

Notes on the Meeting to discuss Housing & Care Support Provision in GM for Physically Disabled People held on Tuesday 14 December 1983 in County Hall, Piccadilly Gardens, Manchester.

Present: Bernard Gosschalk, Housing Centre Trust (in the Chair)
Margaret Bone, Tameside
Anne Miller, ARMS
Zena Homewood, CSV
Patrick Mbatha, Central Manchester District Health Authority
June Maelzer, Manchester Disability Forum
Ken Lumb, Union Physically Impaired Against Segregation
Roy Southern, South Manchester Health Authority
Roger Phillips, North British Housing Association
Dorothy Whitaker, Greater Manchester CVS
Chris Drinkwater, Rochdale Voluntary Action
Stephen Ollerenshaw, Tameside

Apologies Chris Withnall, Institute of Housing
Peter Norman, Irwell Valley Housing Assoc
Judith Gray, North Manchester Health Authority

Action

Dorothy explained that due to a staff crisis Peter Norman had had to apologise for the meeting that morning and Bernard had kindly agreed to chair the meeting. Also Margaret and Zena introduced Stephen Ollerenshaw whose mother had recently left a Leonard Cheshire Home and was being supported in his search for suitable Care Support at home by Ken, Margaret and Chris Drinkwater and therefore because of the distance and time factor they had agreed to meet to talk about CSV's with Zena after the Housing Meeting. It was agreed Stephen was welcome to join in the meeting.

1. Notes of Previous Meeting

Ref 5.2 North West Regional Health Authority should read South Manchester Health Authority.

2. Conference Report

- 2.1 Due to the delayed arrival of Vic Finkelstein's conference contribution Peter Norman and Anne Miller had only just received the draft Conference Report for editing excepting Don Simpson's contribution which had not been received. PN
AM

It was also agreed that the charge for the report, to other than Conference delegates be altered to £1.00 including postage and packing.

3. Video

- 3.1 The video had been shown at a meeting convened by Tameside CHC at Margaret Bone's request on 24 November and Judith Gray, June Maelzer and Ken Lumb had accompanied it. As a result Margaret had changed her initial views on the video and felt it contained some important messages, although it's length still needed reducing and certain specific schemes mentioned in the commentary needed further explanation, particularly for those people not aware of any of the Housing & Care Support options. June wondered if it might be possible to show half of the video and then break for discussion and continue with the rest.

3.2 As a result of the meeting on the 24th an invitation was extended to show the video in Catherine House in Ashton - a residential home for Younger Disabled People. Anne Miller and Ken Lumb showed it to the residents only and it provoked a very interesting discussion. But Anne still wondered if we needed two videos, one for professionals and one for disabled people themselves, particularly those seeking care support. She felt some of the residents of Catherine House were unable to concentrate on the whole video - Ken felt they had understood it all and Stephen Ollerenshaw, who attends the same Day Centre as many of the residents said they had all spoken about its impact the following day. It had certainly given some of them hope for a future living independently. Anne wondered if the video ought to show more practical aspects of independent living such as dressing - Margaret Bone queried whether this was more appropriately the role of the Occupational Therapist because individual needs were so varied. Zena still felt that the video was primarily for disabled people to show them what is possible.

3.3 Ken had taken the information sheets on Housing & Care Support alternatives to the residents of Catherine House and felt it was important that such written information should be produced in adequate numbers to accompany all showings of the video.

3.4 Dorothy had contacted Dennis about a revised edited version but although Dennis was prepared to consider producing such a version for a realistic cost, he felt he would have to meet with the Group to discuss what items needed editing and others included if necessary. Therefore an editing meeting was suggested for Thursday 13 January at 5.00 pm - venue to be confirmed - it was decided that any members of the Housing Group who felt they had ideas on the video would be welcome to attend.

DW

3.5 Bernard had made some alterations to the questionnaire which Anne had produced and this would be submitted to the meeting when Anne had had time to consider it and Dorothy had arranged typing.

AM
DW

4. Future Objectives of the Group

4.1 Ken agreed to prepare the paper on future ideas and activities for the Group. Bernard also agreed to try and meet certain members of the Group and prepare some discussion points about future objectives for the next meeting. Margaret suggested that if possible these papers should be circulated prior to the next meeting and any other members of the Group with ideas on the future should submit them to Ken Lumb or Dorothy Whitaker by early January so that they could be circulated with the next Minutes.

RC
KL
DW

4.2 Anne wondered if the Group should consider applying to the Charitable Commissioners for specific charitable status. Both Ken and Roy thought the group should try and clarify its aims and objectives more before considering such an application as if it was decided that the Group needed to be campaigning as well as educational this could affect charitable registration as it might be considered as political activity. Stephen personally felt that the Group should aim to be campaigning as if it had just been educational his mother would still have been in an institution.

4.3 Zena reported that at the December meeting between DoE, Housing Corporation and CSV the suggestion that a proposed worker for Housing and Allied Care Support for Disabled People might be initially based with the Greater Manchester Group was welcomed. Details of the job were still to be worked out and they suggested that the Group should formally write to CSV expressing our interest in such a worker and offering to help draft the job descriptions. Prior to any meeting about this we needed to clarify our own position with regard to a full-time worker and this could be incorporated at the next meeting in the discussions about the future. In the meantime Dorothy agreed to ask Peter Norman to write to CSV expressing our interest in the proposed post and willingness to be involved in discussions about it.

PN
DW

- 4.4 Both Anne and Roy thought that we should consider the composition of the Group when considering future activities. As we had had no direct representation from Social Services since Bob Lewis resigned, it was decided that Roy would contact Bob Lewis about a possible suggested representative. Dependent on Bob Lewis' reply Dorothy would approach Gordon Littlemore, Deputy Director Social Services Rochdale, to be the representative. Dorothy also reported that although David Halpin who had received the minutes on behalf of Lancs Social Services was on a course for two years, the Department had written to say they would be pleased to still receive the Minutes and Mrs Shepherdson, Controller for the Elderly and Physically Handicapped, might consider representation on the Group. It was agreed to invite Mrs Shepherdson to attend meetings whenever possible.

DW

5. Financial Report

- 5.1 Balance still as last time £23.50, although we were expecting a cheque for sale of extra Conference Information Packs. GM Lotteries were still considering our application and thanks to a contact from Anne Miller we had put in a last minute application for funds to the Rag Committee which was still being considered. Bernard suggested that as the editing of the video would require extra fund raising even if the Lotteries and Rag applications were successful, we ought to consider asking North British if they could form their loan of £125 into a grant. It was agreed that Bernard should write to the Chairman of North British when Dorothy had prepared a more detailed account.

BS
DW

- 5.2 June suggested that when we had an estimate for the revised version of the video we could approach NW Arts for a grant. Also she would talk to her contacts in Granada about possible sources of funding.

- 5.3 Chris Drinkwater thought the Gulbenkian Community Communications Fund might be worth approaching.

6. Any Other Business

- 6.1 June had not had time to contact the Social Service Team who had expressed interest in a meeting about Housing and Care Support in their area but would arrange something in the New Year.

- 6.2 Islington Disablement Association were having a seminar on Housing & Care Support for Disabled People at the end of January and had borrowed the video to consider if it would be suitable to include in their programme, also copies of our Conference Information Pack and Programme.

- 6.3 Dorothy said she had received a letter from Roger Arkell formally withdrawing from the Group due to pressure of work in Preston but saying Roger Phillips would keep him informed of developments. He had expressed his pleasure in being involved with the Group.

7. Date of Next Meeting

Wednesday 19 January 1983 at 11.00 am at the St Thomas Centre.

Greater Manchester Housing & Disability Group.

Some Questions on the role and membership of the Committee:

1. AIMS:

- a) To promote housing and (care) support in G.M/C to facilitate independent living, or,
- b) To encourage a range of housing and care support for disabled* people in G.M/C which meets their wishes and needs.
(* all types of disability?)

2. Is a group required?

Can it move towards being an umbrella organisation for groups involved in disability?

3. If the group is maintained, should it meet as a group of individuals with an interest in and knowledge of disability?

Should it meet out of office hours, as an independent group, not with representatives answerable to other organisations?

or, should it be a group composed of representatives of organisations and individuals with an interest in disability - to what extent do representatives of organisations bind these organisations and report to and represent the views (if any) of their organisations? Are we individuals from organisations, OR representatives of statutory & voluntary bodies in G.M/C.?

What is our mandate, and from whom does it stem ?

4. Possible roles:

- a) Educational - eg: Conferences; use of video to disabled people and official and other bodies.
- b) Educational plus - to follow up video etc with some action.
- c) Operational - provision of housing & Care support ?
- d) Political (campaigning) - lobbying, media, pressure, action group ?
- e) Campaigning - i) Broad, across G.M/C, and/or,
ii) Specific, e.g. in a Local Authority.
- f) Individual cases - does the group take these up officially ?
 - if so, does it involve representatives of organisations who might be in the group ?
 - do members of the group pursue individual cases?

5. If a group is maintained, does it have a constitution,
and voting rights etc. ?

6. From where does it obtain its resources ?

7. Who are the key activists ? Can representatives of other organisations fulfil this role ?

B.Gosschalk

Jan '83.

GREATER MANCHESTER HOUSING & DISABILITY GROUP

Future Aims of Group

Aims

- A To promote, in Greater Manchester, housing and support services for physically impaired people which facilitate independent living.
- B To monitor progressive developments in non-institutional forms of housing provision and support systems with the intention of raising awareness of these developments amongst appropriate organisations and agencies.
- C To promote the active involvement of disabled people and organisations of disabled people in housing and support issues throughout Greater Manchester.
- D To support the establishment of an organisation of disabled people in Greater Manchester which will serve the interests of disabled people within this area.
- E To assist individuals with their housing and support problems insofar as the resources of the group will allow.

Bernard Gosschalk
June Maeltzer
Ken Lumb

Points for Consideration Arising from Above Aims

- 1. The Aims in A state in broad terms what we are about, which social group we are involved with, and the geographical extent of our activities.
- 2. We feel that words such as 'promote', 'raising awareness' and 'assist' are flexible enough to allow a wide variety of approaches from simply passing on information to more vigorous methods of campaigning. None of us thought it a fruitful exercise to attempt to distinguish our approach by using concepts such as 'political' or 'educational'. My own view is that there is no such thing as an a-political position when you are involved with housing.
- 3. In discussing C Bernard asked the question why are we doing what we are rather than some other group? And he followed this up by expressing concern about groups holding jealously onto their 'social cause' (my words) and disregarding wider developments such as the existence of groups covering the same issues. This then leads to an overlapping of effort and confusion. However, as things stand there is no other group concerned with housing and disability at a Greater Manchester level, and there is clearly a need for one. Nevertheless we think we should be prepared for, and support a GMC organisation of disabled people similar to the Derbyshire Coalition, for example.
- 4. I have had a note from Margaret Bone who is concerned that we should help individuals (C). In doing this she suggests that "there should be one person to whom the group can refer individual approaches, otherwise there will be a hotch-potch of group members getting involved in cases." She also suggests that we should have guidelines as to how far our involvement with individuals should go.

5. Margaret also thinks that we should clarify the term independent living. She sees possible conflict between the wishes of an individual and those who provide services designed to promote independent living. She asks 'should the disabled person be required to co-operate reasonably in being suitably housed in the community, or should the authorities be expected to revolve around and supply the needs where and when the disabled person wants them.' In answer to this I would suggest that neither party should devise solutions alone then expect the other to comply. What is 'reasonable' should be something decided through joint discussion on an open and equal basis. Not, as frequently occurs at present, through case conferences from which the 'clients' are excluded. It also helps, of course, if all those concerned with these discussions are aware of what is possible in respect of independent living. The term itself derives from the Independent Living Movement which arose during the late sixties in North America. It grew out of the struggle to combat forms of dependency, exclusion and segregation which had traditionally been imposed upon people with physical impairments. As a generalisation it focuses attention on the rights of disabled people to the same opportunities that are open to other average able-bodied citizens.
6. Since the meeting with Bernard and June I have had some thoughts about the evening at St Kathryn's House when we showed the video to the residents and then had a very interesting discussion about housing and forms of support. During the discussion it emerged that at least five residents were very keen to live in a home of their own. They are unlikely to get this opportunity however if their hopes are left to Tameside Social Services Department to fulfil. Their approach to disability is appalling. I would suggest that our group could co-ordinate a project which would provide housing and support for these residents. The project could be developed on the basis suggested above, whereby all interested parties get together to work through a suitable solution. It seems to me that we have the necessary experience within our group to take such an initiative.

Ken Lumb