

## Overview of Responses and Recommendations

Budget Proposals 16/17 Mental Health Supported Living Scheme		Karen Felgate - Contracts and Commissioning Manager	19 January 2016 Version 2 (Exec)
<b>Proposal:</b>	To cease funding the resource over 2 years.		
<b>Total budget 15/16:</b>	£201,000	<b>Recommended officer saving 16/17:</b>	£100,000 (50%)
<b>Initial proposed saving 16/17:</b>	£100,000 (50%)	<b>Final recommendation to Executive 16/17:</b>	To proceed with this savings proposal, without any modifications.
<b>Nos of responses:</b>	<p>12 online responses. 3 of the online responses were from people who use the service</p> <p>Organisations that provided a response are: West Berkshire Council Housing Service, Tilehurst Parish Council, UNISON. GP Chair and Clinical Lead Newbury and District CCG, NHS Foundation Trust, Pangbourne Parish Council</p> <p>A consultation meeting was held and 9 people attended; including 3 residents of the service, support workers plus one CPN.</p>		
<b>Key issues raised:</b>	<p>Concern that the removal of this service will have a significant impact upon the most vulnerable in our society.</p> <p>This impact included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Emotional and physical well being of individuals and their families</li> <li>• Impact upon the recovery of individuals</li> <li>• Greater risk of homelessness for those individuals who use the service</li> <li>• Increased demand for other services; CMHT, Prospect Park Hospital</li> </ul> <p>The preventative nature of the service was highlighted. One service user stated that <i>'people will die'</i> without this service as the support provided stops people from deteriorating back into very poor levels of mental health and in some circumstances risk of suicide. Cutting the service would lead to greater cost implications due to need to provide more costly intensive support.</p> <p>One respondent made it clear that West Berkshire Council had a legal duty under Section 117 of the 1983 Mental Health Act (reference made to High Court Judgement 'Stennett') and to assessed needs. They made it clear that the Act, Care Act and Mental Capacity Act was not being implemented by West Berkshire Council for this group or their Carers.</p> <p>Cuts will impact particularly hard on individuals with paranoia and schizophrenia. Service users who responded feel the</p>		

**NB:** This overview and recommendation paper should be read in conjunction with the Summary of Responses and Verbatim Responses received in relation to this proposal, circulated electronically to all members alongside the agenda pack and published online on our [Consultation Portal](#).

## Overview of Responses and Recommendations

Budget Proposals 16/17 Mental Health Supported Living Scheme		Karen Felgate - Contracts and Commissioning Manager	19 January 2016 Version 2 (Exec)
	<p>service is a lifeline and would not be in a good place if it was taken away. Most people would not know where to turn.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BHCFT highlighted recovery of individuals. - Successful shift in service as ‘step down care’ from more intensive services; without such support there will be a greater risk of relapse or disengagement.</li> <li>• Withdrawal of the service would lead to delayed discharges at Prospect Park Hospital, leading to sub-optimal care in expensive out of area placements.</li> </ul> <p>BHCFT argued that this facility is the only available facility in the district and is a hugely valued resource upon which the Local Community Mental Health Team is highly dependent. It may lead to pressures in other areas of Local Authority budgets as individuals may need to be placed in more expensive residential options.</p> <p>Will also have a negative impact upon Child mental health and learning disabilities.</p> <p>One respondent proposed that the full saving of £201,000 rather than £100,000 is taken from the project this year in order to retain the supported lodgings project which helps the Council to meet statutory duties. The proposed saving for supported lodgings is £100,000 so this would meet the overall requirement for the proposed budget savings but in a different way.</p>		
<b>Equality issues:</b>	Vulnerable people (Mental Health)		
<b>Suggestions for reducing the impact on service users:</b>	<b>Suggestion</b>	<b>Council response</b>	
	Drop in support delivered via GP surgeries	Whilst a useful complement would not be a substitute to the service provision	
	Consider re-purposing the crisis flat to make another unit of supported accommodation	This option is certainly worth exploring if we are to consider a scaled down version of the service	
	Yearly health questionnaires could be completed in school and those at high risk could be offered counselling in school	West Berkshire implementing mental health academy	

**NB:** This overview and recommendation paper should be read in conjunction with the Summary of Responses and Verbatim Responses received in relation to this proposal, circulated electronically to all members alongside the agenda pack and published online on our [Consultation Portal](#).

## Overview of Responses and Recommendations

Budget Proposals 16/17 Mental Health Supported Living Scheme		Karen Felgate - Contracts and Commissioning Manager	19 January 2016 Version 2 (Exec)
	Increase preventative measures such as fitness schemes to improve mental health	Whilst a useful complement would not be a substitute to the service provision	
	Increase information and advice such as flyers and promotions left at Drs surgeries, schools etc.	Whilst a useful complement would not be a substitute to the service provision	
	<b>Suggestion</b>	<b>Council response</b>	
<b>Alternative options for applying the saving in this area:</b>	Mental health provision at Garland Court and Bramble Court are support package led and can be used to support Fountain Gardens with correct package	Not enough provision at these sites to deliver the service	
	Housing service could work with support provider to move individuals into alternative accommodation. This could be delivered via the mental health housing panel.	Housing team will be able to assist with alternative accommodation options but consideration will need to be given as to how support will need to be provided to enable service users to maintain a successful life in the community. This could potentially be a consideration of a remodelled scaled down service	
	Is 24/7 support necessary. Could this be managed in a different way?	This is something which could be considered if the service is remodelled	
	Increase use of volunteers	Volunteers alone would not be sufficient to maintain the level of service	
<b>Suggestions for how others may help contribute:</b>	CVS would not be able to deliver the same level of service. This includes volunteers.		
<b>Officer conclusion as a result of the responses:</b>	Cutting this service is likely to lead to need to rely on higher cost intensive residential options.		

**NB:** This overview and recommendation paper should be read in conjunction with the Summary of Responses and Verbatim Responses received in relation to this proposal, circulated electronically to all members alongside the agenda pack and published online on our [Consultation Portal](#).

## Overview of Responses and Recommendations

Budget Proposals 16/17 Mental Health Supported Living Scheme		Karen Felgate - Contracts and Commissioning Manager	19 January 2016 Version 2 (Exec)
<b>Officer recommendation as a result of responses:</b>	<p>Feedback has not uncovered any further issues which would prevent the council from proceeding with this proposal.</p> <p>Whilst it is understood a decision to withdraw funding will have an impact on the users of the service, given the level of financial savings the Council is required to make to achieve a balanced budget position and maintain core statutory services, the recommendation is to proceed with the proposal as described with no changes.</p>		

**NB:** This overview and recommendation paper should be read in conjunction with the Summary of Responses and Verbatim Responses received in relation to this proposal, circulated electronically to all members alongside the agenda pack and published online on our [Consultation Portal](#).