

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL****CABINET****DATE: 10 MARCH 2015****REPORT OF: MR MEL FEW, CABINET MEMBER FOR ADULT SOCIAL CARE****LEAD OFFICER: DAVID SARGEANT, STRATEGIC DIRECTOR FOR ADULT SOCIAL CARE****SUBJECT: SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL RESIDENTIAL CARE HOMES FOR OLDER PEOPLE****SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

On 21 October 2014 the Cabinet took a decision to consult on the future of six Surrey County Council residential care homes for older people. This followed a comprehensive review of the services provided, future commissioning requirements, and consideration whether Surrey County Council should continue operating older people's residential care homes.

The homes under consultation are:

- Brockhurst in Ottershaw
- Cobgates in Farnham
- Dormers in Caterham
- Longfield in Cranleigh
- Park Hall in Reigate
- Pinehurst in Camberley

Between them the homes currently provide a range of services including residential care, respite, day care and reablement services (see glossary of terms, Annex 1).

When the homes were constructed people referred were required to be fully mobile and continent. The infrastructure of these homes was not designed to meet the current and future needs of the elderly who continue to present with complex needs requiring more specialist modern facilities. As a responsible provider, the council needs to consider how it can deliver a quality dignified care service, meeting current and future needs.

The numbers of people across the six homes using these services include: 133 permanent residents, 28 current day care users (varying frequency use), an average of 36 temporary/respite beds occupied, and an average of 13 people commencing a period of bed based reablement per month (Annex 2, as at January 2015).

The public consultation took place from 30 October 2014 and was extended to 31 January 2015. Views were sought from current users of the services provided by the homes, relatives, staff, stakeholders and any other affected people.

Many residents and their families took advantage of face to face meetings where their concerns were aired and discussed. In addition visits were undertaken to relatives living out of the county.

Recognising that the recommendations are likely to lead to disruption of persons using the services and their family members, the needs and wellbeing of those

affected are paramount. Careful planning taking account of best practice will mitigate the impact on the users through individual assessment and planning of alternative services, which are available in the independent sector.

It is recognised that refurbishment and upgrading of these homes as laid out in option 2 would cause significant upheaval to the residents through multiple moves which would not be best practice.

The council is determined to ensure future adult social care needs are met appropriately, and working with other partners, will start further work on the potential alternative use of the properties for future services, which could include facilities for extra care, dementia care, and support for carers (such as short breaks).

The Cabinet is asked to consider the summary consultation report, and decide on the recommendations for each of the homes under consideration.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

It is recommended that the Cabinet agree:

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

### **REASON FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:**

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 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 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.
- 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.

#### **DETAILS:**

##### **Background:**

1. Four options were considered for each home in terms of their potential to meet future needs of those affected:
  1. Stay 'as is'
  2. Extend and refurbish or redevelop the home
  3. Sell or lease the home to another provider
  4. Support residents to move to another appropriate service and close the service.
2. Surrey County Council's preferred option, contained in the Cabinet paper of the 21 October 2014 (report available on Surrey County Council website), was to close each of the six homes and support residents to move to another appropriate service, taking into account individual needs.
3. The consultation outlined the strategic review of the services including the challenges associated with the environment for each home. Annex 3 includes a summary of this used during the consultation. This document was updated

during the consultation to reflect the fact that all of the homes have continued to provide good quality care despite the environmental challenges and to reflect current occupancy and staffing numbers. It is acknowledged that during the consultation many residents, family members, staff and some stakeholders felt that there were more positives about the homes than were outlined in Annex 3 and this is reflected in the consultation feedback. During the consultation further information on the challenges was requested and provided, which is available on the consultation area of the Surrey County Council website.

4. More detail on the extent of the consultation can be seen in the Consultation section of this report.
5. A summary report of the consultation feedback and Surrey County Council's response to issues raised during the consultation is presented in Annex 4. A decision is required on each individual home. A fuller report on the consultation is available on the Surrey County Council website.

**Summary of key themes heard during the consultation and the council's response:**

6. The high level summary of key themes and Surrey County Council's response is seen in the table below. Annex 4 contains a fuller summary.

<b>1</b>	<p><b><u>Impact on Residents Who May Be Moved</u></b> If closure goes ahead, there would be a detrimental effect on current residents, as well as their families, when being moved to alternative services.</p>
	<p><b>Surrey County Council Response</b> The welfare of residents will be the primary consideration in the event of any home closure: it would be planned and carefully managed over a period of time, in line with national best practice guidance. This would include the involvement of residents, families, friends and staff from the closing home.</p>
<b>2</b>	<p><b><u>Care and Quality</u></b> Surrey County Council delivers excellent care and a good quality service. There is concern that a similar quality of care cannot be delivered by providers within the independent care sector.</p>
	<p><b>Surrey County Council Response</b> All residential and nursing care provision is subject to the same Care Quality Commission (CQC) standards and inspection. The council is committed to quality services which deliver dignified care across all sectors. A "task and finish" group is currently working to ensure high standards of care are maintained across Surrey through information sharing with the public and professionals. The council works to assist any provider that may be experiencing difficulty in achieving and maintaining adequate standards of care, and to ensure that residents are safe and treated with dignity by providers.</p>
<b>3</b>	<p><b><u>Alternative Provision , Care Market Capacity and Demographic Issues</u></b> Surrey has an increasing and ageing demographic. There will be more people living with dementia and associated health and social care needs in future. Closing the care homes would have a negative impact on the care market's capacity to meet current and future demand. Other services, such as planned and unplanned respite care and day care, which caters for people with dementia and people with personal care needs, are needed. Providers who respond swiftly to receive people leaving hospital are needed. The homes are community resources that meet social care needs locally.</p>

	<p><b>Surrey County Council Response</b></p> <p>The council's commissioning strategies take account of projected demographic growth. 91% of the council's placements into residential care are made with the independent sector. In Surrey there has been a net gain of 455 registered residential and nursing beds over the last three years, with over 200 additional nursing and residential beds due to be available by the summer of 2015. There has been a growth in extra care schemes, and plans to develop further schemes are in progress. There are numerous existing day opportunities and a new tender process will commence in early summer 2015, which is likely to result in new flexible alternatives being available to Surrey residents.</p>
4	<p><b><u>Reputation and responsibilities of Surrey County Council</u></b></p> <p>There are views that the council has a duty to continue to directly provide residential care for older people, and as the provider "of last resort", being able to respond flexibly to emergencies. The Surrey "brand" is trusted and respected by Surrey people.</p>
	<p><b>Surrey County Council Response</b></p> <p>The council (like other councils) is looking at more effective ways of providing services, including reviewing its role as a direct provider of services. The council's statutory requirements are to assess needs and secure provision for those eligible for services. Social Care Practitioners will continue to support people who use services regardless of who their service provider is.</p>
5	<p><b><u>Refurbishment, Property and Land Issues.</u></b></p> <p>Many residents and their families consider the current buildings to be adequate, and disagree with the council's position that considerable works are needed. Smaller scale works were suggested, such as knocking through walls to create bigger spaces. Some think the council's review of options, and the scale of investment needed was flawed. Many responses commented that the council should consolidate its provision, and invest in developing some sites.</p>
	<p><b>Surrey County Council Response</b></p> <p>At the time of construction the buildings reflected current standards and guidance. The configuration, layout and spatial provision, as well as the model of delivery, are inappropriate now as it compromises the council's ability to deliver, in the longer term, dignified care in modern environments. It would be necessary to undertake a significant enhancement or extension of the buildings rather than continued minor refurbishments.</p>
6	<p><b><u>Impact on the Whole Health and Social Care System</u></b></p> <p>Effective patient flow is essential to support the delivery of best care for all in the health and social care system. It may not be maintained if the council's homes are closed.</p>
	<p><b>Surrey County Council Response</b></p> <p>The council continues ongoing work with Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs) and local providers to understand and secure the availability of commissioned services which meet current and future needs, and which are flexible to help prevent hospital admissions and facilitate timely hospital discharges.</p>
7	<p><b><u>Surrey County Council Staff</u></b></p> <p>The quality of care delivered by council staff was frequently highlighted. Closure of the homes would have an impact on staff</p>
	<p><b>Surrey County Council Response</b></p> <p>The council is proud of its staff and their commitment to providing high quality care. Should a decision be taken to close any home, the council will support staff to explore opportunities, seeking to retain skills and experience where possible</p>

8	<p><b><u>Community Issues and Impact</u></b> The care homes are part of their local community, and seen as assets</p>
	<p><b><u>Surrey County Council Response</u></b> The council acknowledges the importance of the properties to local people in providing adult social care services.</p>
9	<p><b><u>Surrey County Council Finance and Costs</u></b> There is concern that independent sector provision is more costly. In addition the Surrey County Council guidance fee level is too low, which affects the ability to secure choice of provision.</p>
	<p><b><u>Surrey County Council Response</u></b> The council already actively negotiates with providers and is able to purchase care at acceptable rates. It is not envisaged that there would be any financially adverse impact on affected individuals as a result of any decisions made in relation to this Cabinet report.</p>
10	<p><b><u>The Consultation Process</u></b> Many respondents said that a decision had already been made by the council, and therefore the consultation process was not truly open and meaningful</p>
	<p><b><u>Surrey County Council Response</u></b> The council is satisfied that the consultation process meets common law principles. The consultation material outlines the council's preferred option. No decision has been taken. The views expressed during the extended consultation period will be made known to the Cabinet members who are responsible for making the final decision.</p>
11	<p><b><u>Surrey County Council Placement Policy</u></b> A small number of people suggested a decision had been taken to "run down" the homes before the consultation, to suggest lack of demand.</p>
	<p><b><u>Surrey County Council Response</u></b> The council took the decision to stop making any new permanent admissions to the older people's homes in August 2014 in recognition of the difficulties staff face supporting people with dignity within the constraints of the accommodation. Staffing levels were not reduced to enable a focus upon delivering the best quality service possible for residents.</p>
12	<p><b><u>Issues Affecting Carers</u></b> Carers value the respite and day care provided to enable individuals to live at home, and carers to keep caring (and to have a life outside of caring).</p>
	<p><b><u>Surrey County Council Response</u></b> The council acknowledges the importance of respite and day care services for carers. Commissioning analysis has identified potential alternative services. Any commissioning of alternatives will be informed by conversations with individuals, their families and others important in their care to establish needs and preferences.</p>

**Key factors taken into account in support of the recommendations:**

7. The long term service quality, future viability of the homes, and value for money, together with the change in demand for adult services, have been considered alongside the views expressed during the consultation and the impact of the recommendations on individuals, family members and communities, as summarised above and in Annex 4.
8. In finalising the recommendations the viability of the 4 options proposed during consultation has been reviewed. A graph showing the number of responses indicating broad agreement and disagreement with each option is



included in Annex 4. This indicates high levels of disagreement with the council's preferred option.

9. **Option 1** (Stay "as is") is not viable for any of the homes. Their suitability to deliver quality residential care for older people, meeting future needs, must be addressed.
10. Surrey County Council needs to look ahead at whether each home is able to efficiently deliver modern requirements for high quality residential care to older people, many with multiple complex needs. The demand for residential care services will continue to change, with individuals accessing registered nursing care settings at a later stage of need.
11. There is a national trend, extending to Surrey, with the Care Quality Commission (CQC) noting that the number of nursing bed registrations has increased, whilst the number for residential care has decreased. A report provided by the CQC (27/01/15) provides an Area Profile for Surrey showing a net gain of 455 registered beds in the last three years, the gain being in nursing beds.
12. Occupancy within Surrey County Council's older people's care homes has been low for some time, influenced by the changing nature of referrals the homes have been receiving (more complex care needs), and the inability to safely and effectively deliver the care required in current environments. The change in occupancy levels from ceasing taking placements to the end of consultation, and average occupancy information for each of the six homes over an 18 month period can be seen in Annex 2, showing little change.
13. **Option 2** (Extend and refurbish or redevelop the home) is not considered viable for any of the homes, as the level of disruption for residents would be high due to temporary moves, and investment necessary to deliver the required quality of environment for residential care for older people would not represent best value for Surrey residents.
14. During the consultation, people stated that the indicated investment required seemed high. A Surrey County Council review of this confirmed officer views that the minimum necessary requirement to address building challenges, where practicable, for the future (long term) provision of residential care services for older people would be complete enhancement, refurbishment and extension, as part refurbishment is a limited solution. Supplementary information provided (available on Surrey County Council website) during the consultation outlines further detail on works required for each building including short term capital maintenance requirements and addressing building services (such as heating, wiring, plumbing), and upgrading and enhancing buildings to the required standard. In 3 cases the site is unsuitable for extension.
15. To complete the level of work required would mean significant disruption, including temporary moves, for current residents.
16. Surrey County Council does not consider that a viable business model for residential care for older people, in its existing homes, could be delivered. Investment in each of the properties to continue delivery of permanent residential care for older people would not compare favourably to

commissioning placements in the independent sector, as the council does now for the majority of older people it funds.

17. The Care Act 2014 places a requirement on local authorities to ensure they take a central role in shaping, and supporting the development of high quality, diverse and affordable care to meet future needs. The council is confident that sufficient alternative provision is available to meet anticipated need. Analysis is ongoing, to inform commissioning plans and ongoing work with the local care market.
18. **Option 3** (Sell or lease the home to another provider) was not the council's preferred option as refurbishment would still need to be addressed, and in their current state, the buildings are likely to have limited appeal for their current use to other providers. It is likely that temporary vacation of the properties would be required to allow for building improvement.
19. During the consultation other providers of care and accommodation services showed interest in some of the properties for alternative services, however no formal proposals were received by the close of the consultation period. None of the interest shown would provide an immediate solution to the challenges of the current environments.
20. **Option 4** (Support residents to move to another appropriate service and close the service) in light of the review above, remains the only viable option for each home.
21. Annex 4 includes a graph indicating the level of comments on each major theme of feedback from the consultation. The council has considered the strength of feeling around continuing current provision, and concern around quality and availability of alternative provision, as well as the impact of moves.
22. Mitigation of the impact is considered in the Equality Impact Assessment (Annex 5), and Annex 4. Individual assessment for each affected person will be carried out, including their family members and appropriate care professionals to inform planning of appropriate alternative services.
23. The council has further reviewed key issues such as demand and supply and quality in the independent sector, and the council's response (Annex 4, and paragraph 6 above) to these issues outlines how these can be addressed. 91% of the council's current residential care placements are in the independent sector. Capacity is fluid due to the nature of care, but the level of placements made indicates an ongoing ability to secure alternative services in the independent sector. During the last year the council has secured placements in the independent sector for 263 individuals in residential care, and 857 in nursing care. There has been high usage of our 905 block contracted residential beds. 295 respite placements have been made in the independent sector, not including block contracts.
24. The consultation confirmed the importance of the provision of adult social care services within the local communities.
25. The value of provision of short breaks (including day care) to family carers was highlighted. Of particular value is provision which is able to meet needs associated with dementia and personal care, and being able to plan breaks



with identified provision. The council has, or will put in place, arrangements which can meet these needs.

26. At Park Hall families and stakeholders have identified the particular value of Brook Unit, a unit specifically for older people with learning disabilities, and in some cases dementia. The needs of people currently being met by the Brook Unit can be met through existing provision in the independent sector, or by working with the local older persons and learning disability care provider market to put in place an alternative arrangement.
27. Some stakeholders identified the potential impact of the loss of the homes to the health and social care systems for provision of step down and reablement facilities. The council is working with partners to deliver service models and options for how capacity can be enhanced to support residents with basic nursing as well as care needs.
28. Considering the many responses, and importance of local facilities, if Cabinet approves the recommendations, work will begin to examine future alternative provision of adult social care services in the area of each property, to meet future adult social care needs. The homes would be retained as an Adult Social Care asset until a further assessment of alternative strategic needs has been undertaken and a decision taken that they were not required to meet needs.

**Proposed Implementation:**

29. Surrey County Council has experience of moving older people, due to, for example, change of care needs requiring a move into a nursing home, changing family circumstances, and occasionally when care homes close.
30. National best practice guidance on supporting people to move to alternative services would be followed if a home closes and would include the full involvement of residents, families and staff. Each resident and their family will be supported by a named Practitioner to discuss individual needs and preferences, and to help choose an appropriate alternative service. Other care professionals including health staff and GPs will be fully involved to support the resident and family.
31. Individuals without the capacity to understand the decisions relating to the changes, and who do not have the support of family or an attorney, will be fully supported by an Independent Mental Capacity Advocate (IMCA) within the requirements of the Mental Capacity Act legislation. This will support them with decisions required in selecting and moving to a suitable alternative service.
32. The support of a familiar face is known to be especially (but not exclusively) important to residents with dementia. It is expected that staff from any closing home will be fully involved and will support each individuals' transition into an alternative service.
33. A high level overview of alternative provision planning is included with this report (Annex 6).
34. A three phased implementation of moving people to alternative provision is proposed as follows:

Phase One: Longfield and Brockhurst

Phase Two: Dormers and Cobgates

Phase Three: Park Hall and Pinehurst

The rationale for this prioritisation is based on consideration of current building condition, alternative provision and, service delivery considerations (including the individuals using the services and meeting their needs).

It is planned to start the first phase of assessment of individuals, as well as the staff consultation, during April 2015. The council will review timescales on an ongoing basis, and ensure communication of these with all those affected.

#### **CONSULTATION:**

35. The aims of the consultation were to:
- Provide information on the council's current thinking/options
  - Understand whether there were any other viable options that the council has not considered
  - Listen and understand people's views and concerns.
36. To enhance access to the consultation, referrals for advocacy were offered to those who were assessed as having capacity to engage in the consultation. Family members/next of kin were engaged in all appropriate cases. Referrals for carer support were offered to family members. Differing ways to feedback were offered including: opportunities to meet as groups and individuals support from known staff to residents, a feedback form, and correspondence.

#### **Consultation responses:**

37. 470 responses were received of which 143 responses were received through the "Surrey Says" website. 196 paper questionnaires were received. 131 responses were received through email / letter/ phone from individuals and organisations.
38. A graph indicating broad agreement or disagreement for each of the outlined options can be seen in Annex 4. There is only a small amount of support for the council's preferred option, with most people preferring options 1 (staying as is) or 2 (investment).
39. The summary consultation report (Annex 4), summarises feedback received for each home, and collectively. The council's response to the main themes raised in the consultation is contained in Annex 4. A summary is within this report (paragraph 6).
40. The full consultation report is available on the council's website consultation pages. The council's response to issues raised during the consultation is also included in the full consultation report.
41. Two petitions have been received as part of the consultation. These will be responded to as part of the Cabinet meeting.

### **RISK MANAGEMENT AND IMPLICATIONS:**

42. A range of potential risks have been identified, along with mitigating actions, through the themes drawn out from the responses to the consultation (paragraph 6). More detail on the risks and mitigation is highlighted in the Equality Impact Assessments (Annex 5) and the summary Consultation Report (Annex 4).
43. The key risks are highlighted below:
- In the event the homes are not closed, the continued dignified care of residents could be put at risk and could lead to future CQC compliance issues
  - Disruption, anxiety and impact on wellbeing of residents and family members
  - Impact on workforce during closure programme and through redeployment process – potential for disruption to service delivery
  - Market risk: insufficient capacity of quality alternatives, and fee levels not in line with the council's guide rates
44. Pending the Cabinet's decision a comprehensive implementation plan will be initiated. Risk and mitigating actions will be carefully monitored within the overall project management approach.

### **Financial and Value for Money Implications**

45. The current environment of the six older people's homes is not suitable to deliver the quality of permanent residential in the future. Significant refurbishment and extension works would need, where practicable, to be carried out in order to make the environment of the homes suitable to meet the changing and increasingly more complex needs of individuals requiring older people's residential care.
46. The recommendation to cease residential care is not predicated on any future use of the properties and sites. Should the recommendation to cease providing residential care in the homes be accepted by Cabinet, then further work will be carried out to fully assess the business case for how to make best use of the properties and sites to meet future adult social care needs.

### **Section 151 Officer Commentary**

47. In light of the substantial investment that would be needed and the fact that alternative provision is available in the independent sector at reasonable cost, the Section 151 Officer confirms that the recommendation to cease provision of residential care in all six homes represents best value for the authority.

### **Legal Implications – Monitoring Officer**

48. There is a clear expectation in public law that a council should carry out a consultation process whenever it is considering making any significant changes to service provision especially where it is proposed that a service is withdrawn.

49. The consultation process began on 30 October 2014 and was extended until 31 January 2015. The relevant material was made available to consultees in various ways and care was taken to ensure that it was presented in a format that could be readily understood. Written material was supplemented by group meetings and individual meetings where requested.
50. In order that Cabinet Members can take the outcome of the consultation into consideration when reaching a decision, the summary details of the consultation process and the responses received are set out in Annex 4. In considering this Report, Members must give due regard to the results of the consultation as set out in the report and annexes, together with the response of the Service to the consultation comments, and conscientiously take these matters into account when making its final decision.
51. People have a right to a home and private life which could be disrupted in implementing these proposals. This right may be lawfully limited, having regard to the fair balance that has to be struck between the interests of the individuals affected and the community as a whole. If they accept the proposals, Members must be satisfied that a better use of public resources can be achieved and an improved standard of care can be provided, as suggested in this report. They must also be satisfied that the benefit of this outweighs the disruption to individuals that will be experienced. In making their decision, therefore, Members should take into account the information provided in all the annexes in addition to the consultation responses and the EIA, which is discussed more specifically below.
52. The public sector equality duty (section 149 Equality Act 2010) also applies to the decision that the Cabinet is being asked to make. In agreeing the recommendation, there is a need to have due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity for people with protected characteristics, foster good relations between such groups and eliminate any unlawful discrimination. These matters are dealt with in the equalities paragraphs of the report and the Equality Impact Assessment (Annex 5) attached. Members will see that negative impacts have been identified and will need to take account of these and the mitigating actions that have been identified. An updated assessment of the needs of each resident will be required in order to identify the support required for them before any move takes place.

### **Equalities and Diversity**

53. An Equality Impact Assessment (Annex 5) has been completed for all of the homes. This makes consideration of particular protected characteristics identified for each of the six homes. A summary of the key impacts and actions follows.

<b>Information and engagement underpinning equalities analysis</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consultation feedback (face to face and written)</li> <li>• Feedback from Equality Impact Assessment workshops reviewing impact on staff and impact on residents</li> <li>• Data from Adult Information System as at February 2015</li> <li>• Data from SCC workforce database (SAP) as at 31 January 2015</li> <li>• Best practice guidance in supporting older</li> </ul>
--	--

	<p>people and people with learning disabilities during residential care closures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data from Adult Social Care commissioning function</li> </ul>
<p><b>Key impacts (positive and/or negative) on people with protected characteristics</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The potential anxiety of a move for people using services, and their families / carers, and the impact on their health and wellbeing</li> <li>• Engagement with people in ways that meet their individual communication needs and levels of capacity</li> <li>• A high proportion of people using services have dementia and 61% are aged 85+</li> <li>• There is no comparable unit for older people with learning disabilities and dementia.</li> <li>• Availability of alternative provision for residential, respite, day services and reablement and its proximity to and accessibility for families / carers</li> <li>• Continuity of services provided by the wider community currently offered from the homes</li> <li>• Alternative services would provide more suitable environments and are likely to provide an improved experience of care and support</li> <li>• More women, part time workers and a higher percentage of people from Black and Minority Ethnic groups are employed in this service area than in the rest of the council so there is a greater impact on staff with these characteristics.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Changes you have made to the proposal as a result of the EIA</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whilst the plan is to carry out a robust person centred assessment for all people using services and their families / carers, the Equalities Impact Assessment has helped to further consider their needs and concerns.</li> <li>• The preferred option is to redeploy staff wherever possible. The phasing approach to implementation supports this preferred option. A robust programme of the redeployment offer for staff will be set up as part of the workforce consultation process, which could include reskilling, training and re-employment.</li> <li>• The consultation period was extended and the proposal is to take more time for implementation.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Key mitigating actions planned to address any outstanding negative impacts</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Follow best practice guidance in supporting older people and people with learning disabilities during residential care closures.</li> <li>• Robust person-centred assessments for all users affected by the changes, involving carers, and the development of transitional plans.</li> <li>• Continue to work with the care market to ensure that there is capacity to meet the additional demand within the independent sector.</li> <li>• Assess the wider community impact for all homes in respect of other services offered at the homes as well as residential care and work with partners and stakeholders to agree local</li> </ul>

	<p>solutions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review commissioning arrangements to see how to extend the council's influence with providers to employ more staff with protected characteristics.</li> <li>• The council is proud to employ a rich and diverse workforce and are confident that they have equipped them well as they are well trained and skilled. This would put them in a good position if they need to seek alternative employment and the council would support them through the programme of redeployment, reskilling and training referred to above.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Potential negative impacts that cannot be mitigated</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a higher proportion of women, who use the service - although the council will ensure that appropriate alternative provision is identified for all users regardless of their gender.</li> <li>• More women, part time workers and a higher percentage of people from Black and Minority Ethnic groups are employed in this service area than in the rest of the council so there is a greater impact on staff with these characteristics although the council will ensure that redeployment of all staff will be a key aim.</li> <li>• There may be an impact on pensions and benefits for any staff, who are not redeployed.</li> <li>• It is acknowledged that whilst the action plan has identified steps that will be taken aiming to mitigate potential negative impacts some may still remain even after this work is done.</li> </ul>

#### **Safeguarding responsibilities for vulnerable children and adults implications**

54. During consultation it has been established that many permanent residents in the homes did not have the mental capacity to participate in consultation. Many individuals affected by the recommendations may not have the mental capacity to make a decision on suitable alternative provision. Full assessments will be undertaken. The principles of the Mental Capacity Act or Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards will be adhered to, as appropriate.

#### **WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:**

55. Subject to Cabinet approval of the recommendations outlined within this report, the below timetable for implementation will apply.

<b>Action</b>	<b>Date</b>
Cabinet endorsement of recommendations	10 March 2015
Cabinet call in period	12 - 18 March 2015



<p>Recommendation: ceasing residential care services for older people:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Communication regarding recommendations</li> <li>- Communication regarding Cabinet decision</li> <li>- Implementation planning and resourcing, staff consultation planning</li> <li>- Staff consultation starts</li> <li>- Phase one: assessments for and planning of alternative services for Longfield and Brockhurst</li> <li>- Phase two: assessments for and planning of alternative services for Dormers and Cobgates</li> <li>- Phase three: assessments for and planning of alternative services for Park Hall and Pinehurst</li> </ul>	<p>27 February 2015 onwards 10 March 2015 onwards 19 March 2015 onwards</p> <p>April 2015 onwards April 2015 onwards</p> <p>To be confirmed</p> <p>To be confirmed</p>
<p>Recommendation: to explore potential alternative use of the assets</p>	<p>April 2015 onwards</p>

**Contact Officer:**

Philippa Alisiroglu – Interim Assistant Director, Adult Social Care

**Consulted:**

*Internal*

Councillor Steve Cosser – Cabinet Associate for Adult Social Care

Local Surrey County Council elected Members

Adult Social Care:

David Sargeant - Strategic Director, Adult Social Care

Jean Boddy – Area Director, Farnham and Surrey Heath

Jo Poynter – Area Director, East Surrey

Shelley Head – Area Director, North West Surrey

Liz Uliasz – Area Director, Guildford and Waverley

Sonya Sellar – Area Director, Surrey Downs

Joanne Parkinson – Senior Commissioning Manager

John Woodroffe – Commissioning Manager

Wendy Hale – Senior Manager, South West

Steven Ward – Senior Manager, North West

Joanna Victor -Smith – Assistant Senior Manager, Service Delivery

Rebecca Pettit – Project Manager, Policy and Strategy Project Team

Dina Bouwmeester – Policy Development Manager

Business Services:

Julie Fisher – Strategic Director, Business Services

Finance

William House – Senior Principal Accountant

Paul Goodwin – Senior Accountant

HR and Organisational Development

Gurbax Kaur – HR Operations Manager

Amanda Crouzen – HR Advisor

Procurement and Commissioning  
 Anna Tobiasz – Category Manager, Adult Social Care  
 Jenna Crombie – Senior Category Specialist  
 Ian Lyall – Senior Category Specialist

Property Services  
 Peter Hopkins – Asset Strategy and Planning Manager  
 Chris Duke – Asset Strategy Manager  
 Nick Layton – Compliance and Term Contracts Manager

Chief Executive's Office

Deborah Chantler – Principal Lawyer, Legal and Democratic Services

Tim Edwards – Corporate Communications Manager

Governance groups

Adults Social Care Leadership Team

External:

Local District and Borough elected members  
 Members of Parliament in affected constituencies  
 Clinical Commissioning Groups in affected locations

As part of the formal consultation:

Individuals using the services and their family members or next of kin staff in the homes, stakeholders. Refer to Surrey County Council older people's homes: summary of consultation feedback and response (Annex 4)

**Annexes:**

Annex 1 Glossary of types of care referred to  
 Annex 2 Numbers of people using the services and occupancy information  
 Annex 3 Consultation supporting information  
 Annex 4 Summary of Surrey County Council older people's homes: summary of consultation feedback and response  
 Annex 5 Equality Impact Assessment  
 Annex 6 Alternative provision planning

**Sources/background papers:**

- Surrey County Council older people's homes: summary of consultation feedback and response
- Adult Social Care Commissioning Strategy for Older People (2011 – 2020)
- Market Position Statement for Older People's Services (September 2015 to August 2015)
- 'Achieving closure': good practice in supporting older people during residential care closures - Jon Glasby, Suzanne Robinson, Kerry Allan - a joint publication by the Health Services Management Centre (HSMC), University of Birmingham and the Association of Directors of Adult Social Services (ADASS), published in association with the Social Care Institute for Excellence (SCIE) 2011.
- 'An Evaluation of the Modernisation of Older People's Services in Birmingham – final report' Jon Glasby, Suzanne Robinson, Kerry Allan (2011).
- Adult Social Care Community and Care Home Provider Closure Protocol 2014
- Care Quality Commission, Local Authority Surrey, Social Care Org Sector, 27 January 2015



This page is intentionally left blank