## Appendix 7 – Housing Related Floating Support – Summary of all comments regarding District and Borough Authorities, a potential new unitary and other system partners at the Cabinet Meeting 25<sup>th</sup> February 2025

## Summary of comment under agenda item 5 - Adult Social Care 2025/26 Proposals Overarching Report

| Item:                 | Speaker                                   | Start time: | End<br>time: | Summary of comments  | Notes  |
|-----------------------|---|-------------|--------------|--|--|
| Item 5. ASC proposals | Mark<br>Stainton<br>(Director<br>of ASCH) | 00:6.29     | 00:6.37      | It was noted that system partners have responded to consultation and whilst understanding the financial challenges, are concerned about the additional demand that will be generated.  | Raised in the context of feedback<br>from public consultation on all<br>proposals, not specific to Housing<br>Related Floating Support |
| Item 5: ASC proposals | Councillor<br>Tutt                        | 00:08:45    | 00:08:49     | Stated that we also know [ESCC] will be ending in a couple of years from now   |  |
| Item 5: ASC proposals | Councillor<br>Tutt                        | 00:09:29    | 00:09:54     | Stated that consultation has taken place and the vast majority of people who have replied have said they are opposed to the measures.  |  |
| Item 5: ASC proposals | Councillor<br>Tutt                        | 00:10:47    | 00:11:17     | Stated that if the proposals go ahead there will be an impact on the public purse through increased pressure on the NHS and Boroughs and Districts. Councillor Tutt, referenced that under the new unitary authority, of which ESCC will be part, responsibilities will join together. |  |
| Item 5: ASC proposals | Councillor<br>Daniel                      | 00:14:33    | 00:14:56     | Stated that it is a time of flux and we will be going into a unitary situation and that in parts of these cuts costs would be being transferred onto Districts and Boroughs and so if you look overall it makes no sense.  |  |
| Item 5: ASC proposals | Councillor<br>Daniel                      | 00:15:06    | 00:15:28     | Stated that a holding position would be better so the unitary authority can then consider things as a whole; and that one proposal saves ESCC £4.5 million but costs districts and Boroughs £9 million and that this makes no sense.   |  |
| Item 5: ASC proposals | Councillor<br>Daniel                      | 00:15:31    | 00:16:02     | Stated that he understood the situation, could use more reserves. Stated that although this was not tenable in the long run, ESCC would only exist in its current form for the next  |  |

|                          |                       |          |          | couple of years and therefore the timing was not beneficial to make dramatic decisions that will do real harm.   |   |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|----------|----------|--|---|
| Item 5: ASC proposals    | Councillor<br>Shing   | 00:17:00 | 00:17:19 | Stated that he understood the funding shortage but he was sure if can keep services running for a year until the next mayor election services can be continued in the next council   | Recording cut out at 00:17:19 and started again on Councillor Maples at 18:50 |
| Item 5: ASC proposals    | Councillor<br>Maples  | 00:18:50 | 00:18:57 | Stated that proposals will also have a major impact on other services  |   |
| Item 5: ASC<br>proposals | Councillor<br>Maples  | 00:18:58 | 00:19:40 | Stated that in a short time the history of this council will be done and we will be moving to a unitary, and that what is being set up here makes it less and less possible for that unitary to be successful or to make a success of serving the community which will elect it.   |   |
| Item 5: ASC proposals    | Councillor<br>Scott   | 00:22:07 | 00:22:30 | Stated we have heard about concerns over the long term regarding East Sussex County Council and where it will end up and we don't know at this point. Stated that everything points to a unitary of some sort and we don't know what the funding streams will be then.   |   |
| Item 5: ASC proposals    | Councillor<br>Hilton  | 00:26:34 | 00:27:13 | Stated that there's a willingness in the report that the five local housing authorities would be willing to come together to try and respond to the proposed cuts and that this has been rejected. Stated that this is a really short-sighted cut and to actively delay the cut to look at cross sector working on this, something we are going to have to do given local government reorganisation so that we don't lose a valuable service that is going to cost us a lot of money in the future | Specifically referenced the Housing Related Floating Support proposal         |
| Item 5: ASC proposals    | Councillor<br>Stanley | 00:28:58 | 00:29:20 | In response to comments on the use of reserves and local government reorganisation, stated that we all know reserves can only be spent once and the idea in two years it will be someone else and so it doesn't matter is worrying, and that to bankrupt the unitary before it starts would not help the people of East Sussex.  |   |
| Item 5: ASC proposals    | Mark<br>Stainton      | 00:40:04 | 00:40:51 | Noted Councillor Hilton's comment that there was a rejection of some offer to work with the housing authorities and said this was not recognised. Mark Stainton did clarify that a request to  |   |

|  | extend timescales had been rejected as it would not have enabled us to deliver the necessary savings.  Noted that there have been conversations with all of the Boroughs and Districts, noting they are at an early stage but he is hopeful that regardless of decisions we will be able to work together and with our strategic partner BHT Sussex to come up with some solution to provision, but clarified there had not been any rejection of an approach from the Boroughs and districts. |  |
|--|--|--|
|--|--|--|

## Summary of comments under agenda item 13 – Housing Related Floating Support Service Report

| Item:  | Speaker                      | Start time: | End time: | Summary of comments   | Notes   |
|--|------------------------------|-------------|-----------|---|---|
| Item 13: Floating<br>Support Service<br>report | David Chaffey,<br>BHT Sussex | 02:21:18    | 2:22:03   | It was stated that the political landscape has changed since the original proposals, with a real prospect of East Sussex becoming a unitary authority meaning responsibility for homelessness currently with Districts and Boroughs will become the County's responsibility. It was stated that it would therefore be short sighted to cut the service at this point and that this would be a saving to ultimately spend. | This was part of the Lead petition section        |
| Item 13: Floating<br>Support Service<br>report | Paul Goddard,<br>BHT Sussex  | 02:22:11    | 02:22:31  | It was stated that adults referred by the five District and Borough housing teams are supported and without this there would be an additional estimated cost of £9.9million a year for temporary accommodation.   | This was part of the lead petition section        |
| Item 13: Floating<br>Support Service<br>report | Paul Goddard,<br>BHT Sussex  | 02:23:10    | 02:23:35  | It was stated that as a strategic partner BHT Sussex understand the need for savings and this is why they have proposed a lower reduction so a service could be retained and there could also be work with partners to mitigate the impact of this lesser cut.  | This was part of the lead petition section        |
| Item 13: Floating<br>Support Service<br>report | Mark Stainton                | 02:24:06    | 02:24:24  | It was stated that the floating support service is under a contract delivered by BHT Sussex as a strategic partner, which has a level of significance, it isn't just a commissioned service.  | This was in response to the lead petition section |

| Item 13: Floating<br>Support Service<br>report | Mark Stainton   | 02:25:29 | 02:25:57 | It was stated that because of the housing focus of the service only half of the referrals come from the County Council; just under a quarter from Borough and District housing departments, a fifth from other organisations like the NHS, VCSE and probation, and the balance from self-referrals.  | This was in response to the lead petition section |
|--|-----------------|----------|----------|--|---|
| Item 13: Floating<br>Support Service<br>report | Mark Stainton   | 02:27:14 | 02:27:30 | It was stated that 1,425 consultation responses for housing related floating support were received, many from system partners, and 92% disagreed with the proposals.   | This was in response to the lead petition section |
| Item 13: Floating<br>Support Service<br>report | Mark Stainton   | 02:27:14 | 02:29:19 | It was stated that real concern was highlighted about the absence of alternative provision and the reliance placed on the service by other organisations and the impact on the wider housing system. It was stated that there are limited mitigations, and that these largely relate to working with BHT Sussex and key stakeholders including the Borough and District housing departments to redesign services in the reduced financial envelope.  | This was in response to the lead petition section |
| Item 13: Floating<br>Support Service<br>report | Mark Stainton   | 02:29:40 | 02:30:07 | It was stated that appendix 2 sets out the wider system financial implications that have been reported and that collectively Borough and District colleagues have indicated that if this support had not been available and temporary accommodation had been needed this would generate an additional cost to the housing authorities in the region of £9.9million per annum.  | This was in response to the lead petition section |
| Item 13: Floating<br>Support Service<br>report | Councillor Tutt | 02:34:01 | 02:34:54 | It was stated that as far as the public purse is concerned the proposals make no sense. It was stated that it is recognised it is not a statutory responsibility but that the amount of money that will be spent at Borough and District levels if removed will be considerable. It was stated that the suggestion from petitioners should be seriously considered and the service continued to at least the end of the financial year to give an opportunity to work with the service provider and Boroughs and Districts to find an alternative model. |   |
| Item 13: Floating<br>Support Service<br>report | Councillor Tutt | 02:35:28 | 02:36:07 | It was stated that the use of temporary accommodation has increased dramatically as Borough and District colleagues will confirm, and that as such there would be an impact on the public purse as a whole. It was also stated that the future is a unitary  |   |

|  |                      |          |          | council that is going to have these responsibilities and by taking the proposal for the cut problems will be stored up in the longer term.   |  |
|--|----------------------|----------|----------|--|--|
| Item 13: Floating<br>Support Service<br>report | Councillor<br>Maples | 02:37:48 | 02:37:59 | Stated that the service works currently as there is a strategic partner approach, and this will be needed going into the next phase of local government.   |  |
| Item 13: Floating<br>Support Service<br>report | Councillor<br>Maples | 02:38:50 | 02:39:20 | Stated that what is being proposed is to abandon a strategic partnership that could be positive for a unitary, and that this demonstrates irresponsibility towards the financial future of a unitary authority.  |  |
| Item 13: Floating<br>Support Service<br>report | Councillor<br>Maples | 02:39:30 | 02:39:46 | Strongly suggests that the decision is postponed and reconsidered to allow the service to continue until the point that there can be proper conversations with a new unitary authority.  |  |
| Item 13: Floating<br>Support Service<br>report | Councillor<br>Shing  | 02:40:38 | 02:41:06 | Stated that although the service is not a statutory duty of the County Council and won't impact the County Council 100% in a couple of years if you carry forwards to a new unitary the problems will continue.  |  |
| Item 13: Floating<br>Support Service<br>report | Councillor<br>Daniel | 02:42:55 | 02:43:24 | Stated that if you look at costs then looking at the housing authorities spending £9.9million as well as increasing costs for Children's Services and increased time required by ASCH staff to work with people as cannot refer on, so cost for us as well.  |  |
| Item 13: Floating<br>Support Service<br>report | Councillor<br>Daniel | 02:44:45 | 02:4:54  | Stated that would be throwing the burden to another authority yet goingto join together probably in the next year or two, and that this makes no sense.  |  |
| Item 13: Floating<br>Support Service<br>report | Councillor<br>Hilton | 02:46:26 | 02:47:10 | Stated that the Health and Wellbeing Board agenda had just arrived in her inbox including draft East Sussex Housing Partnership to develop a partnership housing strategy and set medium to long term priorities for the sector locally to provide a framework for cross sector collaboration and support; and therefore questioned whether the 'nonsense' was the fact of not allowing a delay so that Borough and District colleagues can think through a proper support process going forward for something that is going to come back, or if it was talking about partnership working? |  |

| Item 13: Floating<br>Support Service<br>report | Councillor<br>Hilton       | 02:47:44 | 02:47:59 | Stated that if the proposal does go ahead then it is hoped that ongoing cost pressures that will come will be tracked so that there is a future evidence base for what this has cost us.   |
|--|----------------------------|----------|----------|--|
| Item 13: Floating<br>Support Service<br>report | Councillor<br>Robinson     | 02:48:32 | 02:48:54 | Stated that Eastbourne Borough Council and Hastings Borough Council have a tremendous emergency accommodation and homeless problem and that the £9.9million burden that would probably fall on them might have an awful affect financially and maybe even result in them going into section 114. It was stated that it could be argued this is not the County Councils problem, but that it will be.   |
| Item 13: Floating<br>Support Service<br>report | Councillor<br>Shuttleworth | 02:50:54 | 02:51:47 | Stated that there are immense pressures at the moment on housing, homelessness and temporary accommodation, having a massive impact not just in Eastbourne and it seems counterproductive in terms of partnerships working together with BHT, and doesn't make sense to not be trying to continue a dialogue to try and find a short term solution. He noted that from an Eastbourne Borough Council perspective want to work with the County Council to try and find a way through. |
| Item 13: Floating<br>Support Service<br>report | Councillor<br>Wright       | 02:52:18 | 02:52:27 | Stated that in a year or twos time this will be a unitary authority and the problem is just being kicked down the line.  |
| Item 13: Floating<br>Support Service<br>report | Councillor<br>Maynard      | 02:54:04 | 02:54:07 | Stated that there is no them and us between the District and Boroughs and County Council.  |
| Item 13: Floating<br>Support Service<br>report | Councillor<br>Maynard      | 02:55:37 | 02:55:50 | Stated that conversations with the Districts and Boroughs have gone on since the consultation commenced and that officers at the Districts and Boroughs are well engaged with the County Council and vice versa on a way forwards.   |
| Item 13: Floating<br>Support Service<br>report | Mark Stainton              | 02:58:45 | 02:59:21 | Stated that if cabinet decided to go ahead with the proposal there are 34 days before contractual notice would need to be given which will provide an opportunity for further conversations with system partners to see if they could make a contribution towards this service.  |