

CABINET SCRUTINY COMMITTEE – 29 JUNE 2006

Report Title:	Proposed Closure/Variation of Service Use of Whitegates Registered Care Centre, Hythe (Decision 06/007692)
Documents Attached:	Report to Cabinet Member for Adult Services published on 9 May 2006 and Record of Decision taken on 1 June 2006.
Purpose of Consideration:	To explore particularly the justification for closure in the light of recent CSCI reports on Whitegates.
Possible Decisions:	<p>The Constitution (<i>Appendix 4 Part 8</i>) requires the Committee to take one of the following decisions:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">(a) make no comments; or(b) express comments but not require reconsideration of the decision; or(c) require implementation of the decision to be postponed pending reconsideration of the matter by the Cabinet in the light of the Committee's comments; or(d) require implementation of the decision to be postponed pending reconsideration of the matter by full Council.
Previous Consideration:	None.
Background Documents:	None.

RECORD OF DECISION



DECISION TAKEN BY Mr K Lynes

DECISION NO.
06/00792

If decision is likely to disclose exempt information please specify the relevant paragraph(s) of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972

Subject:
Outcome of formal consultation on Closure/Variation of Service Use of Whitegates Registered Care Centre, Hythe

Decision:
To approve the closure of the Whitegates Registered Care Centre, Hythe.

Any Interest Declared when the Decision was Taken:
None

Reason(s) for decision including alternatives considered:
The site of the Whitegates Registered Care Centre in Hythe has been identified as one which would support the development of Extra Care Sheltered Housing as an alternative way of meeting the needs of older people. It was noted that the Whitegates Registered Care Centre had limited accommodation that met CSCI standards and the cost of upgrading the physical environment to CSCI standards was estimated at between £750,000 and £950,000.

A six week consultation process had been undertaken on the proposal to demolish the existing residential care home and redevelop an Extra Care Sheltered Housing Scheme at the site. In addition to the comments arising out of the various meetings held, eight letters of objection were received from members of the public raising issues on the condition of the fabric of the building, clarification on details of extra care services that will replace it and emphasising the excellent care currently provided at Whitegates. A Summary of all the points raised were appended to the Managing Director's report and addressed both within the body of the report and that Appendix

Staff currently employed at Whitegates have been consulted and their concerns addressed so far as possible (including redeployment and support for alternative employment opportunities) with every effort being made to balance individual needs against the delivery of an effective service.

Background Information:
The attached report from Oliver Mills, Managing Director, Adult Services providing details of the outcome of the consultation process into this matter.

.....
Signed

.....
Date

FOR COUNCIL SECRETARIAT USE ONLY

Decision Referred to Cabinet Scrutiny			
YES		NO	

Cabinet Scrutiny Decision to Refer Back for Reconsideration			
YES		NO	

Reconsideration Record Sheet Issued			
YES		NO	

Reconsideration of Decision Published	

By: Oliver Mills Strategic Director, Social Services

To: Kevin Lynes Cabinet Member Social Services

Subject: OUTCOME OF FORMAL CONSULTATION ON
CLOSURE/VARIATION OF SERVICE USE OF WHITEGATES,
HYTHE

Classification: Unrestricted

Summary: The site of Whitegates Registered Care Centre in Hythe has been identified as one which would support the development of Extra Care Sheltered Housing as an alternative way of meeting the needs of older people. We therefore ask for Member approval to proceed with the closure of Whitegates Registered Care Centre.

Background

1. The Adult Services Directorate is engaged in a process which will modernise the way it carries out its responsibilities in order to improve the service outcomes for the people of Kent. So far two integrated care centres providing residential social and nursing care in Tenterden and Margate have been built using the PFI. This was achieved in partnership with health colleagues in the Ashford and East Kent and Coastal Primary Care Trusts. This work has helped re-provide services from two KCC residential care homes that were no longer fit for purpose - The Lindens in Tenterden and Appleton Lodge in Broadstairs. Further work will be needed to modernise the remaining Registered Care Centres to bring them to the National Minimum Standards required by the Care Standards Act 2000. At present the Adult Services Directorate is only able to provide services from its existing Registered Care Centres because of the transitional immunity provision that was made when the provisions of the Care Standards Act came into effect in 2002. Originally this immunity was due to be withdrawn by April 2007 but the large number of care homes that were forced to close persuaded the government to reconsider and the end date was removed in late 2003. While there is no longer a fixed timeframe to achieve national minimum standards we have a responsibility to develop and improve services in the interests of service users. Plans will be needed for each of the Centres over the next 5 – 10 years. These will need to take account of the additional requirements as service users become older and more frail.

2. The introduction of new and innovative services which support the principles of “Active Lives”, has led to piloting services supported by technology such as Telecare and Telehealth which assist older people and people with a range of disabilities to remain living in their own home for longer. Despite the success of the partnership between the Occupational Therapy Bureau and District Councils in administering the Disabled Facilities Grant to enable adaptations, it has become clear that a new approach was needed to the provision of accommodation with care that is neither social residential or nursing care. This view is supported by the reports of the Commission for Social Care Inspection in its reports on the views of stakeholders on the services needed for the future.

3. In 2003 the Public Private Partnership Team, with the support of the Directorate Management Team and the Cabinet Member, and in partnership with a number of District Councils successfully bid to the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister for £72m of PFI funding to build 8 Extra Care Sheltered Housing Schemes in Kent. Extra Care Sheltered Housing has become increasingly popular as an alternative to residential or nursing care since the mid 1990s. It has the advantage of offering stakeholders the status of tenants in their own home and, in some cases, joint ownership with the registered social landlord. At the same time the tenants have 24 hour access to housing, social and nursing care support in an environment that has already been adapted to be able to meet the needs for a range of disabilities. Because of its location at the heart of the community in Hythe, Whitegates Registered Care Centre has been chosen as one of the locations for the development of Extra Care Sheltered Housing for older people and those with a disability.

4. This report sets out comments received following the formal consultation on the proposal to demolish the existing residential care home and develop an Extra Care Sheltered Housing Scheme on the site. The Whitegates Registered Care Centre has limited accommodation that meets CSCI standards. The cost of upgrading the physical environment at Whitegates to CSCI standards is estimated between £750,000 and £950,000.

Consultation Process

Process	Date Action Completed
Obtain agreement in principle from the Cabinet Member for Health & Social Care.	December 2005
Inform in writing: The Chairman of the Policy Overview Committee Vice Chairman Opposition Spokesman Local KCC Member(s) Council Secretariat	17 th February 2006
Inform in writing and invite comments by a stated date at least 6 weeks after the despatch of the consultative letter: - Users, relatives and carers Head of Establishment Staff Trades Unions Local KCC Member(s) District Council Parish / Town Council Relevant NHS bodies Any other relevant person or organisation and the Local MP	Letter sent 16 th January 2006. Consultation period due to end – 6 th March 2006. Summary of Meetings and Correspondence received as a result of the consultation and the responses sent attaches as Appendix Two.

Issue a Directorate Press Release	The Press Officer has responded to all enquiries from the press during the consultation period.
Organise and attend any meetings and / or site visits as a result of any decision taken by the Cabinet Member under Point 9 below. Take minutes or notes and circulate to all attendees.	Staff Meeting 16 th January 2006 & 9 th March 2006. Open Meeting with residents and carers 15/02/06 and ongoing 1:1 meetings with the Care Management Service to explore personal choice.
Compile a detailed report on the closure / variation proposal, including consultees' views and the Strategic Director's recommendations, for decision by the Cabinet Member, through the normal decision making process.	This Report 24/04/06
The Cabinet Member or the Chairman of the Policy Overview Committee will decide if a meeting between him / themselves, KCC Members and consultees is necessary.	Meeting with members [Mark Fittock; Trudy Dean; George Koowaree and the Cabinet Member, Kevin Lynes] 21/04/06
Instigate any change programme	Date to be decided

5. The six-week consultation period on the closure of Whitegates concluded on 6 March 2006. Residents, Carers, Staff, unions and relevant bodies have been involved with meetings and their views have been considered. Clients and their Carers were consulted over the alternative options of service provision. The residents and their families are working with Care Management to ensure that appropriate alternative placements are identified to provide the support they need. Staff have been consulted on a one to one basis and their concerns addressed. It is hoped that the majority of staff will be redeployed keeping any redundancies to a minimum.

Issues of concern raised in the consultation.

6. There have been 8 letters expressing concerns from members of the public. These included The Friends of Whitegates and local GPs. The issues raised were related to questioning the condition of the fabric of the building, asking for clarification on details of the extra care services that will replace it and emphasising the excellent care currently provided at Whitegates.

7. These letters – as summarised in Appendix 2 - were answered and the issues were addressed as follows.

- a) The Whitegates building does not meet minimum care standards. The Commission for Social Care Inspection (CSCI), the body which enforces these standards, has made it clear that Whitegates would have to make significant improvements to its fabric to meet the National Minimum Standards. In order for Whitegates to meet the minimum standards the following would be necessary to:
- increase the size of each bedroom from 10 square metres to a minimum of 12 square metres of usable floor space;
 - install ensuite facilities which include at least a toilet and wash hand basin in each room;
 - refurbish the laundry and sluice areas;
 - increase the number of assisted bathrooms;
 - complete the replacement of the existing windows in each bedroom and public room to ensure that residents could open and close them easily and to ensure security at night;
 - replace the majority of furniture [armchairs, dining chairs, dining tables, side tables, sideboards, book cases etc] and equipment [assisted baths, hoists, weighing scales / hoist, medication room equipment, kitchenettes – including hobs and cookers] in the Home and to rewire and redecorate following the works replacing carpets, curtains and other soft furnishings.
- In addition to the work inside the Home it would also be necessary to undertake extensive works to the exterior of the building and the grounds to fully comply with the requirements of the standards.
- b) The extra care housing services will provide 24 hour care for tenants/residents in their own apartments when they need it and have additional facilities such as a gym and a shop. The extra care facility will be one of the finest of its type in the country when opened.
- c) The care currently provided at Whitegates is of a good standard but it is increasingly difficult to carry out in an ageing residential care home. Maximum efforts are being made to identify choices of alternative employment for staff and once the new extra care facility is opened the care jobs will be open to staff to apply for.
- d) In addition, residents and their relatives are also being given choices about alternative care home places either with KCC care homes or other local homes. If a current resident wishes to, they can apply for housing in the new Whitegates extra care facility once it is opened. This is planned to be in 2008.
- e) Financial issues were not raised as a major area of concern through the consultation. The financial issues are considered in the attached Appendix One.

Personnel and Training implications

8. As part of the consultation, Staff issues related to redeployment opportunities, redundancies, and support for staff through the consultation process.

9. All Adult Services vacancies were frozen to allow opportunities for the redeployment of staff. Staff have been offered the opportunity to receive skills training to enable them to continue their employment within the Adult Services Directorate. Redundancies will be kept to a minimum.

10. All vacancies within the Older People's Direct Services Unit and Specialist Services as a whole are ring fenced to those staff affected by the proposed changes, as well as all

suitable vacancies in the local area, to allow opportunities for the redeployment of staff. Special arrangements have been put in place to enable staff to apply for posts while continuing to support service users until the service has closed. Staff who are not successfully redeployed into these posts will be offered support to secure alternative employment.

Recommendations

11. The Cabinet Member for Adult Services is asked to approve the closure of the Whitegates Registered Care Centre.

Background Documents

Green Paper "Independence, Well-being and Choice"

CSCI Report "All Our Tomorrows" – Inverting the Triangle of Care [ADSS / LGA – October 2003]

DMT report by Bill Anderson on the Modernisation of Services for Older people.

Closure/Variation Policy for the closure/variation in the service use of a Social Services Establishment.

Kim Maslyn
Acting Director – Specialist Services
01622 221834

Note to: David Weiss
Project Manager

From: Andrea Melvin
Project Accountant

Date: 12th April 2006

The potential savings to Kent County Council of providing an extra care facility compared with Whitegates residential home.

1. Summary

1.1 My initial calculations are based on the actual net expenditure at Whitegates in 2004/05 and the anticipated level of support required in an extra care facility. The details of the calculations are outlined below but given my assumptions my figures show a potential saving per person per annum of approximately £10k. This equates to approximately £307k per annum based on 30 clients. These figures should only be used as a broad indication of the potential saving as extra care is a new area of service provision and it is impossible to know exactly what level of care will be required by the residents. This will be determined ultimately by the dependency of residents who are referred into the facility, and as the housing is intended to provide a 'home for life' it is anticipated that this would increase over time.

2. Background

2.1 This paper is in responds to a request for an estimate of the potential saving to Kent County Council of running an extra care facility compared with Whitegates residential home. I have the used the actual expenditure figures for 2004/05 for Whitegates residential home as a basis for my comparison. I have used the average occupancy levels for that year for Whitegates.

2.2 I have been attempting to estimate the likely cost of care for the Better Homes Active Lives PFI project and I have used this work to provide the basis of a comparison. Until the Better Care Active Lives project is signed and the facilities have been running for a number of years it is impossible to be certain about the staffing levels required. Levels of care are likely to vary either because a resident becomes less independent through deteriorating health or it may vary because of an accident and a temporary higher need for care. The profiling of the level of need is therefore extremely difficult. The extra care facilities will fill a current gap in service provision and there is no existing facility which can be used as a basis for comparison. It must therefore be stressed that the figures in this paper are **purely very broad estimates**.

3. Figures for Whitegates

3.1 The 2004/05 outturn figures have been inflated to 2006/07 at an assumed level of inflation of 2.5%. This is to bring them to a comparable basis to the work I have been undertaking for the Extra Care Homes PFI. A breakdown of the actual expenditure and income for Whitegates is attached at Appendix A. I have spread the cost on the actual average usage for 2004/05 which was 91%.

4. Figures for extra care

4.1 These are based on the estimated cost of care for a 40 bed unit. The figures include provision for night cover (2 waking staff) and also a small element for training and sickness. Annual leave and bank holidays have been taken into account. The level of personal support provided to each resident is assumed to be **14 hours per person per week**. The occupancy rate is assumed as 96%.

5. Comparison

5.1 The table below shows a comparison of the costs of running a residential home with an extra care facility.

	2004/05 outturn	2006/07 Inflated at 2.5% p.a.	No. of beds	Occupancy	Average use of beds per year	Cost per person per week
	£000	£000		%		£
Whitegates	669	703	33	91	30	451
Extra care		502	40	96	38	254
Difference per person per week						197
Difference per person per annum						10,244
Potential saving for 1 year based on 30 clients						307,320

This shows that the saving per person per annum is approximately £10k based on the assumptions outlined in this paper.

5.2 An additional point to take into consideration is the cost of upgrading Whitegates to an acceptable standard. In the previous report this is estimated to be in the region of £1m. It is anticipated that the cost of the extra care homes will be contained within the PFI credit and the rents and service charges with no additional cost to KCC. The care services will continue to be the responsibility of KCC.

Whitegates residential home**Actual expenditure at Whitegates residential home for 2004/05**

	2004/05 outturn	
	£	£
Salaries	638,221	
Other staffing costs	330	638,551
Premises	62,601	
Transport	4,702	
Supplies and Services	95,185	162,488
Total Expenditure		801,039
Income		131,582
Net Expenditure		669,457

Total number of beds **33**

Average occupancy rate **91%**

Extra Care

Extra care	FTE	206/07 Cost £000
Team leader/care co-ordinator	3.0	95
Admin support	1.5	36
Care workers	15.2	371
Total cost to KCC	19.7	502

Total number of units **40.**

Assumed void rate of **4%**

KCC – ADULT SERVICES DIRECTORATE – OLDER PEOPLE’S DIRECT SERVICE UNIT

WHITEGATES CONSULTATION PROCESS

LETTER/MEETING DATE	DETAILS OF LETTER	RESPONSE
Letter to staff dated August '04	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advising of extra care sheltered housing scheme 	
Letter to Staff dated December '05	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional information • 16.1.06 Staff meeting including Union representatives 	
Letter to residents/carers/relatives Dated 31 May 2005 (OM)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advising of funding for extra care sheltered housing 	
Mrs J Heard 1.9.05 (RSP6023) to P Gilroy responding to letter dated 31.5.05	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Challenges/disagrees that Whitegates doesn't meet the standards required for core of older people • Requests reconsider decision to close 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • O Mills 21.9.05 – doesn't meet new CSCI standards re physical environment • Report will be prepared at end of consultation period for Members
Letter to residents/carers/relatives Dated December 2005 (OM)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More information • Invitation to meeting on 16.1.06 • Proposing to close on 1.10.06 	
Letter residents/carers/relatives Dated 12.1.06 (OM)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Postponement of meeting on 16.1.06 • To be re-arranged within the next two months 	
Letter to residents/carers/relatives Dated 3.2.06	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Invitation to meeting on 15.2.06 	
Mrs J Heard 21.1.06 K Lynes, M Howard, MP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Happy with care mother receiving • To close home would be breaking up the 'family' at Whitegates • Feels it would be retrograde step to turn it into flats on the site • Quotes the CSCI report that care is good and facilities adequate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chris Manthorp 8.2.06 Modernisation of services, need for change/care provision across Kent • Prohibitive cost of modernising Whitegates

LETTER/MEETING DATE	DETAILS OF LETTER	RESPONSE
Letter to K Lynes 23.1.06 from 'Friends of Whitegates' (CM)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dismayed by closure • Worried about effect on residents, loss of their friends they have made in the home 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chris Manthorp 9.2.06 • Modernisation of services, need for change/care provision across Kent • Prohibitive cost of modernising Whitegates • Reminder about residents meeting 15.2.06
Letter from Staff 31.1.06 to PG (RSP 6727)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing staff will not be employed in new scheme • No explanation given regarding the 'u turn' • Feel let down • Asking for reconsideration of decision to close it 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acknowledges difference in letter in August '04 and 16 Jan '05
Mrs M Gasson, 13.2.06 K Lynes, P Gilroy (RSP 6720)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern proposals will not be suitable for existing clients • 10 years ago unit shut for repair • 2 years ago all windows replaced 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acknowledged by J Hughes 2.3.06 • 13.2.06 Modernisation of services, need for change/care provision across Kent • Prohibitive cost of modernising Whitegates • Invitation to residents/carers meeting 15.2.06
Ms M Woods 9.2.06	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wrongly addressed letter • Cannot make mid week meetings as works 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • J Payne 13.2.06 apology • Suggested contact Care Manager or Registered Manager for 1:1
CSCI 22.2.06 copy of their reply to Mrs J Heard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Business decision by KCC, not CSCI • Information given on relevant standards re environment 	
Mrs S Botting, 14.3.06 re grandmother who is a resident RSP 6831	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moved into Whitegates Jan '05 • Very happy there • Shattered by news that she will have to moved again • Concern that KCC washing their hands of this type of care • Worried about care in private sector homes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CSCI Consultation revealed people prefer to stay in own homes • Modernisation of services, need for change/care provision across Kent

LETTER/MEETING DATE	DETAILS OF LETTER	RESPONSE
Letter to Sarah Barwick, UNISON 15.3.06 reply by KM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inability of staff to apply for posts • If successful ability to remain at Whitegates to assist in working towards closure • Undertook to discuss alternative way forward: • All members of staff may apply for posts within CS on permanent basis • If successful their starting date will be after closure of Whitegates, should the decision be ratified 	
Dr John Allingham GP, 16.3.06 (RSP6836) to K Lynes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pleased with quality of care for residents in Whitegates • Hythe already has several warden assisted residential complexes both private and local authority • Closure will leave a gap • Building of ECH will not meet needs of residents in Hythe 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • K Lynes 20.3.06 • Building coming to end of life • Modernisation of services, need for change/care provision across Kent • Committed to finding highest class care for residents