation to the Services that the Programme Funds

3.1 Option One and Option Two. This evaluation is based on the indicative preference shown by the Commissioning Body for option two as opposed to option one prior to an impact assessment being demonstrated. This preference has been reinforced by the preference shown by the Core Strategy Group for Option Two. Option Two is also the financially most preferable solution.

3.3 Ashford Borough Council

Ashford Borough Council is benefited by Option Two in relation to sheltered housing, and long term supported housing. It is more disadvantaged by Option Two in relation to short-term supported housing, alarms, and marginally in relation to Home Improvement Agencies. The Programme would need to ensure that the impact in relation to option two was managed effectively by Ashford Borough Council, the Supporting People Programme, providers, and service users.

3.4 Canterbury City Council is benefited by Option Two in relation to sheltered housing, long term supported housing, and short term supported housing. It is not benefited by Option Two in relation to alarms, extra care sheltered and marginally its home improvement agency.

3.5 Dartford Borough Council is benefited by Option Two in relation to sheltered housing, long term supported housing, and short-term supported housing. It is disadvantaged by Option Two in relation to alarms. The HIA is only marginally impacted.

3.6 Dover District Council is benefited by Option Two in relation to sheltered housing, long-term supported, and short-term supported housing. Dover is disadvantaged by Option Two in relation to alarms, and marginally its home improvement agency.

3.7 Gravesham Borough Council is benefited by option two in relation to sheltered housing, long-term supported housing, and short-term supported housing. Gravesham is disadvantaged by Option Two in relation to alarms and marginally in relation to the HIA.

3.8 Maidstone Borough Council is benefited by Option Two in relation to short-term supported housing. Maidstone is disadvantaged in relation to all other services, but only marginally as far as the HIA is concerned.

3.9 Sevenoaks District Council is benefited by Option Two in relation to sheltered housing, long term and short term supported housing. It is disadvantaged by Option Two in relation to alarms, and extra care sheltered housing.

3.10 Shepway Borough Council is benefited by Option Two in relation to sheltered housing, long-term supported housing, and short-term supported housing. It is disadvantaged by option two in relation to alarms, but only marginally as far as the HIA is concerned.

3.11 Swale Borough Council is potentially disadvantaged by option two in relation to sheltered housing. However a final discussion needs to take place about the overall level of investment required for sheltered housing in Swale between the Supporting People Programme and the provider. Swale is disadvantaged by option two in relation to alarms, marginally by long term

supported housing, and their HIA. It is benefited by option two as far as short-term supported housing is concerned.

3.12 Thanet is advantaged by Option Two in relation to sheltered housing, long-term supported housing, and short-term supported housing. It is disadvantaged in relation to alarms, extra care sheltered, and is marginally disadvantaged as far as the HIA is concerned.

3.13 Tonbridge and Malling is advantaged by option two in relation to sheltered housing, and short term supported housing. It is marginally disadvantaged by Option Two in relation to long term supported housing, alarms, and as far as the HIA is concerned.

3.14 Tunbridge Wells is advantaged by Option Two in relation to sheltered housing, long-term supported and short-term supported housing. It is disadvantaged in relation to alarms, and marginally in relation to the HIA.

3.15 Floating support would benefit from Option One more than Option Two. However the decision to benefit floating support by opting for Option One would lead to inevitable disinvestment elsewhere within the Programme.

4.0 Implementation

The Supporting People Programme will identify an officer to work with an identified officer within Kent Adult Social Services to undertake joint assessments in relation to extra care sheltered, and long term supported housing. The joint assessments of extra care sheltered will commence in April 2011, and once completed will be followed by joint assessments within long-term supported housing. The joint assessments will establish if the individuals require further social care interventions and if so of what nature. They will also identify if the service users need interventions from any other relevant agencies. The Supporting People Programme will work with the affected providers to establish a strategic and operational approach to delivering the savings options by 2012/13 and 2013/14 (the final deadline for delivering ten hours per service user per week in long term supported). The Programme will develop a time line with adult social services to deliver these objectives.

5.0 Conclusion.

5.1 This report sets out an impact assessment to better understand the implications of the proposals to deliver the savings within option one and option two. The Commissioning Body supported in principle the adoption of option two, following further consideration by the Core Strategy Group. The Core Strategy Group has now given its final endorsement, with two provisos that have been recognised within this report and its appendices. These relate to the implementation and the Equality Impact Assessment. The Supporting People Programme will ensure that the priorities of the CSG in relation to the implementation of the savings are delivered.

5.2 Option one will make the delivery of supported housing and floating support undeliverable. The Kent Supporting People Five Year Strategy indicated that certain client groups would be given priority, and that an overall direction of

travel that promotes independence and does not lead to dependency would be prioritised. The Programme proposes that Option Two delivers these objectives. The Programme seeks to ensure that investment in services continues to meet these criteria, remain viable and that services, demonstrate value for money. The Programme aims to fulfil its ambition to maximise the independence of service users, and to consider how the development of the concept of the Big Society can contribute towards bringing a range of services together to achieve the relevant outcomes.

Recommendations

The Commissioning Body is asked to agree;

1. The implementation of Option Two for the delivery of the £7 million savings on the Supporting People Programme between 2011/2012 and 2012/2013.

Claire Martin
Head of Supporting People
Extension 1179

John Roach
Acting Contracts Manager
Extension 4547

Emily Matthews
Acting Contracts Officer
Extension 4877

Appendix One Equality Impact Assessment