

We all need good quality social care

During our life most of us become carers, or dependent on social care, whether of our elderly parents or partners, our disabled siblings or children. Our need for social care is a basic need, not a minority need of the <5000 users Haringey has on its books. We all have an interest in what the Council does to social care.

The Council's budget proposal to cut social care by £30m is a threat to this basic need. Proposals to cut 3 LD day-centres, Linden residential, 'Shared Lives', 20% cut in care packages, 25% cut in social workers.

These cuts follow closure of 5 day centres and 5 residential homes for OP, LD since 2011.

Stripping away Haringey's social care assets will have a profound impact on the most vulnerable, leaving v little provision left. Asset cuts are irreversible.

We would have expected a rigorous examination of the impact of the cuts and the consequences of new provisions replacing decommissioned services. But no...

- little on future numbers of elderly/dementia, LD, Physically Disabled & MI whose needs council has duty to meet; only broad brush ONC & IPC data
- nothing on future levels of critical and substantial needs. We know that needs have been increasing year by year for several decades because of the ageing population.
- no data on carers in Haringey who bear the brunt of cuts. Yet the new proposals expressly place new burdens of care on carers. According to *Care Purchasing Packages* the Council proposes *to make more use of personal, community, family and voluntary sector resources rather than professional help*
- little on new provisions to replace decommissioned provisions. Only talk of *reablement* and *enablement*. Plans to pursue 'intensive reablement' (6 weeks) aiming to achieve full independence or at least to reduce high cost packages can help only to a small proportion of elderly and PH; but not dementia, LD, autism. BT thought 1-2% LD would benefit from reablement. Evidence for this limited to small numbers of elderly and PD
- talk of profit-led *social enterprise schemes*: very risky for the council and for its most vulnerable. If these social enterprises fail, the council would have to meet their needs with provisions it will no longer have. These enterprises - like Neighbourhood Connects - are spelt out in terms of vague objectives and outcomes, but not in terms of what they are and what they do - apart from one case study in tonight's papers. Insufficient evidence to pin such high hopes on
- talk of passing social care activities from trained and experienced staff of day centre onto residential and supported living staff who are already overloaded and poorly paid; amounting to a denial of rights of vulnerable people to socialise with others outside their homes; a denial of their right to be included

- No costing on new provision to replace decommissioned buildings. SS Director has written in response to this question: "The proposals are high level and if the budget is agreed by Cabinet there will follow more detailed consultation and development of plans to support the information requested".

So Cllrs are being asked to vote on service cuts without the information they need on the type and cost of new services to replace decommissioned services. Council has legal duty to provide Cllrs with information to make *informed* decisions

We're told **budget proposal is higher level plan**, therefore plans to cut services don't need research input or detailed costings

- But £70m cut will have to fall somewhere, social care with planned £30m cuts will still take big hit

Conclude

Haringey is way out of kilter with other London authorities who have so far announced their cuts: ie tens and hundreds of £1000; not £millions. Islington has announced £11.1m cuts from Housing & SS. Take away housing and cuts in admin and training, you get about £1.5m. All other London Bor budgets announced so far include at worst much smaller social care cuts.

The test for the council is: *Can it meet these needs with building-less care, social enterprises and reablement?* We can see no evidence to support this contention.