

CABINET

The following decisions were taken by the Cabinet on Tuesday, 10 March 2015 and will take effect on 18/03/2015 unless the call-in procedure has been triggered. **CALL-IN DEADLINE: 17/03/15.**

The following represents a summary of the decisions taken by the Cabinet. It is not intended to represent the formal record of the meeting but to facilitate the call-in process. The formal minutes will be published in due course to replace this decision sheet.

County Members wishing to request a call-in on any of these matters, should contact the Senior Manager for Scrutiny or relevant Democratic Services Officer.

The Cabinet at its meeting on Tuesday, 10 March 2015 considered the following matters and resolved:

Members' Questions (Item 3a)

Questions were received from Mrs White and Mr Essex. The questions and responses are attached as **Appendix 1**.

- **PETITIONS** (Item 3c)

That the response to the petitions, as set out in **Appendix 2** be noted.]

- **SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL RESIDENTIAL CARE HOMES FOR OLDER PEOPLE** (Item 4)

1. That the decision to close residential care provision by Surrey County Council at Brockhurst be approved.
2. That the decision to close residential care provision by Surrey County Council at Cobgates be approved.
3. That the decision to close residential care provision by Surrey County Council at Dormers be approved.
4. That the decision to close residential care provision by Surrey County Council at Longfield be approved.
5. That the decision to close residential care provision by Surrey County Council at Park Hall be approved.
6. That the decision to close residential care provision by Surrey County Council at Pinehurst be approved.
7. That a phased implementation programme to move people to alternative services be undertaken, which must take account of best practice and be guided by individual assessments of those affected, including carers.
8. That suitable alternative services for each affected person in those homes closing be identified.
9. That further work be undertaken for each property to fully evaluate

potential alternative use to meet future needs for adult social care.

10. That a full staff consultation begins, with the objective, where possible, of retaining existing staff skills and knowledge.

Reasons for Decisions:

After analysing all the consultation responses received and comments made in the individual meetings during the consultation period, and the council's review of services, the reasons for closure of the provision of in house residential care homes for older people are:

- The physical environment of the homes is not fit for purpose and cannot easily or quickly be made so. The poor quality of the environment impacts on the quality of care that can be offered.
- The demand for residential care for older people is changing as is their preference, with support, to continue living at home. Optimum occupancy cannot be achieved in any of Surrey County Council's six older peoples residential care homes due to the building limitations, which in part leads to low occupancy and higher staffing levels. This makes the continued delivery of services unsustainable.
- It will remain difficult to accept the range of referrals and complexity of need being presented unless the current facilities are significantly upgraded to the modern standards identified for dignified care delivery. To complete the required level of works, residents would need to temporarily relocate, potentially meaning two moves at least, if they were to return to the refurbished home.
- Residential placements made by the council in the independent sector make up 91% of the total funded placements by the council. Surrey is fortunate in having a diverse independent care sector offering quality services. The council has an ongoing relationship with the sector to ensure responsiveness to commissioning intentions. In the last year the council has placed 263 people in residential care and 857 in nursing care in independent sector provision. It has had high utilisation of its 905 block placement residential care beds. Investment in the council homes refurbishment does not compare favourably with commissioning existing alternative provision in the independent sector.
- A phased approach, based on individual assessment and plans, enables time to ensure appropriate alternatives are identified for each individual and carers, and to work with the independent sector market in a managed way.
- Employees within the homes are recognised as delivering a good quality of care in challenging environments. There has been investment in their training, and there is a wealth of skill and experience. The council will support staff to explore opportunities, seeking to retain skills and experience.

Should a decision be taken to close a home, any future use of that asset for Adult Social Care or the local community will need to be carefully assessed.

[The decisions on this item can be called in by Adult Social Care Select Committee]

Members' Questions

Question (1) from Mrs Fiona White (Guildford West) to ask:

As you are all aware, there have recently been two high-profile closures of care homes, one of which - Merok Park - is in Surrey and the other in Sutton has been used by Surrey County Council to place people in need of residential care packages. A search of CQC's website shows that 5 care homes within a 13 mile radius of Guildford have been reported as being Inadequate in one or more category. In view of this information, do the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and his cabinet colleagues believe that this is the right time to close council-owned residential homes, especially in view of the responsibility on Surrey to provide alternative care at very short notice in the case of a home being required to close?

Reply:

We are satisfied that the council would still be able to meet its responsibilities in relation to securing alternative care in the event of a home closure, if a decision is taken to close any of the older peoples in-house care homes.

When any home closes the welfare of residents is the primary consideration. The council has experience of moving people out of homes, including in emergency situations. Moves are managed in line with national best practice guidance. The council would support the residents and their families in accordance with the council's 'Community and Care Home Provider Closure Protocol 2014'.

Whilst the council acknowledges that this scenario is a possibility, it is not a frequent occurrence, and homes that close, or have been deemed inadequate, represent only a fraction of the number of independent care homes in Surrey.

91% of the council placements into residential care homes are made with the independent sector, with the remaining 9% in the councils residential care homes for older people. The council has been successful in working with the independent sector care market to source residential care

There are 6,490 residential care beds currently registered across the county (as at 29/01/15). In the past year 263 residential care placements and 857 nursing placements have been arranged in the independent sector. There has also been a high level of use of the council's 905 block placement residential care beds. In addition to these placements, there will have been many more people who fund their own care entering residential care homes in the independent sector during these times. This means that in most places, at most times, there is the capacity needed to meet the demand

**Mr Mel Few
Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care
10 March 2015**

Question (2) from Mr Jonathan Essex (Redhill East) to ask:

(1) Response to Surrey Residents

4,503 individuals have had their signatures presented to this meeting, advocating for a continued future of all of the six care homes in Camberley, Reigate, Caterham, Cranleigh, Farnham and Ottershaw. Why is the Cabinet considering implementation of the closure of the care homes, when this option received by far the broadest level of disagreement of all four options through the recent public consultation, with 87% of respondents stating that they did not support closure?

(2) Impact of Transfer of Existing Patients to New Homes

What specific safeguards would the Council put in place during any proposed movement of residents to eliminate all risk of mortality caused by the trauma of moving for elderly and vulnerable patients?

(3) Validity of Cost Benefit Analysis

The comparison of what is required to sustain these six care homes does not equate to the case for closure. Why has the refurbishment cost been based on en-suite while this may not be what would be provided should care for patients with the same needs be sought by Surrey County Council in the private sector?

Do the placement of residents with the same care needs in privately run care homes by Surrey County Council have the same specification as reflected in the full refurbished specification for these six care homes. In particular, does Surrey require all residents placed in private care homes to have en-suite bathrooms - as this requirement in particular underpins the cost estimates used for refurbishment, which is used to argue for these care homes to be closed?

Why was the value of respite, re-enablement and day care being not fully reflected in assessment of the level of utilisation of these six care homes, or the added-value of these services being combined with residential care being reflected in the assessment of the quality of care provided in these six care homes?

(4) Impact of Choice and Benchmarking Quality across Surrey Residential Care Contracts

How can the Cabinet ensure the people of Surrey that the closure of these facilities would not have the adverse impact on choice for elderly residents and their families?

How can the Council ensure that the same investment in stable management is provided in privately run care home alternatives when, Merok Park for example, one such privately run care home which could have been used as alternative provisioning, has just been closed down.

How can the Council ensure value-for-money for the private sector with the same degree of assurance without the hands-on experience and grasp of costs that comes from running the same services in-house?

Given that 91% of funded residential placements made by the Council are already within the independent sector, why does the Cabinet not consider the maintenance and expansion of alternative care options to be a priority for elderly residents and families in Surrey?

(5) Timing

Why has the Council chosen to consider this report at this particular time rather than wait until the full impact of the new Care Act is known?

Reply:

As the question is in several parts the responses are set out below under each part.

(1) Response to Surrey Residents

4,503 individuals have had their signatures presented to this meeting, advocating for a continued future of all of the six care homes in Camberley, Reigate, Caterham, Cranleigh, Farnham and Ottershaw. Why is Cabinet considering implementation of the closure of the care homes, when this option received by far the broadest level of disagreement of all four options through the recent public consultation, with 87% of respondents stating that they did not support closure?

Response

The decision to make the recommendations in today's Cabinet report has not been taken lightly. Two separate petitions have been received. In addition, there has been extensive consultation including conversations with people who live in and use the services provided at the homes, their families and carers. All of the feedback received from the consultation has been considered.

The reasons for the recommendations are contained within the Cabinet report.

(2) Impact of Transfer of Existing Patients to New Homes

What specific safeguards would the Council put in place during any proposed movement of residents to eliminate all risk of mortality caused by the trauma of moving for elderly and vulnerable patients?

Response

It is acknowledged that there are risks with moving any person, including planned moves. The Council has extensive experience of moving people such as when their care needs change, when a resident is moved to a home that is more local to family and in emergency situations, should they arise.

The welfare of residents is the primary consideration in the event of any home closure. It would be approached in a planned and carefully managed way over a period of time, and in line with national best practice guidance. This would include the involvement of residents, families, friends and staff from the closing home.

Each resident and their family would be supported by a Social Care Practitioner who will assess individual needs and discuss preferences, and help to choose an appropriate alternative service. The approach is by nature specific to each individual.

(3) Validity of Cost Benefit Analysis

The comparison of what is required to sustain these 6 care homes does not equate to the case for closure. Why has the refurbishment cost been based on en-suite while this may not be what would be provided should care for patients with the same needs be sought by Surrey County Council in the private sector?

Do the placement of residents with the same care needs in privately run care homes by Surrey County Council have the same specification as reflected in the full refurbished specification for these six care homes. In particular, does Surrey require all residents placed in private care homes to have en-suite bathrooms - as this requirement in particular underpins the cost estimates used for refurbishment, which is used to argue for these care homes to be closed?

Why was the value of respite, re-enablement and day care being not fully reflected in assessment of the level of utilisation of these six care homes, or the added-value of these services being combined with residential care being reflected in the assessment of the quality of care provided in these six care homes?

Response

The information provided during the consultation sets out the requirements that contributed to the estimated refurbishment costs. These encompass a wide range of factors and are not limited to or underpinned by en-suite facilities.

The focus of this process has been ensuring that services provide dignified care, appropriate to the changing level of need, for Surrey residents now and in the future. It has also been recognised that level of disruption for residents during a refurbishment or rebuild would be high due to temporary moves. In line with the Council's long term strategic vision, it is more appropriate to consider other models of service delivery.

The average level of use of service in the homes can be found at Annex 2 of the Cabinet report and includes average use of Day Care, Reablement and short stay services. These services and potential alternative provision have been considered throughout the process.

(4) Impact of Choice and Benchmarking Quality across Surrey Residential Care Contracts

How can Cabinet ensure the people of Surrey that the closure of these facilities would not have the adverse impact on choice for elderly residents and their families?

How can the Council ensure that the same investment in stable management is provided in privately run care home alternatives when, Merrick Park for example, one such privately run care home which could have been used as alternative provisioning, has just been closed down.

How can Council ensure value-for-money for the private sector with the same degree of assurance without the hands-on experience and grasp of costs that comes from running the same services in-house?

Given that 91% of funded residential placements made by Council are already within the independent sector, why does Cabinet not consider the maintenance and expansion of alternative care options to be a priority for elderly residents and families in Surrey?

Response

The Adult Social Care Commissioning Strategy for Older People 2011 – 2020, and supporting Market Position Statement for Older People's services, outlines Surrey County Council's vision as to what services it needs to commission to ensure services provided deliver dignified and flexible solutions and meet future needs in appropriate settings including the community.

Whilst the Council acknowledges that what happened at Merok Park is a possibility in the future, it is not a frequent occurrence, and homes that close, or have been deemed inadequate, represent only a fraction of the number of independent care homes in Surrey. All residential and nursing care provision, regardless of who provides it, is subject to the same Care Quality Commission (CQC) standards and inspection. One of CQC's key lines of enquiry is that a service is 'Well led'; covering management and leadership. The Council is committed to quality services which deliver dignified care across all sectors.

In the past year, 263 residential care placements and 857 nursing placements have been arranged in the independent sector, highlighting the ability to commission services at rates agreeable to the council.

(5) Timing

Why has the Council chosen to consider this report at this particular time rather than wait until the full impact of the new Care Act is known?

Response

The potential impact of the Care Act 2014 across adult social care is recognised, but will not affect the key reasons for the recommendations: changing demand for residential care, the increasing complexity of people's needs when referred and the current challenges to delivering dignified care.

In the further work to explore alternative models of delivery of adult social care services for each site, the impact of the Care Act will continue to be taken into account.

Mr Mel Few
Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care
10 March 2015

RESPONSES TO PETITIONS

The Petition concerning 'Save the Surrey 6 Care Homes'

It states: 'We the undersigned agree with the following statement.

Save the Surrey 6 care homes and re-develop them to provide the best care for the elderly community in Surrey'

Submitted by Mr Frank Minal on behalf of GMB

Signatures: 130

The Petition concerning 'Save Our Elderly Care Homes'

It states: 'We call on Surrey County Council to invest in the redevelopment and refurbishment (or rebuilding) of its six remaining in-house elderly care homes. Brockhurst in Ottershaw, Cobgates in Farnham, Longfield in Cranleigh, Dormers in Caterham, Park Hall in Reigate and Pinehurst in Camberley. We do not accept the rationale for closure of any of these homes. The quality and level of care in these homes is outstanding. What is needed is the political will to invest in their modernisation - not to close them.'

Submitted by Mr Paul Couchman on behalf of Save Our Services

Signatures: 4373

The Cabinet's response

Thank you for the petitions in support of the statements outlined above.

The decision to make the recommendations in today's Cabinet report has not been taken lightly. The recommendations include the closure of the six remaining in-house older people's residential care homes and find suitable alternative services for all current users in each of these homes.

The change in demand for residential adult social care services place the future viability of the six homes in doubt. This change in demand has been the main focus of the service along with the need to deliver quality, dignified care to older people, often with multiple complex needs.

In finalising the recommendations the validity of the four options proposed during consultation has been reviewed.

The reasons for the recommendations are:

- The demand for residential care for older people is changing as is their preference, with support, to continue living at home.
- Optimum occupancy cannot be achieved in any of these homes due to the

building limitations, which in part leads to low occupancy and higher staffing levels. This makes the delivery of the services unsustainable.

- It will remain difficult to accept the range of referrals and complexity of need currently being received unless the current facilities are restructured to the modern standards identified for dignified care delivery. To convert these homes would require multiple moves for the residents which is not best practice and would not necessarily result in a satisfactory conclusion.
- 91% residential placements made by the council are made in the independent sector. There is a diverse independent care sector in Surrey offering quality services. The council has an ongoing relationship working with the sector to ensure responsiveness to commissioning intentions. In the last year the council placed 263 people in residential care and 857 in nursing care in independent sector provision. It has also had high utilisation of its 905 block placement residential care beds. Investment in the council homes, either by refurbishment or reconfiguration, does not compare favourably, nor provide best value, with commissioning existing alternative provision in the independent sector.

Should a decision be taken to close a home, any future use of that asset for Adult Social Care or the local community will need to be carefully assessed.

Mr Mel Few
Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care
10 March 2015

DEMOCRATIC SERVICES – CONTACT LIST

Cabinet, Committees and Appeals

Bryan Searle x419019

Bryans@surreycc.gov.uk

Cabinet Business Manager

Vicky Hibbert – x419229

Vicky.hibbert@surreycc.gov.uk

Cabinet Committee Manager

Anne Gowing - x419938

anne.gowing@surreycc.gov.uk

Regulatory Committee Manager

Cheryl Hardman - x419075

cherylH@surreycc.gov.uk

Committee Assistant

Rianna Hanford - x132662

rianna.hanford@surreycc.gov.uk

Committee Assistant

Andy Baird – x417609

Andrew.baird@surreycc.gov.uk

Committee Assistant

George Foster – x132732

George.foster@surreycc.gov.uk

Scrutiny Manager

Helen Rankin – x419126

helen.rankin@surreycc.gov.uk

Scrutiny Officer

Ross Pike - x417368

ross.pike@surreycc.gov.uk

Scrutiny Officer

Huma Younis - x132725

huma.younis@surreycc.gov.uk

Scrutiny Officer

Andy Spragg – x132673

Andrew.spragg@surreycc.gov.uk

Scrutiny Officer

Victoria White – x132583

victoria.white@surreycc.gov.uk