

## Supporting People

### Minutes of the Supporting People Strategic Core Group Meeting held on Tuesday, 10 May 2011, 2 - 4pm, Lockwood Room, Design Exchange

#### Present:

David Shepherd (Chair)	Assistant Director Housing Service, CBMDC
Jayne Hellowell	SP Lead and Service Manager (Adults & Housing Related Support)
Sheila Bamford	Horton HA (Provider Rep)
John Hill	Foundation (Provider Rep)
Rominder Dhothar	Service Development Officer – CBMDC
Phil Howell	Strategic Commissioning Manager – CBMDC
Mark Hird	Bradford Foyer (Provider Rep)
Graham Mynott	Key House Project (Provider Rep)
Claire Blacka	Stonham (Provider Rep)
Katie Pierce	Service User Involvement Officer (BMDC)
AK	Service User Rep
EW	SP Service User
Neal Heard	Bradford Alliance on Community Care (BACC)
Pam James	Service User Advocate
Nina Smith	Programme Lead – Alcohol & Drugs (BMDC)
Val Balding	Safer Communities (BMDC)
Tim Sanders	Integrated Commissioning Manager (BMDC)
Andrew Bebbington	Strategic Officer, Access to Housing
Alexandra Mullett	Transitions Officer (BMDC)
Maggie Colwill	Quality Assurance Manager (BMDC)

#### 1. Apologies / Introductions

Guy Van Dichele	SP Accountable Officer & Assistant Director Commissioning, Performance & Business Support (Adult & Community Services)
Sarah Possingham	Access to Housing (BMDC)
Dave Coe	Bradford Youth Offending Team (BMDC)
James Purdie	Children's Services (CBMDC)

#### 2. Declaration of Conflicts of Interest

Item 7 and 9 – Neal Heard, Sheila Bamford, John Hill and EW  
Item 5 – Claire Blacka

#### 3. Minutes of the Special Meeting held on 04 April 2011

Page 5, bullet point 8 should read “a hostel replacement programme is not currently underway ...”

Note for future minutes - Victim Support – if this refers to the organisation then it should be Capital V and S.

#### 4. Lead Officer Update – Jayne Hellowell

##### 4.1 Client Records and Outcome Monitoring

Providers are expected to submit data around client records and outcomes monitoring returns to the Centre for Research at St Andrews in Scotland which is funded by CLG, this will not be funded from May onwards. St Andrews wrote to Local Authorities to say that they have all the systems and place and can continue with the work but at a cost. It was felt that there were benefits in doing this especially around the client monitoring. This would cost the Local Authority approximately £2,000. As there is no capacity within Adult Services to carry

out this function and given that a new system would need to be developed, in principal the Local Authority has said yes to this.

**Action** – Message has gone out to Providers to continue submitting the forms to St Andrews.

#### **4.2 Attendance Monitoring**

To Note

#### **5. Update on LD Framework BSH – Alexandra Mullett**

Update/progress on the report presented to the SCG on 09.11.10 and CB on 13.12.10. Alex went through some of the key points from the report as follows:

- The Local Authority started contracting with BSH in 2003
- In this period there have been a multiple number of serious concerns and safeguarding issues regarding the service.
- In December 2010 it was agreed to defer the decision to decommission the service whilst Adult Services was in the process of re-engaging Care Managers who had withdrawn in 2009 due to high risks posed by the tenants.
- The approach with re-engaging Care Managers with BSH tenants has been successful and they have been working with Adult Services to mitigate risks.
- All 29 tenants have been offered an assessment of which 24 have been carried out
- The 5 remaining tenants have refused to engage in the process, 3 of these are in receipt of Social Care Funding, this will be followed up and an assessment will be offered by the newly established Bradford Independent Review Team (BIRT)
- BSH as well as other LD Providers were required to apply to the LD Framework and were unsuccessful at the PQQ stage of the procurement process.
- Adult Services can no longer contract with them to provide Domiciliary Support, Housing Related Support or Supported Living Services.
- Once the procurement process is complete Adult Services will develop a transitions plan and any contracts with BSH will be transferred over to a Framework Provider.
- This decision is being challenged by BSH with a request for information under procurement law and a Freedom of Information request. The outcome of this is ongoing.

Alex summarised by thanking the SCG and the CB for making the decision to defer the decision for decommissioning the service, thus allowing the following positive outcomes.

- Most tenants have completed the assessments and support plans.
- Adult Services has a better understanding of the standards that BSH are operating at and funding can now potentially be given to better quality services.
- Care Managers have managed to re-establish a link following a robust risk management approach.
- Service users have detailed support plans around their assessed needs, which provides clarity around the type of support they can expect to receive and can also challenge their Provider if they feel this hasn't been met.
- The Local Authority has a better understanding of what needs to be commissioned via the LD Framework.

#### **Recommendations**

None, if the members are happy for the department to continue with the course of action which is currently taking place to redistribute the business once the procurement process is complete.

Nina asked if the 5 people who were refusing to engage, given that they are clients with learning disabilities, understood what they were being asked to do and / or if there was any support to enable them to engage in the process.

Alex answered that the Care Managers had engaged with them and that clients had been offered opportunities to engage with an Independent Advocacy and have also been offered the support of BSH. 2 of the clients are self funders and 3 were placed with BSH through CTLD. The BIRT team will follow this up.

John asked about the decision that is being challenged and if there was any kind of assessment in place as to how long this challenge period could go on for and even though this is a difficult situation where there were threats of violence and service users being used against Officers if there were any ideas or plans on how to stop this kind of thing happening again.

Jayne said that the Freedom of Information request contained many questions ranging from how staff were qualified to make decisions to some of the legal questions; there has been a lot of support from both Legal and Procurement in putting the response together. The Provider will exhaust this process as the process that has been followed has been really stringent and well within legal parameters. The Provider may take this further to the Ombudsman or equivalent, but that is as far as it could go. Adult Services is confident that the process has been followed correctly.

To ensure that this situation does not occur again, Adult Services has to make sure that business is done with the right organisation in the right way from the beginning and the LD Framework is one way of doing this business within the correct processes and systems. Jayne also explained some of the background that had enabled Adult Services to respond to the Freedom of Information request and the lessons that had been learnt.

**Action** – The next key action from the Framework is the Contract Award. Feedback to the panel at the next meeting on progress on the Framework and the Freedom of Information Request.

## **6. Strategic Review Older People's Sheltered Housing Support Services and Community Alarms – Phil Howell**

Update report on 2 strategic reviews that are taking place and went to the special meeting on 4 April 2011.

The recommendation made for the Support in Sheltered Accommodation was to

- Re-model the existing support service taking away the artificial barrier between people living in sheltered accommodation and people living in their own homes / private rented accommodation. This would be done by procuring a locality based floating support model across the district focussing on where traditionally support was a prerequisite to tenancy in sheltered housing and where potentially people got very minimal / disproportionate services across Providers, focussing on needs of people with specific Housing Related Support.
- Procuring new low level services focussing on Community Integration and on building on community assets that are already there.

The recommendations for the Community Alarms were

- The money that goes towards the Community Alarms will be retracted from the sheltered support Providers and put with the money from Careline to the in house Careline service (now Safe and Sound).
- Increase the capacity of the monitoring and response to the service.
- To run through elements of the SP funding that goes to 16 different sheltered accommodation Providers.
- Some Providers have local monitoring arrangements, others have national call centres, the majority of Incommunities properties uses the Local Authority's in house service
- Bring in house the extra 2800 alarm systems and the monitoring of them, at the same time using some of the efficiency savings to enhance the response service for the

alarms which only at the moment operates between Careline and Incommunities properties.

- The process is in three stages, monitoring of the alarms into a call centre in house, over the period of 12 – 18 months sort this service out in terms of the wider agenda around Telehealth and other elements of monitoring and Health and Social Care through assisted technology – with a view long term to re-commissioning the service out to the market.

The 2 reviews were set up in January with the savings in mind which are about the efficiency and equality in the services and the personalisation agenda, both of the services have little in the way of opt out clauses for those people who do not want this support.

Work carried out since April 2011

- Work around procurement, this will be an open procurement 2 stage process for both the floating support service and the low level Community Integration services
- In the process of engaging with the in house Careline service with the view to sorting out the technical dialogue around the Alarm Service coming back in house
- There has been a meeting set up with Providers of sheltered accommodation focussing on how to go through the changes as it is important that we have access to the sheltered accommodation but also for the new services that go in to benefit the people there.

Jayne said that there were mixed messages / rumours about what the Local Authority's intentions are and wanted to give assurances that Adult Services are trying to give the right messages around these reviews.

Pam James asked if there are any plans to make this more public knowledge to stop rumours and people's feelings of uncertainty to calm the situation in sheltered housing schemes regarding what is happening and when this might be happening.

Phil said that they have met with the service user group who have been on board with this from the start, as mentioned there is a meeting scheduled with the Providers around this, the Providers are also having their own internal meetings about this, Phil assured the group that they have / are trying to communicate the right messages to all concerns from the start of this process.

A discussion took place around choices for people or if the proposed process would be restricting people's choices, it was clarified that in terms of the actual support there would be choice and that traditionally this support was a pre-requisite of the tenancy and that people got the service whether they wanted it or not and that there is no correlation between the subsidy paid to the Provider and the service that people got. The locality model in terms of procurement may be restricted in that potentially 1 Provider could be chosen to provide services across all 5 localities or between 1 – 5 Providers chosen to provide services in these localities, this could be seen as a restriction but the procurement process would ensure that the right choices were made in terms of value and the quality of the services provided.

Assurances were given that this piece of work links into the work that previously was looked at around the Older People's Housing Strategy that the members recently endorsed, it was also mentioned that this work links in with the review of Intermediate Care and the need to prevent people going into residential / nursing homes and blocking up hospital beds, this forms part of the customer journey making Housing Related Support strongly linked with the pathways through to palliative care.

Pam James wanted reassurance that the people who didn't need the service now but would in the future would be able to access it.

Jayne explained that they would have to go through the eligibility / capacity route and people would have equal rights to access the support.

**Decision** – The Group support the recommendation to continue with this work.

**Action** – Phil / Jayne to work with the press office to see if positive messages can be communicated on this.

David Shepherd asked for a briefing to be done to go to members regarding people in Sheltered Schemes.

## **7. Vulnerable Persons Housing Strategy – Jayne Hellowell**

Jayne went through the finding of the strategy that was commissioned and said that the final report would be ready in a couple of weeks.

### **Background**

The work was commissioned to look at a number of properties predominately hostels and refuges to find out what condition they were in and where we potentially needed to highlight that they needed future capital investment to get them up to standard or where a decision might be needed to decommission due to the state of the building. There have been things that have been highlighted through the strategy which dovetail into the strategic reviews, Jayne gave reassurances that no light decisions have been taken around any of the buildings, and it was only where the state of the building was so poor that a decision to decommission was made.

Jayne went through the report relating to specific sectors, main points as follows

- VAW - the strategy came up with a number of recommendations and the strategic review came up with a number of issues, these have been concluded in the strategic review with regards to the current position and also went through the financial findings
- Services supporting homeless people – Sitra did an extra piece of work around this and the decommissioning of the Salvation Army.
- To note Blenheim was taken out of domestic violence and put into homelessness as part of the review. Work needs to be done around the Blenheim Project which needs £124,270 investment over 5 years, and around what this investment will mean.
- A question was asked around the Blenheim being a homeless service rather than a VAW and if this was because the demand has dropped for VAW or if there is accommodation for this elsewhere. Jayne clarified that the Blenheim Project have stated that their primary group is homelessness.
- Services supporting young people – the strategic reviews haven't taken place for this sector and only the recommendations from the VPHS are listed.
- Offenders, refugees, alcohol misuse, complex needs and mental health - the strategic reviews haven't taken place for this sector and only the recommendations from the VPHS are listed. Box Tree Cottage has had a review and this service is improving.
- The total investment required is £609,965 over the next 5 years, this money can't all come from the Homes Agency and any money from them would go to the registered Providers, the Local Authority would need to take a proactive approach with the Landlords to see if they could bring in more investment.
- This information would go to colleagues in Housing (Richard Burnham) and will be built in more detail into to the Local Investment Plan, which will go to the Homes Agency outlining what investment is needed in Bradford.

Clarification was sought on understanding the terms used. The report was referred to as a strategy in terms of looking at the provision that exists at the moment. Nina's understanding

of a strategy was looking at the broader sector and the need, which is what is called the strategic review.

Jayne explained that the VPHS strategy took information from a number of sources to inform the process and have been dovetail into wider strategic information. Jayne explained that it was a strategy because it looked at how to deal with existing properties.

Sheila expressed her concerns around the registered Social Landlords building up a sinking fund to deal with issues highlighted in the report and felt that these funds may not be available and said that a robust approach may need to be taken with some of the housing associations as there has always been an argument that they consider investment in supported housing to be cross subsidised from the general needs accommodation and that there has always been a reluctance to do this and then they are in a situation where large amounts of investment is needed which Sheila felt was unacceptable.

Jayne agreed with this and said that the VPHS would be used as a lever to address these issues with the housing associations.

A discussion took place around the deadline for the bid to be submitted to the Homes Agency which has passed and if people did not put bids in then there would be no money for this for the next 4 years. The HCA are aware of this issue and that this was not limited to Bradford but across Yorkshire and Humber and maybe throughout the country and that there was some flexibility on this.

David mentioned that he was doing a report that would go to the Chief Executive in July and that it was worth mentioning something about supported accommodation either identifying where we would like the investment and what support we would envisage or even just opening it up for the Chief Executive to know that at a later date there is an opportunity to continue with work that is being done.

### **Recommendations**

To note the contents of the paper in relation to the strategic reviews.

## **8. Strategic Review VAW – Val Balding**

Val explained that the report follows on from the joint meeting which took place in April at which option 3 was approved in principal and is being presented at this group for approval before it goes to the Commissioning Body on 06 June. Val went through some of the key points of the report.

- Option 3 which has been approved in principal is a 3 hub + a BME hub
- Work is being done with Providers and the hubs seem to be running smoothly
- Providers have come back agreeing that they can work within the budget that was set
- There will be a decommissioning of Victim Support as they have been doing some of the target hardening which will now be picked up by the hubs, Victim Support are also not fulfilling the contract and have offered the money back.
- Val said that this would be better as this will keep the clients journey clearer as they would go from target hardening to through to outreach support.
- Decommission of the SODASSA project - there was an option to incorporate this work into one of the hubs but none of them wanted to pick this up – so it will be decommissioned.
- The overall efficiencies takes into account that the working neighbourhoods fund of £125,000 is gone, this work will be picked up by the hubs
- All organisations are moving positively towards the new hub system and hope that everything will be in place by October providing that this is approved by this group and the Commissioning Body on 06 June.
- With the hubs working closely together it is a much more pulled together service focussing on client journey whereas before the refuges were working in isolation.

Jayne mentioned that the services have been maintained whilst the 8.7% efficiency savings were made.

**Decision** – The group approved the recommendation for Option 3 and the implementation of the 4 hubs.

## 9. Strategic Reviews Homelessness – Jayne Hellowell

Representation from Gingerbread and Salvation Army would be made after Jayne had gone through the report in relation to the recommendations made in the report to decommission these services. Both Providers had extracts relating to their service prior to the meeting.

- At the Special meeting on 4 April the proposal was made for 4 hubs and a decommission, since then and having worked closely with Providers the outcome is to have 4 hubs and decommission 2 services.
- The 4 hubs are:
  - i. a merge between Key House and Wesley, there are still some slight adjustments to be made around the estimated costs highlighted in the report
  - ii. an arrangement between Incommunities and Fairweather, with Incommunities holding the primary contract and sub-contracting to Fairweather, and to carry out the Out of Hours duty service.
  - iii. Bradford Cyrenians and Blenheim Project with Bradford Cyrenians holding the primary contract and sub-contracting to Blenheim, there is also a Service Level Agreement with the DISC Project. In dialogue with Horton Housing the proposal is to have the Day Shelter open 7 days a week instead of 5 days and also to support the training around support planning and outcomes which Horton Housing have been delivering. Along with this to transfer some of the generic floating support to be re-designated as homelessness.
- In the whole of this review there has been built in an additional £100,000 to look at the need of a gateway and furniture provision, the cost is estimated but work still needs to be done on this.
- The hubs are subject to them reaching Level B of the Quality Assessment Framework, records tell us that there is significant progress towards this.
- Decommissioning of the 2 services (Gingerbread and Salvation Army)
  - iv. Salvation Army – the decommissioning of this service was raised at the meeting on 4 April and is now backed up by the report Sitra did in addition to the VPHS. A decommission plan has been put together which has not been submitted here and there is a working group ready to take forward the decommissioning plan. The decommissioning plan is a 12 month plan because of the size of the service and there are no estimated efficiency savings in this financial year.
  - v. Gingerbread Project – there is a strong argument that Gingerbread Project has had as much opportunities as other Providers in terms of trying to forge working relationships and bringing in some efficiency savings, this has not proved positive for the Local Authority and believe that this is an unsustainable service in its own right. Gingerbread has not been able to reach an agreement with any of the other hubs in terms of contracting or sub-contracting arrangements to make it sustainable. We now believe that this service sits outside of the 4 hubs hence the recommendation to decommission. This is a small service for which the contract expires in October and would like the service to be fully decommissioned by October when the contract expires.
- Efficiencies – Jayne went through the efficiencies listed under item 7 saying that as it stand the efficiency is estimated at 12.45% across the sector but needed to take into account the additional proposal for the gateway, furniture and any enhancements which will bring the efficiency down but would not want to bring it any lower than 8 or 9%.

## **Recommendations**

To approve the model of the 4 hubs noting the recommendation on Hub 4 around the Day Shelter and the training service.

Approve the decommissioning of the Gingerbread Project and the Salvation Army.

Note the expected benefits listed

Note the predicted efficiency savings across the sector.

A question was asked if there was any plan to re-tender for these services in particular Gingerbread Project. Jayne said that it was just a decommission but there was dialogue with Accent who are the landlord to see what happens with the building

A brief discussion took place around Gingerbread not being included in the VPHS, Jayne to look into this.

## **Decommissioning of the Gingerbread Service**

Gingerbread was at this stage invited to the meeting to make their representation.

Introductions were made by David Shepherd who explained the procedures for the process.

Representatives from Gingerbread were Corine Campbell – Manager and Sandra – finance Officer

Corine thanked the group for the opportunity for them to make their representation and said that she didn't feel that the report that has been presented today was an accurate representation of the project. Key points as follows.

- The project has existed for many years and has built up their expertise in the area
- Offer services to lone parent families
- The accommodation is in the second stage of semi independent living in self contained purpose built flats with staff on site Monday to Friday
- The service often fills gaps between 24 hour hostels and independent living.
- In the last 3 years 70% of their move-ons are still maintaining their tenancies which is an excellent example of their success
- Provide floating support for those service users who reach a crisis in their lives and may just need a quick phone call or a visit to see if they are ok and to prevent them from becoming homeless again
- Have an occupancy of 97.5% most of the time.
- It is entirely service user led, the management committee is made up of service users some of which have been homeless themselves
- The only organisation that offers accommodation and floating support to male victims of domestic violence and to male lone parents and their families
- In terms of the decommissioning they don't feel they have been treated fairly
- They have been in dialogue with 8 other Providers some of which were suggested by the review team and others that they approached themselves.
- Have always been willing to offer efficiency savings and contribute to the hubs and pathways.
- Still want to remain independent but are willing to work with other Providers and have been proactive in seeking partnership with Providers but those that have been suggested did not meet the approval of the review team
- Are willing to work with other organisation but would like to retain their ethos and speciality.
- If SP funding is withdrawn this will have a devastating effect on service users and the organisation, there is over 100 service users, 100 families and 11 jobs at stake.
- Have a number of other contracts and funding sources to supplement the work with other service users and lone parents in the district.
- Members were invited to look around the service and speak to service users before a decommissioning decision was made

Clarification was sought on what other services Gingerbread provided. Corine said that they ran a community based nanny service and had funding from the NHS to provide training for service users in all aspects of the support plans.

Clarification was also sought on point 14 above about their ethos and what they meant by this, Corine explained that they wanted to deliver services to lone parents as part of a holistic service across the district and in a way that has been built up by the management board who have an understanding of what lone parents need.

Clarification on point 15 – re the impact on service users and organisation if SP money was withdrawn. The explanation given was that the SP money allowed Gingerbread to have an office base / a centre for activities, through this base the organisation are able to receive donations and secure funding to be able to provide more services, the accommodation is unsustainable with out the SP money.

David explained that the recommendations would be looked at but it was not this group who would make a decision. The recommendations would go to the Commissioning Body on 06 June. Feedback would be given to Gingerbread after this meeting.

Corine closed with a final request that if they were unsuccessful in changing the recommendations then they would like to be part of the decommissioning process and for any support that they could offer to service users.

### **Decommissioning of the Salvation Army**

Salvation Army was at this stage invited to the meeting to make their representation.

Introductions were made by David Shepherd who explained the procedures for the process.

Representatives from Salvation Army were Kath Skelly – Centre Manager and Brian Wallace – Homelessness Support Manager for the North of England.

Brian acknowledged from the terms of reference that they were only here to challenge the accuracy of the report presented to the group. The key points that Brian highlighted are as follows

- With reference to the second paragraph in relation to Sitra's report as part of the VPHS, the Salvation Army felt that this was a generic statement and not specific to Lawley House
- The statement goes on to say that the worst case scenario is that the temporary provision can prevent people from moving on and believed that this was conjecture and did not fit in with the statistics for Lawley House
- The cumulative figure for the last 12 months indicated that there was a throughput of 525% resulting in 156 people being positively re-housed.
- In respect of the Annual Sector Review the Salvation Army believe that dialogue should have taken place and copies of the report should have been made available prior to the meeting today.
- According to the minutes of the last meeting the VPHS findings have only been presented today therefore the results have not been published prior to this meeting and therefore the decision to decommission the service was made before the results of the report being released and feel that they are being asked to respond to reports that haven't been made available to them. As well as this the result of the survey carried out for the VPHS have not been made available to them
- The first time they heard about the decision to decommission the service was at the provider forum
- In 1971 Lawley House was purpose built to provide a service to homeless males and was fully supported by the Local Authority as a strategic need.

- In 1999 the Salvation Army undertook a refurbishment of the premises at a cost of £1mil which was also supported by the Local Authority as it was seen as a specific need
- Kath read out some statements outlining that there was a need for accommodation for homeless people and that during the winter covering a 3 month period that 1,426 bed nights had been provided to 115 different people on Church hall floors
- Kath said that the Local Authority was proposing to close bed spaces provided by the Salvation Army when homelessness was at an all time high.
- The bed spaces provided in Church halls only covered a 3 month period but the Salvation Army was an all year round service providing accommodation to homeless and vulnerable people across the district
- The report stated that service users felt that the quality of the service was poor and that the service seemed to be institutionalised in nature and that residents would like more modern en suite facilities and kitchens.
- Stated that the report does not highlight that there is a willingness expressed to Sitra during their reporting of the VPHS that they were looking at funding any recommendations made.
- The Salvation Army have always been willing to undertake a feasibility study to look at the redesign of the service but have not been given the opportunity to discuss this.
- 800+ referrals have come through Lawley House in the last 12 months and there are increased referrals from the Probation service and are recording above average referrals and admittances from the Armed Forces
- The protocols in the terms of reference 4.4 have not been followed
- In view of this a request was made to defer the decision until the above points were addressed.
- The Salvation Army would like to have a presence in Bradford and were willing to work with the Local Authority to provide a service that is strategically relevant.
- An Independent Quality Inspectorate stated that Lawley House was the highest improving centre within the Salvation Army

Once representatives from Salvation Army left the room, discussions on the decommissioning of both services took place. The following are a few key points:

#### **Salvation Army**

- Jayne said that the remodelling into smaller self contained units was new and that the recommendations had been communicated much earlier.
- Jayne clarified that the strategic reviews always made it clear that the VPHS would inform that process and is not seen in isolation with what is happening with the hubs and also clarified that the decision to decommission had not been made as it was a recommendation at previous meetings.
- Concerns were also raised about the gap that could be left if the service is decommissioned and also needed further understanding of the statistics presented especially around the 800+ referrals and where they were coming from. Jayne said that the decommissioning would be done over 12 months and the 4 hubs would be in place by October, so there would be an overlap which would reduce any risks
- A discussion also took place around other work that would need to be picked up by the hubs if the Salvation Army was decommissioned.

#### **Gingerbread Project**

- There had not been any proposals from Gingerbread where were able to come to a working arrangement with any of the other hubs.
- Nina closed the discussion by asking if there was any support and advise the Providers may be able to access in order to operate without SP funding.

#### **Decision on Recommendations –**

Sheila said that if there was anyone who had a vested interest i.e. have been involved with the homelessness review should refrain from the decision making process

The modelling of the 4 hubs noting the recommendation on Hub 4 around the Day Shelter and the training service – approved.

The decommissioning of the Gingerbread Project and the Salvation Army - Approved

- Salvation Army 6 votes for decommissioning, no votes against this.
- Gingerbread 5 votes for decommissioning, 3 votes against this.

The expected benefits listed were noted.

The predicted efficiency savings across the sector were noted.

#### **10. Any Other Business**

Nina handed out flyers at the meeting regarding the big challenge event which was about having fun, friendship and learning new things, team members and volunteers were needed to support the event, members were needed from the following groups

- Young disabled people
- Other young people
- Community Reps
- Local Businesses
- Faith reps
- Older people
- Public Sector
- There would also be a wild card entry

For further information please contact Darryl Smith (Cohesion and Inclusion lead) on 01274 431234, email [darryl.smith@bradford.gov.uk](mailto:darryl.smith@bradford.gov.uk)

**Date of Next meeting – 16 August 2011**