Committee Ref:

REF: HSCRG/05/21

Notice of Meeting

Scrutiny Health and Social Care Review Group

Date	:	Tuesday, 04 May 2021
Time	:	18:00
Place	:	Virtual meeting via*Skype .
Councillors	:	Agbley (Chair), Adrees, Campbell, Donelon, Pedersen, Petts, Roche, Underwood
Co-Opted Members	:	Pat Lattimer (Healthwatch Luton) Stephanie Power (Healthwatch Luton)
Quorum:		3 Members

Contact Officer: Bert Siong (01582 546781)

Email bert.siong@luton.gov.uk

Skype Meeting Link

PURPOSE

To discharge Luton Council's powers under the Local Authority (Public Health, Health and Wellbeing Boards and Health Scrutiny) Regulations 2013, to ensure that the planning, provision and operation of health and social care services for Luton residents are in their best interest and to advise/ make recommendations to inform and enhance decision-making on any matters affecting these services.

***SKYPE:** During the Covid 19 emergency period, this meeting will take place virtually, via Skype. To access the meeting, please click on the link to the meeting above**.**

AGENDA

Agenda Item	*Subject*	*Page No.*
1	**Apologies for Absence**	
2	**Minutes**	
	1. Minutes - 3 March 2021	**1 - 14**
3	**Disclosures of Interest**	

Members are reminded that they must disclose both the existence and nature of any disclosable pecuniary interest and any personal interest that they have in any matter to be considered at the meeting unless the interest is a sensitive interest in which event they need not disclose the nature of the interest.
A member with a disclosable pecuniary interest must not further participate in any discussion of, vote on, or take any executive steps in relation to the item of business.
A member with a personal interest, which a member of the public with knowledge of the relevant facts would reasonably regard as so significant that it is likely to prejudice the member's judgment of the public interest, must similarly not participate in any discussion of, vote on, or take any executive steps in relation to the item of business.
Disclosable pecuniary interests and Personal Interests are defined in the Council's Code of Conduct for Members and Co-opted members.

4 **Urgent Business**

The Chair to report on any business which is considered to be urgent and which should be discussed at the meeting in accordance with Section 100B(4)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972 and to determine when, during the meeting, any such business should be discussed.

5 **References from committees and other bodies**

6 Chair's Update

Chair to report on issues since the last meeting.

Reports

7 Public Health Grant Annual Allocation 15 - 17

(Report of the Director of Public Health)

8 Contain Outbreak Management Fund 2021-22 18 - 26

(Report of the Director of Public Health)

Information Items

None

9 Local Government Act 1972, Part VA

To consider whether to pass a resolution under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 to exclude the public from the meeting during consideration of any item listed above if it is likely that if members of the public were present during those items there would be disclosure to them of exempt information falling within the Paragraphs of Part1 of Schedule12A to the Local Government Act 1972.

Luton

Item No:
2.1

Health and Social Care Review Group Meeting

Minutes
3 March 2021 at 6.00 pm

Present:

Councillor Agbley (Chair), Councillors Donelon, Pedersen, Petts, Roche and Underwood

Co-optees Present:

Pat Lattimer (Healthwatch- Luton)
Stephanie Power (Healthwatch Luton)

14. Apology for Absence (Ref: 1)

Resolved: An apology for absence from the meeting was received on behalf of Councillor Campbell.

15. Minutes (Ref 2.1)

That the minutes of the meetings of the committee held on 4 January 2021 and 14 January 2021 be taken as read, approved as correct records and signed by the Chair in due course.

16. Covid-19 Update Report (Ref: 7)

The Director of Public Health presented the report on Covid-19 update (Ref: 7). She advised that following the publication of the report, the position in Luton had noticeably improved, with case numbers declining to 174 per 100k of population. Positivity rate had also fallen to 6.5%, which was good, but still higher than wanted. The target figure was 3%.

She said that there was positive news from the government about the road map out of lockdown, showing the importance of testing and vaccination. Luton had been proactive supporting the testing with provisions of the PCR test centres and the rapid lateral flow test sites. Luton was also making a significant new offer to distribute and collect rapid tests to and from people's homes. Luton had also applied to provide more test places to monitor tests.

In terms of secondary schools, she said children would be offered three rapid tests before returning to schools and thereafter be offered two tests per week. Staff would also have access to home rapid tests.

Tests would be offered at testing centres or in the home twice a week for all people. The existing testing bus would also be kitted and deployed to provide a mobile capacity, an extra service, as part of the partnership effort.

She advised that CCG colleagues would speak on vaccination.

Dealing with members' questions and comments, the Director of Public Health provided further clarification and explanation, as set out below.

In relation to the number of cases and positivity rate, she said 174 per 100k of population was an improvement, but needed to come down further. She added that the message remained the same and people still needed to follow the existing guidance about washing their hands, not touching their faces and keeping their safe space from other people, even if vaccinated and after easing of the lockdown. Case numbers could easily go back up if not.

She further said that it was important that people get themselves tested and isolate if tested positive. The Council was looking at what further support could be provided to people to help with isolation and at taking on more responsibility to extend its successful contact-tracing offer. As case numbers go down, Luton Public Health could track and trace better that the national provision.

She re-iterated the main message about Hands-Face-Space and isolate to stop the lockdown.

On the question on the South African and Brazilian variants, she said that she was not aware of any cases in Luton, but if notified, the management plan would be refreshed to respond to it.

Responding to a question on why Luton was twentieth worse in the country for Covid-19 cases, she explained that it was due to Luton having many common factors, known as Covid disparities, as many of the areas with the highest level of Covid cases on the list. Examples of these factors included, e.g. jobs where people had to go out to do, people living in densely populated areas, many living in houses of multiple occupation/ multi-generational families, large number of people having underlying health conditions.

She added that Luton had many of those factors due to its demographics and the Public Health plan could not address many years of health inequalities over one year, as the root causes needed to be tackled.

She did not believe that playgrounds should be closed, as case numbers were coming down, but agreed that people needed to follow the rules. Police enforcement was difficult in relation to people in parks, as the rules had nuances, but people should not flout the rules. If case numbers were to rise again, the situation with parks might need looking at again.

On comparative rate of infections in BLMK area, she said the latest figures per 1000K of population were as follows:

- Luton – 174
- MK - 116
- Bedford – 111
- Central Beds - 79

She said that Luton was not doing anything wrong compared with Central Beds, which did not have the high level of disparities and structural inequalities that existed in Luton.

Dealing with a question on the situation in the hospital, the Bedfordshire Hospitals Chief Executive said there was a significant reduction in the number of Covid patients at the L&D hospital, from 100 the previous week to 44, with six in critical care. The number of deaths from Covid was also coming down, with none recorded in the previous 6 days. He had no information to hand on the ethnicity of Covid patients in hospital.

He added that nationally, the proportion of Covid patients aged 65 and over in hospitals was going down, due to vaccination, but an increasing number of younger people were being admitted with Covid.

Proceeding with the report, the Director of Primary Care, BLMK CCGs, said that six sites were opened in Luton to provide vaccination. These were four Primary Care Network Centres at Kingsway, Bushmead, Medici and Leagrave Centre, and two community sites at Inspire and Redgrave. She gave the breakdown of vaccination so far as follows:

- For the over 80s, 86% had been vaccinated. Around 11% (285) from this cohort had declined to have the vaccine
- For the 75-80 age group, 87% had received the vaccine, with 10 decliners
- For the 70-74 age group, 84% had been vaccinated, with 13 decliners
- For the 65-69 age group, which started later, 72% had been vaccinated
- For the 60-64 age group, which had only just started, 35% had been vaccinated
- In elderly care, 715 (84%) residents in care homes had been vaccinated and had follow up dates for the second dose offered. In terms of staff in care homes, 967 (53%) had been vaccinated, compared with 86% of nurses at the L&D

Primary Care Services were working with Public Health team to reach homebound people and those hard to reach.

The 65+ had three telephone calls and a letter to invite them to get an appointment for the vaccine. Some letters were returned as not known at the address. Some were out of the country and some people actively refused to have the vaccine.

Responding to a question on vaccine hesitancy in relation to ethnicity, she said the information was available, but there was no capacity to retrieve it currently, but the matter was under discussion and being addressed.

The BLMK Director of Communication explained the different methods of communication and actions being taken to deal with vaccine hesitancy, including engagement with community and faith leaders and ‘community champions’, working with GPs, e.g. using videos to show what could be done to persuade people to have the vaccine and how the vaccine was saving lives. More details would be provided to the following meeting of the Board.

The Director of Public health said that there was vaccine hesitancy across all communities, hence why there was engagement with all communities to address the

problem. Vaccination of all people all was crucial to tackle Covid-19. Work was continuing to prepare people to book for appointments as soon as they received their vaccination offer.

In response to a question, she said that around 7000 people in the shielded group had been prioritised for vaccination.

The Director of Primary Care added that more detailed data on community vaccination would be available for the following meeting.

She advised that the Covid bus would need to be used for targeted work, but Luton was doing exceptionally well to encourage people to come forward. The rate of vaccination for staff in care homes and the L&D Hospital was being looked into, as it was not known if staff declined or not come forward yet.

On the issue of vaccine availability, she added that there had been limited supply, hence why some centres were only operation on two or three days a week, but for the week commencing on 15 March, supply was plentiful.

Responding to a question of staff sickness rate at the L&D hospital since vaccination, the Chief Executive said absences due to Covid were significant down to one or two per day, compared with 20-25 per day at the peak of the pandemic.

He added that vaccination for staff had been paused, but was re-starting for the second dose.

In terms of ethnicity breakdown, 80% of those who had the vaccine were white and 65% from a black, Asian or other minority ethnic (BAME) group, which was the same as for the general population. From the BAME group, black staff were less likely to have had the vaccine than Asian staff, for many reasons, including hesitancy, pregnancy. Many did not wish to give a reason. Every effort was being made to address this issue, using BAME leaders to promote the message through videos to encourage staff to take up the vaccine.

Dealing with a question from a Healthwatch Luton co-optee on vaccination for carers, the Director of Primary Care advised that there were some 5000 carers registered with their GPs in Luton. Any registered carer was allowed to request and be given an appointment for vaccination. Many carers were in the older age groups and qualified for the vaccine by age anyway. She agreed to deal with any specific issues directly with the co-optee outside the meeting if needed.

Responding to questions on the issue of vaccination centres, she said that at the beginning of vaccination, there were only a few sites and the national centre for Luton was at Stevenage. Some people chose to go there and would need to go there for their second dose. She said people should wait to be offered and then ring up to book an appointment. The national booking system was an issue, as they would offer booking slots in accordance with expected supply of the vaccine. If people could not see any slots, they should keep looking online, as the situation was changing on a daily basis depending on supplies.

After booking an appointment, if someone could not make it, they were allowed to cancel and re-book another slot by ringing 119.

Vaccination centres did not have a choice on the type of vaccine there were supplied with. She advised that people should not be seeking one or other of the vaccine, as they were equally effective. However, some clinically vulnerable 16-18 year olds and people with known allergies were advised to have the Astra Zeneca vaccine.

The Chair thanked the officers for the excellent reports and answers to members' probing questions.

Resolved: (i) That the update on the impact of Covid-19 on Luton be noted

(ii) That the committee's thanks to all Officers for the excellent report and their updates in response to members' questions be noted.

17. BLMK Integrated Care System (ICS) Update (Ref: 8)

The Director of Primary Care, BLMK CCGs gave a presentation (Ref: 8), updating the committee on the BLMK Integrated Care System (ICS), focusing on the following keys areas:

- Covid Pandemic
- BLMK Strategic Priorities
- White Paper: Integration & Innovation: 'working together to improve health & care'

In terms of Covid pandemic, she stated that the BLMK ICS focus had been on testing and the roll out of the vaccination programme. She added that there had been increases in demand for certain services, such as critical care and mental health to provide support for residents and health and care staff. ICS had also been myth busting that services, e.g. GPs, had been open and working as far as practically possible.

She said that the BLMK Strategic priorities were being developed to build on NHS Long Term Plan objectives to deal with changes brought about by Covid-19. Discussions had taken place with partner organisations, including with councils leaders, chairs of Health and Wellbeing Boards and Chief Executives

She added that workshops, involving all partners and stakeholders, would be taking place during March to develop priorities for BLMK framed around population health outcomes and health inequalities. The strategic priorities would be subject of Stakeholder, public and staff engagement in due course.

She informed members that the emerging strategic priorities under consideration included, in summary, as follows:

i. That every child had a strong, healthy start in life
ii. That people are supported to take responsibility and enabled to manage their own health and wellbeing
iii. That people age well, with proactive interventions to stay healthy, independent and active as long as possible
iv. That we work together to build the economy and support sustainable growth

She added that a fifth priority was under consideration around reducing health inequalities or explicitly threading it through the four priorities set out above to ensure inequalities were not entrenched in them and more vulnerable groups were targeted and supported in areas of less positive outcomes.

The outcomes of workshops would be reported to the NHS Boards and Health and Wellbeing Boards of BLMK partner organisations.

In relation to the Health and Care White Paper recently published, she said that the implications on working in collaboration and the governance of the ICS would be discussed with partners. She proceeded to provide an overview of the proposed purpose, responsibilities and accountabilities of the NHS in England highlighting key points from the slide as follows:

- Health and Wellbeing Boards would remain responsible for Joint Strategic Needs Assessments (JSNAs) and Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategies (JHWS)
- New proposal would give the Secretary of State the power to direct NHS England, and intervene in service reconfigurations at any stage and remove Local Authority referral power
- ICS would be an NHS Body,
    - With clear purpose to improve population health and healthcare, tackling unequal outcomes and access, enhancing productivity and value for money and helping the NHS to support broader social and economic development.
    - The CEO would be the Accounting Officer responsible for the day to day running of the ICS and NHS planning and allocation decisions and for developing a plan to address the health needs of the population, setting out the strategic direction for the system and the plans for both capital and revenue spending for the NHS bodies in the system and securing the provision of health services to meet the needs of the population
    - Powers and duties would include:
        - the duty to meet the system financial objectives and deliver financial balance
        - reciprocal duty to collaborate placed on NHS bodies and local authorities
        - Shared duty on all NHS organisations to have regard for the 'Triple Aim' of better health and wellbeing for everyone, better care for all people and sustainable use of NHS resources
        - Power to create joint committees with NHS providers and include other parties
        - Power to apply to the Secretary of State to create new NHS Trusts
    - ICS's must have regard for Joint Strategic Needs Assessments and Joint Health and Wellbeing strategies
    - Some flexibility to develop processes and structures which work most effectively
    - ICSs to delegate significantly to place level and to provider collaboratives
- The proposals would formalising the merger of the past few years, but details were awaited
- Each ICS should set up a Partnership and invite participants, but membership and what, if any, functions would delegated to the ICS Health and Care Partnership would be a matter for local decision. Their responsibilities would include:
    - promoting partnership arrangements and

    - developing a plan to addresses the wider health, public health, and social care needs of the system
- NHS ICS body and Local Authorities would have to have regard to the plan when making decisions
- Members of the Partnership could include:
    - Health and Wellbeing Boards
    - Healthwatch
    - Voluntary and independent sector partners
    - Social care providers
    - organisations with a wider interest in local priorities (such as housing and leisure providers)
- There would some flexibility to develop processes and structures which work most effectively for them
- Health and Wellbeing Boards would continue to be responsible for developing Joint Strategic Needs Assessments (JSNAs) and Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategies (JHWS)
- NHS provider organisations powers and duties would include:
    - Duty to have regard to the system financial objectives
    - Shared duty on all NHS organisations to have regard for the 'Triple Aim' of better health and wellbeing for everyone, better care for all people and sustainable use of NHS resources
    - Reciprocal duty to collaborate on NHS bodies and local authorities
    - Power to create joint committees with ICS and with other NHS providers and include other parties
- ICS Board, as a minimum would include:
    - A chair
    - CEO
    - Representatives from NHS Trusts
    - Representatives from General Practice
    - Representatives from Local Government
    - Others determined locally
- The ICS Board would be required to ensure appropriate clinical advice when making decisions.
- There would be no legislative provision about place-based arrangements between local authorities, the NHS and between providers of health and care services, leaving these to local organisations to arrange.
- In terms of structure, an ICS NHS body would be responsible for the day to day running of the ICS, with membership including NHS Trusts, General Practice and Local Authorities

- A ‘separate’ ICS Health and Care Partnership would bring together systems to support integration and develop a plan for the systems health, public health and social care needs
- In terms of implications for partners, local authorities would retain the power, as integral partners, statutory members of the partnership board and key in place-based committees, which would lead local decision
- NHS would be a key partner in economic and social regeneration, developing new Assurance Framework for social care
- The Voluntary Sector would also be a key strategic partner, as provider of services and community advocate, with representatives invited at NHS ICS Board. Further guidance was expected later in 2021
- In terms of the timeline, proposals set out in the White Paper would play an important role in meeting longer-term health and social care challenges. Legislation would be brought forward to ensure every part of England was covered by an ICS, established on a statutory footing, to include representatives from local authorities and an ICS health and care partnership. ICSs would be accountable for the health outcomes of the population. The process would include public engagement and consultation, leading to the start of the passage of the bill through the Parliamentary process from the early summer 2021 and implementation of the reform from April 2022
- The procurement process would be a partnership matter, using methods which would help and not be disruptive to the partnership work

From members’ comments and questions, further information and clarification were provided, with key points recorded as set out in the below:

- The Chair requested an update in June 2021
- The ICS would be co-terminus with the current BLMK CCGs and in line with the current process, the integrated ICS structure would start from April 2021. It was not sure who would provide future updates to HSCRG
- Local authority representatives would be part of the local committee meetings within the ICS. It was important to note that ‘Place’ would be key and not subject of change
- The Corporate Director, Population Wellbeing commented that quite important changes were proposed, but no details yet available. She agreed that an update with more details on how the ‘Place’ element would work should be brought back to the committee in June 2021
- In terms of impact on the hospital, the Chief Executive commented that ‘Place’ was important, as the L&D hospital served three local authority areas responsible for the wider determinants of health and was already integrated with Bedford Hospital. He added it was important that current partnership arrangements were not lost and that there would be no risk to the concept of collaboration in place between the Luton and Bedfordshire system
- A member commented that he looked forward to the details of the proposals, particularly how they would tackle health inequalities and support people to look after their own health and wellbeing, as we come out of the Covid-19 pandemic and people started to get back together.
- The issue of software for the NHS IT system was yet to be determined.

Resolved: (i) That the presentation of the Director of primary Care, BLMK CCGs be noted

(ii) That Corporate Director, Population Wellbeing be requested to coordinate a further update to its June meeting, once further details were published on the implications of the government's White Paper, 'Integration and Innovation: working together to improve health & care'.

18. EEAST Report to Luton Health & Social Care Review Group (Ref: 9)

The Head of Operations, East of England Ambulance Service Trust (EEAST) presented EEAST's report (Ref: 9), updating HSCRG on the performance of the service in Luton in the preceding year, including the impact of Covid-19 and on progress against the CQC most recent inspection of the Trust.

He directed members to Appendix A, page 26 of the agenda pack, where an overview of the performance South Beds, which included Luton and was provided in the tables. He added that performance were mostly on target, shown as 'green', with some shown as 'red' on which he was happy to take questions, if any.

He further directed members to page 35 of the pack, where the impact of Covid-19 was summarised.

He pointed members to section 3 at page 32 of the pack, about a joint initiative between EEAST and Bedfordshire Fire and Rescue service to strengthen partnership working to support patient care in rural areas of Bedfordshire.

The Fire Service was also supporting EEAST in a range of other collaborative projects, such as providing frontline Covid-19 drivers on secondment, working alongside EEAST clinicians. This support had been vital to increase capacity and allow deployment of additional ambulances during peak periods of demand and staff sickness.

The Head of Operations also directed members to Section 6 from page 37 onwards where details of the CQC inspection and EEAST response and progress to support staff was provided.

Appendix B provided details of how calls to the ambulance service were categorised.

He said that Appendix C provided a summary of key aspects of EEAST's improvement plan.

Dealing with members' comments and questions, further information and clarification were provided, with key points recorded as set out in the below paragraphs.

Concerns raised by staff to the CQC about sexual harassment, bullying and other inappropriate behaviour had been recognised by the Trust, which conducted its own survey. EEAST accepted the challenge and had put in place a range of measures to instigate a cculture change, summarised at paragraph 6.10, page 38 of the agenda pack to support

- veys being taken to check staff views on progress regularly

A full time staff member was in place at Luton to provide a drop-in facility for staff to speak to and raise any concerns.

In terms of complaints, each case was reviewed every month by a consistency panel to ensure progress and decisions made at key points. Speed and consistency were of the essence, as cases took too long to be dealt with previously.

The support process sat alongside existing processes to ensure there were the resources and oversight to move cases on and implement system to manage concerns at more speedily than before.

On the issue of staffing levels and the availability of personal protection equipment (PPE), members were informed that Luton and South Beds were fully staffed and there was no shortage of PPE.

In May 2020 due to Covid-19, EEAST had a 10% sickness rate and took the opportunity to collaborate with the Fire Service in using their drivers on secondment. Sickness level had improved and was running at 1% at the time of reporting.

With the success of student paramedic scheme and flexible workforce, EEAST was prepared for core peak demand during the winter months, which was in fact lower than expected for this time of the year.

Take up of Covid-19 vaccination was running at around 90%, with focus on vulnerable staff from black, Asians and other minority ethnic groups. Staff had also been given their appointments for their second dose of the vaccine.

To protect against Covid-19, there was an increased cleaning regime implemented. Staff wore facemasks in the cabs. On station, social distancing was not an issue, as staff worked mostly outside.

The Chair thanked the Head of Operations and requested an update on progress with their improvement plan in 6 months, which was agreed.

Resolved: (i) That the presentation on the performance of the East of England Ambulance Service Trust (EEAST) on progress achieved in the previous year and on actions taken to address issues identified in the CQC inspection (Ref: 9) be noted

(ii) That the Head of Operations, EEAST be requested to provide HSCRG an update on progress with their improvement plan in 6 months (timing to be arranged by the DSO outside the meeting)

(iii) That the thanks of the committee to Simon King, the EEAST Head of Operations for his report and for the information provided is response to members' questions be noted.

19. Modernising inpatient mental health services in Bedfordshire and Luton (Ref: 10)

The Director of Integrated Care, ELFT presented the report (Ref:10), informing HSCRG on proposals to modernise inpatient mental health services in Bedfordshire and Luton and seeking comments on the approach to the next steps.

Before he proceeded, the Chair commented on a press article and asked if it was correct that two mental health centres in Luton were closing. If so, he asked the Officers to note that in future if significant changes were proposed to services in Luton, that they be discussed with the HSCRG first before going to the press.

The Director of Integrated Care said that he had shared the plan and addressed concerns in the report. He went on to introduce the ELF Medical Director, the ELFT Director of Mental and Wellbeing for Luton and Beds and the BLMK CCGs Mental Health Lead, who were in attendance to provide support with members' questions.

He added that the plan was an ambitious one to improve mental health services in Luton and Bedfordshire for adults, children and young people over the next few years in line with the NHS long-term plan and as part of the Integrated Care System (ICS). It was also in line with the commitment to return mental health patients back to Bedford following the closure of Weller Wing in 2017. Residents of Luton would in the future be admitted to the Luton Centre for Mental Health.

ELFT was in the final stages of securing a long-term lease for the preferred site at Shires House at the Bedford Health Village.

ELFT was developing the business case to take the proposal forward. The next step was to develop the case for change to provide context and the rationale for the proposals, including the expected benefits, risks and the equality impact.

He said that the proposals met the five critical tests set by NHS England for service change and were actively going up for users' and carers' challenge and support, before going out for engagement.

As part of the case for change, there was a need to assess and understand the details of which residents would be admitted to which unit, the impact of population growth and the growth in mental health demand due to Covid-19.

ELFT was also looking at the travel impact on the population likely to re-locate from Townsend Court, Oakley Court and the L&D site to the new unit.

The proposal would reduce the four current sites in Bedfordshire and Luton at Bedford Health Village, Townsend Court (Houghton Regis), Oakley Court (Leagrave) and the Luton Centre for Mental Health, to two sites, at Bedford Health Village and the Luton Centre for Mental Health.

Bedford Borough and Central Beds Health Overview and Scrutiny Committees had been briefed and decided that the proposals amounted to significant change in services and would be looking for ELFT to go through the process of formal public consultation. EFLT was hence seeking HSCRG advice on the same question.

The Director said that Townsend Court and Oakley Court were currently mainly used for Bedford and Central Beds patients. Luton and South Beds patients would to be treated at an improved facility at the Luton Centre for Mental Health adjacent to the L&D Hospital.

The proposed new facility at Bedford Health Village would provide the opportunity to create new local inpatient mental health facilities for children and young people across

Bedford, Central Beds and Luton, who currently had to be placed in out of area beds, which can sometimes be far from home.

Currently ELFT are working with NHS England & Improvement to confirm the consultation and capital business case requirements, including capital departmental expenditure limit cover. The process was likely to take about 12-18 months, subject to NHS England and NHS Improvements' approval. Planning and consultation would likely take in the region of 12 – 18 months, and construction would take 2 years.

The Clinical Director commented on the clinical case for change and said that the proposal was a significant investment in mental Health inpatient services. He added that staff, patients and carers were excited about the proposed development and had been involved on the journey from the beginning. The development would be an advantage for Bedford and Central Beds.

He added that Oakley Court, which contained both male and female wards, had different responsibilities after Covid-19. Its location in the middle of a residential estate was not an ideal location, due to noise and disruption caused residents, which ELFT had been trying to resolve for 2 years. Access to community facilities was limited. He said that, in the long term re-location was the only answer.

He added that both Oakley Court and Townsend Court were of dated designs, with little outside space, limited line of sight and the fabric and locations were problematic.

Townsend Court, which catered for female and older adult Luton patients, struggled to build a critical mass of staff. The intention was to relocate the psychiatric intensive care unit currently at Calnwood Court to Bedford, to ensure the Trust is able to provide the highest possible quality environment for people who are very unwell.. However, he said Calnwood Court was a small unit of 9 intensive care beds, with a small therapeutic area doing the best to get up to standard. The intention was to build a larger unit for Luton and Bedfordshire.

He re-iterated the benefits of the Bedford facility for children and young people, which would avoid them being placed out of area. It would also provide a Section 136 suite in Bedford, which would cut down on travel time for the Police and improve the effectiveness and efficiency across the system.

The Medical Director acknowledged the anxiety caused with the closure of services and reinforced the positive benefits of the proposed developments for Luton, Bedfordshire and MK, in terms of services for children and young people.

From members' comments and questions, further information and clarifications were provided, as set out below.

Under the proposed change, Luton patients would not be affected, as they would continue to be admitted to the Luton Centre for Mental Health, adjacent to the L&D Hospital.

Townsend Court and Oakley Court mainly took patients from Bedford and Central Beds following closure of Weller Wing in Bedford. The newspapers did not present the situation correctly.

AS part of our programme of work, the Trust would also be looking to improve the quality of the estate at the Luton Centre for Mental Health.
Consultation on the proposed changes would cover Luton, Bedford and Central local authority areas. The proposals were co-produced by a collaboration of people and organisations to meet local needs.

The 're-imagining mental health' development would seek the three outcomes of choice, control and empowerment and build on the strength of the service to ensure people stay well at home.

The development represented a major investment on mental health services over 3 years.

Engagement and co-production had taken place despite the challenge Covid-19, due to help from the active group of service users and carers, using technology and other mechanism creatively over the last 12 to 18 months. Face to face engagement might be possible, as people get vaccinated against Covid-19. The case for change and pre-construction business case would be subject of public consultation.

In terms of demand and supply, ELFT was working with Public Health and their information analysts to determine the number bed that would be needed over the next 15-20 years to ensure the development was future proof. The initial thinking was that the Bedford unit would provide around 88 beds, but more work was needed based on expected population growth over the next 20 years.

Members were re-assured that there would be full public consultation before any action was taken on proposed closures of the units at Townsend Court and Oakley Court.

The Chair welcome the proposal to consult the public and the committee. He thanked the officers for the report and answers to members' questions and requested that an update on the next steps be reported to HSCRG in June 2021, which was agreed.

Resolved: (i) That the report on proposals to modernise inpatient mental health services in Bedfordshire and Luton be noted

(ii) That members' concerns and comments on the proposals be taken into consideration in developing the next steps of the programme

(iii) That the Director of Integrated Care, ELFT, be requested to provide an update on the next steps of the programme at the HSCRG's meeting in June 2021

(iv) That HSCRG's thanks to the Officers for their report and answers to members' questions be recorded.

20. Draft Work Programme 2021-22 (Ref: 11)

Members considered the work programme and agreed the additional item listed below, as discussed at Minutes 17, 18 and 19 above:

(i) Update on the implications of the government's White Paper, 'Integration and Innovation: working together to improve health & care' – Laura Church, Corporate Director, Population Wellbeing and Nicky Poulain, Director of Primary Care, BLMK CCGs (tbc) (June 2021)

(ii) Progress on the implementation of EEAST's improvement plan – Simon King, Head of Operations, EEAST (timing to be arranged by the DSO outside the meeting)

(iii) Next steps of the programme to modernise inpatient mental health services in Bedfordshire and Luton – Richard Fradgley, Director of Integrated Care, ELFT (June 2021)

Resolved: That the Democracy and Scrutiny Officer (DSO) be authorised to update and amend the work programme, adding the items as set out below and reviewing items for each meeting in consultation with the Chair of the committee:

(i) Update on the implications of the government's White Paper, 'Integration and Innovation: working together to improve health & care' – Laura Church, Corporate Director, Population Wellbeing and Nicky Poulain, Director of Primary Care, BLMK CCGs (tbc) (June 2021)

(ii) Progress on the implementation of EEAST's improvement plan – Simon King, Head of Operations, EEAST (timing to be arranged by the DSO outside the meeting)

(iii) Next steps of the programme to modernise inpatient mental health services in Bedfordshire and Luton – Richard Fradgley, Director of Integrated Care, ELFT (June 2021)

(Note: The meeting ended at 8.31 pm)

Luton

Item No: **7**

Committee:	Health and Social Care Review Group			
Date of Meeting:	04 May 2021			
Subject:	Public Health Grant Annual Allocation			
Report by:	Lucy Hubber, Director of Public Health			
Contact Officer:	Lucy Hubber, Director of Public Health			
Implications:	Legal	☐	Community Safety	☐
	Equalities	☐	Environment	☐
	Financial	☐	Consultations	☐
	Staffing	☐	Other	☐
Wards Affected:	All			

Purpose

1. To inform Members of the annual allocation of the Public Health Grant to Luton and the allocation of spend.

Recommendation

2. The Committee is recommended to note and support the Public Health grant spend in line with the spend categories identified to meeet the grant conditions.

Background

3. Public health services are funded through a ring-fenced grant provided to local authorities on an annual basis. The value of the grant is calculated using the standardised mortality rate for under 75s, adjusted for age, gender and health outcomes. Luton benefits with a higher per capita allocation than surrounding areas.

4. The terms of the public health grant means that it is ring-fenced for specific purposes, as outlined in table 1.

Table 1: Categories for reporting local authority public health spend in 2021/22

Prescribed functions:	**Non-prescribed functions:**
1) Sexual health services - STI testing and treatment 2) Sexual health services – Contraception 3) NHS Health Check programme 4) Local authority role in health protection 5) Public health advice to NHS Commissioners 6) National Child Measurement programme 7) Prescribed Children's 0-5 services	8) Sexual health services - Advice, prevention and promotion 9) Obesity – adults 10) Obesity - children 11) Physical activity – adults 12) Physical activity - children 13) Treatment for drug misuse in adults 14) Treatment for alcohol misuse in adults 15) Preventing and reducing harm from drug misuse in adults 16) Preventing and reducing harm from alcohol misuse in adults 17) Specialist drugs and alcohol misuse services for children and young people 18) Stop smoking services and interventions 19) Wider tobacco control 20) Children 5-19 public health programmes 21) Other Children's 0-5 services non-prescribed 22) Health at work 23) Public mental health 24) Miscellaneous, can include but is not exclusive to: • Nutrition initiatives • Accidents Prevention • General prevention • Community safety, violence prevention & social exclusion • Dental public health • Fluoridation • Infectious disease surveillance and control • Environmental hazards protection • Seasonal death reduction initiatives • Birth defect preventions 25) test, track and trace and outbreak planning 26) other public health spend relating to COVID-19

5. Local authorities have to provide a Statement of Assurance to PHE and a Revenue Outturn form to MHCLG confirming that the amounts shown on the Statement relate to eligible expenditure on public health and that the grant has been used for the purposes intended. The returns must be certified by the authority's Chief Executive (or the authority's S151 Officer) and the Director of Public Health.

6. Any breach in the terms or conditions of the Grant, such as the Chief Executive, DPH or S151 officer unable to confirm that spend fairly presents the eligible expenditure, may mean that the Secretary of State may reduce, suspend or withhold grant payments or require the repayment of the whole or any part of the grant monies paid.

Report

7. On 16 March 2021, Luton Council was notified of its allocation for 2021/22. The Council will receive £15,730,216 which is an increase of 0.96% since last year (or a reduction in real terms).

Proposal

The public health grant will be spent as shown in table and are in line with the activities set out in Table 1 and will allow the Director of Public Health to sign off the Statement of Assurance.

External Reporting Lines	PH grant 2021-22 (£)
Sexual Health - STI testing and treatment	1,060,098
Sexual Health - contraception	946,826
Sexual Health - promotion, prevention and advice	520,784
NHS Health Check Programme	156,002
Health Protection	46,405
National Child Measurement Programme	24,164
Public Health Advice to NHS Commissioners	44,020
Obesity - Adults	392,053
Obesity - Children	116,555
Physical Activity - Adults	374,989
Physical Activity - Children	147,226
Substance misuse- treatment for drug misuse in adults	2,996,204
Substance misuse- treatment for alcohol misuse in adults	272,667
Substance misuse-preventing and reducing harm from drug misuse in adults	480,629
Substance misuse-preventing and reducing harm from alcohol misuse in adults	243,910
Substance misuse-specialist drug and alcohol misuse services for children and young people	303,875
Smoking and tobacco-stop smoking services and intervention	571,191
Smoking and tobacco-wider tobacco control	35,937
Children 5-19 public health programmes	868,817
Mandated 0-5 children services	4,215,569
All other 0-5 children's services	143,160
Health at work	-
Public Mental Health	52,697
Public Health team and contributions to other services which support Public Health outcomes.	1,716,438
TOTAL	**15,730,216**

Appendix

None

List of Background Papers - Local Government Act 1972, Section 100D

PH Grant determination letter 16/03/21 here

Luton

Item No: **8**

Committee:	Health and Social Care Review Group			
Date of Meeting:	04 May 2021			
Subject:	Contain Outbreak Management Fund 2021/22			
Report by:	Lucy Hubber, Director of Public Health			
Contact Officer:	Lucy Hubber, Director of Public Health			
Implications:	Legal	☐	Community Safety	☐
	Equalities	☐	Environment	☐
	Financial	☐	Consultations	☐
	Staffing	☐	Other	☐
Wards Affected:	All			

Purpose

1. To set out how the Council is proposing to use utilise Contain Outbreak Management Funding to support the ongoing COVID response. The report also seeks a more detailed response on proposals to provide financial support to community organisations engaged in supporting the Covid response in Luton, particularly focusing on the wellbeing of the community.

Recommendations

2. Subject to the views of Health and Social Care Review Group, the Committee is asked to:

(i) to support the allocations of the COMF funding set out in Table 1 in supporting the Council's response to COVID-19;

(ii) support the proposal to commission additional services from key providers to work on specific public health related concerns caused by the pandemic for COVID recovery and for response funds to deal with any emerging issues;

(iii) support the specific proposal to create a Community Services COVID recovery fund.

(iv) Recognises that the pandemic may change during the year and that the use of the COMF may need to change to reflect this.

Background

3. Luton Council has received financial support through the national Contain Outbreak Management Fund (COMF) to support the local level response to the Covid pandemic.

4. The funds can be spent in line with the letter from Contain dated October 2020 (appendix A). The corporate operational Covid Serious Incident Management Team (SIMT) have oversight across all Covid response funds, and delegate responsibility for the COMF budget to the Director of Public Health in line with an approved financial plan.

5. Luton Council has been allocated nearly £8.5 million across 2020/21 and 2021/2022. It is currently assumed that Luton Council has to have allocated all resources by 31 March 2022 to avoid clawback of underspend.

Report

6. There are a number of key strands of the Council's response to COVID which will need to continue into 21/22. This includes:

- Additional resources to support Outbreak Management and dedicated support on the analysis and interpretation of data;
- Support for the COVID marshals and on-going engagement and support for businesses through the Environmental Health Services;
- Contact tracing;
- Support for Community Lateral Flow Testing;
- Communication and engagement;
- Behavioural Insights.

These are all core elements of the Council's approach and response.

7. COMF funding can also be used to support recovery work. Some key priority areas have been identified for additional activity to support recovery which will be delivered through additional commissioned services:

- Mental Health
- Getting Active

or where gaps have been identified. Additional spend of £1m has been identified.

8. Resources have also been identified to do focused work around disparities in health through COVID. This will be developed following the receipt of the research which has been commissioned from the University of Bedfordshire.

9. There are also some emerging challenges in the Social Care sector with an increase in Safeguarding and DOLS cases. There has also been significant support for the home care and domiciliary care sector directly by the Government. This funding ceases in June and so COMF may need to be used to support the care sector.

10. The community and local organisations in Luton have been critical partners in the Covid response, providing essential practical and emotional support to people affected by the virus. Luton has truly shown the value of a strong community and voluntary sector during this period.

11. As we move from a pandemic response, to recovery and transformation it is proposed to build on this community support by offering financial support to local organisations who can provide services across five key priorities of recovery:

- Mental health
- Social isolation
- Disparities exposed through Covid (inequalities)
- People vulnerable to Covid
- People made vulnerable by Covid

12. It is proposed to build on the established partnership with Bedfordshire and Luton Community Foundation for the administration of the Fund. This provides the benefits of strong community networks, a programme of support and development of small community organisations and the ability to carry funds across financial years to ensure a sustained Covid recovery offer. An initial draft proposal is attached for reference (for information only and subject to further discussion) in appendix 2. HSCRG are asked to give views on the outline.

13. The proposed spend of COMF is set out in Table 1:

Table 1: COMF funding allocation 2020/21 and 2021/22

Description	**Total projection 20/21 £'000**	**Total Projection 21/22 £'000**
Outbreak Management	143	150
Environmental Health	66	100
Data management	41	150
Communications/Engagement	92	50
Contact tracing	276	670
Lateral flow testing (fixed stations)	458	1,429
Lateral flow testing (Community model)	5	590
Behavioural interventions	10	70
Enforcement	0	150
Disparities in health impact	50	450
Response funds	6	
Covid recovery - commissioned services	0	1,000
Covid recovery - community services	0	1,500
Response funds (contingency)	0	1,000
Total Projected Spend	1,148	7,309

14. It needs to be recognised that the response to the pandemic has been changing over the past 6 months but these proposals represent an appropriate response at this time.

Proposal/Options

15. To spend the COMF as set out in Table 1.

16. To create a £1.5m Covid Community Recovery Fund to support community organisations engaged in the Covid response in Luton, particularly focusing on the wellbeing of the community, working with Bedfordshire and Luton Community Foundation.

Appendices

Appendix A - Contain letter October 2020
Appendix B - Bedfordshire and Luton Community Foundation indicative draft offer

List of Background Papers - Local Government Act 1972, Section 100D

None

Department of Health & Social Care

19 October 2020

Dear Local Authority Chief Executives,

Thank you for your incredible efforts to mitigate the impacts of the COVID pandemic, as we seek to break the chains of transmission, protect our NHS and save lives. I appreciate these efforts carry a financial burden, so I am writing to inform you about changes to the Contain Outbreak Management Fund. This is a Department of Health and Social Care fund set up to support Local Authorities to carry out your responsibilities during this crisis.

Following the move to Local COVID Alert Levels, and as of 12 October 2020, Local Authorities will be eligible for a series of payments from the Contain Outbreak Management Fund to support proactive containment and intervention measures:

1. A payment of up to **£1 per head of population** will be provided to Local Authorities in Local COVID Alert Level Medium. This will be disbursed as soon as public health activities have been agreed with the relevant Regional Convenor.
2. Where Local Authorities move to Local COVID Alert Level High or Very High this financial support will automatically be increased to **£3 per person** and **£8 per person** respectively.
3. This funding is incremental, not additional.
4. Funding is one-off. Repeated movement between Local Alert Levels will not enable reoccurring support from this fund.
5. Funding will be paid to Upper Tier Local Authorities, for onwards disbursement.

Financial support for Local Authorities at Local COVID Alert Level Medium and High is to fund the following activities:

a. Targeted testing for hard-to-reach groups out of scope of other testing programmes.
b. Additional contact tracing.
c. Enhanced communication and marketing e.g. towards hard-to-reach groups and other localised messaging.
d. Delivery of essentials for those in self-isolation.
e. Targeted interventions for specific sections of the local community and workplaces.
f. Harnessing capacity within local sectors (voluntary, academic, commercial).
g. Extension/introduction of specialist support (behavioural science, bespoke comms).
h. Additional resource for compliance with, and enforcement of, restrictions and guidance

Financial support for Local Authorities at Local COVID Alert Level Very High has a broader scope, to support local economies and public health. We expect this to include activities such as (this list is not exhaustive):

i. Measures to support the continued functioning of commercial areas and their compliance with public health guidance.
j. Funding Military Aid to the Civil Authorities (marginal costs only).
k. Targeted support for school/university outbreaks.
l. Community-based support for those disproportionately impacted such as the BAME population.

m. Support for engagement and analysis of regional areas to assess and learn from local initiatives.
n. Providing initial support, as needed, to vulnerable people classed as Clinically Extremely Vulnerable who are following tier 3 guidance.
o. Support for rough sleepers.

This list will likely evolve over time, with updated guidance provided on gov.uk.

Local Authorities should liaise with their Contain Regional Convenor, JBC Regional Lead and MHCLG on the details of expenditure and the monitoring of outcomes.

This support is in addition to previous financial support that has been provided or formally committed from the Contain Outbreak Management Fund. Furthermore, the Prime Minister confirmed that there would be a further package of support for local government, of around £1 billion, on Monday. Further details of this funding will be confirmed by MHCLG next week.

Please email covid-19LAfundingrequests@dhsc.gov.uk if you have any questions. Further guidance will be provided on gov.uk in due course.

Yours faithfully,

Carolyn Wilkins

Dr Carolyn Wilkins OBE

Contain Divisional Director	NHS Test and Trace	NHS Test and Trace
Chief Executive	Oldham Council	Oldham Council
Accountable Officer	NHS Oldham CCG	

Bedfordshire & Luton
Community Foundation

Capability House,
Wrest Park,
Silsoe,
Bedfordshire
MK45 4HS

01582 522422
admin@blcf.org.uk
blcf.org.uk
@bedlutcf

Appendix B

BEDFORDSHIRE AND LUTON COMMUNITY FOUNDATION SUMMARY

About us

Bedfordshire and Luton Community Foundation (BLCF) is the leading local grantmaker in the county, distributing nearly £15million pounds locally since our inception and establishing a national reputation for an innovative, community-focussed and strategic approach.

Our aim is to be a catalyst for positive social change in the county by connecting people, ideas, resources and needs to make a lasting difference. We strongly believe that there should be opportunity for all and the lives of the most disadvantaged should be transformed through innovative, community-based solutions.

We are passionate about improving the lives of people in Bedfordshire and Luton and we are known for our ground-breaking initiatives, for our investment in supporting local charities and for our deep relationships with grassroots groups in our area. Our work has been recognised nationally for the impact we have made, but we remain firmly rooted in our communities.

During the last 12 months we have awarded over £4.65million in grants to 186 different organisations across Bedfordshire, benefitting over 732,000 people.

The top 3 main issues being supported were:

1) Health, wellbeing and serious illness (incl. mental Health)

2) Poverty & disadvantage

3) Stronger Communities/community support & development

We are committed to being an equitable funder. We are part of the ***Funders for Race Equalities Alliance*** (FREA) and a partner with the new ***BAOBAB Foundation*** and ***LBC Fairness Taskforce*** and contribute our data on grants to a national alliance to combat inequality in funding distribution within diverse communities and groups working primarily in diverse communities. Compared to the national data we deliver the following;

- 40% of our grants were designed to benefit BAME communities – nationally the figure is 23%
- 47% of funds went to organisations who had the mission or purpose of supporting BAME or minority communities – nationally that was 14%
- 35% of funding went to BAME organisations – national that was only 6%

How we work

We manage grants through our experienced staff team who use a dedicated grants management software system to manage applications and to ensure all due diligence checks are made. We pride ourselves on our knowledge of the County and its needs and regularly work with partners and stakeholders to ensure our programmes align with this need and undertake specific research data using the ***VitalSigns*** initiative to inform our work and strategic focus.

We run a ***Small Charities Forum*** where we bring groups together to access our ***Grant +*** offer of support and advice for grant making as well as providing information around particular areas of interest, e,g, fundraising, marketing, financial good practice. We also signpost groups to more specialist or in-depth support, for example CVS and Cranfield Trust and help redirect projects to appropriate funders working across the Country. In total there are 24 funders working in Bedfordshire and to ensure we join up our thinking we also run a regular ***Bedfordshire and Luton Funders Network*** where we share data, respond to need, support strategic use and distribution of national funds.

BLCF is further able to access national funding opportunities through.

1. Our partnership with ***UK Communities Foundation*** (UKCF) – our national membership organisation who work directly with Government and National agencies to distribute funding from corporates, governments initiatives and through the network of 46 Community Foundations across the UK.
2. Our partnership with ***National Emergencies Trust*** (NET) – set up specifically to respond to national emergency they have an MOU with us to speed up distribution of funds in response to an emergency. In 20219-20 Covid-19 the response was a national appeal which led to £98m of funding secured to distribute. Through working with us at BLCF we were able to secure and share £764k of funding across 128 grants to organisations in Bedfordshire

Success in Luton

Over the last 3years we have awarded 294 grants totalling nearly **£8million** pounds to 143 organisations, who are based in or deliver their work in Luton, benefiting 556,724 people.

The above information also includes figures for the LLAL Community Investment Fund (CIF) which specifically distributed almost £3million pounds across 34 grants, benefiting 307,804 people.

Proposal

Luton Borough Council (LBC) have identified a potential pot of funding worth £1.5m which has been awarded to support the post covid recovery of community work and services across Luton. The post covid recovery is likely to impact on the charity sector for the next few years and as such LBC are seeking a partnership to act as a distributor for these funds as part of its plans for community support and to target key priority areas, which includes;

1. Mental health
2. Social isolation
3. People vulnerable to Covid 19
4. People made vulnerable by covid19
5. Disparity from protected characteristics

BLCF proposed model

As an experienced grantmaker we propose the following grant making model to support distribution of these funds.

1. Firstly, we would recommend spreading grants over a period of **3 years** (£500k made available per year) to ensure we can build resilience in organisations for which short term funding is challenging and does not contribute to financial or organisational sustainability.

2. Grants to be developed against the criteria identified above, across 3 levels to ensure some flexibility for organisations applying;

   - Level 1– Up to £1.5k – for 1 year only, quick grants to encourage applications into later phases (contributing basic data and case studies back)
   - Level 2 – Up to £20k – for work up to 2 years (contributing to outcome reporting and evaluation)
   - Level 3 – Up to £50k – for work up to a maximin of 3 years (contributing to quarterly impact case studies and outcome reporting and evaluation)

3. We would anticipate awarding Grants in this model each year approx. (adjusted down in yr 1 for short year).

   In Year 1 (of the 3 years programme) – deliver Level 1, 2, 3 grant options.

   In Year 2 – deliver Level 1, 2 grant options only.

   In Year 3 – deliver Level 1 grant options only.

Cost

Activity	Est No. Grant awarded	Total Grants	Annual Contract
• Year 1 – 2021-22	Level 1 x 20 £1500 grant Level 2 x 20 £20k grants Level 3 x 8 £50k Grants	£30,000 £400,000 £400,000	
• Year 2 – 2022-23	Level 1 x 20 £1500 grant Level 2 x20 £20k grants	£30,000 £400,000	

• Year 3 – 2023-24	Level 1 x 20 £1500 grant	£30,000	
		£1,320,000	
	BLCF Fee 10% standard (to be agreed and discuss)	£150,000	
	Outreach to level 1 groups (over 3yrs)	£25,000	
	Monitoring and evaluation reports	£5,000	
TOTAL		**£1,500,000**	

For more information and to discuss details;

Contact Karen Perkins, BLCF CEO at Karen.Perkins@blcf.org.uk