

## Appendix 1

### Cllr Wrighton's Scrutiny Request

#### Request for Scrutiny of Dual Diagnosis

<p>1. Matter for scrutiny and reason why raised</p>	<p><b>DUAL DIAGNOSIS SCRUTINY</b>  <i>To investigate and suggest improvements to the provision of health, housing and support services for those in the community, who because of an actual or perceived co-existing substance misuse and mental health problem, fail to receive adequate medical and social care</i></p>
<p>2. Importance of the matter and relation to Council's strategic priorities and policies</p>	<p><i>The city is ranked 2<sup>nd</sup> in the UK in terms of drug related deaths. The Sussex Partnership Trust report there are 2,000 local people registered with mental health conditions and estimate there are 2,500 injecting drug users in the city. Although the people with this kind of dual diagnosis is much smaller, this sector nevertheless represents a significant expense and drain on resources for all the statutory agencies.</i></p>
<p>3. If scrutiny is requested on the basis of a deficiency in the decision making process, evidence that decision not properly made</p>	<p><i>Not applicable</i></p>

**Cabinet Agenda Item 48 Appendix 2(a)**

<p>4. Potential benefits of a scrutiny activity</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Improved service provision for patients</i></li> <li>• <i>Better chance of positive patient outcomes</i></li> <li>• <i>Better chance of less incremental damage/societal cost</i></li> <li>• <i>More cost effective treatment/support packages</i></li> <li>• <i>Creation of local centre(s) of excellence</i></li> <li>• <i>Improved mutual inter-agency understanding of issues affecting shared clients (ie on the whole mental health services tend to be good at mental health problems and struggle when there are co-existing substance misuse problems. Similarly substance misuse services struggle when there are severe mental health problems. This applies across all service type including residential services. Therefore the options for residential services for this client group are limited and they easily become excluded)</i></li> <li>• <i>Enhanced capacity and better trained practitioners</i></li> <li>• <i>Improved partnership links between BHCC and other specialist providers links ie the health trusts, Brighton Housing Trust and others.</i></li> </ul>
<p>5. Other avenues tried and extent to which attempts have been made to resolve the matter</p>	<p><i>The informal discussions I've had with SPT, BHCC Housing, BHT and individuals affected by this kind of provision have all suggested that a HOSC-type enquiry will be able to consider evidence across a wide spectrum and be able to make inter-agency recommendations</i></p>
<p>6. Any other considerations or relevant information: (e.g. an indication of the desired outcome, relevant evidence, suggested witnesses etc)</p>	<p><i>I would suggest the Review takes its business in three stages;</i></p> <p><b>Review</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Consider context of current provision/policies/practice/demand</i></li> <li>• <i>Consider agency 'cultures' are we too compartmentalised, how can this be improved?</i></li> <li>• <i>Examine examples of care from other towns</i></li> <li>• <i>Consider if there are lessons to be learnt from Willow House (a property set up to cater for this client group which closed)</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Emerging factors</b></p>

**Cabinet Agenda Item 48 Appendix 2(a)**

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider the impacts of the new Mental Health Act, particularly in regard to compulsory administration of medication</li> </ul> <p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Propose model(s) of housing and support services which provide safe and appropriate protection from harmful influences</li> <li>• Comment on delivery vehicles and possible funding streams for any such new model(s)</li> </ul> <p><i>I would imagine the Panel would want to take evidence from senior officers in the Health &amp; Council services. Additionally external evidence from external housing providers could be very useful, especially when considering models from other areas.</i></p>
<p>7. Suggested type of scrutiny/terms of reference for in-depth review</p> <p>* Examples of actions short of a full scrutiny review are set out below. You may want to propose one of these instead of a full review.</p>	<p><i>This is a complicated area, where the client base have many problems - often closely interlinked. To address the client's behaviour is a long term project. This Scrutiny bid sets out to create the space for the sharing of expertise and consideration of alternative housing and support models between (but not necessarily restricted to) the main agencies concerned, Brighton &amp; Hove City Council, Sussex Partnership Trust and housing providers</i></p>

Councillor Wrighton 26 November 2007

