

## Participatory Budgeting Health and Well-Being: Summary and Analysis of comments

### Create shared service for adult social care – combine with other authorities

#### Summary of comments

- **All respondents offering an opinion were broadly supportive with only proviso being a single comment calling for service only to be shared with councils with similar principles and ethos as WBC**

#### Areas for possible for consideration (depending on other sources of information)

Positive responses suggest general acceptance of this proposal however it should be noted that this is an 'easy' proposal to support from the public's point of view (it can be seen as non-detrimental to residents) as it does not obviously imply any loss of service

### Seek more volunteers to support people in need of help but who don't have 'eligible needs'

#### Summary of comments

- **There was a mixed response to this proposal with only limited clear dissent or approval (one comment each). The dominant focus of comments was on capacity and funding of Voluntary Community Sector (VCS)**

#### Areas for possible for consideration (depending on other sources of information)

There was only limited objection to the principle of implementing this proposal, but there were clear doubts expressed about the practicality of doing so.

Responses questioning the capacity of the VCS to provide this support, and the need for more funding from WBC if it is to do so, demonstrate a clear link between this and the proposals below to reduce support to the sector. This raises a question over WBC's ability to implement both this proposal and reductions to the sector.

### Reduce support costs to people with learning disabilities in their homes – homecare rather than 'support workers'

#### Summary of comments

- **Responses focused on the quality of the care with concerns over whether this could be maintained if proposal were to be implemented. Some respondents assumed this could not be the case (and therefore strongly opposed the proposal); others sought reassurance on the issue.**

#### Areas for possible for consideration (depending on other sources of information)

Although responses showed no appetite or acceptance for a lower quality of care offer (and some unwillingness even to link care for people with learning disabilities with saving money), reaction to this proposal in terms of the number of strength of comments was lower than other H&WB 'reduced support/funding' proposals.

### Firm focus on Continuing Healthcare – ensuring the NHS funds NHS activity

#### Summary of comments

- **As with other proposals that could be seen as ‘detriment free’, this received a reasonably high level of support. There were also a number of other saving suggestions linked to this proposal that focused on early intervention and joint commissioning**

#### Areas for possible for consideration (depending on other sources of information)

The principle of NHS funding NHS activity was generally (and unsurprisingly) accepted. However, some respondents’ comments suggest that they link the issue of Local Authorities’ relationship with the NHS more with maximising opportunities for joint early intervention rather than disputes over who should pay. This may reflect the reality that taxpayers pay either way and the perception that joint working and early intervention increase efficiency

### Reduce the amount given to carers

#### Summary of comments

- **Responses were unanimously opposed to this proposal, although one comment suggested an alternative saving that could be achieved through identifying carers who should not be funded**

#### Areas for possible for consideration (depending on other sources of information)

Responses showed a strong appreciation for the role of carers, including a perception that they provide a preventative service that saves money in other areas.

The suggestion of identifying those who should not be funded was not elaborated on but suggests that at least one respondent would have been prepared to support WBC distinguishing between carers who need financial support and those who don’t (means-testing?)

### Charge for carers services

#### Summary of comments

- **This proposal attracted few comments compared to most other H&WB proposals and provoked noticeable less opposition than other proposals that would directly affect residents (as opposed to those that could be seen as non-detrimental). The two comments offering conditional support called for means-testing to be used**

#### Areas for possible for consideration (depending on other sources of information)

The comparably low level of responses may suggest this proposal would be among the more acceptable to residents and may receive support if linked to means-testing.

There may be a link between this and the proposal above in terms of potential support for mean-testing carers in general

### Reduce the number of social work practitioners (social workers and social work assistants)

#### Summary of comments

- Respondents were almost unanimous in their opposition to this proposal with the only supportive comments focussing on early intervention and education as a means of reducing need for social work practitioners
- Specific points raised in opposition focussed on existing staff shortages and impact on other services.

#### Areas for possible for consideration (depending on other sources of information)

Responses show there is a perception that this service is already over-stretched and this was the main reason for opposition to the proposal. This may suggest that the proposal would be more acceptable were it accompanied by measures to prevent the need for social care practitioners by reducing dependency upon them.

### Outsource remaining in-house services

#### Summary of comments

- This proposal attracted the fewest comments and, in line with others that could be perceived as non-detrimental, it was well-received. The only conditions placed on support were that standards do not drop and that outsourcing should be to a non-profit-making organisation.

#### Areas for possible for consideration (depending on other sources of information)

There was no objection in principle to out-sourcing to non-profit-making organisations, however no comments related to other potential implications of out-sourcing such staff reductions or other changes to the way the service would actually be delivered

### Radically reduce prevention services (voluntary organisations, social and leisure services to older people)

#### Summary of comments

- All respondents commenting directly on this proposal opposed it, with main focus on prevention being cheaper and better in long-term

#### Areas for possible for consideration (depending on other sources of information)

Respondents showed a recognition of the link between prevention services and long-term savings

Particular focus of those opposed to the proposal was on its impact on older population

### Build more homelessness provision to avoid paying more expensive bed and breakfast accommodation

#### Summary of comments

**Strong support for this proposal as both an invest-to-save initiative with only issues raised being whether saving would be lost in capital cost overruns and whether homelessness should be prevented rather than coped with.**

#### Areas for possible for consideration (depending on other sources of information)

As with support for preventative services above, responses suggest support for short-term investment to make longer-term savings

### Reduce the amount people are given (Personal Budgets) to meet their care needs

#### Summary of comments

- **Mixed response to this proposal, with some clear opposition but also questions over how personal budgets should best be managed and whether**

#### Areas for possible for consideration (depending on other sources of information)

Although not widely supported, this proposal attracted less negative comment than other H&WB 'reduced support/funding' proposals

Comments suggest there is confusion / doubt over the use of Personal Budgets at this time

### Move those in residential care who have run out of money to cheaper homes

#### Summary of comments

- **Overwhelming opposition to this proposal with main focus on impact upon older people affected and on the general quality of care.**

#### Areas for possible for consideration (depending on other sources of information)

Unlike on other proposals, no responses cited personal responsibility (to ensure individual can afford to remain in residential care) as a reason to support reduction. This may reflect the fact, as one respondent expressed it, 'we all have to get old one day' and therefore this would be seen having a potential effect on all residents

### Reduce free school holiday swimming programme to provide only for pupils receiving free school meals

#### Summary of comments

- **Although there was general opposition to this proposal, the responses were more mixed than most other H&WB 'reduced support/funding' proposals. As with other proposed cuts to preventative services, the risk of incurring longer term costs was raised.**

#### Areas for possible for consideration (depending on other sources of information)

The more mixed response to this proposal suggest it could have a greater level of support / acceptance than other savings.

As with other reduction in preventative services, this could have long-term cost implications