

# Bristol City Council

## Supported Parents Commissioning Plan

Full consultation report

October 2022 Carmel Brogan

### Contents

Section A – Introduction and methodology

Section B – Feedback from the consultation event

Section C – Feedback from Supported Parents Service Users

Section D – Consultation Feedback Summary

Section G – Survey results

## Section A - Introduction and methodology

The draft Supported Parents Service recommissioning plan was developed following extensive engagement with a range of internal and external stakeholders including focus groups and interviews with current and ex-service users who have gone through the homelessness prevention services.

On 14<sup>th</sup> October 2022, we carried out a consultation exercise with both internal and external stakeholder which marks the beginning of the 6 weeks consultation period that ended on 30<sup>th</sup> November 2022. During this period, we used a variety of methods to gather people's views on the proposal set out in the draft plan. This document summarises the feedback we received and the council's response to the key issues raised during the consultation.

### Methodology

We invited people to give us their views in a variety of ways as follows:

- Consultation workshops with providers, focus group and internal stakeholders
- Supported Parents group interview by IF group
- Survey Monkey Online Survey for Supported Parents service users

### What we consult on

For the Supported Parents Service, we consulted on the following.

- To increase the age of children accessing the service to up to 5 years.

- To make provisions for accessible accommodation with ground floor level access.

We have not consulted with service users on our commissioning plan to split the integrated services (separate the floating support element from accommodation-based support). We do not feel the service users have an understanding of the nature of the integrated service and hence their feedback may not be relevant.

## Who did we speak to

Consultation method	Date	Service Users	Internal stakeholders	External stakeholders	Total attendees
Consultation workshop	14/10/2022		5	17	22
Feedback from service provider's senior management	24/11/2022			2	2
IF Group interviewing Supported Parents face-to-face.	November/December	7			7
Survey Monkey survey for Supported Parent Service users.	September/October	4			4

## Section B – Feedback from Consultation event & Current Providers

Supported Parents Service Recommendation Section	
1	<b>Recommendation 1: Increase the age of children accessing the accommodation to up to 5 years. What would be the added benefits or risks to increasing the age range?</b>

1.1	<p><b>Benefits:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More families will be eligible for the service.</li> <li>• Reduction in use of temp/shared accommodation.</li> <li>• Greater stability particularly important at preschool and school transition</li> <li>• Closer monitoring of more children-more targeted approach.</li> </ul> <p><b>Current Provider's feedback:</b>  We are keen for the new service to deliver to as many households as is feasible. In that spirit, we would support broadening the eligibility to include children aged up to 5 years at service entry. Application of this change in eligibility however, must be considered, taking into account the safety of all children in the service, the limitations of the building in which the services will be delivered and professional expertise in child development.</p>	<p>Commissioners agree that this proposal will reduce the numbers of refusals, more family will be eligible for the service and may help reduce void days.</p> <p>Current providers have during the consultation event identified Lanecost &amp; Wigton and Owen Street as two schemes that can accommodate children up to the age of 5 years. Commissioners are happy with this identification.</p> <p>A possible option could be to use Lanercost &amp; Wigton as a low support scheme for parents with older children. This should avoid the issue of mixing young and older children.</p>
1.2	<p><b>Risks:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could make school applications more complicated</li> <li>• Risk of disruption to child's schooling if they move over from accommodation-needs education involvement</li> <li>• Mixing a wider age range of children can be challenging</li> <li>• Specialist responsibilities needs to be clearly assigned</li> <li>• Ensuring physical environment is available for age group.</li> <li>• Some risks include the services having to take on more work that is not part of their specialist role.</li> </ul>	<p>Having older children at one scheme will reduce the challenges of children moving from one school to another.</p>

1.3	<p><b>General comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarity on specialist work done by providers such as dealing with children who have learning difficulties such as autism etc.</li> <li>• A suggestion of a party agreement with the specification.</li> <li>• Eligibility of certain sights need to be considered such as the physical environment as well as the unit of where the child is living if the age increases to 5 years.</li> <li>• Clarity of the responsibility to do with the contract and be specific what we as commissioners expect providers to be doing and to what extent.</li> </ul> <p><b>Current Provider's feedback:</b> The service would be more effective and deliver improved outcomes with a greater degree of transparency around waiting lists and a formalised process for service providers to input into allocation decisions. We do not believe that the provision of the service should be predicated on partnership working between the providers and Social Services (though we agree that effective partnership working will be essential to deliver the best possible service).</p>	<p>We appreciate that on occasions the service has to deal with children with learning difficulties such as autism as with other family service providers. Social care support can be requested from the family social worker.</p> <p>The specification will be SMART, providers will have opportunity to input.</p> <p>Provider have identified Lanercost &amp; Wigton as a scheme able to accommodate children of up to 5 years. We are proposing to use this scheme for older children only, so no mixture of younger and older children.</p> <p>The ISAT coordinator is responsible for nominating into family and parent services. Provider's request to have access to waiting list was discussed and was not recommended by ISAT team. However, a clear formal process for nominations should be made available.</p>
<b>How would the service flex to support this client group with slightly older children?</b>		
1.4	<p><b>Provider Feedback from Consultation Day</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can flex the scheme by looking at what units can accommodate children who are up to 5 years of age such as Lanercost &amp; Wigton which could accommodate for 4-5 years at service entry, and up to 7 years could be manageable.</li> </ul> <p><b>Feedback Rec'd from Current Provider</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bristol Parents Alliance is not averse to housing children up to 5 at entry to the service, however we ask for recognition that the accommodation should reflect the growing needs of the child and family and not be placed in the one bedroomed accommodation where there are younger children also being housed. We are happy</li> </ul>	<p>Current provider indicated that Lanercost and Wigton and Owen Street can accommodate children of age 4-5 years.</p> <p>Commissioners have proposed to increase the age across all the schemes but have now reconsidered not to mix younger and older children. To nominate only parents with older children to Lanercost &amp; Wigton and Owen Street which were identified by provider as the suitable scheme for older children.</p>

	to discuss with commissioners if there is an identified need for placements with older children, a procurement of further accommodation to support these families.	
2	<b>Recommendation 2: Make provisions for accessible accommodation with ground floor level access.</b> What percentage of the total number of units provided within the service or quantity be deemed as a suitable level, based on the needs analysis?	
2.1	<p><b>General comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4-6 units need to be accessible-possibly more as longer stays due to lack of adapted social housing.</li> <li>• Overall, 36 units in the service and the following could be deem as suitable for level access.</li> <li>• Priory Court 2 units</li> <li>• Lanercost &amp; Wigton 6 units</li> <li>• Kilburn Court 2 units</li> <li>• Phoenix Place 2 ground floor fully accessible</li> <li>• To fully map accessible properties audit</li> <li>• Need to audit needs of clients in terms of accessibility.</li> <li>• There is also a need for more accessible social housing.</li> </ul>	<p>The units identified on the left as suitable for level access to be earmark for wheelchair users during nomination when they become void.</p> <p>Commissioners would request provider to specify the details of these units identified, so it is clear in the specification.</p>
2.2	<b>What type of accommodation (dispersed, block, self-contained) would best suit people with physical disability and mobility issues?</b>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Self-contained, as sharing facilities can be prohibitive, preferable all on one level.</li> <li>• Mixture of dispersed and block- could be hub and spoke model (in same geographical area)</li> <li>• Priory Court and Lanercost &amp; Wigton-looking at more units on site</li> </ul>	<p>Self-contained ground floor units with level access are required.</p> <p>Commissioners will welcome more units where feasible.</p>
2.3	<b>In terms of access to accommodation more generally, which areas of the city currently work well or would work better for people to be supported in this service?</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• South, East and North covered</li> <li>• Generally located in more dispersed area.</li> <li>• More families coming through with no.</li> <li>• So generally, people want to be able to access city centre (big % 19-25)</li> <li>• All areas well served by local community infrastructure</li> <li>• Potential to increase units close to the city centre would be preferable.</li> </ul>	<p>We will continue to consider location accessible to service users and accessible to city centre with bus routes.</p>

	<b>Issues raised during consultation</b>	<b>BCC Response</b>
1	<b>Rationalise the Resettlement Support Service and the floating support element of the Supported Parents Service into a single Floating Support Service to cater for the needs of adults, young people and families. Would a single service be able to cater for the needs of adults, young people and families?</b>	

	<b>Issues raised during consultation</b>	<b>BCC Response</b>
1.1	<p><b>Advantages:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Less confusing for clients</li> <li>• YP and adult pathways working together</li> <li>• Workers working closer together and fitting in with the wider needs of clients, less refusals-rather than clients having to fit in to a service or a box.</li> </ul> <p><b>Current BPA provider's feedback:</b> The need for a specialist floating support service for families remains. Loss of the specialist floating support service would lead to a lower quality of support being provided to families in need, a diminishing of effectiveness in partnership working, particularly with Children's Services, and ultimately a reduction in positive outcomes for service users.</p>	<p>In the light of comments at the consultation events and other issues, Commissioners are proposing to keep existing adult resettlement service for further year (to align with adult and young people's pathways recommissioning in 23/24) and just focus this report on the floating support needs of families.</p> <p>Commissioners accept the strength of feeling around distinction of floating support needs for families (and relationship with children's services), compared with resettlement needs of single adults. Also agreed gaps in support provision for young people but particularly for families in EA. Young people resettlement needs will be addressed within the Pathways recommissioning in 23/24. So, propose to keep a family floating support service but not integrated with a supported parents service but more widely available to include support for families in EA (and the increasing supply of council TA provision).</p>
1.2	<p><b>Issues:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Risk of diluting skillsets and contacts &amp; networking-young people's services have built strong relationships and network, so we wouldn't want to lose this.</li> <li>• There are different safeguarding issues and concerns for young people as opposed to adults</li> <li>• Would there be sufficient money to deliver one service?</li> <li>• In terms of referrers selecting an HSR service, there could be the risk of losing a service's specialism, so criteria needs to be clear.</li> </ul>	<p>So propose to keep a family floating support service but not integrated with a supported parents (with young children) service but more widely available to include support for those in EA ( and the increasing supply of council TA provision).</p>



There were 4 parents who responded to this online survey, responded to the questions below.

	Priory/Wells	Lanercost & Wigton	Kilburn/Owen
Where do you live now?	4 (100%)	0 (0%)	n/a
	<b>No</b>	<b>Yes</b>	
Will you have issues/concern if the age of the children in the scheme is increased to 5 years?	3 (75%)	1 (25%)	n/a
Do you feel the standards of accommodation met your current needs?	2 (50%)	2 (50%)	n/a
Do you feel the standards of support your receiving meet your needs?	1 (25%)	3 (75%)	n/a
Overall are you finding the help you're getting useful?	0 (0%)	4 (100%)	n/a

## Section C – Feedback from Supported Parents Service Users through IF Group

There were six parents, and one parent ex-service user were interviewed by the IF group. Details of their response are below.

	Yes	No	Scheme
To increase the age of children who can access this accommodation-based service to up to 5 years old	0 (0%)	7(100%)	Priory and Kilburn/Owen
Do you feel the support you're receiving is meeting your current needs, and overall, are you finding the help you're getting useful?	5(75%)	2(25%)	Priory and Kilburn/Owen
	<b>High Support</b>	<b>Medium Support</b>	<b>No Support</b>
Please indicate your current support needs.	4 (57%)	2 (29%)	1 (14%)

The IF group conducted a service user survey at Priory Court and Kilburn Court to help clients understand the questions being asked and have captured some of the following comments from clients in response to the proposal to increase child age to 5 years.

“Accommodation is too small for someone older than 3 years old, 5-year-olds will be too loud and energetic for neighbours with small children. No one will get any rest. Maybe there should be more projects like this, not adding older children. This project should stay for pregnant women and parents with kids under 3. Sometimes families stay here for a few years until they find suitable accommodation. That means if 5-year-olds are allowed to be here this could mean 7-year-olds living here”.

“Not a good idea. Active children would be in danger, maximum age of 2. My little one fractured a finger with a door handle. Children at 5 are hyperactive, there would be many more incidents”.

“No – not a good idea - Pregnant women or young children only”.

“Not good. Safety concern with doors – New-born to 2 and pregnant women only”

The equalities data of the 11 parents who took part in both our online survey and IF Group survey.

<b>Description</b>	<b>16- 18</b>	<b>19-25</b>	<b>26 and above</b>	
Parents age	3 (28%)	4 (36%)	4 (36%)	
	<b>0-1 Year</b>	<b>1-2 Years</b>	<b>2-3 Years</b>	
Child/ren age	2	4	5	
	<b>White/White British</b>	<b>Asian/Asian British</b>	<b>Black/Black British</b>	<b>Other</b>
Ethnic origin	8 (73%)	1 (9%)	2 (18%)	0 (0%)
	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Transgender</b>	<b>Prefer not to state</b>
Sex	0 (0%)	11 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Don't Know</b>	<b>Prefer not to state</b>
Disability	0 (0%)	11 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Are you Pregnant?	0 (0%)	11 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

## Section D – Consultation Feedback Summary on recommendations

### **Recommendations 1: To increase the age of children accessing the accommodation to up to 5 years.**

There were 13 individual responses (11 service users, 2 service providers managers). 3(27%) of the service users do not have issues with increasing the child age and 8(73) have issues or concern for increasing the child age. However, the service users who responded to this recommendation are all from the shared accommodation schemes. This recommendation was receptive by service providers however, their concern was the mixture of young babies and older children in the same scheme. Providers have identified both Lanercost & Wigton and Owen Street as possible use for older children. However, we must consider the safety of all children in the scheme, the limitations of the building in which the services will be delivered and professional expertise in child development.

### **Recommendation 2: To make provisions for accessible accommodation with ground floor level access.**

Overall, there are 36 units in the service, the providers have indicated that the following could be deemed as suitable for level access. Priory Court 2 units, Lanercost & Wigton 6 units, Kilburn Court 2 units, and Phoenix Place 2 ground floor fully accessible. It was recommended to fully map accessible properties audit, audit needs of clients in terms of accessibility. There is also a need for more accessible social housing.

### **2.2: What type of accommodation (dispersed, block, self-contained) would best suit people with physical disability and mobility issues?**

- Self-contained, as sharing facilities can be prohibitive, preferable all on one level.
- Mixture of dispersed and block- could be hub and spoke model (in same geographical area)
- Priory Court and Lanercost & Wigton-looking at more units on site

### **Recommendation 3: To rationalise the Resettlement Support Service and the floating support element of the Supported Parents Service into a single Floating Support Service to cater for the needs of adults, young people and families. Would a single service be able to cater for the needs of adults, young people and families?**

- The need for a specialist floating support service for families remains. Loss of the specialist floating support service would lead to a lower quality of support being provided to families in need, a diminishing of effectiveness in partnership working, particularly with Children's Services, and ultimately a reduction in positive outcomes for service users. There are different safeguarding issues and concerns for young people as opposed to adults.
- Commissioners have now reconsidered to keep a family floating support service but not integrated with a supported parents (with young children) service but more widely available to include support for those in EA (and the increasing supply of council TA provision).

