

# Open Agenda



## Place of Safety Joint Overview & Scrutiny Committee

Tuesday 26 April 2016

8.30 pm

Coin Street neighbourhood centre, 108 Stamford Street, SE1 9NH

## Supplemental Agenda

### List of Contents

Item No.	Title	Page No.
7.	<b>SLaM's Place of Safety proposal</b>	1 - 3
	The views of the local borough based NHS Clinical Commissioning Groups & social care commissioners have been invited. Southwark & Lambeth have provided a report and letter, which are enclosed.	
8.	<b>Stakeholders views on the central Place of Safety proposal</b>	4 - 5
	Local police forces and Healthwatches have been invited to submit their views on the proposal.	
	Metropolitan Police Service have provided a submission on the Place of Safety proposal, which is enclosed.	

Contact Julie Timbrell on 020 7525 0514 or email: [Julie.timbrell@southwark.gov.uk](mailto:Julie.timbrell@southwark.gov.uk)

Date: 22 April 2016

## **JOINT HEALTH OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE 26<sup>th</sup> APRIL 2016 – PLACE OF SAFETY**

### **SOUTHWARK COUNCIL COMMISSIONING AND SOCIAL CARE RESPONSE**

---

#### **Summary**

**This paper sets out the response by Southwark Council commissioning and social care to the proposals of the South London and Maudsley (SLAM) NHS Foundation Trust in the report – “Improving SLAM’s Place of Safety Provision”. This paper has been shared with lead commissioning partners in NHS Southwark Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG).**

#### **Response by Southwark social care**

1. Southwark social care have been involved in a number of discussions at which SLAM have set out both current issues and future proposals for ‘place of safety’ provision across Croydon, Lambeth, Lewisham and Southwark.
2. Southwark social care have also noted the significant issues raised by the Care Quality Commission (CQC) about current services, and would wish to undertake further work with SLAM and other neighbouring boroughs to ensure that people requiring ‘place of safety’ provision are able to access quality, integrated support – including through access to social care Approved Mental Health Professionals (AMHPs).
3. Southwark social care would have welcomed a more detailed consultation on the SLAM proposals. The Trust recognises it has not followed due process.
4. At this stage, Southwark social care continue to have key concerns about the SLAM proposals. These are set out below:
  - SLAM have not provided sufficient evidence (including detailed financial comparisons) for the rationale behind adopting a one site ‘place of safety’ model as opposed to other options. Southwark social care would have preferred to have received a detailed options appraisal, in particular on the potential for a two-site solution. There is limited information as to whether any other site option has been considered in detail besides the Maudsley site proposal.
  - There is no current solution in place for how the four boroughs will coordinate AMHP services to support the proposed ‘place of safety’ model, including organising AMHP rotas and the potential alignment of out of hour’s services. Very early discussions have taken place between the four boroughs on this issue. However, without more detailed consultation, it needs to be recognised that social care have not until very recently had the level of information needed in order to understand the potential operational impact. There is a risk of a

disproportionate impact on Soutwhark AMHP services without any solution in place.

- The proposal includes specific provision for children under 18 years of age, however there has not been appropriate consultation with Children's Social Care leads in any of the four boroughs.
  - The proposal does not provide sufficient evidence on how those people taken to the 'place of safety' would be able to be helped to integrate back into their own home boroughs. There is a particular risk for homeless people, and for individuals with no recourse to public funds. In this, there is a risk that the proposals would have a disproportionate impact on Southwark housing options and homeless prevention services.
  - Social care have not been provided with detailed information on the proposed site for the 'place of safety' and therefore are unable to comment on the quality or safety aspect of this proposal. Southwark social care would welcome the opportunity to visit the site and to further discuss ensuring that AMHPs are considered as part of the service as a whole.
5. Southwark social care are requesting the commencement of a consultation period in order for all four boroughs to consider these proposals in more detail.
  6. The additional consultation period would allow for time to consider other site options, as well as to look at the best configuration of AMHPs and other community services to support a new 'place of safety' model. It is recognised that SLAM would need to take immediate action to ensure that all of its current 'place of safety' services are safe.

### **Response by Southwark commissioning**

7. The statutory duty for the commissioning of 'place of safety' services lies with NHS Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs). Southwark has a joint approach to commissioning mental health services across the Council and CCG, which is underpinned by a s75 agreement.
8. At this stage, the Council's commissioning team have not been provided with sufficient information to support the proposals set forward by SLAM, including an assessment of the risk of additional financial revenue costs to Southwark Council as the host borough.
9. The Director of Commissioning in the Council notes the concerns raised by social care regarding due process and the impact on AMHPs, and would wish these issues resolved prior to the delivery of a new 'place of safety' service.



21<sup>st</sup> April 2016

Re: Single Place of Safety proposal

Lambeth Council and Lambeth CCG support the proposal to establish a single Place of Safety on the Maudsley Hospital site.

Current waiting times to access s136 assessments are too long leading to delays in accessing appropriate treatment. Staff are currently undertaking the work as part of other roles and may be busy with other people with mental illness or need to travel across the borough. If we establish a single Place of Safety this enables us to secure dedicated capacity and/or share staff across the borough and improve the quality of provision.

We have received assurance from South London & the Maudsley (SLaM) that this will be cost neutral. We fully appreciate and understand Southwark Council concerns about the potential impact on them. We have offered to work with them to resolve these issues through a partnership approach. We think there are significant benefits to people with mental illness and staff, but it would clearly be unfair for the 'host' borough to be disproportionately affected. We are confident that partners can work together to resolve these issues.

Yours faithfully

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Moira McGrath'.

Moira McGrath  
Director of Integrated Commissioning (Adults)  
London Borough of Lambeth & NHS Lambeth CCG

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Fiona Connolly'.

Fiona Connolly  
Service Director, Adult Social Care  
London Borough of Lambeth



Metropolitan Police Service submission to the Place of Safety Joint Overview and Scrutiny  
Committee, 26 April 2016

The police are afforded an extraordinary power under s136 Mental Health Act 1983; to detain a person who is in need of **immediate** care **and** control from mental distress. There is not an equivalent power afforded to the police for those that are physically unwell. Those who are in crisis, to the extent that they need immediate care and control, are a medical emergency and need to be treated as such. Police, whilst trained in restraint and awareness of mental crisis, are not trained as medical practitioners.

This means that access to trained medical care should be completed as quickly as possible; with the involvement of police minimised for both the health and dignity of the patient.

The Metropolitan Police Service has become increasingly worried about the provision of health facilities through which care can be quickly accessed for those in need and detained under s136. SLAM is fully conversant with these concerns, which form part of the Crisis Care Concordat.

SLAM offers an increasingly effective Street Triage scheme, giving officers advice on how to deal with a situation where they may need to consider s136. Ideally this will be an alternative pathway; often this will mean using s136. Its success has been in keeping the level of s136 use static in the four SLAM boroughs, whilst other areas have continued to rise. It is notable that SLAM still has the highest levels of s136 use in London. For Southwark and Lambeth this meant around approx. 100 s136 for the calendar year 2015. Croydon and Lewisham have similar levels. Each borough is already looking at higher levels this year.

The MPS recognises that police custody should only be used for those detained under s136 in truly exceptional circumstances. With the support of SLAM, it has very rarely been used on the four SLAM boroughs; and only when all accessible health care provision has been unavailable.

The only provision on each borough for s136 detentions is a dedicated 136 suite; A&E consistently refuse to accept those detained under s136. However, the 136 suites are not permanently staffed, and in some cases are not fit for purpose. Frequently the staff required to run the 136 suite are unavailable, or a suite is put out of action through damage. Whilst the Street Triage team will try to find another available s136 suite, the volume in the four boroughs means that unavailability is a real risk for any s136 detention.

During the period January 2015 through to March 2016, the Trust was unable to provide any place of safety to the Police on 72 occasions. This has been caused by all suites being occupied or a mixture of some suites being closed and some occupied.

The largest single factor which has led to closures has been the availability of staff.

The current difficulties in the London Ambulance Service means that the majority of those detained are transported by police van; despite this being against both MPS policy and the Concordat.

It is not unusual for someone detained to be held in the back of a police van for a number of hours whilst a s136 suite is found. This is not acceptable.

The MPS therefore supports improvements that speed up the access to appropriate health care, minimising the amount of time in detention by the police, improving health outcomes and dignity.

**Not protectively marked**

The combined place of safety offers a number of advantages:

- 24 hour dedicated staffing; with staff recruited directly for this role providing specialism and consistency.
- Four PoS beds, with 2 high dependency beds. Flexibility to deal with CAMHS.
- A new facility designed specifically for the task, minimising the likelihood of damage.
- The Maudlsey (and KCH) has a dedicated police officer post to support the suite.

Given the daily volumes on each borough it is unlikely that the whole suite will be unavailable – meaning that a detained person can quickly access the place of safety without delay. The process of initial assessment through Street Triage, through detention, onward briefing by Street Triage to the dedicated, specialist s136 team waiting to accept the person in crisis is very attractive. It minimises risk, and maximises health outcomes and dignity. This is dependant on that permanent team being available to respond immediately to a notified s136 through Street Triage, with a capacity to surge extra staff at periods of high demand.

Both Croydon and Lewisham police recognise that the location increases the travelling time for the detained person and their officers. However both feel that the benefits, particularly in the reduction in unavailability/delays, outweigh this concern.

The police in each of the four SLaM boroughs have been involved in the planning process. There are several areas that still require reassurance and agreement:

- The combined s136 suite is dedicated solely to s136. To use it as spare bed capacity, including following a s135 assessment or Mental Capacity Act admission, would severely detract from the advantages of having a combined suite.
- If the combined suite is at capacity, then SLaM will commit to finding alternative provision.
- We anticipate that each borough will utilise the A&E serving their area for those under s136 requiring physical health care; this needs to be formally agreed by SLaM and the acute trusts.
- Transportation remains a significant concern; LAS continue to have limited a capacity. A police van is not acceptable transport either from the street or other health care setting (including A&E).
- The pathway between A&E and SLaM continues to be a weakness. In particular, the provision of care, assessment and transport for those in crisis requiring physical treatment. This requires agreement between SLaM, the acute trusts, and LAS.
- Clarity on transportation home by SLaM for those leaving the suite following assessment who may well be vulnerable.
- Some design issues, including provision of a secure area if there is a delay in entering the suite; allowing those detained some space, particularly in summer.

These have been raised through the planning meetings, and we expect to resolve them with SLaM.

Nick Collins

Chief Inspector

On behalf of the police Borough Commanders for Southwark, Croydon, Lambeth and Lewisham.

21 April 2016

**Our Healthier South East London  
Joint Health Overview & Scrutiny Committee  
MUNICIPAL YEAR 2015-16**

**AGENDA DISTRIBUTION LIST (OPEN)**

**NOTE:** Original held by Scrutiny Team; all amendments/queries to Julie Timbrell Tel: 020 7525 0514

Name	No of copies	Name	No of copies
<b>Committee Members</b>		<b>Southwark Council &amp; Southwark Clinical Commissioning Group Officers</b>	
Councillor Carole Bonner	1	David Quirke-Thornton, Strategic Director of Children's & Adults Services	1
Councillor Jacqui Dyer	1	Andrew Bland, Chief Officer, Southwark CCG	1
Councillor Alan Hall	1	Dr Ruth Wallis, Southwark Public Health Director	1
Councillor Robert Hill	1	Shelley Burke, Southwark Head of Overview & Scrutiny	1
Councillor Rebecca Lury	1	Sarah Feasey, Legal Services	1
Councillor John Muldoon	1	Tom Crisp, Legal Services	1
Councillor Michael Neal	1	Norman Coombe, Legal Services	1
Councillor Bill Williams	1	Chris Page, Principal Cabinet Assistant	1
<b>Health Partners</b>		Niko Baar, Liberal Democrat Political Assistant	1
Michael Patrick, CEO, SLaM NHS Trust	1	Julie Timbrell, Southwark scrutiny project manager , Scrutiny Team SPARES	10
Catherine Gormally, Director of Social Care	1	<b>External</b>	
Jo Kent, SLAM, Locality Manager, SLaM	1	Healthwatch Lewisham	1
Marian Ridley & Jackie Parrott Guy's & St Thomas' NHS FT	1	Healthwatch Lambeth	1
Lord Kerslake, Chair, KCH Hospital NHS Trust	1	Healthwatch Croydon	1
Julie Gifford, Prog. Manager External Partnerships, GSTT	1	Healthwatch Southwark	1
Geraldine Malone, Guy's & St Thomas's	1		
Sarah Willoughby	1		
Stakeholder Relations Manager			
Experience King's College Hospital KCH FT			
<b>Electronic agenda (no hard copy)</b>		<b>Total:50</b>	
Cllr Jasmine Ali, Southwark reserve members		<b>Dated: January 2016</b>	
Cllr Paul Fleming, Southwark reserve member			
Rick Henderson, Independent Advocacy Service			
Tom White, Southwark Pensioners' Action Group			
Jay Strickland, Southwark Adult Social Care Director			
Jin Lim , Southwark Public Health Assistant Director			
Timothy Andrew (Lewisham scrutiny lead)			
Elaine Carter (Lambeth scrutiny lead)			
Solomon Agutu (Croydon scrutiny lead)			
Southwark Borough Commander via email			
Lambeth Borough Commander			
Croydon Borough Commander			
Lewisham Borough Commander			