

# Public Document Pack

EXECUTIVE BOARD – 7<sup>TH</sup> SEPTEMBER 2011

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

AGENDA ITEM 9 – ‘BETTER LIVES FOR OLDER PEOPLE: FUTURE OPTIONS FOR LONG TERM RESIDENTIAL AND DAY CARE SERVICES’

- STATEMENT OF THE SCRUTINY BOARD (HEALTH AND WELLBEING AND ADULT SOCIAL CARE)

AGENDA ITEM 24 – ‘PUBLIC REPORTS OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT OMBUDSMAN REGARDING COMPLAINTS

- ADDITIONAL CORRESPONDENCE – DESIGNATED AS EXEMPT UNDER THE TERMS OF ACCESS TO INFORMATION PROCEDURE RULE 10.4(1) AND (2)

This page is intentionally left blank

## Scrutiny Board (Health and Well-Being and Adult Social Care)

### Future Options for Long Term Residential and Day Care Services

#### Statement for consideration by the Executive Board

##### **Purpose**

The purpose of this statement is to provide the Executive Board with comments from the Scrutiny Board (Health and Well-Being and Adult Social Care) as part of its consideration of the report *Better lives for Older People: Future Options for Long Term Residential and Day Care Services* on 7 September 2011.

##### **Background**

In June 2010, the former Scrutiny Board (Adult Social Care) agreed to include the future provision of Residential Care Services in Leeds within its work programme and considered a range of information around the provision of such services. In November 2010, this led to the former Scrutiny Board issuing its comments and recommendations for inclusion into a report to the Executive Board on 15 December 2010 (attached at Appendix 1).

At its meeting in July 2011, the new Scrutiny Board (Health and Well-Being and Adult Social Care) agreed to establish a working group, to further consider the future options for long term Residential and Day Care Services for Older People, following the outcome of the public consultation (which ended on 5 August 2011) and prior to further consideration by the Executive Board in September 2011.

##### **Residential and day care services working group**

The working group met on 31 August 2011 and considered the report prepared for the Executive Board meeting on 7 September 2011. Six members and three co-opted members of the Scrutiny Board attended the working group meeting, as follows:

##### Members of the Scrutiny Board

- Cllr Suzi Armitage
- Cllr John Illingworth
- Cllr Judith Chapman
- Cllr Lisa Mulherin (Chair)
- Cllr William Hyde
- Cllr Shirley Varley

##### Co-opted members of the Scrutiny Board

- Joy Fisher
- Paul Truswell
- Sally Morgan

Apologies were received from the following members of the Scrutiny Board:

- Cllr Karen Bruce
- Cllr Andrea McKenna
- Cllr Graham Kirkland

The Director and Deputy Director of Adult Social Services both attended the working group meeting to outline the report, including the consultation outcomes, the options being recommended to the Executive Board and the associated rationale.

Examination of the proposals followed, including a question and answer session, and it was subsequently agreed that the Chair of the Scrutiny Board prepare a statement reflecting the comments of the Scrutiny Board for consideration by the Executive Board.

### **Comments / observations from the Scrutiny Board:**

Following on from the previous Adult Social Care Scrutiny Board's finding that 'no change is not an option' for the service moving forward, the bullet points below provide a summary of the new Health, Wellbeing and Adult Social Care Scrutiny Board's discussions and are provided as additional information to inform the decision-making process:

- We recognised the consultation process as being 'genuine public consultation', with views from service users and other key stakeholders being considered and reflected in the proposals presented.
- We believe that the recommendations to Executive Board demonstrate that the views of local people and service users have been listened to and taken into account. This is particularly evident in the Otley, Morley and Rothwell areas, where the continuing provision in these localities represents a significant shift from the original proposals that went out to consultation.
- We support and welcome the exploration and development of alternative service delivery, particularly in terms of any future potential Community Asset Transfer.
- We sought and received assurances that support and advice would be offered to those exploring the possibility of developing community interest companies in this regard.
- We were assured that full consideration had been given to minimising the impact and stress for those residents who will still have to move home if the recommendations to Executive Board are approved. We welcomed the reassurance that the needs of individual residents would be at the heart of those arrangements.
- We questioned the quality assurance of independent provision in light of recent high profile concerns in the media about provision in other areas. In the Department's response the statutory external quality assurance processes undertaken by the Care Quality Commission (CQC) in terms of service providers, and the additional internal assurance processes undertaken by the Council in its commissioning role were noted. We further welcomed the direct assurance sought directly by the Director of Adult Social Services through a series of visits, as part of drawing up the recommendations put forward in the Executive Board report.

- We sought reassurance on the implications for staffing and welcomed reassurances about the process to manage staff reductions through the Council's 'Early Leavers Initiative (ELI)' scheme.

As Chair of the Scrutiny Board, I hope that this statement on behalf of the Board reflecting the discussions of the Board's Working Group will provide further assurance that the recommendations drawn up following the public consultation have been scrutinised prior to the Executive Board decision and that they will assist the Executive Board in its deliberations and subsequent decision.

***Councillor Lisa Mulherin***

***Chair, Scrutiny Board (Health and Well-Being and Adult Social Care)***

***5 September 2011***

## **Scrutiny Board (Adult Social Care)**

### ***Inquiry into the Future of Residential care Provision for Older People in Leeds***

#### ***Comments for inclusion into Executive Board Report***

#### ***Introduction***

*At the June 2010 Adult Social Care Scrutiny Board meeting members expressed their desire to conduct an inquiry into the future provision of Residential Care Services in Leeds. It was considered appropriate for the Scrutiny Board (Adult Social Care) to conduct an inquiry at this juncture in order to influence decision making and assist with policy development which will ensure effective service delivery and value for money.*

*It was agreed that the Inquiry would focus on the current provision of Residential Care and the requirement for modernisation to meet customer demand whilst providing a quality service and value for money. The Board paid particular attention to:*

- *Current Residential Care Service provision across the City and aspirations for the future.*
- *Anticipated customer demand (both long and short term)*
- *Council provided Residential Care, Commissioned Private Sector Care, Quality, Sustainability and Value for Money*
- *Working with Partners and Future Commissioning/De-commissioning.*

*The Scrutiny Board has received and discussed a large amount of information, covering the following;*

- *The National Social Care Context*
- *Current Policy Context*
- *Demography – Projected Population Growth and Dependency*
- *Benchmarking Comparisons*
- *Demand for Housing Options and Services to Maintain Independence The Local Picture and Expected Numbers of Beds for Future Services –*
- *Facilities and Supply of Residential Care in Leeds*
- *Implications for Local Authority Residential Care*
- *The forecast reduction in provision of residential care in contrast to the increasing elderly population.*
- *Provision of end of life and palliative care.*
- *Respite care and facilities for carers*
- *Sheltered housing*
- *Those who received care from families and friends and were not accounted for by the care system.*

*The Board also discussed.*

- *Financial requirements of existing public sector residential homes – staffing costs, registration and regulation issues, capital investment.*
- *Cost of void beds*
- *Lack of opportunity for capital investment in public sector residential properties.*
- *Unit cost comparisons with the private sector.*

*This report presents the agreed view of Scrutiny Board (Adult Social Care). The Board has requested that these comments are incorporated into the report to go before Executive Board.*

### **Observations, Conclusions and Recommendations**

*The Scrutiny Board is clear that that the current arrangements for public sector residential care are not sustainable in the long term, particularly in the light of the significant budget reductions announced in the comprehensive spending review.*

*Therefore the Board has concluded that the 'do nothing option' is not an option but rather a need to review future provision and consider all alternative options.*

#### *Consideration of options*

*The Board has considered what options could be pursued in relation to each of the current 19 residential homes for older people.*

#### **Recommendation1**

***It is the view of the Board that the range of options as presented by officers are appropriate models that can be tested for each establishment and would recommend that the Executive Board supports these options.***

#### *Consideration of Criteria*

*The Board considered the criteria to be used when considering which option best suited each individual establishment.*

#### **Recommendation 2**

***It is the view of the Board that the criteria presented provides a sound framework for considering the most suitable option for an establishment and should be adopted by Executive Board. In addition the Board recommends that Care Quality Commission ratings are included within these criteria. The Board also recommends that inclusion issues are incorporated when looking at the impact on communities where facilities are located.***

#### *Consultation*

*The Board considered the proposed consultation methodology and structure.*

#### **Recommendation3**

***The Board recommends the Executive Board agree the consultation methodology and structure and that it determines the consultation timetable appropriate having regard to statutory obligations.***

***The Board also recommends that the consultation includes; ad hoc community groups specific to a local area, neighbourhood networks and advocacy groups.***

**Recommendation 4**

***The Board recommends that the Executive Board agree the use of a template based on the consultation questionnaire used by Kent County Council, subject to the reorganising of the questions.***

*Other observations made by the Scrutiny Board*

*The Scrutiny Board made the following observations which may be of interest to Executive Board;*

- *Independent sector homes generally had more modern facilities and required less updating and were therefore able to provide a cheaper unit cost for services.*
- *The acknowledgment that as any phased decommissioning programme is implemented the unit cost of providing residual local authority provision will rise.*
- *The current pay differential between independent and voluntary sector employed carers and those employed by the local authority could be more justifiable by the local authority providing more specialised services in collaboration with NHS colleagues*
- *The overall reduction of people needing permanent residential care was due in part to the success of the Local Authority policy of developing a range of alternative care packages that had allowed people to remain in their own homes longer and other housing options such as sheltered and extra care housing.*

**November 2010**



Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank