Supplementary Papers for Overview and Scrutiny Board

Date: Tuesday, 29 March 2022



5. Call-in of Decision - Homeless Health Hub

3 - 10

This supplementary pack contains partly redacted appendices which were previously parked as exempt.

These have been released in the interests of openness and transparency and to allow scrutiny of this item to be held as far as legally possible in open session.

Published: 29 March 2022



EXEMPT INFORMATION

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

BOURNEMOUTH, CHRISTCHURCH AND POOLE COUNCIL CABINET

Exempt Minutes of the Meeting held on 09 March 2022 at 10.00 am

143. <u>Update on Establishing a Multi Disciplinary Team and a Homeless Health</u> Centre

Exempt Information – Paragraph 3 (Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)).

The Leader advised that he hoped that as much of the conversation as possible could be held in public. The Leader advised the Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Board that the Cabinet had received and considered the recommendations from the Overview and Scrutiny Board.

The Chairman of Overview and Scrutiny expressed concern that the recommendations presented with the report were significantly different from the options which were presented to the O&S Board, and as such the Chairman did not feel that there was a purpose to discussing the recommendations from the Board which were formulated on the basis of the options outlined within the report at the time. The Chairman advised that the Board were overall very supportive of the principle of the hub but had some very strong concerns regarding the acquisition of St Stephen's Church Hall. The Chairman advised that the Board felt that there were other options, particularly in the reduced demand for retail space which could be explored further. The Chairman acknowledged that the proposed recommendation was a delegation which included measures to mitigate against some of the concerns regarding costs but explained that there were still issues with it and that the new recommendations should be reconsidered by the Overview and Scrutiny Board.

Cabinet acknowledged the issues raised by the Overview and Scrutiny Board but also considered the benefits provided by St Stephen's Church Hall. There was also consideration given to other location options.

This page is intentionally left blank



CABINET - 9 March 2022

Notice of Recommendations from the Overview and Scrutiny Board Meeting held on 28 February 2022, for provision to Cabinet meeting of 9 March 2022.

Action required – for consideration by Cabinet and publication of a response within 2 months of 9 March 2022.

Cabinet Agenda Item 8 – Update on Establishing a Multi Disciplinary Team and Homeless Health Centre

Whilst fully supportive of the principles and purposes of the multi disciplinary team in supporting the homeless and the provision of a homeless inclusion health centre (health hub), the Overview and Scrutiny Board recommended that:

- The Cabinet reconsiders the purchase of St Stephen's Hall and the Council should continue its search for appropriate alternative premises, to be acquired by either lease or purchase;
- The Council explores partnership work on what is needed before progressing with the proposal.

This page is intentionally left blank

EXEMPT INFORMATION

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

BOURNEMOUTH, CHRISTCHURCH AND POOLE COUNCIL OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINYBOARD

Exempt Minutes of the Meeting held on 28 February 2022 at 2.00 pm

172. <u>Scrutiny of the Update on Establishing a Multi-Disciplinary Team and a Homeless</u> Health Centre Cabinet Report

This item was restricted by virtue of paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Exempt information — Category 3 Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information).

The Lead Member for Homelessness presented a report, a copy of which had been circulated to each member of the Board and a copy of which appears as Appendix 'C' to these minutes in the Minute Book.

The Lead Member and officers responded to questions and comments from the Board on the issues raised in the exempt appendix, in particular the options being put forward to Cabinet for consideration. Matters raised included:

- Option 4 involved acquiring St Stephen's Hall and then transferring or leasing it to a community structure. The Lead Member referred to the cost issues associated with previous options. She explained that Option 4 was the preferred option because it took the project out of Council procurement and requirements and enabled the Council to work with partners to deliver a more cost-effective solution within budget.
- Board members queried why Option 4 had not been identified as the preferred option in the report.
- Board members expressed concerns about the escalating costs of the project which had more than doubled and the potential for these to increase further, with rising building costs and the risks associated with the retaining wall behind the building. It appeared that costs had been hugely underestimated and some members felt the public should be aware of this.
- Bearing in mind the issues raised in the report, the timescale for 'going live' from April 2022 seemed very unrealistic.
- Board members were generally supportive of the service proposed but felt that
 alternative options should be considered for its location, as stated in paragraph
 18 of the appendix. It was noted that the NHS was running a service hub from the
 Beales site in Poole. There may be similarly innovative solutions for this project
 such as using empty units in the town.

- The Monitoring Officer advised that caution should be applied if a decision was taken solely for the purpose of circumventing normal procurement rules as this would be unlawful.
- There was concern that the Council was funding this on its own without contributions from other partners involved. A Board member questioned the lack of evidence to support some of the assertions in Option 4 and noted that the original proposal had already identified a significant annual revenue shortfall. It was suggested that partners should be secured before proceeding any further and that existing provision continue in the interim.
- Board members questioned whether a decision to proceed with Option 4 should be made when the true financial costs were not yet known.
- Board members queried whether the revised overall costs Redacted
 represented value for money and noted that this view was shared by officers in
 the report. The Director of Housing explained that there were concerns around
 proportionality as the costs involved were high compared to the limited numbers
 who would benefit. However, the advantages and disadvantages of each option
 warranted further debate.
- It would help to know anticipated outcomes for the health hub when considering cost benefit. Members also commented on a lack of detail on opening hours and staffing requirements.
- A Board member questioned the delegation proposed in the recommendation and the delegation process was clarified. In this case the recommendation related to implementation of the decision rather than the decision itself. Reda

cted

- The Lead Member clarified that this service differed from other hub type provision by offering a targeted multi agency approach in a single location for access across BCP.
- A Board member accepted that there was a need for space to be provided for the homeless to access services but felt that this would be better provided locally rather than in a central location.
- There were concerns that the remit of the proposal had widened and that the original objectives were getting lost.
- Redacted Redacted
- It was confirmed that additional due diligence was underway on specific risk areas, including the retaining wall. This was due to be completed in the next few weeks
- There was concern at a lack of urgency in the timescales for delivering the service. It was suggested that Option 2 may allow an interim location to be opened without delay while seeking a more permanent solution.
- When considering the original proposal, the Board stressed the emphasis on statutory, charity and community organisations working with the Council and coming forward with funding. The Council appeared to have secured a location before determining exactly what provision was required.

 A Board member asked whether the 'interim building based option' could become a more permanent solution. The Lead Member explained that the buildings involved were smaller, not ideally located and not able to deliver the long term brief.

The Lead Member responded to points raised in discussion. She clarified that the building was not derelict but did need renovation. Redacted

. A more suitable location had not been identified. The location was supported by partners, it was discreet and was well known to the homeless community. The suggested use of empty units on the high street would be highly visible and could stigmatise people wishing to access services.

The Board discussed whether its proposed recommendation could be made public. As the recommendation related to issues of commercial sensitivity within the exempt appendix the majority of the Board agreed that the recommendation should also remain exempt.

RESOLVED that whilst fully supportive of the principles and purposes of the multi disciplinary team in supporting the homeless and the provision of a homeless inclusion health centre (health hub), the Overview and Scrutiny Board recommends that:

- a. The Cabinet reconsiders the purchase of St Stephen's Hall and the Council should continue its search for appropriate alternative premises, to be acquired by either lease or purchase;
- b. The Council explores partnership work on what is needed before progressing with the proposal.

This page is intentionally left blank