

NOTICE  
OF  
MEETING

**ADULTS, CHILDREN AND HEALTH  
OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PANEL**

will meet on

**THURSDAY, 14TH MAY, 2020**

**At 6.15 pm**

**VIRTUAL MEETING - ONLINE ACCESS**

**(THE MEETING LINK WILL BE AVAILABLE ON OUR WEBSITE PRIOR TO THE MEETING  
TO VIEW THE MEETING PLEASE GO TO OUR RBWM YOUTUBE PAGE -  
[WWW.YOUTUBE.COM/CHANNEL/UCZNP1KMF3YNABN6ENZLYELQ](http://WWW.YOUTUBE.COM/CHANNEL/UCZNP1KMF3YNABN6ENZLYELQ))**

TO: MEMBERS OF THE ADULTS, CHILDREN AND HEALTH OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY  
PANEL

COUNCILLORS SIMON BOND, CAROLE DA COSTA, MAUREEN HUNT,  
JULIAN SHARPE (CHAIRMAN) AND JOHN STORY (VICE-CHAIRMAN)

SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

COUNCILLORS GARY MUIR, HELEN PRICE, GURCH SINGH, CHRIS TARGOWSKI  
AND AMY TISI

Karen Shepherd – Service Lead - Governance - Issued: May 5<sup>th</sup> 2020

Members of the Press and Public are welcome to attend Part I of this meeting. The agenda is available on the Council's web site at [www.rbwm.gov.uk](http://www.rbwm.gov.uk) or contact the Panel Administrator **Andy Carswell** 01628 796319

**Recording of Meetings** – In line with the council's commitment to transparency the Part I (public) section of this virtual meeting will be streamed live and recorded via Zoom. By participating in the meeting by audio and/or video you are giving consent to being recorded and acknowledge that the recording will be in the public domain.

If you have any questions regarding the council's policy, please speak to the Democratic Services or Legal representative at the meeting.

## AGENDA

### PART I

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>SUBJECT</u>	<u>PAGE NO</u>
1.	<u>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</u> To receive any apologies for absence.	-
2.	<u>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</u> To receive any declarations of interest.	3 - 4
3.	<u>MINUTES</u> To approve the minutes of the meeting held on January 29 <sup>th</sup> 2020.	5 - 10
4.	<u>CALL IN: CHILDREN'S CENTRES CONSULTATION RESULTS - FAMILY HUBS</u> To consider and determine the above Call In.	11 - 20

## MEMBERS' GUIDE TO DECLARING INTERESTS IN MEETINGS

### Disclosure at Meetings

If a Member has not disclosed an interest in their Register of Interests, they **must make** the declaration of interest at the beginning of the meeting, or as soon as they are aware that they have a DPI or Prejudicial Interest. If a Member has already disclosed the interest in their Register of Interests they are still required to disclose this in the meeting if it relates to the matter being discussed.

A member with a DPI or Prejudicial Interest **may make representations at the start of the item but must not take part in the discussion or vote at a meeting.** The speaking time allocated for Members to make representations is at the discretion of the Chairman of the meeting. In order to avoid any accusations of taking part in the discussion or vote, after speaking, Members should move away from the panel table to a public area or, if they wish, leave the room. If the interest declared has not been entered on to a Members' Register of Interests, they must notify the Monitoring Officer in writing within the next 28 days following the meeting.

### Disclosable Pecuniary Interests (DPIs) (relating to the Member or their partner) include:

- Any employment, office, trade, profession or vocation carried on for profit or gain.
- Any payment or provision of any other financial benefit made in respect of any expenses occurred in carrying out member duties or election expenses.
- Any contract under which goods and services are to be provided/works to be executed which has not been fully discharged.
- Any beneficial interest in land within the area of the relevant authority.
- Any licence to occupy land in the area of the relevant authority for a month or longer.
- Any tenancy where the landlord is the relevant authority, and the tenant is a body in which the relevant person has a beneficial interest.
- Any beneficial interest in securities of a body where:
  - a) that body has a piece of business or land in the area of the relevant authority, and
  - b) either (i) the total nominal value of the securities exceeds £25,000 or one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that body **or** (ii) the total nominal value of the shares of any one class belonging to the relevant person exceeds one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that class.

Any Member who is unsure if their interest falls within any of the above legal definitions should seek advice from the Monitoring Officer in advance of the meeting.

A Member with a DPI should state in the meeting: ***'I declare a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in item x because xxx. As soon as we come to that item, I will leave the room/ move to the public area for the entire duration of the discussion and not take part in the vote.'***

Or, if making representations on the item: ***'I declare a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in item x because xxx. As soon as we come to that item, I will make representations, then I will leave the room/ move to the public area for the entire duration of the discussion and not take part in the vote.'***

### Prejudicial Interests

Any interest which a reasonable, fair minded and informed member of the public would reasonably believe is so significant that it harms or impairs the Member's ability to judge the public interest in the item, i.e. a Member's decision making is influenced by their interest so that they are not able to impartially consider relevant issues.

A Member with a Prejudicial interest should state in the meeting: ***'I declare a Prejudicial Interest in item x because xxx. As soon as we come to that item, I will leave the room/ move to the public area for the entire duration of the discussion and not take part in the vote.'***

Or, if making representations in the item: ***'I declare a Prejudicial Interest in item x because xxx. As soon as we come to that item, I will make representations, then I will leave the room/ move to the public area for the entire duration of the discussion and not take part in the vote.'***

### Personal interests

Any other connection or association which a member of the public may reasonably think may influence a Member when making a decision on council matters.

Members with a Personal Interest should state at the meeting: ***'I wish to declare a Personal Interest in item x because xxx'. As this is a Personal Interest only, I will take part in the discussion and vote on the matter.***

This page is intentionally left blank

# Agenda Item 3

## ADULTS, CHILDREN AND HEALTH OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PANEL

WEDNESDAY, 29 JANUARY 2020

PRESENT: Councillors Simon Bond, Carole Da Costa, Maureen Hunt, Julian Sharpe (Chairman) and John Story (Vice-Chairman)

Also in attendance: Councillors Gurpreet Bhangra, Catherine Del Campo, Stuart Carroll, Geoffrey Hill, David Hilton, Lynne Jones, Amy Tisi and Simon Werner

Officers: Mark Beeley, Hilary Hall, Lynne Lidster, Kevin McDaniel and Duncan Sharkey

### APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Mark Jervis, Tony Wilson and Councillor Johnson.

### DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Chairman declared an interest that he was a trustee of an organisation that would let some of its rooms to a college that was mentioned in the Ofsted report.

### MINUTES

**RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY; That the minutes of the meeting held on 19<sup>th</sup> September 2019 be approved an accurate record.**

### ADULT SOCIAL CARE TRANSFORMATION PROGRAMME

**RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY; The Panel agreed to amend the order of items, with the first item to be considered being Item 7. It was also agreed that Item 5 – Budget 2020/21 would then be the next item considered before proceeding with the rest of the items on the agenda.**

Councillor Carroll, Lead Member for Adult Social Care, Children's Services, Health and Mental Health, said that the report was looking at how to transform the Adult Social Care service. There were some pressures that had to be considered, particularly as there was an ageing population. There was a greater focus on prevention and community, especially with regard to isolation and mental health.

Hilary Hall, Director of Adults, Health and Commissioning, said that the programme was structured around six work streams. The focus was on delivering strengths based practise and harnessing technology to utilise it in the best way possible.

Councillor Story asked for clarity on the residents and communities that were mentioned as part of the outcomes for the programme. Hilary Hall said that it involved a wide variety of groups, including parish councils, and underlined that listening to the community was vital as partnership was important to delivering services.

Councillor Story asked if the integrated care system was a formal structure. Hilary Hall explained that it was and that the Royal Borough was a key partner in the Frimley Integrated Care System along with the other East Berkshire local authorities and health organisations.

The Chairman asked if people were slipping through the net. He was told that it was always a challenge to ensure that no one was left behind but it was anticipated that the strategy would meet the challenge. A further question asked about the timescale for the programme. Hilary

Hall said that it was a transformation and therefore things would change over time. It was unlikely the programme would have a 'final stage'.

Councillor Hunt queried the recruitment and training of staff, and asked if the programme was using agency workers. Hilary Hall said that there was not a huge number of agency staff, but in other areas they were struggling to recruit, for example in care homes.

Councillor Da Costa agreed that recruiting could often prove to be challenging but that it was good that the programme was using providers that use the living wage. She asked if there would be an external evaluation of the programme. Hilary Hall said that some evaluation would be done by the programme board and some by the Panel.

Councillor Da Costa asked a further question about dementia and what the future plan was. Hilary Hall said that it was a real issue and as part of future proofing they had an ambition to ensure that residents were living healthier for longer.

Councillor Carroll said that there was a prevention theme in the programme and that the government had recently passed a green paper about prevention, which would soon be moving to white paper, showing that there was a significant focus on prevention activities. In terms of financing, things like the Better Care Fund should be utilised, but more dedicated policy thinking was needed.

The Panel noted the report.

## BUDGET 2020/21

Councillor Story said that the Panel had a direct responsibility for vulnerable people and that two of the changes that had been made in the proposed budget were applicable to the directorate.

Before the main debate on the item, the Chairman invited two members of the public to speak on the item. Janet Hayes-Brown explained that her son had a disability but had benefitted from 'Ways into Work' which had helped him gain a job. The service provided ongoing support for those that were part of the scheme, and there was concern that the budget cuts would affect the level and quality of the service that Ways into Work provided.

Becky Beechen, who was representing Ways into Work, explained to the Panel that funding was needed to continue to provide employment opportunities. RBWM had been closing the disability employment gap and support had been provided to over 90 participants on the programme. A reduced workforce would not be able to provide the same level of support and service as before and this would directly affect the opportunities available.

Councillor Carroll, Deputy Chairman of Cabinet, Adult Social Care, Children's Services, Health and Mental Health, said that the council was not looking to remove things that were already there and was looking instead to transform and change existing services. He said that it was important to still deliver a good quality of service to residents but to also gain value for money.

Councillor C Da Costa asked if the changes that had been made would therefore have been made anyway. Councillor Carroll said that they would have due to the financial pressure that the council currently found itself in. He passed on his gratitude for the work that Ways into Work had done but said that the strategy was to consider which services needed to be outsourced. By working with Opatlis, RBWM could save money while still providing the same high level of service as Ways into Work.

Hilary Hall said that they wanted to work with Ways into Work and form a close partnership.

Councillor Story stated that he would like to know more about the youth and early services that the council provided, as well as placements for children.

Kevin McDaniel, Director of Children's Services, said that placements are covered by third party providers to look after children in care. They were focussing on work which would help to promote independent living and they were optimistic that the amount of money spent could be streamlined.

Councillor C Da Costa said that it was important that young children in care were ready and well equipped to live independent lives.

Kevin McDaniel confirmed that Ofsted had recently undertaken a standard inspection to ensure that children were achieving the expected levels and the result of this inspection would be available towards the end of February. He also told Members that a Cabinet paper would be created which would be a consultation on how RBWM could combine services into a 'family hub'. This would enable more efficient targeting in services for the most vulnerable in society and a reduction in the number of duplicated services that were being offered.

Councillor Tisi said that by already making the saving in the budget, the process of holding a consultation was pointless as the decision had already been made.

Kevin McDaniel said that all services were open between set times and that they were not closing down any routes which would enable access to these services for the most vulnerable in society.

Councillor Werner commented that he believed the consultation to be pointless as the savings had already been agreed. Councillor Carroll reiterated his commitment to holding a consultation.

Councillor Del Campo asked about those children that 'slipped through the net' and were not picked up their families, and what support they would now be getting. Kevin McDaniel said that there was a wide degree of training in order to spot any signs at sessions.

Councillor Tisi asked what would happen to parent led groups at children's centres. She was told that children centre buildings were well used but did not know which services were valued.

Councillor Jones expressed concern about the area that would be invested, saying that in 2012 there was a cut of £400,000 but this was not built back into the Budget.

Hilary Hall said that there would be investment in prevention and ensuring that residents in the borough were stay healthier for longer. Councillor Carroll said that he thought the savings were achievable.

Councillor Werner said that Optalis had not yet confirmed what their proposals would be regarding Ways into Work. He said that he would need to see the plans before he could support the Budget.

Councillor Carroll responded by saying that there would be investment in the service through Optalis and the new service would be operational from 1<sup>st</sup> May 2020.

Duncan Sharkey, Managing Director, said that the council needed to continue to deliver excellent services and that additional resources would be needed to deliver on the change.

Councillor Tisi asked if there was sufficient incentives offered that would encourage social workers to come and work in the borough. Kevin McDaniel said that it was a high priority and that they needed an organisation where it was safe for social workers to practise.

Councillor Jones said the council needed to ensure that the terms and conditions of contracts were attractive, as it was the conditions rather than the money which were important in retaining social workers to a particular area.

At the end of item, the Panel noted the recommendation and agreed that comments made in the debate on the item would be passed on to Cabinet for consideration.

### ASCOT MEDICAL CENTRE

Hilary Hall informed the Panel that she would provide an update on the Ascot Medical Centre. Construction started in January, with a 25 week build scheduled. There was going to be significant investment in technology at the site and it would be aligned with the Ascot Plan. Hilary Hall said that Alex Tilley from the Clinical Commissioning Group was happy to meet with Members to discuss the centre further.

Councillor Hilton, Lead Member for Finance, said that in this ward there were two GP surgeries in the same building which could create savings and be more cost efficient. Hilary Hall said that occupation was not for a while after construction had finished and therefore there was scope to influence what services were provided in the centre, including creating a hub for the people of Ascot.

The Panel decided that an update on the Lynwood Clinic would be put on the work programme and considered at a future meeting.

### Q2 PERFORMANCE UPDATE REPORT

Hilary Hall introduced the report and explained that most of the indicators were on track. One was red, four were orange and the rest were green. In Q3, the results had significantly improved, this included things like the performance on delayed transfers of care where performance had dipped due to the loss of a domiciliary care provider, but was now back on track.

The Chairman asked if there was anything that had not been highlighted that the Panel should be aware of. Kevin McDaniel said that there was nothing that he would draw the Panel's attention to but they looked at a huge amount of data in the creation of the report.

Councillor Bond asked if all areas of public health were covered in the report. Hilary Hall said that it covered public health in its entirety but a few key themes had been picked out. They were measured by Public Health England.

The Chairman suggested that it could be possible to organise an extra meeting to analyse the content of the report, particularly areas of public health. Councillor Carroll said that it could be done in collaboration with the NHS and members of the Health and Wellbeing Board could be invited.

The Panel noted the report.

### OFSTED AND CQC INSPECTION REPORT

Kevin McDaniel explained to the Panel that the last Ofsted report was in 2017 which had discovered significant weaknesses in certain areas. In the 2019 report, 6 of the 8 areas that had been identified as weaknesses had made significant progress. The leadership at the school had now tackled the issues that they had previously faced. The Department of Education would take over checking progress, which would happen every six months.

The Chairman said that it was pleasing to see that progress had been made between the two Ofsted reports.



WORK PROGRAMME

The Panel agreed that the following item would be added to the work programme:

- Update on Lynwood Clinic

It was agreed that the Annual Scrutiny Report would be discussed in a separate working group, which would be arranged in due course.

The resident suggested scrutiny topic was deferred to a future meeting.

The meeting, which began at 6.30 pm, finished at 8.55 pm

CHAIRMAN.....

DATE.....

This page is intentionally left blank

Report Title:	<b>Member Call In – Children’s Centres Consultation Results – Family Hubs</b>
Contains Confidential or Exempt Information?	No – Part I
Meeting and Date:	Adults, Children and Health Overview and Scrutiny Panel – 14 <sup>th</sup> May 2020

www.rbwm.gov.uk



In accordance with Part 3 B7 and Part 4 A16 of the Constitution, the 30<sup>th</sup> April 2020 Cabinet decision relating to the item ‘Children’s Centres Consultation Results – Family Hubs’ has been called in for review by the Adults, Children and Health Overview & Scrutiny Panel.

## 1. REASON(S) FOR CALL IN

1.1 The call-in notice, submitted on 5<sup>th</sup> May 2020 stated the following reasons for calling in the decision:

- The consultation informing the decision, was not conducted in accordance with Section 5D of the Childcare Act 2006 (as amended) nor the statutory guidance issued by the Secretary of State under Section 5D(2) of the Act (Sure Start children’s centres statutory guidance, April 2013; Chapter 2), which is the lawful basis for consultations on children’s centre provision.
- The process was followed in deciding to close children’s centres as part of the reorganisation of provision fails to comply with duties under, *inter alia*, Sections 3 and 5A of the Childcare Act 2006 (as amended) together with the statutory guidance issued by the Secretary of State under Section 3(6) of the Act (Sure Start children’s centres statutory guidance, April 2013; Chapter 2) namely ensuring there are sufficient children’s centres, so far as reasonably practicable, to meet local need.
- In making the decision, Cabinet has failed to comply with the duty regarding socio-economic inequalities, in accordance with Section 1 of the Equality Act 2010, and the Public Sector Equality Duty, in accordance with Section 149 of the Act, as deficiencies in the Equality Impact Assessment relied upon render it impossible to demonstrate that due regard has been exercised to the need to advance equality of opportunity, as per Section 149(1)(b) of the Act.
- Moreover, responses to the draft report were not returned by the Head of Law nor the Monitoring Officer by the time of publication. Cabinet were informed by the Lead Officer that he had circulated the paper “late last week” to these officers and had received “some comments”, understood to be in relation to the Equality Impact Assessment, but these were not provided to the meeting. The vote was nonetheless taken by Cabinet, despite members not being privy to the nature and

scope of the legal feedback raised. This clearly demonstrates a failure to meet the standard to “have due regard” in discharge of the Public Sector Equality Duty as set out in *Bracking v Secretary of State for Work and Pensions* [2013] EWCA Civ 1345. To proceed to make a decision in these circumstances also fails the more general “Wednesbury unreasonableness” test.

- The decision is in conflict with Policy ASF12 (Access for All), which forms part of the Improving Access Strategy within the Local Transport Plan (2012-2026). Access to everyday services and facilities, which encompasses children’s centres and youth centres, is not improved but worsened by the reorganisation of provision, particularly impacting the young and those on low incomes.

## **2. MEMBERS CALLING IN THE REPORT**

- 2.1 The call-in notice was signed by the following Members: Councillors Baldwin, Werner, Del Campo, Tisi and Price.

## **3. Panel Options**

- 3.1 Having considered the Call-In the Overview and Scrutiny Panel may:

- i. to take no further action, in which case the decision will take effect immediately;
  - ii. to refer the decision back to the decision-maker for re-consideration, setting out the nature of the Panel’s concerns; the decision-maker must then re-consider the matter with a further 5 working days, taking into account the concerns of the Overview and Scrutiny Panel, before making a final decisions;
  - iii. to refer the matter to full Council, in which case paragraph (h) below will apply; or
  - iv. to refer the matter to a sub group of the Panel for further consideration and report back to the Panel within a specified period not exceeding 14 days, in which case the Panel will, at its reconvened meeting take one of the decisions set out above; if the Panel does not reconvene within 14 days or does reconvene but does not refer the matter back to the decision maker or to the full Council, the decision will take effect on the date of the reconvened Panel meeting or the expiry of that further 14 day period, whichever is the earlier.
- g) If, following an objection to the decision, the Overview and Scrutiny Panel does not meet in the period set out above, or does meet but does not refer the matter back to the decision making person or body, the decision

shall take effect on the date of the Overview and Scrutiny Panel or the expiry of that further 5 clear working day period, whichever is the earlier.

- h) If the matter was referred to Council and the Council does not object to a decision which has been made, then no further action is necessary and the decision will be effective in accordance with the provision below. However, if the Council does object, it has no locus to make decisions in respect of an executive decision unless it is contrary to the Policy Framework, or contrary to or not wholly consistent with the Budget. Unless that is the case, the Council will refer any decision to which it objects back to the decision making person or body, together with the Council's view on the decision. That decision making body or person shall choose whether to amend the decision or not before reaching a final decision and implementing it. Where the decision was taken by the Cabinet as a whole or a committee of it, a meeting will be convened to reconsider within 5 clear working days of the Council request. Where the decision was made by an individual, the individual will reconsider within 5 clear working days of the Council request.
- i) If the Council does not meet, or if it does but does not refer the decision back to the decision making body or person, the decision will become effective on the date of the Council meeting or expiry of the period in which the Council meeting should have been held, whichever is the earlier.

#### **4. APPENDICES**

- 4.1 This report is supported by two appendices:
- Appendix A - Cabinet Decision 30<sup>th</sup> April 2020
  - Appendix B - Cabinet Report 30<sup>th</sup> April 2020 - [Integrated Family Hubs Report](#) (Electronic version only)

#### **5. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS**

- 5.1 This report is supported by two background documents:
- Council Constitution – Part 4 A - Purpose and Procedure Rules for O&S
  - Cabinet agenda – 30<sup>th</sup> April 2020

## **Appendix A**

### CABINET DRAFT MINUTES – 30<sup>th</sup> APRIL 2020

#### CHILDREN'S CENTRES CONSULTATION RESULTS - FAMILY HUBS

Cabinet considered the report regarding the remodelling of the early help services - Children's Centre, Youth services and Family Resilience Teams into a integrated Family Hub model.

The Deputy Chairman of Cabinet, Adult Social Care, Children's Services, Health and Mental Health informed that it was important to be able to bring this paper for full discussion at Cabinet for transparency and that he had also attended a Members briefing session at the request of the Chairman of the Adults, Children and Health Overview & Scrutiny Panel.

Cabinet were informed that the purpose of the report was the remodelling of the services to focus resources to work with the most vulnerable children, young people and families in RBWM who most need the help, thus strengthening families and reducing demand for statutory services.

The recommendations being proposed in the report were in line with the government's Life Chances agenda and All Party Parliamentary Group report on the future of Children's Centres. There had also been a 12 week consultation period with the vast majority of residents supporting one to one support. The report sets out the proposed changes in light of the consultation results to deliver integrated family hubs.

The Lead Member for Housing, Communications and Youth Engagement informed Cabinet that there had been an extensive social media campaign during the consultation period to encourage people to take part. There had been 501 respondents to the consultation, which compared well to Buckinghamshire that was a much larger population and had 752 responses to their consultation. There had also been a number of staff workshops to enable the staff to feedback. He confirmed that both Lead Members had also visited the hubs and youth centres.

The Lead Member for Housing, Communications and Youth Engagement also informed that the briefing session held for Members earlier this week had also been very useful and he made reference to comments made by Cllr Story regarding the provision of services in South Ascot, as concerns had been raised amongst some residents there that they may find it difficult to access services because the nearest hub would be in Windsor, his comments would be taken on board and it was noted that the health visiting service would remain in Ascot as well as home visits. Attention was also brought to the useful comments made by Cllr C Da Costa about remote and digital working as well as the importance of being service focused and not building focused.

The Lead Member for Housing, Communications and Youth Engagement also mentioned the importance of having targeted services with the paper also showing how a number of organisations would be working together.

The Director of Children's Services addressed Cabinet and reiterated the importance of the consultation results that were summarised with the report and contained as appendix 2. Consultation had been undertaken online, 10% of results from paper respondents and focus groups had been held. The majority said that the focus should be on one to one support focusing on families in crises. With over two thirds of respondents not having any strong views against the proposals this gave us a strong mandate.

The Director informed that the Health Visiting Service continued to remain a critically essential service and thus the offer of 5 visits for new-born to 2 years old for family visits would remain in place. It was proposed to have two family hubs, one in Windsor and the other in Maidenhead that would help deliver outreach services. The current national lockdown had shown how delivering services to people's homes on request had been effective. This also demonstrated how we could make a difference in a time of need to those who need help the most. Section three of the report talked about how the proposals would enable us to focus our provision on the families that need the support the most and respond more quickly. The proposals would also release funding from buildings as well as giving an opportunity to transform the role of officers to create better resilience, more flexibility and higher skilled roles.

The recent C-19 crisis had demonstrated how strong our community groups were. The proposals would allow greater support to such groups with staff being able to go on location to help and train.

The Chairman thanked the Lead Members and officers for their work on this report and for their innovative approach. He opened questioned / comments to Cabinet followed by other Members in attendance.

The Deputy Leader of the Council, Resident and Leisure Services, HR, IT, Legal, Performance Management and Windsor said that this was a very strong report and the current national situation showed the importance to being able to help those who need it in our society. We need to be more agile to be there to support our young people. She asked what were the services doing whilst the centres were closed and that it was important that we retained the Poppies Children's Centre as it was an asset in supporting army personnel.

The Deputy Chairman of Cabinet, Adult Social Care, Children's Services, Health and Mental Health replied that he agreed that Poppies was an important centre that he had visited, it was important to retain an excellent relationship with our armed forces. The Director also responded that with regards to C-19 some resources had been realigned to the Health Services for specific help, made videos to provide support, helped parents who were at home and Baby Bank items had been delivered by staff just to name a few activities staff had undertaken.

The Lead Member for Finance and Ascot reported that and that the briefing to Members had been valuable as was the equalities impact assessment that he had also read. Similar models had successfully been introduced by other authorities and during C-19 staff had been able to respond on a one to one basis with those in need. There had been no waiting lists and targeted support had been provided. He asked about the 50% reduction in parenting services with no loss of staff and was informed that this would be a 50% reduction in universal services but with an increase in targeted support.

The Lead Member for Environmental Services, Climate Change, Sustainability, Parks and Countryside said that when you have a new born child it can affect your self-esteem and you may not be up to going to a universal setting so being able to be seen at home could be beneficial. With regards to those who had responded via hard copies it was important to bear them in mind when communicating with the public, we need to make sure we reach those in need.

The Deputy Chairman of Cabinet, Adult Social Care, Children's Services, Health and Mental Health replied that he had given thought to how to communicate with those who did not have access to digital means. There had also been a need to re-focus how we communicated with residents during the current lockdown period.

Cllr Del Campo referred to the all parliamentary reports, which this report was based upon, and said there were some contradictions such as maintaining universal provision wherever possible, that direct support could stigmatise families as failing and that universal provision

often allowed staff to identify more complex issues at an early stage such as mental health that did not discriminate against wealth or location.

She went on to say that there was also alcohol and substance misuse as well as domestic abuse that did not discriminate. Heard about focusing on families in crises but this report talks about early intervention this linked back to providing universal services. There were many hidden challenges that families faced that they did not always ask for help and could go undetected without universal support. She was worried about people falling through the gaps. Liberal Democrats participating in the all-party report would not have supported the closure of children centres or making people redundant, they would have rather enhanced services at centres. At the briefing meeting she said they were told of the need to make savings of £600,000, this was not the aim of the all-party group to support cuts. How did the all-party report map what was proposed tonight.

The Deputy Chairman of Cabinet, Adult Social Care, Children's Services, Health and Mental Health replied that the reason why there was a savings target mentioned was that they had looked at what the service would look like and out of that there were savings. The first time this remodelling was looked at was around 2018/2019 following the children's commissioners advice and all party report. It was incorrect to say we were doing this to save money it was to provide targeted support. The £600,000 saving was mentioned at the start of the briefing session but this was as a result of the re-design. With regards to the all-party report it was correct to say that it had many different layers and it was important to use evidence based decisions such as the public consultation. It was not proposed to cut all universal services as areas such as health care visits remained. He also made reference to other areas that were commissioned such as DASH that should not be forgotten when protecting the vulnerable residents.

The Director for Children's Services informed that if we look at the statistics of the referrals we get into early help at the moment the vast majority of them come through schools and nursery settings. We get very few from universal services run via children's services. Community groups would also be trained into spotting any issues and we also had our health visitors. Proportional universal provision was important but it was not to be supplied just by the council and we did support community groups. It was also important to maintain our health service and support services protecting people from domestic abuse and mental health. We could monitor referrals from the different groups to see if we were successful.

Cllr Del Campo mentioned that with regards to the health visitor visits she had only received one and thus can we guarantee five visits. In response she was informed that over the last two years, after health visitors had come under the council, 100% of those families that we were aware of were offered visits. About three out of ten families declined visits as they felt they were not needed. It was also important to triangulate those that we are worried about with other services to try and make sure they are supported.

The Lead Member for Housing, Communications and Youth Engagement wanted to address the question of what came first the savings target or the transformation of the service. The Lead Member had requested and cabinet agreed to postpone any paper to make sure that service provision was in line with the key principles mentioned at the front of the report and what was wanted. Subsequently it became apparent that savings were what we see in the paper today. Savings were not set first but we look at transformation to deliver services in a targeted way and saving come out of this.

Cllr Werner mentioned that the savings first appeared two years ago in plans for transforming Children's Services. He raised concern that the proposals would adversely impact on young people and new residents. When looking at savings the impact on our residents is forgotten. He mentioned that when he was a new parent the universal services provided were very important and that removing these to waiting until families were in crises was not an approach he could support.



Cllr Werner also raised concern about the location of the proposed changes, there was no evidence of a review of walking routes, bus routes or why there should be a north south location in Maidenhead or an east west location of centres. He asked why it was proposed to close the Pinkneys Green Youth Centre when it was the second most popular centre and had been there since the estate had opened, he felt that attendance had dropped as services provided had been reduced.

Cllr Werner also said he had visited a youth centre and had received negative comments from staff about the proposals, he felt universal services should be kept and youth centres should be kept open. He made reference to the group Theresa May called JAMS (just about managing) as they could be impacted.

The Lead Member for Housing, Communications and Youth Engagement said that Pinkneys Green services could be accessed at the Riverside Centre and that both centre were close by. He reiterated the point made by Cllr C Da Costa at the briefing session that we should be looking at targeted services and not buildings. He also mentioned that at the Pinkneys Green Youth Centre the average weekly attendance was zero to three residents therefore the building was no longer required. After being part of the focus group he did not believe staff were afraid to give their views.

The Director said that with regards to the Pinkneys Green Youth Centre looking back a year there were about five to ten young people each week this had fallen to zero to three even though there was exactly the same offer. With regards to staff he said there would naturally be some concern about any changes but he had an open door policy if staff wished to raise anything with him.

Cllr Price said that there were two areas she wished to comment on; the Equality impact assessment and the consultation. She was concerned that the report had been presented without comments from the head of law especially as there was currently a judicial review against the council. With regards to the equality impact assessment she felt that the format was more detailed than previously presented and was produced by Achieving For Children, which nevertheless should follow the the RBWM policy. She felt that this appeared to more of a poverty impact assessment rather than an equality one, which is a legal requirement. She mentioned that under nearly every one of the protected characteristics it says there was no data and assumptions were made, and asked if it would not have been more prudent to collect such data before proceeding with the assessment, and that the final decision was to be taken by the Council, whilst it appeared to be taken by Cabinet. She highlighted two of the characteristics, age and gender; one was the impact that young people would no longer access the services when centres were closed which was shown as a positive where logically this should be a negative. The second was that under gender it said that the changes would have a bigger impact on females and again this was said to be a positive which again seemed wrong. She was also not clear if this was a full stage two assessment (referring to the RBWM 2018 approved policy on assessment and compliance) and said it should have been submitted to law and governance for review and advice. If it was had they confirmed legal obligations had been met. If it was a stage one assessment she asked what changes had been made due to the assessment. She was concerned if the correct legal process had been followed.

With regards to consultation Cllr Price said she had attended one of the focus groups and was informed that they had to save £600,000 and this consultation was about finding the best way of doing this. They were also informed that some staff had left the authority as they were expecting redundancies and after leaving the positions were not filled, and thus the current service was already being scaled back. . It was also not clear if groups, such as the Disability Access Forum, had been actively approached. Do we know of the fifteen stakeholders who had responded, who they were and if they were representative of the diverse groups in the borough. She also feared that with the C-19 situation how realistic it was to have other groups providing support when they would be affected by the crises. Is it wise to proceed with this scale of cuts when the number of young people in need may

increase. She mentioned the map had been useful and wanted to know that areas such as Horton, as an area of multiple deprivation, would be supported. The Director said the Cllr Price was correct that the assessment had been undertaken by AFC and said that it had been reviewed by their legal services. It had been circulated to RBWM colleagues late last week to enable this meeting to take place, comments had been received and that he would look at them and come back to her about the areas she had raised. It was hard to provide data on universal services that had been provided as these had not always been recorded so they looked at the consultation results.

The Director said the Cllr Price was correct that the assessment had been undertaken by AFC and said that it had been reviewed by their legal services. It had been circulated to RBWM colleagues late last week to enable this meeting to take place, comments had been received and that he would look at them and come back to her about the areas she had raised. It was hard to provide data on universal services that had been provided as these had not always been recorded so they looked at the consultation results.

Cllr Baldwin was concerned about the lawfulness of the consultation in section five the reports say gunning selectively and leaves out more telling guidance. The report says the consultation should be taken at the formative stages. But we know that proposals were first considered in 2016 and that Cllr Carroll although not then the Lead Member had been present. It could be seen that the consultation had been taken after the decision had already been made. Cllr Baldwin quoted statutory guidance that said all those who could be affected should be consulted. He raised concern that only 32% were in favour of the proposals and this was not, as mentioned earlier a strong mandate. The Director corrected and said that 32% had said they were against it and this gave the strong mandate.

The Lead Member for Housing, Communications and Youth Engagement reiterated to the opposition what he had previously said about the paper being delayed to review service provision and it was out of this that savings were identified.

Cllr Bhangra agreed that this was a good report and asked if the schools in Boyne Hill would be used. He was informed that the Lead Member had held discussions with the two schools and that as a whole schools were supportive of the proposals.

Cllr Tisi asked how the redundancies were made up and that she had heard that 20 health care visitors would be losing their jobs and that health visitors were picking up the slack with early intervention. The Director replied that there were no redundancies for health visitors, the service was crucial to the provision discussed at this meeting. There would be a review of positions as part of the process undertaken by AFC. There would be 11 FTE redundancies and it was hoped that they could be relocated within AFC or the Council.

Cllr Jones reiterated that saving proposals had been identified 2 years ago. She asked how we would monitor that we were serving the same number of people coming through the system especially from pre-school settings if there is reduced universal provision. How would we monitor we are getting referrals through. In reply she was informed that we would have a single referral system and thus a clearer view of those being referred. It would be harder to pick up those families that receive smaller interventions, such as a 10 minute conversation that are happening with other groups.

The Deputy Chairman of Cabinet, Adult Social Care, Children's Services, Health and Mental Health said that in terms of the savings put down we must be clear that when he became Lead Member in 2019 the decision was taken to defer process of bring through any kind of saving target at all as he wanted to be clear about the area. The point of the paper is targeting the most vulnerable, how we can better connect and use our resources.

As the meeting was taking part virtually the clerk asked each Cabinet Member to confirm that they had heard the debate and had no connectivity problems and then to stat if they were for,

against or wished to abstain. All Cabinet Members confirmed that they had heard the debate and that they supported the recommendations.

**Resolved unanimously: that Cabinet notes the report and:**

- i) Agrees to a remodelling of Family Resilience Services, Children’s Centres and Youth Services to a “Family Hub” model (see appendix 1-diagram of the proposed Integrated Family Hub model).**
- ii) Agrees to the prioritising of services for children, young people and families most in need as set out in 3.3 and 3.4.**

This page is intentionally left blank