

RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL

please ask for: STEPHEN BARKER
direct line: 01200 414412
e-mail: stephen.barker@ribblevalley.gov.uk
my ref: SB/EL
your ref:
date: 2 March 2018

Council Offices
Church Walk
CLITHEROE
Lancashire BB7 2RA

Switchboard: 01200 425111
Fax: 01200 414488
www.ribblevalley.gov.uk

Dear Councillor

The next meeting of the **HEALTH & HOUSING COMMITTEE** is at **6.30pm** on **THURSDAY, 15 MARCH 2018** at the **TOWN HALL, CHURCH STREET, CLITHEROE.**

I do hope you will be there.

Yours sincerely

CHIEF EXECUTIVE

To: Committee Members (Copy for information to all other members of the Council)
Directors
Press

AGENDA

Part I – items of business to be discussed in public

1. Apologies for absence.
- ✓ 2. To approve the minutes of the last meeting held on 18 January 2018 – copy enclosed.
3. Declarations of Pecuniary and Non-Pecuniary Interests (if any).
4. Public Participation (if any).

FOR DECISION

- ✓ 5. Review of Fees and Charges 2018/2019 – report of Chief Executive – copy enclosed.
- ✓ 6. Christmas Markets – report of Chief Executive – copy enclosed.

FOR INFORMATION

- ✓ 7. Revenue Monitoring 2017/2018 – report of Director of Resources – copy enclosed.

- ✓ 8. Capital Programme 2018/2019 – report of Director of Resources – copy enclosed.
- ✓ 9. Market Events 2018 – report of Chief Executive – copy enclosed.
- ✓ 10. Supported Housing Lancashire Joint Response – report of Chief Executive – copy enclosed.
- ✓ 11. Home Improvement Agency Return – report of Chief Executive – copy enclosed.
- ✓ 12. Notes of Health and Wellbeing Partnership dated 10 January 2018 and 19 February 2018 – copy enclosed.
- 13. Reports on Representatives on Outside Bodies (if any).

Part II - items of business **not** to be discussed in public

FOR DECISION

- ✓ 14. Empty Dwelling Management Order for 18 Siddows Avenue, Clitheroe – report of Chief Executive – copy enclosed.
- ✓ 15. Community Housing Fund Application – report of Chief Executive – copy enclosed.

FOR INFORMATION

- ✓ 16. General Report – Grants – report of Chief Executive – copy enclosed.
- ✓ 17. Affordable Housing Update – report of Chief Executive – copy enclosed.

RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL

REPORT TO HEALTH AND HOUSING COMMITTEE

Agenda Item No 5

meeting date: 15 MARCH 2018
title: REVIEW OF FEES AND CHARGES 2018/19 - UPDATE
submitted by: CHIEF EXECUTIVE
principal author: HEATHER BARTON

1 PURPOSE

1.1 To seek member approval to:

- amend three proposed 2018/19 fees and charges, which had previously been approved by this Committee in October 2017, and
- agree one new 2018/19 fee.

2 BACKGROUND

2.1 The Council's fees and charges are reviewed on an annual basis as part of the budget setting process. The 2018/19 fees and charges, for implementation from 1 April 2018 for this Committee, were approved at this Committee's meeting on 19 October 2017.

2.2 Since approval of the fees and charges, Environmental Health and Finance officers have considered other factors and become aware of further information which has led to different fee levels now being proposed for three fees. In addition, one new fee area has been identified for inclusion in the 2018/19 fees and charges listing.

2.3 The amended fees and charges proposed here still reflect the key messages from Budget Working Group for officers and Committees to bear in mind when reviewing the fees and charges, as follows:

- Any charges should look to meet the costs of providing the services being used.
- As an **absolute minimum** all fees and charges should be increased by 2%.
- Where possible comparisons should be made to the charges being made by our neighbours in Lancashire – or wider if appropriate.
- We should thoroughly review our services for areas where we are not charging – but where a charge may be made/be appropriate.
- As part of the review, we should be looking at innovative ways of charging.

3 MEMORIAL BENCH AND COMMEMORATIVE TREES FEES UPDATE

3.1 The 2018/19 fees for both Memorial Bench and Commemorative Trees, approved on 19 October 2017, were "At cost – materials plus officer time input". Since the fees were set on that basis and following further consideration, officers now propose to set fixed fee levels for both Memorial Bench and Commemorative Trees. The fixed fee levels proposed should ensure the Council still covers the costs of providing memorial benches and commemorative trees.

3.2 This approach is considered the best option for the following reasons. Firstly, it allows the Council to specify the bench and tree types to be sited in the cemetery, so they fit in with the look and feel associated with the cemetery and, with regard to

trees, fit the ground conditions. Secondly, relatives and friends of the deceased have a straight forward fee structure to select from and do not have to wait for different quotes and estimates. Thirdly, other Lancashire cemeteries have fixed fee levels.

3.3 The proposed 2018/19 fee for a Memorial Bench (inclusive of plaque) is £750. This covers the estimated costs of the Council, is in line with the memorial bench fee set by the Council already for roadside seats and is close to the average of other Lancashire cemeteries' current fees, £717.

3.4 The proposed 2018/19 fee for Commemorative Trees is £170. This is an increase of 70% from the current 2017/18 fee of £100. However, the £170 proposed fee now covers the estimated costs of the Council and is less than the average fee of two other Lancashire cemeteries' current fees, £291.

4 PRIVATE WATER SAMPLES FEES UPDATE

4.1 Under the guidance for setting private water sample fees, the Council should set fees to only cover the estimated costs it incurs.

4.2 The 2018/19 fee for Large Water Supply – Audit and Check Monitoring, approved on 19 October 2017, was set at £103. This was based on the cost of lab test fees and one hour of Environmental Health officer time. Since the fee was set we have been informed of a reduction in lab test fees. To reflect this reduction, it is now proposed that the 2018/19 Large Water Supply – Audit and Check Monitoring fee is set at £100.

4.3 In recent months, the Environmental Health team have commenced the latest round of private water supply risk assessments and sample testing. Several results have prompted re-testing and parameters set for each re-test are specific to that test and thus the lab test fees vary for each re-test. Given that, it is proposed to introduce a fee for Private Water Sample Re-test of "Cost of lab test fees plus officer time".

5 RISK ASSESSMENT

5.1 The approval of this report may have the following implications:

- Resources – Fees and charges provide a key income source for the Council. Fees and charges also provide a mechanism to target concessions, and also to charge service users directly rather than allowing the financial burden of certain service provision to fall on the council tax.
- Technical, Environmental and Legal – The Local Government Acts of 2000 and 2003 extended authorities' powers to charge for discretionary services.
- Political – none.
- Reputation – Substantial increases to charges can generate adverse publicity.
- Equality and Diversity – One of the aims of the fees and charges mechanism on many services is to pass on service concession in order to increase inclusivity.

6 CONCLUSION

6.1 Amended 2018/19 fees are proposed as follows:

- Memorial Bench, £750
- Commemorative Trees, £170
- Large Water Supply – Audit and Check Monitoring, £100.

6.2 A new fee is proposed for Private Water Sample Re-test of “Cost of lab test fees plus officer time”.

6.3 The potential budget impact of the amended fees and new fee proposed above is shown in **Annex 1**.

7 RECOMMENDED THAT COMMITTEE

7.1 Approve the following proposed fees and charges, for implementation from 1 April 2018, to replace the fees previously approved on 19 October 2017:

- Memorial Bench, £750
- Commemorative Trees, £170
- Large Water Supply – Audit and Check Monitoring, £100.

7.2 Approve the proposed new fee for Private Water Sample Re-test of “Cost of lab test fees plus officer time”, for implementation from 1 April 2018.

HEATHER BARTON
HEAD OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

MARSHAL SCOTT
CHIEF EXECUTIVE

HH*-*/
2 March 2018

For further information please ask for Heather Barton or Andrew Cook.

BACKGROUND PAPERS – None

Health and Housing Committee – Updates to Proposed Fees and Charges 2018/19, at 15 March 2018

CLCEM - Clitheroe Cemetery

Fee Type	Fee	Ledger Code	VAT	Date of Last Change	Charge from 1st April 2017 £	Budgeted Income Net of VAT for 2017/18 £	Proposed Charges for 2018/19 £	Indication of Potential Income Net of VAT for 2018/19 £	Percentage Increase in Charge %
Fees for Memorials	Commemorative Trees	CLCEM/8508z	Non Vatable	24 October 2016	100.00	500.00	170.00	850.00	70%
	Memorial Bench	CLCEM/8507z	Non Vatable	New Charge	New Charge	New Charge	750.00	New Charge	N/A

ENVHT – Environmental Health Services

Fee Type	Fee	Ledger Code	VAT	Date of Last Change	Charge from 1st April 2017 £	Budgeted Income Net of VAT for 2017/18 £	Proposed Charges for 2018/19 £	Indication of Potential Income Net of VAT for 2018/19 £	Percentage Increase in Charge %
Water Sample Risk Assessment and Analysis	Large Water Supply - Audit & Check Monitoring**	ENVHT/8417u	Non Vatable	01 April 2017	111.00	2,410.00	100.00	2,170.00	-9.91%
	Private Water Sample Re-test		Non Vatable	New Charge	New Charge	New Charge	Cost of lab test fees plus officer time	New Charge	N/A

RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL REPORT TO HEALTH & HOUSING COMMITTEE

Agenda Item No. 6

meeting date: THURSDAY, 15 MARCH 2018
title: CHRISTMAS MARKET
submitted by: MARSHAL SCOTT – CHIEF EXECUTIVE
principal author: HEATHER BARTON – HEAD OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

1 PURPOSE

1.1 To provide an overview on the Christmas Market activities proposed in Clitheroe market for 2018.

1.2 Relevance to the Council's ambitions and priorities:

- Community Objectives – To promote and support health, environmental, economic and social wellbeing of people who live, work and visit Ribble Valley.
- Corporate Priorities – To provide quality services efficiently and effectively.
- Other Considerations – None.

2 BACKGROUND

2.1 The Council has now delivered Christmas Markets for the previous two years. The Council objectives in doing so were as follows:

1. Bring visitors in from outside the district.
2. Encourage visitors to spend money elsewhere in the borough.
3. To provide value to community effort.
4. The offer of an opportunity over time to generate an income stream.

2.2 Christmas markets are clearly perceived by visitors as bringing something different to a typical market shopping trip.

2.3 There seems to be an availability to make Christmas Markets in historic towns a regional destination.

2.4 Loyalty is also a significant factor in building and expanding Christmas markets. It was noted that people said they had visited the first Christmas market and they came back because of the excellent benefits it brought.

2.5 We are now being approached by big named traders to support our Christmas markets and therefore we have to make a commitment to the Christmas markets early. There are a number of must have features to make the Christmas markets successful. These being:

- Authenticity – most of the visitors feel the market is 'original'
- Quality hot food and beverages – environmental health will inspect to ensure all traders are meeting food hygiene standards

- Showcase of local products and talent – people recognise that Christmas shopping is their spending high point of the year. They are likely to believe that by supporting a local Christmas market they are buying locally made products and boosting the local economy. As part of the appeal is getting a good balance as to the locally sourced quirky goods.
- Focal points – the Christmas markets hanker after a big bowl feature to make it the heart of the market. Whilst Clitheroe Market has a heritage and architectural backdrop from the castle, it is believed that there is a need for a focal point for people to come. Over the past 2 years there has been a large number of school children and young people performing, and last year there was the entertainment from a paid for organ.
- Good transport and parking – liaison will be undertaken with the Head of Engineering Services regarding the offer of Christmas parking

3 ISSUES

- 3.1 It is believed that the Christmas Market had a positive impact on the local economy. It was highlighted that a number of issues such as the lack of speciality traders existed and traders' reluctance to commit to the event due to other events going on within Lancashire.
- 3.2 The market was seen as an opportunity for Clitheroe to attract new tourism and visitors, high spend shoppers and increased visits during the crucial trading periods.
- 3.3 The management of the event will fall to the Council to its Market Superintendent.
- 3.4 The proposed charge is £15 per stall or pitch (£12.50 plus VAT). The charge is to encourage traders who would not have previously visited the event to take the opportunity to sell within Clitheroe. It was looked at as a 2% increase in line with inflation, however to maintain that traders attend the event and feel they are getting good value and ensuring that the area is full, we feel it beneficial to continue at £15.
- 3.5 The Christmas Markets are making a significant contribution to the winter economy in three ways.
1. They have become important generators of retail turnover to the market at the time of year when we would lose visitors and trade would be out of town.
 2. They bring in new footfall into market, for example customer surveys have suggested that there is a regrowth in people and young students, family groups and work colleague groups are supportive of the Christmas markets.
 3. The well managed coordination of the Christmas Market brings a commercial benefit right across the whole town, not just the market themselves.
- 3.6 It is hoped that the Christmas market will coincide with the Santa dash which typically occurs on the first Saturday in December, which is hosted by the Chamber of Trade and also the Town Council event.
- 3.7 It is suggested that the Head of Environmental Health Services sends out application forms in the forthcoming months to create the database and to ensure that large names are anchored to Clitheroe Christmas Markets. It is also anticipated that a

large amount of advertisement will go out particularly on Facebook, local magazines and that an anchorage in the form of a focal attraction is created.

- 3.8 It is anticipated that the Christmas light switch on would occur at 3pm on the first day of trading as it has been historically undertaken. It is hoped that a local celebrity or the Mayor would undertake the role of switching on the lights. The focal point may be to pay someone to come and switch on, however this would be with the approval of Committee at a later date.

4 RISK ASSESSMENT

- 4.1 The approval of this report may have the following implications:

- Resources – No implications identified.
- Technical, Environmental and Legal – No implications identified.
- Political – The decision reflects the Council's intention to maintain a vibrant market.
- Reputation – This document reflects the Council's ability to meet change in circumstances to maintain efficient, effective services.
- Equality & Diversity – No implications identified.

5 **RECOMMENDED THAT COMMITTEE**

- 5.1 Approve the recommendation of a non-refundable fee of £15 per stall including VAT for a pitch or stall during the festive period upon the market.
- 5.2 Approve the dates of 1, 8, 15, 22 December 2018 running from 9am to 4pm.

HEATHER BARTON
HEAD OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

MARSHAL SCOTT
CHIEF EXECUTIVE

BACKGROUND PAPERS

(If any)

For further information please ask for Heather Barton, extension 4466.

REF: HB/EL/150318/H&H

RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL REPORT TO HEALTH AND HOUSING COMMITTEE

Agenda Item No 7

meeting date: 15 MARCH 2018
 title: REVENUE MONITORING 2017/18
 submitted by: DIRECTOR OF RESOURCES
 principal author: ANDREW COOK

1 PURPOSE

1.1 To provide this Committee with information relating to the progress of the 2017/18 revenue budget, as at the end of January 2018.

1.2 Relevance to the Council's ambitions and priorities:

- Community Objectives – none identified.
- Corporate Priorities - to continue to be a well-managed council providing efficient services based on identified customer need, whilst ensuring the Council provides council tax payers with value for money.
- Other Considerations – none identified.

2 REVENUE MONITORING 2017/18

2.1 Shown below, by cost centre, is a comparison between actual expenditure and the revised estimate budget for the period April 2017 to January 2018. You will see an overall underspend of £41,967 on the net cost of services, as at the end of January 2018, after allowing for transfers to and from earmarked reserves. Please note that underspends and additional income are denoted by figures with a minus symbol.

Cost Centre	Cost Centre Name	Net Budget for the Full Year £	Net Budget to the end of January 2018 £	Actual including Commitments to the end of January 2018 £	Variance £	
APLAC	Alma Place Unit	2,780	1,640	1,757	117	G
AWARM	Affordable Warmth	800	668	360	-308	G
CLAIR	Clean Air	2,860	476	715	239	G
CLAND	Contaminated Land	8,370	0	0	0	G
CLCEM	Clitheroe Cemetery	53,310	16,034	9,864	-6,170	R
CLMKT	Clitheroe Market	-50,590	-98,584	-101,096	-2,512	A
CMGHH	Community Groups - Health & Housing	39,570	0	0	0	G
COMNL	Common Land	2,410	552	56	-496	G
CTBEN	Localised Council Tax Support Admin	95,140	-36,399	-38,600	-2,201	A

Cost Centre	Cost Centre Name	Net Budget for the Full Year £	Net Budget to the end of January 2018 £	Actual including Commitments to the end of January 2018 £	Variance £	
DOGWD	Dog Warden & Pest Control	86,040	15,955	13,340	-2,615	A
ENVHT	Environmental Health Services	293,070	-16,635	-21,218	-4,583	A
HGBEN	Housing Benefits	92,670	80,664	71,170	-9,494	R
HOMEE	Home Energy Conservation	11,720	336	0	-336	G
HOMES	Homelessness Strategy	59,360	-4,196	-5,732	-1,536	G
HSASS	Housing Associations	6,360	-418	-241	177	G
HSTRA	Housing Strategy	42,230	5,964	5,688	-276	G
IMPGR	Improvement Grants	82,440	-8,980	-10,906	-1,926	G
JARMS	Joiners Arms	7,690	-16,412	-27,231	-10,819	R
SHARE	Shared Ownership Rents	-1,230	-1,230	-1,227	3	G
SUPPE	Supporting People	-5,040	-23,663	-23,942	-279	G
UCRED	Universal Credit	7,180	-11,380	-10,640	740	G
Total Health and Housing Committee		837,140	-95,608	-137,883	-42,275	
Transfers to/(from) Earmarked Reserves						
Government Housing Grants Reserve – DCLG Single Homelessness Initiative Support Grant		-1,450	-1,450	-1,450	0	
Government Housing Grants Reserve – LCC Affordable Warmth		-800	-668	-360	308	
Government Housing Grants Reserve – DCLG Prevention of Rough Sleeping		-200	0	0	0	
Government Housing Grants Reserve – LCC Domestic Violence Support Worker and Support Resources		14,290	14,290	14,290	0	
Government Housing Grants Reserve – LCC Domestic Violence Sanctuary Scheme		2,920	2,920	2,920	0	
Government Housing Grants Reserve – DCLG Flexible Homelessness Support Grant		6,430	6,430	6,430	0	
Government Housing Grants Reserve – DCLG Preventing Homelessness Grant		13,700	0	0	0	
Equipment Reserve - Local Council Tax Support s31 New Burdens Funding		-2,800	-2,800	-2,800	0	
Equipment Reserve - Dog Control Order Signs		-250	-250	-250	0	
Equipment Reserve - Joiners Arms Furniture Sinking Fund		12,600	12,600	12,600	0	
Capital Reserve – Home Improvement Loan repayment		4,020	4,020	4,020	0	
Total after transfers to/(from) Earmarked Reserves		885,600	-60,516	-102,483	-41,967	

Key to Variance shading	
Variance of £5,000 or more (Red)	R
Variance between £2,000 and £4,999 (Amber)	A
Variance less than £2,000 (Green)	G

2.2 The red variances highlight specific areas of high concern, for which budget holders are required to have an action plan. Amber variances are potential areas of high concern and green variances are areas which currently do not present any significant concern.

2.3 The main variances between budget and actuals on individual budget codes within cost centres have also been highlighted and explained, as follows:

- Red budget code variances (£5,000 or more) are shown with the budget holder's comments and agreed actions in Annex 1.
- Amber budget code variances (£2,000 to £4,999) are shown with the budget holder's comments in Annex 2.

2.4 The main reasons for the £41,967 underspend to the end of January 2018, after transfers to and from earmarked reserves, are as follows:

- **Housing Benefits, Rent Allowance payments and grant income (-£8,428):** Rent Allowance payments to date are £112,400 lower than budgeted for, after adjusting for recovery of housing benefits overpayments to date. Set against this, Rent Allowance grant subsidy income is £103,972 lower than budgeted for.

In practice, any lower Rent Allowance payments made in year will be reflected in less Rent Allowance subsidy grant income being claimed from the DWP at year-end, as Rent Allowance payments are broadly funded by subsidy received, after adjusting for recovery of housing benefits overpayments and non-cash transactions. This means there is no significant Rent Allowance underspend in practice, at this stage.

- **Joiners Arms, Repairs and Maintenance – Buildings (-£3,600):** Less work than budgeted for the year to date. This underspend is likely to disappear by year-end as further work is expected on roof repairs and completion of extractor fan work. The roof work is likely to be very costly and unaffordable within the current revenue budget still available, so different options will need to be considered before confirming the budget funding and timing of the work.
- **Joiners Arms, Dwelling Rents (-£2,985):** Occupancy at Joiners Arms has been higher than budgeted for the year to date. There have been very few void periods as demand for temporary accommodation remains high.
- **Joiners Arms, other underspends (-£4,234):** Lower spend to date in areas such as warden vacancy cover, laundry costs and utilities costs. More payments are expected before year-end to reduce the laundry and utilities underspends.

- **Clitheroe Cemetery, various underspends and increased income (-£6,170):** Increased income from interment fees, exclusive burial rights and commemorative trees, plus lower spend to date in areas such as grounds maintenance charges, purchase of equipment and repairs. More payments are expected before year-end to reduce the equipment underspend.
- **Environmental Health, various underspends and increased income (-£4,583):** Increased income from street trading licences and litter fixed penalty notices, plus lower spend in areas such as subscriptions, nuisance/illegal tipping costs and printing. More payments are expected before year-end to reduce the subscriptions underspend.
- **Dog Warden and Pest Control, various underspends and increased income (-£2,615):** Increased income to date from commercial pest control, plus lower spend in areas such as repairs, baits & poisons and kennelling fees. More payments are expected before year-end to reduce the repairs underspend and no more commercial pest control income is expected in-year.
- **Clitheroe Market, various underspends and increased income (-£2,512):** Increased income from cabins to date, plus lower spend in areas such as utilities and publicity. More payments are expected before year-end to reduce the utilities underspend.

3 CONCLUSION

- 3.1 The comparison between actual expenditure and budget for this Committee at the end of January 2018 shows an underspend to date of £41,967, after allowing for transfers to and from earmarked reserves.

SENIOR ACCOUNTANT

DIRECTOR OF RESOURCES

HH4-18/AC/AC
2 March 2018

BACKGROUND PAPERS: None

For further information please ask for Andrew Cook

Health and Housing Committee Revenue Monitoring – Red Variances

Ledger Code	Ledger Code Name	Budget for the Full Year £	Budget to the end of January 2018 £	Actual including Commitments to the end of January 2018 £	Variance £		Reason for Variance	Action Plan as agreed between the Budget Holder and Accountant
HGBEN/4652	Housing Benefits/Rent Allowance Payments	6,681,880	5,819,917	5,707,517	-112,400	R	Rent Allowance payments to date are 1.9% lower than budgeted for, after adjusting for recovery of housing benefits overpayments to date. This is because the revised estimate anticipated a slight increase in payments for the year as a whole, but November to January actual payments were lower than expected. This was partly due to rent free weeks in December and January.	Any lower payments at year-end will be reflected in less Rent Allowance subsidy grant income received at year-end, as expenditure is broadly funded by subsidy received after adjusting for recovery of housing benefits overpayments and non-cash transactions (see HGBEN/8002z below). This means there is no significant underspend in practice, at this stage.
HGBEN/8002z	Housing Benefits/Rent Allowances Grant	-6,732,580	-5,610,932	-5,506,960	103,972	R	Rent Allowance grant subsidy income to date is 1.9% lower than budgeted for. This is because actual income is in line with estimates prepared for 2017/18 DWP Mid-Year Estimate grant purposes, whereas the 2017/18 Revised Estimate budgeted for a higher level of subsidy income for the full-year than the Mid-Year Estimate, based on an anticipated higher level of rent allowance payments.	The level of subsidy received at year-end will broadly cover the Rent Allowance payments made in-year (see HGBEN/4652 above). This means there is no significant income reduction in practice, at this stage.

Health and Housing Committee Revenue Monitoring – Amber Variances

Ledger Code	Ledger Code Name	Budget for the Full Year £	Budget to the end of January 2018 £	Actual including Commitments to the end of January 2018 £	Variance £		Reason for Variance
JARMS/2402	Joiners Arms/Repair & Maintenance - Buildings	27,350	24,288	20,688	-3,600	A	Less work than profiled for the year to date at revised estimate. This underspend is likely to disappear by year-end as further work is expected on roof repairs and completion of extractor fan work. The roof work is likely to be very costly and unaffordable within the current revenue budget still available, so different options will need to be considered before confirming the budget funding and timing of the work.
JARMS/8802u	Joiners Arms/Dwelling Rents	-31,350	-26,128	-29,113	-2,985	A	This is due to occupancy at Joiners Arms being higher than budgeted for the year to date. There have been very few void periods as demand for temporary accommodation remains high. <i>Note - income can fluctuate within Joiners Arms throughout the year, due to the demand-led and short-term nature of the tenancies.</i>
HGBEN/8007z	Housing Benefits/HRA Rent Rebate Grant	-21,110	-17,594	-13,930	3,664	A	Rent Rebate actual grant income to date is in line with estimates prepared for 2017/18 DWP Mid-Year Estimate grant purposes. However, since the Mid-Year estimate was submitted the classification of the non-self contained units at the Joiners Arms homelessness unit has been changed to "Hostel" status, which means the full rent rebate paid on behalf of claimants in those units can be claimed back in full from the DWP. This additional subsidy income was included in the Revised Estimate budget. Thus, actual income received to date is lower than the Revised Estimate budget to date. In practice, the additional income will be claimed back from DWP as part of the year-end subsidy claim, so there will be no significant income reduction at year-end.

RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL

REPORT TO HEALTH AND HOUSING COMMITTEE

INFORMATION

Agenda Item No 8

meeting date: 15 MARCH 2018
 title: CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2018/19
 submitted by: DIRECTOR OF RESOURCES
 principal author: ANDREW COOK

1 PURPOSE

1.1 To inform members of the schemes which have been approved for inclusion in this Committee's 2018/19 capital programme.

2 BACKGROUND

2.1 As members will be aware, this Committee proposed a five year capital programme for 2018/19 to 2022/23 at its meeting on 19 October 2017. As it stood at that time the draft capital programme across all the committees was unaffordable. The proposals have since been reviewed by Budget Working Group and Corporate Management Team in order to arrive at an affordable programme for 2018/19 to 2022/23.

2.2 Following recommendation by a special meeting of Policy and Finance Committee on 6 February 2018, it is anticipated that Full Council will approve the five year capital programme for 2018/19 to 2022/23 on 6 March 2018. Officers will provide confirmation of Full Council's decision at this Committee's 15 March 2018 meeting.

2.3 The Council's overall capital programme for the five year period 2018/19 to 2022/23 totals £6,624,860 for all committees. The total for this Committee is £1,937,000 over the five year life of the programme. £522,000 of this relates to the 2018/19 financial year.

3 CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2018/19 – APPROVED SCHEMES

3.1 For this Committee there are three approved schemes in the 2018/19 capital programme, totalling £522,000. These are shown in the table below.

Scheme	Budget for 2018/19 £
Disabled Facilities Grants (<i>budget to be confirmed when 2018/19 final grant allocation is notified</i>)	297,000
Landlord/Tenant Grants	50,000
<u>Budget moved from 2017/18</u>	
Clitheroe Market Improvements (<i>scheme currently on hold</i>)	175,000
Total - Health and Housing Committee	522,000

- 3.2 The Disabled Facilities Grants scheme is funded by a yearly grant allocation from the government and has been included at an indicative value of £297,000. The final scheme budget will be set to match the actual government grant funding received in-year, when it is notified to the Council.
- 3.3 The Clitheroe Market Improvements scheme has been moved from the 2017/18 capital programme in to the 2018/19 financial year in line with current proposals for the market redevelopment scheme.
- 3.4 The detailed information for each scheme is shown in **Annex 1**.
- 3.5 During the closure of our capital accounts there may be some slippage on schemes in the current year, 2017/18. One of the tasks of the Budget Working Group will be to review any requests for slippage on capital schemes within the 2017/18 capital programme. A report will be brought to this Committee at a future meeting, giving details of any slippage.
- 3.6 Responsible officers will complete and update capital monitoring sheets for each scheme, which will be reported regularly to members to give an indication of progress.

4 CONCLUSION

- 4.1 This Committee has a capital programme for 2018/19 of three schemes, totalling £522,000.
- 4.2 The Disabled Facilities Grants scheme budget is currently an indicative amount. The actual scheme budget will be confirmed when the 2018/19 final grant allocation is notified to the Council.
- 4.3 The Clitheroe Market Improvements scheme has been moved from the 2017/18 capital programme in to the 2018/19 financial year in line with current proposals for the market redevelopment scheme.
- 4.4 Any slippage on schemes in the 2017/18 capital programme will be added onto the 2018/19 capital programme, subject to approval.

SENIOR ACCOUNTANT

DIRECTOR OF RESOURCES

HH5-18/AC/AC
26 February 2018

For further background information please ask for Andrew Cook.

BACKGROUND PAPERS – None

Disabled Facilities Grants

Service Area: Housing and Regeneration

Submitted by: Colin Hirst

Brief Description of the Scheme:

The scheme provides grant aid to adapt homes so elderly and disabled occupants can remain in their own home. The grants can provide for minor adaptation, for example the installation of a stair lift, up to the provision of a bathroom and bedroom extension.

Revenue Implications:

None.

Timescale for Completion:

The Disabled Facilities Grants budget operates throughout the financial year.

Any Risks to Completion:

The population age of Ribble Valley occupants is increasing and therefore demand for the service will continue, but with finite resources.

The scheme is dependent on the level of funding awarded by the government.

Capital Cost:

2018/19 £
297,000

Please Note - The value above is indicative only and the actual scheme budget will be set to match the actual government grant funding received in-year. Notification of the 2018/19 funding allocation is expected in March or April 2018.

Landlord/Tenant Grants

Service Area: Housing and Regeneration

Submitted by: Colin Hirst

Brief Description of the Scheme:

The scheme match funds a landlord's investment in a property in return for an affordable rental property. Conditions of the grant are nomination rights and a set rent level in line with LHA. The scheme is crucial for move-on accommodation for families in temporary accommodation as the social housing waiting list is so long. The scheme is also used to bring empty properties back into use.

Revenue Implications:

None.

Timescale for Completion:

The Landlord/Tenant Grants budget operates throughout the financial year.

Any Risks to Completion:

Potential for over demand for the scheme.

Capital Cost:

2018/19 £
50,000

Clitheroe Market Improvements Scheme

Service Area: Regeneration and Clitheroe Market

Submitted by: Colin Hirst

NOTE

The Clitheroe Market Improvements scheme was initially approved in 2015, before the proposed Clitheroe Market re-development plans were announced. The Clitheroe Market Improvements scheme has been moved from the 2017/18 capital programme in to the 2018/19 financial year in line with current proposals for the market redevelopment scheme

Plans for the scheme budget will be reported to members at a future Health and Housing Committee meeting.

RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL REPORT TO HEALTH & HOUSING COMMITTEE

Agenda Item No. 9

meeting date: 15 MARCH 2018
 title: MARKET EVENTS 2018
 submitted by: MARSHAL SCOTT, CHIEF EXECUTIVE
 principal author: HEATHER BARTON, HEAD OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

1 PURPOSE

1.1 To inform Members of the proposed market events for 2018.

1.2 Relevance to the Council's ambitions and priorities

- Community Objectives - } It is a key Council objective to promote and support the health and wellbeing of residents and visitors to the Ribble Valley.
- Corporate Priorities - }
- Other Considerations - }

2 INFORMATION

2.1 Ribble Valley Borough Council currently delivers an annual programme of themed markets within the town including monthly markets and the annual Christmas market. The programme is delivered by using our current Market Superintendent, the Head of Environmental Health Services and visiting traders.

2.2 Ribble Valley Borough Council is continuously looking for traders to operate within the themed markets.

2.3 Speciality markets are a further dimension of the existing market adding extra economic, social, regeneration, health and environmental gains.

2.4 Over the past 18 months it has been noted that the economic benefit both to local traders and regular traders has increased footfall and attracted new customers to the town. Whilst we have tried monthly artisan and farmers markets, these have not proved as successful at attracting the consumers that we are requiring and therefore are less likely to become frequent markets.

2.5 It was agreed at the Health and Housing Committee to look at a quieter day for the farmers market and going forward if these were to be rebranded, these would have to be undertaken on a Saturday to ensure that traders were gaining the best footfall.

2.6 The reasoning behind hosting specialist markets is to allow generations of new business to enter into the industry that has traditionally had an ageing population.

2.7 Specialist markets do not usually make profit for the Council. It was noted that often the speciality markets, particularly farmers markets, have a considerably higher price threshold and therefore hosting an event on a Saturday once a month, we feel is ensuring that Clitheroe is a destination as a leisure activity and the market is not providing day to day necessities for household shoppers.

- 2.8 As we have seen over the last two years it has helped bring new vibrancy to the market. There is I believe a new energy to market area that has become tired and lost its ability to generate.
- 2.9 The specialist markets are also playing an important role in the environmental and health benefits of the community. They promote healthy eating, not least by having an interest in a range of quality local produce and encouraging people to take a far greater interest in the food they are eating and where it comes from.
- 2.10 There will be a large amount of PR exercises around the promotion of the market. We will be strongly promoting our achievements and letting people know how successful the markets are. We believe that the specialist markets are well placed to link into 'food tourism'.
- 2.11 The specialist markets that we will be undertaking during 2018 are:
- Easter Market – 24 March
 - Beer & Sausage Market – 21 April
 - Cheese Market – 19 May
 - Vintage & Craft Market – 16 June
 - Pampered Pet Market – 14 July
 - Christmas Markets – December

HEATHER BARTON
HEAD OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

MARSHAL SCOTT
CHIEF EXECUTIVE

For further information please ask for Heather Barton, extension 4466.

REF: HB/EL/130318/H&H

RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL REPORT TO HEALTH & HOUSING COMMITTEE

Agenda Item No. 10

meeting date: THURSDAY, 15 MARCH 2018
title: SUPPORTED HOUSING FUNDING MODEL POLICY STATEMENT AND
CONSULTATION RESPONSE
submitted by: MARSHAL SCOTT – CHIEF EXECUTIVE
principal author: RACHAEL STOTT – HOUSING STRATEGY OFFICER

1 PURPOSE

1.1 To inform Committee of a consultation response submitted in response to a Supported Housing Funding Model proposal.

1.2 Relevance to the Council's ambitions and priorities:

- Community Objectives – To address the housing needs of the borough.
- Corporate Priorities - N/A
- Other Considerations – N/A

2 BACKGROUND

2.1 The consultation seeks views on the Government's proposed new supported housing fund model from 2020 for sheltered and extra care housing in England. It is aimed at Local Authorities, supporting housing providers and people in sheltered and extra care supported housing and their families. It follows an earlier consultation in 2016 on funding for supported housing more broadly.

2.2 The Government released a 'Funding Supported Housing Policy Statement' in consultation in October 2017, with a closing date of 23 January 2018. In summary the consultation sets out the case for change as being 3 clear reasons:

1. To secure supply now and in the future.
2. To strengthen focus on outcomes oversight and cost control.
3. To ensure it works with the modernised welfare system.

2.3 There is a proposed three pronged approach to the funding. Firstly a sheltered rent for those in sheltered and extra care housing; secondly local grant funding for short term and transitional supported housing, which will include supported housing for homeless people with support needs, domestic violence and people receiving support for drug and alcohol misuse; and thirdly a welfare system for long term supported housing.

2.4 The model seeks to meet the stated objectives by delivering a model for now and for the future; one focusses on outcomes and cost control and one that works with the modernised welfare system. These new funding regimes will come into effect April 2020 reflecting the views from the sector that earlier implementation would be hard to achieve. The consultation goes on to set out the models in much more detail. It was agreed at the Lancashire Lead Officers' meeting that a joint response would be prepared across Lancashire and this is attached at Appendix 1 for information.

4 RISK ASSESSMENT

4.1 The approval of this report may have the following implications:

- Resources – Future funding of supported accommodation in the borough.
- Technical, Environmental and Legal – Important any proposals are considered and consulted on.
- Political – The impact for Ribble Valley is reported.
- Reputation – Essential funding for supported housing remains.
- Equality & Diversity – Supported housing is essential provision for vulnerable households.

5 CONCLUSION

5.1 Accept the consultation feedback submitted and acknowledge the implications for supported housing delivery.

RACHAEL STOTT
HOUSING STRATEGY OFFICER

MARSHAL SCOTT
CHIEF EXECUTIVE

For further information please ask for Rachael Stott, extension 3235.

REF: RS/CMS/H&H/130318

Consultation on housing costs for short-term supported accommodation

Question 1: Do you agree with this definition? [Yes/No] Please comment

General Comments

We agree with the flexibility that the proposed definition provides for in terms of meeting a wide range of needs within a period of up to two years, or until suitable accommodation is found. (see comments regarding long-term and stable below). However, where individuals have the skills required to live independently, we would seek to ensure that they move on within a much shorter period than two years. We suggest that this is stressed in the guidance.

Whilst we recognise the difficulty of developing a definition which is sufficiently succinct, but also detailed enough to avoid ambiguity and confusion, one area in which we wish to request some further refinement is in the use of the term 'long-term stable accommodation'.

The phrase "long term" and "stable" is ambiguous, consequently it would be helpful to provide additional clarity to avoid a perception that the only acceptable move on pathways involve the offer of a tenancy within the local authority/social housing sector. This is very important in order to ensure that there is not bed blocking of services. People may move on to a wide ranging number of settings which are suitable including living with family, assured shorthold tenancies, long term supported accommodation and other destinations

Client Groups/Age

- Homeless Families
In relation to the client groups listed, we would suggest including a reference to homeless families.
- Mental health
We suggest using the definition in relation to mental health given on page 23 (people with mental ill health) instead of page 39 (people experiencing a mental health crisis), as the definition of page 23 is wider. However please note our further feedback on the inclusion of mental health services later in this response document.
- Other/No Recourse to Public Funds
More generally it would also be useful to define eligibility for services particularly in the case of 'Others'. Specifically it would be helpful to outline who is not eligible.

Under this new proposed funding regime for short term supported accommodation in which entitlement to housing benefit will not be an issue, is it the intention of government that services should be accessible to people without recourse to public funds? The new funding approach provides the potential to open up eligibility for the accommodation to those not entitled to housing benefits (notwithstanding any remaining issues around the need to obtain charitable resources to cover living expenses).

One of the most common occurrences where this issue has arisen is in the case of women fleeing domestic abuse without recourse to public funds pending any longer term decision around leave to remain. In some rare cases refuge providers have previously accommodated these clients through payment of rent from their own charitable resources.

In other services e.g. young people's services, there have occasionally been cases where young people from abroad, whose eligibility for benefit entitlement is not clear at the point of crisis, have had difficulties in gaining admission to short term supported housing. This is because of delays in assessment of child in need status and/or resolving concerns around the ability to claim housing benefit.

- Age
Clarification on any age range eligibility would be welcome. In particular a confirmation that any services are accessible to people aged 16 year olds and over would be useful.

Point 89

Can you please clarify the points being made in point 89 as it appears to be contradictory and it is unclear as to what is meant by soft support.

Type of services being transferred Specified/Supported

Funding for services being transferred as at 1/4/2020 - please clearly define which type of services will have their housing benefit funding included in the grant being paid to the local authority. Is this going to be solely based on those services recognised as being 'specified' under the current DWP definition?

Please provide clarity as to whether short term supported accommodation which has not been defined as specified will also be transferred (e.g. because the service does not meet the specified accommodation requirements in relation to the landlord, or due to the cost being within LHA levels which has led to housing benefit department not being aware of them). This might include private sector landlords running homeless hostels and some board and lodgings type services

This obviously has implications in terms of local mapping and identification by housing benefit departments on any software.

Long and Short Term

For some client groups there is a clear distinction between short and long term services, whilst for others the needs of the individuals make the distinction less clear.

We are assuming that it is the objective of the service which will determine its status, rather than occupancy by specific individuals who may, because of their particular needs, have remained in a service for a longer period than was expected.

Clarification around this issue would be helpful.

Our greatest concerns relate to mental health services as many services have moved from being a home for life to one which focusses on recovery. Due to the change in service model, we have schemes which include people with both assured tenancies and assured shorthold tenancies, and individuals receive support/intensive housing management for both short and long term periods depending on their individual needs.

Even where services have moved to a more recovery focussed approach and clients mostly have assured shorthold tenancies, people remain in services for more than two years either because of changes in their mental health or because of the difficulty of moving people on to suitable accommodation. This is likely to cause major problems in terms of funding arrangements.

We would suggest that consideration is given to including all mental health services within the welfare benefit system and not transferring them into the proposed short term supported housing funding system.

Types of Services which will be Eligible for Funding from 2020

At the moment the definition of services to be defined as short term accommodation based is fairly loose.

As we will be moving to a commissioning and contracting arrangement, is the intention that local authorities will have complete control over the organisations which are offered contracts e.g. private sector landlords?

Will there be any other restrictions imposed by the grant conditions or is the intention to give local authorities flexibility to meet local need within the broad definition of short term supported accommodation provided?

Specific Service Issues

- Supported Lodgings

Another service type which may require specific clarification in terms of eligibility for funding is supported lodgings for young people and emergency night stop placements (and excluding longer term Shared Lives placements and fostering placements).

Will these services meet the definition of short term services under the new funding regime?

Whilst supported lodgings were always treated as short term services under the Supporting People framework, there have been varying approaches (even within Lancashire) to determining if the service is specified

accommodation and therefore eligible for higher levels of housing benefit. This appears to be due to issues relating to the status of the host household

Where it has **not** been considered to be specified accommodation, service users have been required to claim universal credit and are subject to rent restrictions to the LHA rent level. This presents financial viability issues to some providers.

We recommend that the grant conditions clearly state that supported lodgings are recognised as a type of short term supported housing. Ideally some interim guidance to standardise the approach of housing benefit departments to the treatment of supported lodgings in 2018/19 would be welcome in order to resolve this long standing confusion and facilitate a successful conversion into the new funding regime.

- Bail Hostels

The inclusion of housing benefit funded bail hostels is also an area in which we would like to provide some brief feedback. Although we see no issues arising from inclusion of this type of provision in this new funding regime for short term services, the rationale for separating any existing oversight arrangements from those for the other Ministry of Justice funded bail hostels may be worth further consideration.

Question 2: What detailed design features would help to provide the necessary assurance that costs will be met?

Timing of calculation of funding to be transferred

More information is required regarding the process to be adopted when "lifting and shifting" from the housing benefit system to grant funding.

Will the level of funding reflect rent in payment at 31st March 2020? From recollection, when SP was introduced the pot was sized by having "golden" and "platinum" cuts. The "golden cut" facilitated the formulation of indicative grant allocations in the autumn of 2002, with final figures "the platinum cut" following in the summer of 2003. It is unclear from the consultation document if a similar process is being considered or if annual spend is being considered.

If the grant allocation does not reflect, as a minimum (see below), benefit being paid on 31st March 2020, services may be in operation for which funding is not provided to councils through the grant allocation.

Difference between funding being paid out and cost of service and resulting impact on ability to block contract for accommodation

Owing to a combination of factors including voids periods, non-entitlement, sanctions, partial entitlement for e.g. working clients, failure to submit or complete a successful claim or any other reason where these have not subsequently been backdated on appeal, we are concerned that the amount being paid when lifted at

April 2020 will not cover the full accommodation cost of the service and will have a detrimental effect on any ability to block contract for existing accommodation

Young people's services: The number of young people (16 and 17 year olds) who are Section 20 at the time of the "cut", and therefore not eligible for housing benefit, may not reflect the average figure over a normal 12 month period. The number of young people who are Section 20 is difficult to predict from year to year. Therefore the potential for a mismatch between housing benefit spend and the cost of the accommodation is probably greatest in young people's services. The net impact is that it is likely to have a significant impact on the funding transferred to the Council, and the sustainability of some services for young people.

Ring fence – We support the passporting of funding for short term supported accommodation

Longer Term funding/ Formula

We support the initial "lift and shift"; however it is unclear what funding will be available after 2020/21

We support the proposal to ensure that funding is based on an assessment of need. However, there is currently a lack of clarity regarding the mechanism to be used for estimating need and determining how funding will be distributed across England. It is unclear if there is an intention to develop a specific funding formula for short term supported housing.

In addition, whilst there are always challenges in seeking to ensure that funding levels reflect need, the potential difficulties have been exacerbated in the short term supported housing context as a result of the wide variation in responses to the removal of the supporting people ring fence, combined with rising demand and general funding restrictions.

In order to facilitate a full assessment of need for supported housing services and the associated funding requirements, we recommend that the needs assessment includes prevalence data in relation to the following:

- domestic abuse
- homelessness
- substance misuse
- mental health issues
- long-term limiting illness
- care leavers
- crime (victim and perpetrator)
- Index of Multiple Deprivation and its domains
- claimants of relevant benefits and credits

In addition, we welcome the enhanced monitoring and recording of need made possible by the new homelessness monitoring system introduced to support the implementation of the Homelessness Reduction Act.

There is a lack of consistency across the country in relation to the recording of homelessness in the PIE returns. Consequently, it is important that data from the new system is used instead of historical PIE which is likely to misrepresent levels of homelessness across the country. The levels of homelessness presentations/acceptances are likely to be higher if there are no support services.

In general, it is important to recognise the difference between demand data and needs data. We are seeking to ensure that any assessment would be based on an estimation of need rather than current demand. However, it should be recognised that when individuals are homeless or fleeing violence, multiple applications to services may be made.

Whilst we wish to see a comprehensive needs assessment, we recognise that a funding formula may have to be simplified as much as possible into a few key indicators of need, with appropriate weighting applied

Question 3:

a) Local authorities – do you already have a Supported Housing plan (or plan for it specifically within any wider strategies)? [Yes/No]

We currently don't have a plan in place, although supporting people commissioning plans for all client groups were in place up to 2015.

Some districts include supported housing provision within their Homelessness Strategy; however the level of detail in relation to needs and future planning varies considerably

b) Providers and others with an interest – does the authority (ies) you work with involve you in drawing up such plans? [Yes/No]

N/A

c) All - how would the Supported Housing plan fit with other plans or strategies (homelessness, domestic abuse, drugs strategies, Local Strategic Needs Assessments)?

Supported housing can contribute towards the delivery of a range of wider strategies and plans (e.g. homelessness, drugs strategies, mental health) by enabling people to develop the skills required to live independently or with less support.

It is envisaged that wider strategies and plans will inform the development of supported housing plans, and supported housing plans will in turn influence the development of those wider strategic plans.

In order to enable this to happen, it would be preferable for the governance of the planning of supported housing to be owned and included within wider strategic planning structures.

We would wish to ensure we maximise links with the Lancashire and South Cumbria Sustainability and Transformation Plan, Accountable Care Systems, Health and

Wellbeing Boards and other similar structures that work across Lancashire. Supported housing must be considered amongst plans to improve healthcare and should be a priority area for shared work between different local public services including co-commissioning, population health planning and preventative support.

Question 4:

a) Local authorities – do you already carry out detailed needs assessment by individual client group? [Yes/No]

We currently still collect client record and outcome data for supported housing services commissioned by LCC for young people, people fleeing violence, teenage parents and homeless household. In addition, we collect data on individuals who apply for services, but are either refused access, withdraw their application or are placed on waiting lists, so we can understand the level and nature of unmet demand.

Whilst prevalence data is collated and shown on the JSNA intelligence website and contract monitoring information and population profiling for some client groups is also collected by a range of commissioners (e.g. substance misuse), needs assessments are not currently undertaken for all client groups.

A specific DV JSNA was completed in June 2013 and some work has been undertaken in relation to needs of young people during 2016/ 2017.

b) Providers – could you provide local government with a detailed assessment of demand and provision if you were asked to do so? [Yes, both / Yes, demand only / Yes provision only /No]

All – is the needs assessment as described in the National Statement of Expectation achievable? [Yes/No]

The extent to which the expectation in relation to needs assessment is achievable depends on:

- whether the government wants a similar approach to be adopted across the country to enable comparison of levels of need, and
- the level of resources made available by government for implementation

Historically, there has been difficulty in developing approaches to assessing need for supported housing. Tools were developed under the SP framework which were adopted across a range of authorities (e.g. North West, London etc.). It would be useful to review the benefits and challenges of previous models, prior to issuing any guidance

Where assessments of need determine future funding allocations, it is important that there is some consistency in the approach being adopted, whilst also recognising the need for local flexibility to reflect the pattern of local organisations which may be responsible for collecting data

c) Please comment

Question 5: Do you agree with this approach? [Yes/No]. Please comment.

LCC Response

We support passing funding to upper tier authorities, subject to:

- funding being passed in full from DWP to local authorities,
- funding being made available for implementation
- appropriate consultation being undertaken in relation to any future funding formula and
- the implementation of any formula being undertaken in a reasonable manner.

We have concerns regarding the future funding for all types of services, in particular services for women at risk of domestic violence

District Response

“the upper tier needs to include the Districts” – needs to be strengthened, it must be recognised that this funding delivers the districts statutory duties and therefore the districts need to have equal joint decision making in place with LCC on commissioning and governance arrangements. Whilst the involvement of other agencies such as health is supported, the Districts have to have more of a voice in this than anyone else, especially taking into account the new duties under the Homeless Reduction Act.

Question 6: The draft National Statement of Expectation (see Section 4) published today sets out further detail on new oversight arrangements and the role of local authorities. We would welcome your views on the statement and suggestions for detailed guidance.

We welcome the development of the draft National Statement of Expectation for Supported Housing (housing costs)

Overall Expectations

We support

- the emphasis on the benefits of supported housing
- identifying three distinct segments: sheltered and extra care, short-term and transitional support and longer-term support
- links to the wider government strategies to ensure an integrated approach
- the objectives which have been detailed – meeting local needs, ensuring fair access, supporting collaborative working, promoting delivery to a decent standard and encouraging innovation in commissioning through a strategic approach
- the development of a partnership approach to the development of a local Supported Housing Strategic Plan – we support the involvement of a wide ranging group of statutory agencies and provider organisations
- the focus on value for money and delivery of good quality service

Short-Term Supported Accommodation

- Whilst we support the emphasis on enabling fair access, including where no local connection has been established, we are concerned that given the overall inadequate level of supply of provision across the country and the requirement for local people to have priority then there are likely to be significant practical difficulties in delivering this objective. Also see comments under Question 9.
- We support the focus on "move on" planning in the commissioning process and would seek to take a customised approach to setting outline target length of stays for each service which reflect the needs and complexity of service user needs but also enable timely move on. We recognise the difficulties which may arise in relation to moving people on who are working as they will be financially better off by staying in the supported accommodation and not paying rent
- We support the emphasis on transparency in reporting on spend and delivery and the annual reporting against delivery for short-term accommodation (including length of stay, types of providers and need). Whilst we support the idea of gathering data on cross border arrangements, collating data on numbers of people exiting the local area is likely to be difficult unless this information is supplied by the receiving organisation (as happened in the anonymised client record data under Supporting People)

Question 7: Do you currently have arrangements in place on providing for those with no local connection? [Yes/No] If yes what are your arrangements?

Some of the current supported housing contracts include a prioritisation framework which gives priority to people from Lancashire, whilst other contracts, such as those for refuges, do not have any local connections provisions. See comments below under Question 9.

Question 8: How can we help to ensure that local authorities are able to commission both accommodation and associated support costs in a more aligned and strategic way? Do you have further suggestions to ensure this is achieved?

We would welcome guidance and training on procuring accommodation and support, including how such services may be packaged (accommodation separate from support or together with support) Procuring services where the accommodation is owned by organisations which are also seeking to provide support is challenging given that there is an inherent potential conflict of interest. Landlords understandably seek to minimise business risk or seek to secure benefits from their assets, whilst commissioners seek to procure the best provider of support for the service being commissioned and a level playing field for bidders

By combining housing and support funding, there is the potential for securing improved value for money and developing a more strategic approach to supported

housing provision. However, through reducing the range of funding streams available and having one organisation commissioning all services, there is also the risk of creativity and innovation being inhibited and the range of options available to service users being reduced.

Consequently, we would welcome any guidance or examples of good practice in relation to:

- working collaboratively with strategic partners to jointly commission and procure services, which would enable us to meet our objectives of achieving value for money, whilst also promoting creativity and flexibility;
- commissioning accommodation and support.

Question 9: How will you prepare for implementation in 2020, and what can the Government do to facilitate this?

We have identified the following tasks which will need to be completed before 2020:

- Mapping of current provision which will be eligible to be transferred.
- Mapping of spend and impact on financial viability of services
- Needs assessment
- Development of supported housing plan
- Development of governance arrangements
- Review of approach to procurement to include procurement of accommodation and support services
- Review of contracts – to include development of contracts for block purchasing of accommodation and other contracts where we wish to vary the existing support contract with a landlord provider to include the accommodation element.
- Establish systems to facilitate reporting to DCLG

We would welcome guidance on the following:

- Detailed information on criteria for inclusion of services as 'short term supported accommodation' in the transfer of funding (required in 2018/19)
- Approach to mapping of spend for services will be included in the transfer of funding
- Procurement of accommodation and support services, including guidance from the Office of Government Commerce (OGC) in relation to the need to vary existing contracts to include accommodation costs. This may require variations of more than 50%
- Needs assessment
- Assessment of core rents and service charges.
- Guidance for new build in terms of acceptable future rent levels, as there are concerns about the impact of high rent levels on a fixed grant .
- Where specialist services exist within a local area which results in people seeking to move on the supported accommodation in the same area, there is the potential for increased funding pressures locally. Can guidance please be provided on collaboration between authorities and pooling of resources

Exemption from the Shared Accommodation Room Rate

We would also like to request that the DWP reviews the exemptions from the shared accommodation room rate for single people moving out of supported accommodation. People leaving all forms of supported housing (including people who are under 25 years old) are likely to have needs which would impact on their ability to share general needs accommodation, and therefore effects their ability to move on from supported housing. This has a negative impact on the individual and impacts on value for money as supported housing is being utilised by people who could move on to live in the community.

The entitlement to an exemption is currently linked to having lived in a 'hostel', where the accommodation is not self-contained. We think that the exemption should be expanded to include supported housing more generally.

Many supported housing schemes are now partially or fully self -contained. It is often designed this way to facilitate internal move on progression from fully shared crisis bed rooms to final stage self- contained accommodation prior to move on into independent accommodation. Therefore under a rigid enforcement of the 'hostel' rule a resident of a crisis bed at our new purpose built supported accommodation for single homeless people in Lancaster would be eligible for an exemption when moving out but a resident of a final stage self -contained flat in the same building would not be entitled to an exemption. Consequently, the current definition mitigates against effective move on planning and might be a deterrent to allowing residents to have the opportunity to test out more independent living prior to moving out.

We would like to request that in the interests of meeting individual needs and supporting planned move on that the DWP reviews the exemption criteria wording around 'hostel'

Question 10: What suggestions do you have for testing and/or piloting the funding model?

In order to test out the particular issues which occur within a two tier setting, we suggest that two tier authorities are involved with this pilot.

Question 11 If you have any further comments on any aspects of our proposals for short-term supported housing, please could you state them here.

We recognise the removal of short term supported housing services from the welfare benefit environment enables:

- Clients to secure employment without putting their housing at risk, and there would be reduced risk of access being refused or eviction because of issues

relating to payment of rent. In addition, when working clients can save for deposits/furniture/ other move on expenses

- Local authorities to have greater control over the development and cost of supported housing,
- Providers to reduce the time spent in dealing with benefit claims and gives them greater certainty regarding income levels

However, we have concerns regarding the medium to long term availability of funding for services and the significant cost of implementation for local authorities.

Consequently, we support passing funding to upper tier authorities, subject to:

- funding being passed in full from DWP to local authorities,
- funding being made available for implementation
- appropriate consultation being undertaken in relation to any future funding formula and
- the implementation of any formula being undertaken in a reasonable manner.

Whilst we have concerns regarding the future funding for all types of services, we do have particular issues regarding the funding of services for women at risk of domestic violence as outlined in the attached letters recently sent by Lancashire County Council to Sajid Javid and David Gauk.



Letter to Sajid
David.pdf



Letter to David
Gauke.pdf

RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL REPORT TO HEALTH & HOUSING COMMITTEE

Agenda Item No. 11

meeting date: THURSDAY, 15 MARCH 2018
 title: HOME IMPROVEMENT AGENCY – HOMEWISE MONITORING INFORMATION
 submitted by: MARSHAL SCOTT – CHIEF EXECUTIVE
 principal author: RACHAEL STOTT – HOUSING STRATEGY OFFICER

1 PURPOSE

1.1 To inform Committee of the service delivery provided by the Home Improvement Agency for the past 6 months.

1.2 Relevance to the Council's ambitions and priorities:

- Community Objectives - }
- Corporate Priorities - } To address the housing needs of the borough.
- Other Considerations - }

2 BACKGROUND

2.1 The Home Improvement Agency provides a wide variety of assistance to vulnerable households. Appendix 1 sets out the monitoring report from April 2017 to December 2017.

3 RISK ASSESSMENT

3.1 The approval of this report may have the following implications:

- Resources – The Home Improvement Agency is provided by funding from LCC and a grant from the Council.
- Technical, Environmental and Legal – The work enables vulnerable households to live independently.
- Political – The agency can provide assistance to the most vulnerable households in the borough.
- Reputation – The feedback from service users is very positive.
- Equality & Diversity – The service is available to households with children or vulnerable adults.

4 CONCLUSION

4.1 That Committee accept the contents of the report and acknowledge the valuable work delivered by Homewise in the borough.

RACHAEL STOTT
HOUSING STRATEGY OFFICER

MARSHAL SCOTT
CHIEF EXECUTIVE

For further information please ask for Rachael Stott, extension 3235.

REF: RS/CMS/H&H/130318

INTEGRATED HOME IMPROVEMENT SERVICES - MONITORING INFORMATION	2017
DISTRICT - RIBBLE VALLEY	April to December
Total number of enquiries, resulting in:	673
Number of Core Completed Jobs including Fundraising/Value of work	32
Advice and support only	22
Number of Handyperson jobs/Rep Off Homecare/Security	
Handyperson jobs	52
Security	18
Repair Officers - Homecare full costs	23
Affordable Warmth	34
Number of minor adaptations (non structural) completed (as listed below)	132
Joinery/Plumbing	8
Bannister rails	111
Landing rails	12
Floor/ceiling pole	1
Number of minor adaptations (structural) completed (as listed below)	
Steps/Other	28
Outside rails	82
Number of Trusted Assessor HHA carried out	57
Number of Recycled Aids sold	39
Memory Matters - number of people/families supported	22
TOTALS	673

Client satisfaction - Ribble Valley - 100% reponses

94.44%

5.56%

PREVENTION/ADDITIONAL SERVICES AND SUPPORT

Benefit checks/fundraising for repairs/improvements - **enable people to continue to live independently**

Amount of funding raised **£21,389.00**

Amount of increase in benefits: **£99,857.80**

Recycling of Disability Aids - Keeping people safe at an affordable price

East Lancashire Service

Items sold:	488
Hyndburn	249
Ribble Valley	39
Rosendale	27
Burnley	29
Pendle	8
other	136

Memory Matters - supporting people living with Dementia and their carers

Helped:	197
Hyndburn	85
Ribble Valley	22
Rosendale	18
Burnley	37
Pendle	35

In addition in order to promote our services - **see list of presentation, exhibitions, drop in sessions etc**
Information is also provided to: Health Centres, Doctors surgeries, community centres, Residential Home

See Just a Normal Day in Ribble Valley:

Case studies and client comments

Number of Completed jobs	Value of work
32	£29,765.00
93	£3,278.98
34	£1,765.00
	£11,960.32
110	£23,190.00
269	£69,959.30

found the service Excellent
found the service Very Good

y in their own home

c., attended
s etc.,

HEALTH & WELLBEING PARTNERSHIP

Meeting Date: Wednesday, 10 January 2018 at 3.00pm

PRESENT:	Councillor B Hilton – Chairman	Mark Beveridge
	Councillor S Brunskill	Colin Hirst
	Councillor M Fenton	
	Councillor R Newmark	

	AGENDA ITEM	ACTION
1	<p><u>Apologies</u></p> <p>Apologies were received from Councillor S Bibby, Phil Mileham, Chris Lee and Marshal Scott.</p>	
2	<p><u>Minutes</u></p> <p>The minutes of the meeting held 2 October 2017 were approved as a true record.</p>	
3	<p><u>Update on the Lancashire Health and Wellbeing Board</u></p> <p>i) Bridget reported that, prior to the last board meeting, a workshop had been held considering the wider determinants of ill health and related issues, including unemployment, apprenticeships, air quality, affordable housing, reducing poverty, economic development across Lancashire, and skills and lifelong learning.</p> <p>ii) Bridget reported on health and wellbeing improvements markers that have been considered, by reference to school ???? for children, mental health and wellbeing for children and young people and self-harm in the 10 – 20 age group. Issues had also been considered relating to self-care and the need to attend the correct level of medical care – eg pharmacist, GP or accident and emergency department, as well as prevention related issues including alcohol problems, road safety and social isolation (including support for independent living).</p> <p>Members considered the role of voluntary services in supporting individuals, and it was suggested that Paul Gott, the Care Navigator, be invited to the next meeting.</p> <p>iii) Bridget reported on the receipt of a letter by Jeff/Geoff Driver, Leader of Lancashire County Council, from the Health Secretary and the Communities Secretary, expressing concern about Lancashire County Council figures for delayed discharge from hospital, and the failure of hospitals across Lancashire to meet targets, which could result in the reduction of financial support for Better Care Funding.</p> <p>iv) The board had received the Safeguarding Board Annual Report relating to children and vulnerable adults. Police figures for the number of vulnerable adults increased by 30%, including those subject to honour based violence and domestic violence.</p>	

	<p>v) The board have received a report to agree the way forward for the Lancashire Health and Wellbeing Strategy. Bridget considered that this would be of use in the Ribble Valley Local Delivery Plan.</p> <p>vi) Bridget circulated a paper on Winter Pressures and Preparation, and the health profile of the Ribble Valley.</p>	
5	<p><u>Update on the Lancashire County Council Health Scrutiny Committee</u></p> <p>Bridget reported that the committee had received a full and informative presentation from the North West Ambulance Service. Members discussed the pressures to which this service was subject.</p>	
5	<p><u>Update on Lancashire County Council Children's Services Scrutiny Committee</u></p> <p>Stella reported on the Service Offer prepared by the Children and Family Wellbeing Service, offering support to children, young people and their families across Lancashire.</p> <p>An issue had been flagged up with regard to the lack of secure accommodation for children from the county, with families having to travel hundreds of miles, or children being remanded into adult care.</p> <p>A problem had been identified in recruitment, training and retention of Social Workers.</p> <p>In the Ribble Valley, an issue had been identified with regard to the misuse of youth shelters and Members remarked on the lack of Police supervision and reliance on the voluntary sector. Members also remarked on the concerning issue of acceptance of drug use by some parents in the Ribble Valley.</p>	
6	<p><u>Children and Young People's Partnership Board</u></p> <p>i) Mark Beveridge reported that the current indication from Lancashire County Council was that they will no longer be able to provide support to the Hyndburn, Ribble Valley and Rossendale Board, from April 2018, when funding would be removed for administrative support. It was established that this problem fell outside the remit of the East Lancashire Health and Wellbeing Partnership, but could be an issue to be taken to the Lancashire County Council Health and Wellbeing Board as the strategic body involved.</p> <p>Mark reported that, as matters stood, the Partnership Board would disband at the end of March 2018. Bridget suggested that the Ribble Valley Local Delivery Plan should reflect the services which are not being provided. It was suggested that Kathy Ashworth or Nighat Parveen (respectively the East Lancs Senior Manager and the Hyndburn, Ribble Valley and Rossendale Locality Manager of the Children and Family Wellbeing Service) be invited to the next but one meeting of this partnership.</p> <p>ii) Mark reported on the success of the Up and Active service, for which East Lancashire Local Authorities had a contract with Lancashire County Council for delivery of services, locally led</p>	

	<p>through Pendle Leisure Trust. The three year contract was due to expire in April 2019 – Pendle Leisure Trust were to negotiate with Lancashire County Council to seek to adopt the option of a two year extension.</p> <p>iii) Mark reported that Pennine Lancashire (the Borough Councils of Ribble Valley, Hyndburn, Burnley, Pendle and Rossendale, together with Blackburn with Darwen Council) had successfully applied to be one of the 12 pilot areas for the Sport England Places for People programme. Nationwide, £100,000,000 was available for the scheme with pilot schemes of different sizes. In Pennine Lancashire 37,000 people had been identified as experiencing mental health or issues to merit support through the scheme. It was not known how many of these people were Ribble Valley residents.</p>	
7	<p><u>Dementia Friendly Borough Council</u></p> <p>Colin reported that two working group meetings had been held, but the outcome was to be reported to Health and Housing Committee with a headline framework to move forward, and that dementia work related to the Council would be overseen by the Health and Wellbeing Partnership. Work would need to be done to achieve the objectives of the framework.</p> <p>It was reported that Kirsty Hamer, who had been the Locality Manager with East Lancs CCG, had moved to a new secondment and that her replacement due to be appointed later in the winter or early in the spring had specific experience in dementia work, and would work with the Council in its progress to be a dementia friendly Council.</p> <p>Bridget reported that Dr Hussain, the GP lead in the Ribble Valley on Dementia, was to meet her and Colin.</p>	
8	<p><u>District Council Network Application</u></p> <p>Colin informed Members that a report had been submitted to the District Council's Network, including reference to the Ribblesdale Community Partnership. The good progress in this respect may be highlighted nationally.</p>	
9	<p><u>Local Delivery Plan</u></p> <p>Colin reported the work had been carried out by Joseph Hildred, based on the health audit, before he left the authority. Work was ongoing. Bridget suggested that this item be included at future meetings of the Partnership.</p>	
10	<p><u>Review of Membership and Terms of Reference of the Ribble Valley Health and Wellbeing Partnership</u></p> <p>Colin advised that, if revision of the Terms of Reference was required, it would need to be considered by Health and Housing Committee. Bridget and he would review the Terms of Reference in advance of the next meeting of the Partnership.</p> <p>Bridget queried whether membership of the Partnership should include the Leader and/or Deputy Leader of the Council. There was also discussions on the interests to be represented, including children, elderly</p>	

	<p>and vulnerable adults and a community representative.</p> <p>It was reported that Phil Mileham was due to retire in March 2019, and would need to be replaced on the Partnership.</p>	
11	<p><u>Health Fair</u></p> <p>Bridget had been approached by the Chair of the Clitheroe Rotary Club to establish if the Borough Council would take a lead in organisation of a Health Fair in Clitheroe in 2019, with organisations and businesses offering health services, could promote their services on the streets or in an accessible venue, in a similar approach to the Food Festival. This would include offering tests on aspects of health (such as blood tests, weight tests and blood pressure checks) and promotion of services and products. Bridget had advised that it was not her position to reach any decision.</p> <p>The Partnership considered that, whilst the Borough Council could attend ??? officer ???, it was not viable or the right time for the Council to take a lead on such a project.</p>	
12	<p><u>Meeting Pattern for 2018</u></p> <p>There was discussion of the proposed date in mid-February for the next meeting, the lead into the Health and Housing Committee meeting scheduled for 15 March 2018. It was suggested that the next meeting after that be held in the week commencing 9 April 2018.</p>	
	<p>The meeting closed at 5.30pm.</p>	

RIBBLE VALLEY HEALTH & WELLBEING PARTNERSHIP

Meeting Date: Monday, 19 February 2018 at 3.00pm

PRESENT:	Councillor B Hilton – Chairman	Mark Beveridge
	Councillor S Brunskill	Colin Hirst
	Councillor M Fenton	Phil Mileham
	Councillor M Robinson	Dianne Hartley
		Jayne Lowthion

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE: Paul Gott – Community Connector

	AGENDA ITEM	ACTION
1	<p><u>Apologies</u></p> <p>Apologies were received from Councillors S Bibby, R Newmark, Marshal Scott and Chris Lee</p>	
2	<p><u>Presentation by Paul Gott</u></p> <p>Paul explained the role of Community Connectors, which is an organisation which covers the whole area of the East Lancashire CCG. He and his two colleagues (all of whom work part-time) receive referrals for the Hyndburn and Ribble Valley area, primarily from GP's or related agencies, or on self-referral. The aim is to enable people with any type of difficulty (physical, mental health, including anxiety) to connect with the community at large. This could be by way of engagement with groups or arrangement of support including attendances at agencies providing support.</p> <p>Outcomes include the development of positivity for participants, and engagement in the wider community. Connectors would support people in attendance at known groups, or they would attend and vet groups to whom referral had not taken place previously.</p> <p>Ideally, the first approach was a home visit, but any quiet location could be suitable. The service was for over 18's only. The Connectors would try to make initial contact within 48 hours and meet within one week. They could also refer for support within the home (eg with Carers Link or Hyndburn Homewise.)</p> <p>Paul answered queries, accepting that there can be particular issues in Ribble Valley with isolation and transport. Neighbours in rural areas tend to know each other better than neighbours in urban areas. Out of 273 referrals in Hyndburn and Ribble Valley since June 2017, very few came from rural areas and most had been from Hyndburn. The rural issues included genuine isolation – eg where children had moved out and people wanted to do something, having previously been fully focussed on their children. The Connectors had spent 2 days at Slaidburn Health Centre when it was busy with flu jabs, and spoken to a lot of people on those days, but no referrals had ensued. Getting word out about the service was important. More medical referrals had come from the integrated neighbourhood teams than from the GP's themselves.</p> <p>Community Connectors would seek to support and identify the most appropriate source of non-medical help. This could include support with Asbrac or Transforming Lives where there was Police involvement.</p>	

	<p>They considered that 60% of their work was with over 55's. People in their 30's or 40's might present with anxiety or mental health issues, having passed through a large number of support schemes.</p> <p>The Community Connectors were happy to make presentations to organisations or groups with regard to their services.</p> <p>Paul was thanked for his presentation.</p>	
3	<p><u>Minutes</u></p> <p>The minutes of the meeting held on the 10 January 2018 were approved as a true record. Jayne explained that she was not an expert on dementia. Mary advised that she was taking on some responsibility with regard to the Health Fair in 2019.</p>	
4	<p><u>Review of Membership and Terms of Reference of Ribble Valley Health and Wellbeing Partnership</u></p> <p>Colin advised that the Terms of Reference had last been reviewed in 2015. The Terms of Reference reflected the current activity of the Partnership, and were wide enough to allow all partners to attend. This partnership covered the whole borough, including Longridge and Blackburn affiliated areas which were not covered by the work of the Ribblesdale Community Partnership.</p> <p>Bridget expressed a concern that Health and Wellbeing is changing with strategic policies being encouraged which extended into areas covered by other committees of the Council then Health and Housing. Colin explained that widening the scope of the partnership would involve review of governance of the Council in relation to committee responsibilities if there was accountability to other committees than Health and Housing.</p> <p>Bridget responded that the leadership of the Council was considering amendment of the committee title to Wellbeing and Housing to reflect the current emphasis. She also reported that health remained one of the leader's top priorities.</p> <p>The question of a Local Delivery Plan was then considered. Phil explained that the Ribblesdale Community Partnership had worked up a delivery plan with regard to their services. This covered the basic issues required for a delivery plan for the Health and Wellbeing Partnership. Colin explained the undesirability of having multiple plans, and that he would be meeting contacts at Preston CCG and would like to establish contact with Blackburn with Darwen in this respect.</p> <p>The current Terms of Reference were to be circulated for consideration prior to the next meeting.</p>	SB
5	<p><u>Update on Lancashire Health and Wellbeing Board</u></p> <p>Bridget reported on the expansion of the Board to include the Directors of Children's Services and Old People's Services and the Police. She explained the current hierarchy from the STP through the individual Health and Wellbeing Partnerships.</p>	

	<p>The majority of the recent meeting had focussed on the report by Ofsted and the CQC into Children's Services, which had been damning. Both in respect of Children's Services in general and the Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service (CAMS), it had been considered that LCC and the CCG's addressed issues from the viewpoint of their own structures rather than putting children and families first. A plan was required to be prepared and submitted to Ofsted and the CQC. An interim Director of Children's Service had been appointed.</p> <p>Bridget reported that LCC had carried out improvements with regard to delayed discharge from hospital, and therefore avoided the imposition of the fine threatened by the Health Secretary and the Communities Secretary.</p> <p>There had been approximately £2m slippage in LCC better care funding.</p>	
6	<p><u>Update on Lancashire County Council Health Scrutiny Committee</u></p> <p>The meeting had considered the Ofsted/CQC report. There had also been the reduction in sexual health funding. Bridget considered this to be a particular issue for rural young people in small communities, and had spoken against this.</p>	
7	<p><u>Update on LCC Children's Services Scrutiny Committee</u></p> <p>Stella reported on the embarrassment felt when discussing the Ofsted/CQC report. She reported that funding was targeted at the urban areas, and she considered there should be specific providers in the Ribble Valley to meet the needs of the community, querying whether some family service could be introduced into the heart of Clitheroe.</p> <p>She reported on further issues, including difficulty in recruitment and retention of social workers; lack of office accommodation; and a lack of secure accommodation in Lancashire for Young Offenders. Since the effective demise of the Children and Young People's Partnership Boards, there was no input or comment from teachers, and nurses were no longer in place in specialist schools.</p>	
8	<p><u>Update on Children and Young People's Partnership Board</u></p> <p>Mark had no update, as there had been no meeting since Christmas. Lancashire County Council had given no indication that funding would continue. The meeting which had been pencilled in for March would not proceed if the board was to be abolished. (Concern was expressed that Stella had been appointed to the Lancashire County Council Children's Scrutiny Committee by this Partnership Board.)</p> <p>Mark also remarked that the Up and Active team at Ribble Valley Borough Council would be interested in participation in the Health Fair, although their funding was currently due to expire on 31 March 2019.</p>	
9	<p><u>Update on Ribblesdale Community Partnership</u></p> <p>Phil reported on the operation of the Partnership over 14 months. They had considered the priorities for the locality, and had already achieved some successes.</p> <p>It included older people, children's services, living well and healthy, and</p>	

	<p>joined up care and support. There was still no specific funding for the Partnership.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the older population, children and young families were a priority. There was no local access to support services for people with regard to alcohol, drug, abuse or other issues. The Foundation for Ribble Valley Families had been requested to analyse local needs. They had contacted local schools and identified problems with access to services locally. They had suggested the development of a Ribble Valley Families Hub, but there was a difficulty in identifying a suitable and accessible property.</p> <p>Locations were discussed, including problems with certain properties that had been suggested, and other locations were put forward to Phil.</p> <p>Phil was also concerned with regard to the problems in drug and alcohol services and sexual health services locally. He had responded critically to the decision to withdraw Inspire from Clitheroe, and had met Chris Lee to discuss the GP's views on the lack of local service.</p>	
10	<p><u>LCC Dementia Strategy</u></p> <p>This had been circulated for members' information.</p>	
11	<p><u>Ribble Valley Borough Council as a Dementia Friendly Council</u></p> <p>Colin advised on the plan which had been put forward to Health and Housing Committee, and that, on analysis, it appeared that Ribble Valley Borough Council was possible further on the route to becoming a Dementia Friendly Council than had initially been perceived.</p>	
12	<p><u>Other Business</u></p> <p>Diane Hartley explained that the Emotional Care in Schools Service (organised by LCC through Lancaster University) had engaged with 5 of the 6 high schools in the Ribble Valley to deliver training to teachers, with regard to awareness of issues for students. She would also liaise with Colin on the multi-agency partnership being developed by LCC with regard to suicide prevention. She told members that the 2 year review of the contracts with regard to sexual health services was taking place.</p>	
13	<p>The next meeting was to be held in the week commencing 9 April 2018.</p>	

The meeting closed at 4.48pm.