

By: Graham Gibbens, Cabinet Member, Adult Social Services and Oliver Mills, Managing Director, Kent Adult Social Services

To: Cabinet - 10 January 2011

Subject: **OLDER PERSON'S MODERNISATION**

Classification: Unrestricted

Summary: To provide a summary of the consultation, to share the final reports and to obtain sign-off on the recommendations in order for the Cabinet member for Adult Social Services to make his decisions.

Introduction

1. (1) Cabinet members are aware of the consultation undertaken on the future of Older Peoples Provision between 21 June 2010 and 1 November 2010, a total period of 19 weeks.

(2) These proposals were:

Establishment	Proposal
Bowles Lodge, Hawkhurst Manorbrooke, Dartford Cornfields, Dover	To close, demolish and build Extra Care Housing with PFI funding in partnership with District Councils – services to be re-provided to current residents and service users following a review of needs
The Limes, Dartford Sampson Court, Deal Ladesfield, Whitstable	To close – services re-provided to current residents and service users following a review of needs
Blackburn Lodge, Sheerness Doubleday Lodge, Sittingbourne Kiln Court, Faversham	To modernise through partnership with an independent sector provider. Services may not be delivered at these sites in future
Wayfarers, Sandwich	To sell to the independent sector as a going concern
Dorothy Lucy Centre, Maidstone	To review and identify opportunities and to consult on the identified proposal in 2011

(3) The drivers behind the proposals are:

- People are living longer and the numbers of older people are increasing including those with dementia and they rightly expect more choice in care.
- People wish to remain in their own homes with dignity and expect high quality care.
- Residential care should be in high quality buildings. Our older buildings have reached the end of their life and do not meet the required standards for new build.

- Good quality care can be commissioned for less money in the independent sector. Unit costs for in-house services are substantially higher.

(4) The considerations to inform the proposals for each home were:

- a) The range of alternative local services for older people
- b) The opportunity for developments with partners in the local area
- c) The condition of the buildings and likely capital expenditure required to maintain services
- d) The appropriateness of the design of the buildings for the services delivered and required
- e) The need to release money that is tied in to services that could be used to deliver equivalent services to more people

Consultation Process:

2. (1) Kent Adult Social Services (KASS) officers held 82 meetings to discuss the proposals and over 1400 people attended. Over 5000 individuals accessed the information on the website. 490 people shared their views in writing either directly or through their local councillor or MP. 499 people completed the questionnaire which was designed as an additional method for participating in the consultation. The feedback from the questionnaire is attached to the final reports.

(2) Petitions were heard at County Council in October for Manorbrooke, Cornfields and Sampson Court and at County Council in December for The Limes, Blackburn Lodge and Bowles Lodge.

(3) Dedicated project officers from care management teams have been meeting with the individuals living at or accessing the services from the units to identify their needs and wants should the proposals be agreed. This information has informed the re-provision plans for alternative services.

(4) Alternative proposals were received for Cornfields, The Limes, Bowles Lodge, Ladesfield and Sampson Court and were evaluated against how they would address the four main drivers behind the proposals. The detail of the alternative proposals is documented in the final reports.

(5) KASS officers sought advice from the KCC Legal department on the consultation process. The view was that the processes had been followed satisfactorily and that the opportunities for people to contribute to the consultation were enhanced with the additional time period and the production of the questionnaire.

Re-provision:

3. (1) KASS Commissioners undertook strategies for each unit affected, identifying how the services for current service users can be re-provided. Current services delivered and take up are as follows including the number of permanent residents.

Unit	Services	Residents at 1.6.10	Residents at 30.11.10	Average daily day care attendance	Respite users (people)
Cornfields	Permanent, respite, ICT, day care	10	4	10	52
Sampson Court	Permanent, respite, day care (dementia)	19	14	12	39
Ladesfield	Permanent, respite, ICT, day care	19	14	3	58
Manorbrooke	Permanent, respite	31	22	0	0
The Limes	Enablement, day care	0	0	17	0
Bowles Lodge	Permanent, respite, day care	29	20	13	42
Total		108	74		

The above table does not include data for Intermediate Care or Enablement

(2) Local KASS commissioners have been liaising with the independent sector and partners to:

- clarify capacity in the existing available market for re-provision of residential, respite enablement/intermediate care beds and day care,
- ascertain the interest in developing new services where existing capacity is not available and
- assess the viability of proposed alternatives.

(3) It is not possible to make definite plans for new services until such time as the proposals have been agreed as this would inevitably run the risk of being accused of pre-empting the outcome of the consultation and the decision.

(4) Commissioners are confident that suitable local alternative services can be provided within the timeframes documented in the reports, should the proposals be agreed. Largely, the re-provision is within the independent sector particularly for Manorbrooke, Cornfields, Sampson Court and Ladesfield with some services moved to remaining in-house provision including the enablement service and some day care at The Limes (to Gravesham Place) and some residential and day care at Bowles Lodge (to Westview in Tenterden).

Authorisation:

4. (1) The reports have been finalised, one for each unit. The reporting schedule was as follows:

Meeting	Date	Status
Strategic Management Team	3 Dec 2010	Confidential
Corporate Management Team	7 Dec 2010	Confidential
Reports published	30 Dec 2010	
Cabinet	10 Jan 2011	
Adult Social Services Policy Overview and Scrutiny Committee (ASSPOSC)	12 Jan 2011	
Decision		
Cabinet Scrutiny (if called)	19 Jan 2011	

(2) If the proposals are agreed, full Individual Needs Portrayals (INP) of each permanent resident will be completed in line with the agreed Policy for home closures. The INP is a full and detailed re-assessment of need and will identify the elements of importance to those individuals such as location of home and facilities. This could include health colleagues where necessary. The INP equally will detail the projected timescales for any proposed move specific to the individual.

(3) The project officers will also undertake full reviews of those accessing day care services to make sure that alternative services meet their needs.

(4) Kent Adult Social Services have significant experience of successfully moving older people, for instance when their needs change and the homes can no longer meet those needs. KASS officers will ensure that individuals and their families are fully informed and involved in every stage of the process, that they are provided with options of alternative quality accommodation that will meet the individuals needs and that, where appropriate, friendship groups are kept together.

(5) KASS officers will use a variety of strategies to make sure that there is a seamless transition into the new home and/or service.

(6) A plan for communicating the decisions to staff and service users will be agreed to make sure all stakeholders are kept up to date. The communication strategy will also include notifying councillor colleagues and other key stakeholders.

Consultation outcome and Reports:

5. (1) The recommendations for each unit are the same as the original proposals. During the consultation at both Bowles Lodge in Hawkhurst and Sampson Court in Deal an estimated date of closure was given of September 2011. However in both areas commissioners believe that a short extension to January 2012 for Bowles and December 2011 for Sampson would enable them to better guarantee the full range of new services will be in place for the current users prior to closure.

(2) The impact on the PFI project is that the works schedule for Bowles Lodge will be put back however it is still planned that contractual and financial close will be achieved in October 2011.

(3) There has been strong resistance to the proposals from campaigners.

Financial impact:

6. (1) The revenue funding currently allocated to the running of the homes proposed for closure will be re-invested to provide alternative services in the independent sector to those currently accessing the services. As services can be purchased for less than it costs to provide in KCC homes, there will be funding available to deliver services to more older people that meet the KASS eligibility criteria. In addition, the proposals will generate savings of £2.2m over the next two years.

Risks and Issues:

7. (1) Risks include the political impact of the proposals being agreed particularly in the face of strong and high profile opposition.

(2) Other risks identified include maintaining services with a diminishing staff group. Agency staff are being used and existing staff are working additional shifts to ensure continuity of service. However, if the decision is taken for the homes to close, further staff may leave.

(3) The buildings may need some expenditure to keep the services running. Known areas include the roof at Bowles Lodge and the hot water boiler at Ladesfield. The winter period will put additional pressure on both sites and they are being monitored to make sure the services remain operational whilst capital investment is kept to the minimum.

(4) Assuming the decision is taken to proceed with the proposals, the risk of legal challenge from one of the campaigners is high. This is based on the inevitable response from campaigners that their views were not considered given that the vast majority of feedback including that from the questionnaires was for the homes to remain unchanged. The view from KCC Legal department was that KASS has followed its agreed policy and process and fulfilled the requirements under the consultation protocol and thus could resist a technical challenge.

(5) If the proposals are not agreed, the savings will not be realised and will need to be found elsewhere. Furthermore the imperatives which underpinned the proposed changes will not be addressed and the future of older peoples services will not have been addressed and will inevitably need to be tackled at a later date.

Conclusion:

8. (1) The stakeholders with whom we are required to consult are primarily the service users, carers/relatives and staff. They are understandably and predictably not in favour of these proposals. However many carers/family members have expressed their support for extra care housing but only if it is not built on the site where their relative is living. Also many people are supportive of the need for KCC to plan for the future.

(2) A detailed consultation was undertaken for a period of 19 weeks. Comprehensive analysis of alternative provision and indicative planning for individuals has been completed. The reports include the detail of the alternative provision, how service users needs would be met and any alternative proposals.

(3) Equality Impact Assessments have been finalised with regard to all 11 reports.

Recommendation:

9. Cabinet is asked to NOTE the contents of this report and the attached 11 reports.

Margaret Howard
Director of Operations
01622 696763 (7000 6763)
margaret.howard@kent.gov.uk

Background documents:

- Government White Paper 'Our Health, Our Care, Our Say' – January 2006
- National Dementia Strategy – February 2009
- Active Lives for Adults 2006-2016
- Closure/Variation Policy for the closure/variation in the service use of a Social Services Establishment
- A Vision for Adult Social Care: Capable Communities and Active Citizens
- Think Local, Act Personal: Next Steps for Transforming Adult Social Care
- Locality Commissioning Strategies