

Leeds City Council Scrutiny Support

CALL IN REQUEST

Date of decision publication: **25th June 2021**

Delegated decision ref: N/A

Executive Board Minute no: **Minute 25**

Decision description: **Adults & Health Service Review 6 - Care Delivery: Care Homes, Post Consultation Recommendations Report**

.....
.....

Discussion with Decision Maker:

Prior to submitting a Call In, a nominated signatory must first contact the relevant officer or Executive Member to discuss their concerns and their reasons for wanting to call in the decision. Part of this discussion must include the Member ascertaining the financial implications of requesting a Call In.

Please identify contact and provide detail.

- Director/author of delegated decision report.
- Executive Board Member

Detail of discussion (to include financial implications)

Cllr Caroline Anderson had a conversation with Cllr Fiona Venner (Executive Board Member for Adult and Children’s Social Care and Health Partnerships) and Cath Roff (Director of Adults and Health) on 30th June 2021, during which she outlined her concerns regarding the decision, which included the impact on service users, the scale of opposition to the proposals and what this said about the weight attached to the consultation, whether the full range of options for alternative sources of savings were considered, and the loss of convenient access to the care homes for local people and their carers.

Cllr Anderson was informed that there would be no financial implications arising from a delay to the decision being implemented, on the timescales envisaged for holding a call-in meeting.

Leeds City Council Scrutiny Support

Reasons for Call In:

All requests for Call In must detail why, in the opinion of the signatories, the decision was not taken in accordance with the principles set out in Article 13 of the Council constitution (decision making) (principles of decision making) or where relevant issues do not appear to be taken into consideration. *Please tick the relevant box(es) and give an explanation.*

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Proportionality (ie the action must be proportionate to the desired outcome)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Due consultation and the taking of professional advice from officers
<input type="checkbox"/>	Respect for human rights
<input type="checkbox"/>	A presumption in favour of openness
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Clarity of aims and desired outcomes
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	An explanation of the options considered and details of the reasons for the decision
<input type="checkbox"/>	Positive promotion of equal opportunities
<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural justice

Explanation

Whilst accepting the financial challenge faced by the Council, in the opinion of the signatories, the decision to close Richmond House and Home Lea House care homes has placed budgetary concerns above the personal impact on vulnerable older people using these facilities and will have a disproportionate impact on the local care offer.

We do not accept the premise in the report that if the care homes were not closed, “Adult Social Care would be required to find the financial savings elsewhere, which could only be achieved through considerable further reduction of funding to other directly provided or commissioned service provision.” (Paragraph 81). It is arguably a choice to decide that Adult Social Care should contribute a certain proportion of savings to the Council’s overall budget strategy, and the Council could have instead chosen to find additional savings from other departments’ budgets, such as the Leeds 2023 culture monies. Scrutiny may wish to consider whether the department fully considered this as an alternative viable option.

We also have questions regarding the meaningfulness of the “due consultation” carried out and the Council’s response to it. The results of the consultation are stark and demonstrate the strength of local feeling on the matter: 141 separate submissions were received, and three petitions, one opposing the closure of Richmond House (1,178 signatures), the other opposing the closure of Home Lea House (1,248 signatures) and a petition from Trade Union GMB Members (390 signatures). The report says that “the vast majority of respondents are strongly against the proposed closures of both care homes and would want the financial savings to be found elsewhere.” The Council appears not to have varied its proposals at all as a result of this feedback, which raises questions over how much weight is attached to the consultation process in practice.

The report repeats several times that the proposals to close Home Lea House and Richmond House “will not reduce or remove the care of our most vulnerable people now or in the future...” We would question the clarity of this statement. The report points to other facilities that residents could access, however this does not acknowledge the convenience of local access to quality care homes and the impact on partners and carers who may not be able to travel further distances for visits. In any event there will surely be some degree of impact on access to the city’s care offer if these homes are closed.

For the reasons noted above, we would ask that scrutiny look further into this matter and consider if the right balance has been struck between achieving financial savings and the inevitable disruptive impact on users of these care homes if they close.

Leeds City Council Scrutiny Support

A Call In request may be made by a **minimum** of:

5 non-executive Members of council from the **same political group**;

or;

2 non-executive Members of council if **they are not from the same political group**.

This Call In request should be submitted to Scrutiny Support, 1st Floor West, Civic Hall by 5.00pm by no later than the fifth working day after the decision publication date. The following signatories (**original signatures only**) request that the above decision be called in.

Nominated Signatory

Caroline Anderson.

Print name Councillor Caroline Anderson
Political Group Conservative Group

Signature

Amanda Carter.

Print name Councillor Amanda Carter
Political Group Conservative Group

Signature

S Seary

Print name Councillor Simon Seary
Political Group Conservative Group

Signature

T Smith

Print name Councillor Trish Smith
Political Group Conservative Group

Signature

Dawn Seary

Print name Councillor Dawn Seary
Political Group Conservative Group

Leeds City Council Scrutiny Support

Signature.....

Print name

Political Group.....

Signature.....

Print name

Political Group.....

Signature.....

Print name

Political Group.....

Signature.....

Print name

Political Group.....

Signature.....

Print name

Political Group.....

Signature.....

Print name

Political Group.....

Leeds City Council Scrutiny Support

For office use only: (box A)

Received on behalf of the Head of Democratic Services by:
.....Angela Brogden.....(signature)

Date: 1st July 2021 Time: 10.45 am SSU ref: 2021/22-25/75

For office use only: (box B)

Exemption status checked:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Call In authorised: Yes
Date checked:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Signed: Angela Brogden
Signatures checked:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Date: 1 st July 2021
Receipts given:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Validity re article 13	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	