

**To:** Graham Gibbens, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Public Health

**From:** Andrew Ireland, Corporate Director of Social Care Health and Wellbeing

**Decision Number:** 16/00067

**Subject:** **ACCOMMODATION BASED SHORT BREAK MODEL**

**Classification:** Unrestricted

**Previous Pathway of Paper:** Social Care, Health and Wellbeing DMT – 7 September 2016  
Adult Social Care and Health Cabinet Committee – 11 October 2016

**Future Pathway of Paper:** Cabinet Member decision

**Electoral Division:** Faversham

**Summary:** A twelve week formal consultation period started on 7 June 2016. The consultation documents set out the future provision of Kent County Council (KCC) accommodation based short breaks for children, young people and adults with a disability. The consultation documents explained the work that has been completed in the assessment and design phases of the short breaks transformation project. They set out the importance for KCC to publicly consult on the proposal to end service provision from Osborne Court, Faversham, including seeking views of what the current 58 services users and family carers would want from the alternative short breaks accommodation based service.

This report sets out how the formal consultation process was managed and provides detail on the outcomes and conclusions of the consultation process.

**Recommendations:** The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Public Health is asked to

- a) **PROCEED** with the Accommodation Based Short Break Model
- b) **END** service provision from Osborne Court and identify alternative services for the 58 service users and family carers and close Osborne Court.
- c) **DELEGATE** authority to the Corporate Director of Social Care, Health and Wellbeing, or other nominated officer, to undertake the necessary actions to implement the decision.

## 1. Introduction

The consultation documents set out the proposed future provision of KCC accommodation based short breaks for children, young people and adults with a disability. They explain the work that has been completed in the assessment and design phases of the short breaks transformation project. They set out the need for KCC to publicly consult on the proposal to end service provision from Osborne Court, including seeking views of what the current 58 services users

and family carers would want from alternative short breaks accommodation based services.

- 1.2 Consultation documents were circulated to all stakeholders either by post or email and were also available on the consultation website. In order to understand the proposals in full, and the response to the consultation, all parties need to have read either one or all of the consultation documents included as background documents to this report.

## **2. Vision and service model**

- 2.1 During July a number of service model design workshops were held and the following vision for a short breaks service model was formed:

*The in-house model offers a specialist overnight and daytime accommodation based short breaks service, which meets the needs and aspirations of the service users and their families of those aged 16 years and above, who have disabilities, and additional complex needs.*

*The criterion for 'complex' needs is:*

- *Service user meets dependency level 3 to 6*
- *Carer is in crisis (irrespective of the complexity of the person they care for)*

- 2.2 A key focus for the redesign will be to ensure services providing accommodation based short breaks are aligned (alongside other services) with the Lifespan Pathway (a seamless continuity of support from 0-25, for disabled children/young people and their families, into adulthood).

- 2.3 Therefore the proposed model for accommodation based short breaks is:

- a) A countywide accommodation based short break service which meets the needs and aspirations of the service users aged 16 years and above who have disabilities, and additional complex needs and their families. The services will also have a clear focus on supporting carers in crisis irrespective of the complexity of the person they care for.
- b) The countywide service will consist of six adult accommodation based short break units across Kent, (four Kent County Council in-house and two external private providers) that are invested in to provide modern, accessible facilities that are fit for purpose, particularly for those with the most complex needs and therefore fit for the future, with five disabled children short breaks units (Kent County Council in house) which already meet the needs of complex individuals and are fit for purpose.
- c) There will be greater integration between the children's and adults short break services to ensure a more streamlined transition for the service user. With a shift from access to the short break service being based on the 18<sup>th</sup> birthday of an individual to the appropriate time within the transition from children to adult services (between the ages of 16 and 25) based on individual needs.

2.4 In order to realise the above vision and model and ensure the sustainability of the services the proposal is to proceed with the accommodation based short break model and to end service provision from Osborne Court and identify alternative services for the 58 service users and family carers.

### 3. Outcome of Formal Consultation

#### 3.1 Consultation Process

3.1.1 A twelve week formal consultation was carried out between 7 June and 29 August 2016. Consultation has been extensive, with consultation packs, easy read consultation packs and questionnaires cascaded to all stakeholders and available on the KCC consultation webpage. This included parent/carers, staff, Trade Unions, Advocacy Groups, Carers Organisations, Community Partners, Integrated Teams, Borough/Town Councillors and KCC Members.

3.1.2 A total of 247 consultation packs were circulated via a range of formats:

- 152 copies were posted to service users, family carers and staff
- 64 copies were emailed internally to KCC Members, Locality Teams, Disabled Children's Services and other relevant officers
- 31 copies were emailed to relevant Local Borough and Town Councillors, Community Organisations and the wider community

3.1.3 A number of stakeholder focused meeting dates took place as follows:

Meeting Date	Meeting Time	Focus of Meeting
Monday 7 <sup>th</sup> June	2.30 – 3.30pm	County Councillors, Cabinet Members
Wednesday 8 <sup>th</sup> June	2 – 3.30pm	Staff
Wednesday 8 <sup>th</sup> June	5 – 7pm	Service Users/Parents/Carers
Wednesday 15 <sup>th</sup> June	1 – 2.30pm	Staff
Wednesday 15 <sup>th</sup> June	3 – 5pm	Service Users/Parents/Carers
Wednesday 29 <sup>th</sup> June	2 – 3pm	Staff
Wednesday 29 <sup>th</sup> June	3 – 4pm	Other Stakeholders & Local Councillors
Wednesday 29 <sup>th</sup> June	5 – 7pm	Service Users/Parents/Carers
Monday 11 <sup>th</sup> July	3.30 – 4.30pm	<i>Faversham Health Matters**</i>
Monday 25 <sup>th</sup> July	7pm	<i>Faversham Town Council**</i>

*\*\* Additional meetings requested*

3.1.4 Further letters, dated 21 June and 18 August 2016, were posted to service users and family carers to remind them of the importance of booking their 1:1 meeting (if not already booked).

3.1.5 The Council's Press Office put out two press releases, one at the beginning of the consultation period in June and another approximately one week prior to the end of the consultation period, to remind stakeholders to respond. Responses to the consultation were received from a number of stakeholders and there were also two articles published in Kent Online and Faversham Times regarding the proposals.

3.1.6 A total of 54 1:1 meetings/discussions were held over the consultation period with the care manager and Osborne Court manager and the service users and family carers that currently access Osborne Court. The remaining four were already in the process of moving to permanent placements and so would not require a short breaks service in the future. The meetings were to discuss the future model and the impact of the proposal on individual circumstances. Information was available on the range of alternative short break services and visits to the other services were arranged, where requested.

3.1.7 The table below identifies the preferences made by the service users and family carers following discussions at the 1:1 meetings:

<b>Proposed Alternative Service</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup> Preference</b>	<b>In Process of Accessing</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Southfields</b>	21	1	<b>22</b>
<b>Meadowside</b>	8	-	<b>8</b>
<b>Hedgerows</b>	2	-	<b>2</b>
<b>Canterbury ASU</b>	7	2	<b>9</b>
<b>External Provider</b>	6	-	<b>6</b>
<b>Shared Lives</b>	3	3	<b>6</b>
<b>Direct Payment</b>	-	1	<b>1</b>
<b>Permanent Placements</b>	1	3	<b>4</b>
		<b>Total</b>	<b>58</b>

3.1.8 There are a five service users and family carers who have requested to begin a planned transition to alternative short break services prior to the outcome of the proposal as follows:

<b>Planned Transitions in Progress</b>	
Southfields	2
Hedgerows	2
Canterbury ASU	1

3.1.9 The table below highlights the impact of the above preferences on the occupancy of the four remaining services (if proposal goes ahead):

Short Break Units	Beds	Occupancy (Sept 2015)	Occupancy (July 2016)	Impact of Consultation Preferences	Status % Occupied (Post Decision)
Meadowside, Deal	22	-24.40%	-24.40%	-18%	82%
Southfields, Ashford	15	-22.96%	-26.38%	-4.20%	96%
Hedgerows, Staplehurst	5	100%	-9%	-3%	97%

3.1.10 Advocacy services were available to service users and family carers as part of the consultation. A contract with Advocacy for All, an independent advocacy service is in place and individuals can approach Advocacy for All for support at any time. The key carers organisations across Kent were informed of the consultation, emailed consultation packs directly and informed of the dates of the carer focused consultation meetings.

3.1.11 Further opportunity to discuss the model and proposals and gain feedback came at a social event and barbeque held at Osborne Court. The event was attended by over 80 people and views were gathered from over 20 service users and family carers who currently access Osborne Court. These views and feedback are included in 3.3 below.

3.2 Number and Type of Responses – Completed questionnaires, number of downloaded consultation documents and communication received.

3.2.1 The table below shows the number of online questionnaires completed on the consultation webpage and number of email and written responses received to the consultation mailbox during the consultation period.

Consultation responses from:	No. Completed Questionnaires	No. Email Responses	No. written Responses	No. Telephone Responses
Service Users	2	0	0	0
Family Carers	10	2	0	6
Staff	5	0	0	0
Wider Public	6	0	0	0
Organisations	0	2	2	0
<b>Total Responses</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>6</b>

3.2.2 The number of consultation packs and other documents downloaded from the consultation website was as follows:

Consultation Document (Word version)	131 downloads
Consultation Document (PDF version)	70 downloads
Consultation Document - Easy Read	68 downloads
Equality Impact Assessment (Word Version)	76 downloads

Equality Impact Assessment (PDF Version)	55 downloads
Member Briefing Paper (Word Version)	103 downloads
Member Briefing Paper (PDF Version)	51 downloads
Frequently Asked Questions	60 downloads
<b>Total</b>	<b>614 Downloads</b>

### 3.3 Key Themes - feedback and comments from service users and family carers

3.3.1 As the short break service provides respite to the carers, they were the main focus of conversations during the consultation period. Service users have been involved in both group and 1:1 meetings as well as any visits to alternative services. Service users and their family carers will also have extensive involvement in planning their transition to an alternative service, if the decision is made to close Osborne Court.

3.3.2 A selection of comments and Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) is provided below, and a full copy of the FAQs is included with the background documents to this report.

- a) **The effect of change on the individuals accessing the service was a key concern for family carers. This along with the change in staff and routine that a new service would bring worried family carers, particularly those who care for individuals with autism and complex needs.**

Family carers were encouraged to book a 1:1 meeting where the future model for accommodation based short breaks could be explained in detail and for them to have the opportunity to discuss the impact this new model may have on their individual circumstances. Information was available on the range of alternative short break services and if they wished to visit the other services they were supported to do so. The focus of the meetings was to discuss the needs of the individual and the particular support required to ensure a positive transition with the minimum disruption possible if the proposal were to go ahead.

- b) **The location of alternative services and travelling to alternative services was an issue raised by the family carers.**

A statement regarding the possible impact of the proposal, if agreed (in that it may result in a change in distance for some individuals to access alternative short break services) was included in the Member briefing paper that was available on the consultation webpage. The subject was also discussed extensively in the stakeholder group meetings as well as at the 1:1 meeting.

- c) **Service users and family carers wanted to know why Osborne Court had been chosen as the service proposed to close and not one of the other services.**

We explained that advice had been taken from our Landlords (KCC Property and Infrastructure) as to which building we proposed to close. See Appendix 1.

- d) **There were some concerns regarding whether Southfields would be able to accommodate the additional service users that may choose it. Also how we would manage the refurbishment at Southfields if it had to close whilst the work was completed.**

The above points were discussed at the consultation meetings and included in the presentations. We explained that as this is a proposal we will not be in a position to give a clear answer until we have listened to the 58 service users and their family carers as to which alternative services they may feel are appropriate. This will in turn inform where the capital funding is invested and any timeframe and impact this will have on the remaining four buildings.

### 3.3.3 General Feedback

- The family of service user A were concerned about the transition process and support arrangements for the move to Southfields. Tea visits have now been arranged for service user A at Southfields during a planned stay. The family now feel re-assured with the transition process and the support for service user A and themselves with the changes.
- Service user B had originally said they would not go anywhere else. After further discussion with the family and discussion about a planned transition for service user B. it was agreed on their next stay at Osborne Court, we would arrange visits for them to go to Southfields as they felt that would be the most appropriate service.
- “As parents/carers, we need that respite care to unwind and rest, I just want a good standard for my son and staff are key to this. I don’t care how far I have to travel as long as the facilities are good. I have no qualms about Osborne Court closing as long as you have the budget to improve facilities at the other buildings”.

### 3.4 Key Themes - feedback and comments from members of staff

3.4.1 A number of concerns were raised and questions asked by members of staff including:

- a. **The staff team were also concerned as to the reason why Osborne Court was the building proposed to close.**

Staff were informed that advice had been taken from our Landlords (KCC Property and Infrastructure Division) as to which building we proposed to close. See Appendix 1.

- b. **There were questions regarding how we would manage the refurbishment of Southfields and possible closure of Osborne Court and still make sure we had enough short break beds available.**

This matter was covered in the group meetings and presentations where we explained that any decisions going forward with regards to planned refurbishment of any of the four remaining buildings and the business continuity of the service will be managed following the outcome of the consultation.

**c. The staff team were concerned about their jobs and whether there may be extra staff needed at the other four remaining sites if the proposal goes ahead.**

A specific presentation was put together for the staff group meetings that explained that the Council want to retain, wherever possible, the staff employed at Osborne Court. Copies of all consultation paperwork and FAQ were placed on the staff notice board.

3.4.2 It was explained by the Human Resources Advisor at the meetings that if the proposal goes ahead there will be a formal 30 day staff consultation period during October/November 2016 during which the focus will be on exploring options for similar or alternative roles for staff across the In-House Provider Unit and wider KCC vacancies.

3.4.3 In order to support staff during this consultation period and prepare them for what may be ahead the staff group have been provided with additional information about working through change, interviewing experience, CV writing and career planning.

3.5 Key Themes: feedback and comments from the wider public and from organisations

**a) There were concerns raised by Faversham Health Matters (a local Community Interest Company) regarding recent proposals to close a number of services in the Faversham area by both KCC and Health, therefore in their view leaving Faversham with a lack of services for local people.**

The consultation report included information that highlighted that the KCC accommodation based short break units are countywide services. Therefore they are regularly accessed by people who do not live locally to the short break service they utilise. Family carers access the service that best meets the needs of the person they care for rather than the closest to where they live. This is evidenced in the maps, attached as Appendix 3, which identify the spread of those currently accessing the 5 Short Break Services.

3.5.1 Further detailed data was collated as part of the assessment phase, however this was not included in the final report. This additional information was requested by Faversham Health Matters and was provided below:

3.5.2 The table below identifies the location of the short breaks and day services accessed by those adults living within the ME13 and ME9 postcode:

<b>Swale Data</b>	
<b>Total Number of LD Clients in Swale (Caseload)</b>	<b>186</b>
Residential Care (person moves away from their parents)	60
Supported Living (person moves away from their parents)	19
Shared Lives (person moves away from their parents)	3
<b>Total – The above would not access Short Breaks</b>	<b>82</b>



<b>Number of Clients Living with Parent/Carers in the postcodes ME13 &amp; ME9 (person will access Short Breaks)</b>	<b>31</b>
Osborne Court	5
Other KCC Short Breaks (Meadowside, Southfields, Cant ASU, Hedgerows)	4
External Short Breaks (private residential care homes)	9
KCC Day Services (local services)	20
External Day Services (local services)	22
Direct Payments (choose to purchase)	3
Supporting Independence Service (local service)	4
Domiciliary Care (in the home)	3
<b>All 31 clients access 1 or more of the services above &amp; are eligible for short breaks</b>	

3.5.3 The table above demonstrates that from the 31 adults with a learning disability living locally to Osborne Court (postcodes ME13 & ME9) only five choose to access Osborne Court for their short break.

- b) The option of accessing Southfields, Ashford and the issues with transport were raised as a concern.** A statement regarding the possible impact of the proposal, if agreed, in that it may result in a change in distance for some individuals to access alternative short break services was included in the Member briefing paper that was available on the consultation webpage. The subject was also discussed extensively in the stakeholder group meetings and in the presentation and it was explained that support may be available if this is an issue for individuals.
- c) Questions were raised relating to the lack of investment in the Osborne Court building.** There was information relating to the fabric of the Osborne Court building and the facilities available internally. The specific amount spent on the building had not been included in the final reports and so was shared with Faversham Health Matters.
- d) In addition we received feedback and comments from the Faversham & Swale East Labour Party. The key themes as follows:**
- Concern that the public consultation report did not include sufficient information regarding the reasons for young people in transition not accessing adult short breaks.**  
The detailed information was included in the Member briefing paper, however there were three key reasons included in the public consultation report that were: 1. Change in aspirations, 2. Quality of the buildings & resources, 3. Disparity between children's & adults buildings.
  - Concern that the access to and from Ashford for the users of Osborne Court and their families is both beyond the distance and time that people are willing to travel.**  
A statement regarding the possible impact of the proposal, if agreed, in that it may result in a change in distance for some individuals to access alternative

short break services was included in the Member briefing paper that was available on the consultation webpage.

- **Concern regarding the new model offering a more robust model in the marketplace and fear that the proposal will leave KCC more exposed to the exigencies of the marketplace while also losing another source of in-house expertise.**

It was explained at the group consultation meetings and presentations that one of the main reasons for proposing the new model is to ensure the sustainability of the in-house accommodation based short break services. There are no plans to outsource the services and so by consolidating what we have, investing in the stock and the expertise of the workforce we are protecting our in-house services as well as making sure we have a place in the wider market.

A full list of the Frequently Asked Questions is included with the background documents to this report.

#### **4. You Said – We Did**

A number of issues arose during the consultation period and this has resulted in a change to the original proposals.

##### **a) The capital investment in Southfields, Ashford**

It had been explained in the initial consultation documents that the proposal was to invest in Southfields to accommodate the move from Osborne Court. The reason for this was that capital funding had to be secured against a named building/site and following advice from the Council's Property and Infrastructure division, Southfields was identified as the named site. Although the capital funding was predicated against Southfields in reality the funding will need to follow the service users and their preferences across the remaining four services. Depending on the outcome of the proposal a decision will be made as to where the capital funding is spent and to what extent in each of the relevant sites up to the total funding secured.

##### **b) Concern regarding the number of additional service users accessing Southfields**

It was not made clear in the consultation documents that there were other options as to where the capital funding could be spent, as a result stakeholders were more concerned about the level of occupancy planned for Southfields than needed to be. In hindsight this could have avoided this if this detail had been included in the documentation.

##### **c) Concern regarding additional capacity for individuals to access short breaks in externally provided accommodation based short break services locally to where they live**

Discussions are underway with colleagues in the Council's strategic commissioning division to scope out the possibility of setting up a block contract (which would guarantee a set number of short break beds/nights per year) with a local provider. This process would need to follow procurement guidelines.

**d) Opportunities for co-production across the four remaining services**

There were a number of family carers and organisations who were interested in the opportunity to become more involved in the services we provide. Co-production is something that had been talked about during the assessment and design phase of the project. Sufficient detail regarding these positive opportunities was not included in the consultation documents. This approach will certainly be taken as an integral part of our short breaks model.

**e) The land value at Osborne Court and related proposal**

The reasons for Osborne Court being identified as the proposed site to close are explained extensively in all the consultation paperwork. However the land values were not included, which in hindsight would have been useful in informing stakeholders that Osborne Court is not identified by the Council's Property and Infrastructure as the site with the highest value

**5. Equality Impact Assessment**

5.1 An Equality Impact Assessment has been completed and is included with the background documents to this report.

**6. Financial Implications**

6.1 The current budget for the service will be reallocated to the relevant services, the cost of which will be known once services are secured. There may be associated costs relating to redundancy and retirement which will be known following the formal staff consultation period, plus efficiencies from the reduction of one short break building.

**7. Legal Implications**

7.1 The County Council has a statutory responsibility to support carers and the person they care for, with one area of provision being accommodation based short breaks.

**8. Conclusion**

8.1 The majority of consultees did not disagree with the proposed future model. There is an understanding that the facts are clear concerning low occupancy, building stock and value for money. In the current financial climate and in order to create sustainability for the services there needs to be focused investment in a smaller number of buildings to ensure the Council continues to provide the much needed respite to family carers that supports both the person they care for and themselves.

8.2 The concern during the consultation was focused around the proposed closure of one of the buildings and the impact on the service users, family carers, staff and local community. As a result of feedback and comments received, appropriate changes have been made to the original proposals.

8.3 The proposals will impact on the key stakeholders involved and a number of key areas of the business; these will be mitigated as follows.

- 8.3.1 Service users and family carers – All 58 services users and their family carers who currently access Osborne Court have been contacted and 93% have met to discuss their individual circumstances with us. The outcome of which is detailed in 3.1.7 above. Their chosen alternative services have been identified and will not see a reduction in the amount of respite each person receives. The Transition Pilot between children's and adults short breaks is underway and is showing signs of success. This will be rolled out across all services and will open up further opportunities for young people with disabilities. There are a number of family carers who have looked in to alternative options that they hadn't previously been aware of and feel will be more suitable for the person they care for and have made arrangements to move to these alternative services prior to the outcome of the proposal.
- 8.3.2 Staff Team – The messages to staff throughout the consultation process have been incredibly positive and focused on the retention of the staff employed at Osborne Court stating that the plans involved no reduction in roles. The focus has been on exploring options for similar or alternative roles for staff across other short break facilities and these conversations have been managed at a local level. This is so that staff are aware of the opportunities that are available across the wider service area in order to reassure staff during the period of uncertainty and encourage the retention of staff. If the proposal goes ahead a further 30 day formal consultation will take place with the staff during October/November 2016.
- 8.3.3 Building/Site – If the decision is made to go ahead with the closure of Osborne Court the building and site will remain open for as long as required to support the transition of service users and staff to alternative services. The site including the building will then be handed back to the Landlord (KCC Property and Infrastructure Division). There has been an 'Asset of Nomination Request' made on the Osborne Court and Faversham Day Service site to Swale Borough Council, the outcome of which will be determined when the Council decide the future of the vacant site.
- 8.3.4 Financial Capital - The capital investment of £504k initially predicated against Southfields in Ashford will be reviewed and invested appropriately to enhance the facilities at the respective sites that individuals and family carers have chosen as their alternative short break service, therefore supporting the sustainability of the sites. Service users and family carers will be involved in coproducing these changes going forward.
- 8.3.5 Revenue – A percentage of the Osborne Court revenue budget will be allocated across the remaining four KCC accommodation based short break units at the appropriate proportion for the number of additional service users accessing those services and the level of dependency of the individuals.
- 8.4 Throughout the consultation the Council has listened to the views and feedback of all the stakeholders. We understand that change is very difficult for everyone and particularly for those who access the service, their family carers and the staff team. In order to ensure we support these key people affected by the proposal we have made the related changes to the original proposal.

- 8.5 We strongly believe, and the feedback from the majority of those we have spoken to agree, that the positive changes the proposed future model of service will ensure the accommodation based short break services are fit for purpose and fit for the future and will therefore be sustainable and continue to be a vital service to family carers.

## 9. Recommendations

**9.1 Recommendations:** The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Public Health is asked to

- a) **PROCEED** with the Accommodation Based Short Break Model
- b) **END** service provision from Osborne Court and identify alternative services for the 58 service users and family carers and close Osborne Court.
- c) **DELEGATE** authority to the Corporate Director of Social Care, Health and Wellbeing, or other nominated officer, to undertake the necessary actions to implement the decision.

## 10 Background Documents

Short Break Services – Proposed Changes to Accommodation Based Short Break Services for People with Disabilities – Public Consultation 7 June – 29 August.2016.

<http://consultations.kent.gov.uk/consult.ti/shortbreaksservices/consultationHome>

Equality Impact Assessment – Theresa to add link

Press Releases – Theresa to add link

## 11. Contact Details

### Report Author

Sue McGibbon

Change Implementation Officer

03000 415412

[Sue.mcgibbon@kent.gov.uk](mailto:Sue.mcgibbon@kent.gov.uk)

### Lead Director

Penny Southern

Director Disabled Children, Adult Learning Disability and Mental Health

03000 415505

[Penny.southern@kent.gov.uk](mailto:Penny.southern@kent.gov.uk)