

Delivering the Better Lives Strategy in Leeds:

Response to the Better Lives Strategy update

Scrutiny Board (Adult Social Services,
Public Health, NHS)

July 2016



Introduction

Introduction

1. In September 2015, the Executive Board considered the report '*Delivering the Better Lives Strategy in Leeds – Proposed Next Steps*'. This report followed an extensive viability review of Middlecross, Siegen Manor and The Green care homes and day centres, which was completed in July 2015. The review was carried out in conjunction with Trade Unions and staff and concluded that no other formal service reconfiguration could deliver a business case to financially justify the continued operation of the homes and day centres
2. As such, the Executive Board report in September 2015 advised members that, due to the availability of alternative provision within the independent sector at a lower cost, purchasing independent sector provision would offer the Council a revenue budget saving of £2.186m. The ongoing viability of the care homes and day centres was further questioned when reviewing the capital costs associated with maintaining the buildings to an acceptable standard in the coming years.
3. At its September 2015 meeting, Executive Board approved that consultation should commence on the proposed closure of Middlecross, Siegen Manor and The Green care homes and their attached day centres along with Radcliffe Lane and Springfield Day centres. It also approved consultation to commence on the proposed decommissioning of Wykebeck Day Centre and recommissioning of the unit as a specialist day service for complex needs.
4. A 12-week public consultation took place from 1st October to 23rd December 2015, specifically aimed at service users and their families and staff across the care homes and day centres.

5. In January 2016, the Scrutiny Board (Adult Social Services, Public Health, NHS) received and accepted a request for scrutiny, asking the Scrutiny Board to specifically consider the proposed closure of The Green care home. In April 2016, the Scrutiny Board agreed its report in relation to The Green, alongside the following recommendation:

Recommendation

That any decision regarding the long-term future of The Green be deferred for a minimum of 2 years, in order to:

- a) Re-consider the comparative costs of provision as the impact of a national living wage and the requirements of the Care Act 2014 take effect locally.
- b) Assess the occupancy levels achieved through positive promotion of The Green to local residents and beyond.
- c) Re-assess the overall 'quality landscape' across the care sector in Leeds and specifically the quality of alternative nearby provision in the independent sector.

6. Two further requests for scrutiny were received in relation to (a) Siegen Manor (May 2016) and (b) All three care homes and attached day centres, with particular emphasis on Middlecross (June 2016). These requests were considered by the Scrutiny Board at its meeting in June 2016.



Introduction

7. At the same meeting, the Scrutiny Board also considered the Director of Adult Social Services report – *Delivering the Better Lives Strategy in Leeds – Progress Report* – and was asked to:
 - (i) Note the work that has been undertaken in the consultation on future proposals for the Council’s residential care homes and day centres; and,
 - (ii) Consider the consultation and its conclusion to ensure they are relevant, focused and purposeful.
8. In respect of the requests for scrutiny and the Director of Adult Social Services’ report, the Scrutiny Board agreed to establish a sub-group to consider the information presented and discuss the issues raised in more detail. The relevant extract from the draft minutes of the Scrutiny Board (Adult Social Services, Public Health, NHS) meeting held on 28 June 2016 is attached at Appendix 1.
9. A sub-group meeting was held on 12 July 2016. The notes of that meeting are attached at Appendix 2.
10. At the time of agreeing this response (at our meeting on 26 July 2016), we were presented with some additional comments from the Director of Adult Social Services. The Director’s comments were provided on our original draft response¹. We acknowledge and appreciate the additional information and comments provided. Nonetheless, the Director confirmed the additional information did not highlight any factual errors or fundamentally incorrect statements within our original draft statement. As such, it should be noted we did not examine the additional information in great detail and therefore it may not be reflected in this response.

¹ *The Scrutiny Board’s original draft response and the comments provided by the Director of Adult Social Services are available on the Council’s website, along with all the other agenda papers for the meeting held on 26 July 2016; accessible [here](#).*



Comments and observations

Overview

11. It is likely that the Executive Board will soon be presented with a range of recommendations and asked to make some final decisions on the future provision of residential care and day care services across the City. Specifically, this is likely to include the Council's future role in the delivery of residential care and day care services and, either directly or as an indirect consequence, the Council's future role in the direct provision of such services.
12. We recognise the complexity of these matters and difficult nature of the decisions facing the Executive Board – balancing the needs of current service users, while looking to develop and implement a strategic and sustainable plan for the future. Nonetheless, **we believe the health and well-being of current service users to be of paramount importance – be they residents within residential care homes, or users of day care services.**
13. Overall, from our discussions, it is clear the circumstances for each care home and day centre are very specific to each facility and its locality. The availability and location of alternative services; the quality of alternative services; opportunities to develop facilities for the future – are some examples of the specific matters that can be particular to individual facilities. As such, in formulating proposals for the Executive Board, **we believe the Director of Adult Social Services should be very clear about how individual circumstances have helped shape any proposals and what the proposals are likely to mean for the City and the individual localities affected.**

14. The comments set out in this statement aim to help inform the view of the Director of Adult Social Services and assist the Executive Board in its decision-making processes. **We believe our input will increase the robustness of any future decisions on the future provision of residential care and day care services across the City.**

Consultation

15. We were specifically asked by the Director of Adult Social Services to consider the consultation and its conclusion to ensure they are relevant, focused and purposeful.
16. In this regard, we are satisfied that **the consultation process has been fair, focused and purposeful.** We are also satisfied that **the analysis of the consultation outcome provided and presented to us has been thorough, accurate and informative – overwhelmingly demonstrating that key stakeholders did not support the proposed closure of the residential care homes and day centres.**
17. In order to truly consider if the conclusion from the consultation is relevant, focused and purposeful, it is important to know how the outcomes will be used to inform decision-making and shape any recommendations. Clearly, this information will from part of the report presented to the Executive Board later in the year; however the Scrutiny Board has not had the benefit of being presented with any initial thinking around how the consultation results are likely to influence any recommendations to the Executive Board. Therefore, **we feel unable to fully comment on the 'conclusion' of the consultation at this time.**



Comments and observations

Quality

18. We welcome the 'care guarantee' set out by the Director of Adult Social Services – in that anyone affected by a future change would receive the same or better quality of care and would not be worse off financially. However, we have reservations whether or not such a guarantee could be practicably implemented.
19. We note the acknowledgement that some independent sector care homes require improvement and the Council is 'looking to address this'. Nonetheless, **we believe more detail is needed to describe the Council's proposed and how such actions will address the identified areas for improvement.**
20. In our previous statement on 'The Green', we highlighted our significant concerns regarding the availability of consistently high standards and quality care across alternative providers. We recognise there are some good independent care providers in Leeds; nonetheless, overall **we still believe the quality landscape across the independent care sector in Leeds remains varied and lacks consistency.** There are also variations across the independent care sector operating in surrounding areas to The Green, Siegen Manor and Middlecross.
21. It has been stated that the Council is reassured by the range of alternatives available in homes rated as 'Good' by the Care Quality Commission (CQC). However, we do not believe this is necessarily supported by the information presented to us. Based on the information provided to us, Table 1 (below) sets out our analysis of independent sector providers rated or projected to be rated as 'good' or 'requires improvement', within a 5 mile radius of each care home. The analysis is provided in terms of the number of providers and the number of care beds this represents – demonstrating that at least 54% and in some case up to 72% of independent care beds 'require improvement'. **We believe this supports our view that the quality landscape across the independent care sector in Leeds remains varied and that further work is needed to improve and sustain good quality of care across the independent sector.**
22. We recognise this information does not represent the whole of the City and may therefore only provide a partial picture. As such, when presenting final proposals and recommendations to the Executive Board, **we believe it would be helpful to present a city-wide picture of the quality of residential and nursing care across the whole of Leeds.**
23. We recognise and welcome efforts to incentivise care quality in the independent sector through the introduction of the Quality Standards framework, with the core and enhanced fee structure. However, from the information provided we note there are occasions where the Council is paying an enhanced fee and the providers have been rated by the CQC as 'Requires Improvement'. Although such occurrences appear to be relatively low in number, **we believe receipt of an enhanced fee payment should be dependent on any provider maintaining a CQC rating of at least 'Good'.**



Comments and observations

24. We recognise the current CQC assessment process and ratings do not make a formal judgement on the impact of any area requiring improvement – something the Director of Adult Social Services has repeatedly highlighted. As such, **we believe there should be a closer link between the Council’s Quality Standards framework and the CQC assessment and rating of providers.** Our initial view is that any care provider assessed by the CQC as ‘Requires Improvement’ or ‘Inadequate’ should not be in receipt of an enhanced fee level until such time that the CQC reassess the provider as ‘Good’ or ‘Outstanding’. There should also be a clear and understood approach where there is evidence of providers repeatedly failing to meet the CQC standards.
25. In the longer-term, **we also believe that any changes to the national processes for assessing the quality of care should be reflected in the Council’s Quality Standards framework.** This will provide a closer link between the standard national processes for the assessment of quality and the Council’s local framework.
26. Furthermore, to recognise and demonstrate the importance of ensuring high quality residential and nursing care is provided across the City, **we believe the Director of Adult Social Services, working in collaboration with the CQC, should routinely produce an annual statement on the quality of care across the City, published on the Council’s website, and made available to the Executive Board, Leeds Safeguarding Adults Board and the relevant Scrutiny Board.** The precise timing of such an annual report would need to be agreed; nonetheless, we believe this would further enhance the quality improvement work and efforts of the Council and, over time, could help to demonstrate (or otherwise) quality improvements across the independent care sector in Leeds. It would also serve to provide public assurance both on the standards of care across the City and the inspection, service monitoring and reporting arrangements in place.
- ## Day care centres
27. The concerns we received about the proposed closure of facilities have tended to be more focused on the existing residential care homes – with a significant focus on these being people’s ‘homes’. By the very nature of people travelling to and from locations to access day services, there does not appear to be the same degree of attachment. In addition, with less people choosing to access services via day centres; the wide ranging work of neighbourhood networks; and the proposed retention of three specialist, city-wide complex needs care and support services, we are more willing to accept the closure proposals for day centres.
28. We also acknowledge and **welcome the commitment that those service users currently accessing day centre services will receive the same level of service they are currently in receipt of and any closures will not result in a loss of service.**
- ## Future care provision – extra care housing
29. We heard that a significant part of the Council’s longer-term and future care strategy included ‘extra care housing’ – with around 700 units required across the City. We heard about the improved level of supported independence that extra care housing can offer – something we would both support and advocate.



Comments and observations

30. We also heard of the commitment from the Executive Board to prioritise the development of ‘specialist housing’ on appropriate sites across the City – although this will require a delicate balance between prioritising such developments and generating capital receipts from surplus assets.
31. We heard of the potential and general impact of planning permissions and processes in the development of extra care housing across the City; along with the different ownership models and the desire of Adult Social Services to maintain ‘nomination rights’ for the lifetime of future extra care housing schemes in Leeds, in order to help ensure people’s needs are met in the future. We also heard the development of extra care housing can be affected by the vagaries of the property market – with the economic downturn being cited as a reason for a relative lack of recent developments.
32. While additional extra care housing will not address the ‘here and now’ issues faced by current residents in residential care homes and their families, it is clear that extra care housing represents part of the Council’s longer-term strategy for meeting people’s future care needs. We specifically discussed this aspect in relation to Siegen Manor and, given the limited availability of alternative independent sector provision (rated by the CQC as at least ‘good’), **we believe any proposal to close Siegen Manor should be accompanied with a clearer vision for future care provision in that area of the City, with specific plans for the reuse or redevelopment of the existing facilities.**
33. In addition, over the coming years the City is also likely to experience significant numbers of new housing, for example the Northern Quadrant in East Leeds. To help develop our communities and provide a range of housing types, we believe it is important that extra care housing forms part of the City’s overall housing growth.
34. In terms of the Northern Quadrant in East Leeds we are aware that developers are keen to explore options to provide homes for the elderly through a third party. We believe opportunities for early, direct engagement need to be grasped in order for the Council to help influence the type, numbers and design of future housing units².
35. Given the current and projected expansion of housing and development opportunities across the City, **we believe it is vitally important for the Director of Adult Social Services to proactively work with and engage developers to help deliver the additional 700 extra care housing units needed across the City.**
- ## Workforce
36. We acknowledge the Director’s assessment of the changing nature of care needs that suggests an estimated over supply of 1000 traditional residential care beds and an under supply of 500/600 nursing care beds across the City. We are also aware of the significant workforce pressures across the health and social care economy in Leeds – including nursing. **We believe the Executive Board should be provided with suitable assurance about the current workforce and workforce projections across the health and social care sector, particularly focusing on how workforce planning will deliver a**
-
- ² Reference to the need for specialist housing is also referred to in the *Housing Mix Scrutiny Inquiry report (March 2016)*.



Comments and observations

suitably trained and skilled workforce in order to support the need for an additional 500/600 nursing care beds across the City.

37. During our deliberations, we have been reminded that built facilities should not be the sole consideration when considering ‘assets’ – with the services themselves and those delivering the services also representing ‘assets’. We have also been struck by the high regard in which the Council’s workforce working in residential care homes and day centres is held by residents, service users and their families: The workforce is regarded as an asset within the City – and rightly so in our opinion. As such, **we believe there should be some consideration by the Executive Board around how parts of the Council’s current care workforce might be suitably developed to help address existing and future workforce pressures.**

Reuse or disposal of surplus buildings

38. At our meeting in June 2016, we requested details of any plans for the reuse or disposal of surplus buildings that may arise from future decisions. We asked for this to be presented to the sub-group meeting on 12 July 2016. The briefing note described how older people’s overall housing and care needs had been considered within the Council and by the Executive Board over a number of years: It also described a number of sites where services had been decommissioned and set out the future use or proposed use of those sites.
39. Previously, when considering proposals from Leeds Community Healthcare NHS Trust (LCH) to change the locations for some of its services, we were critical of

the Trust for failing to adequately plan for dealing with buildings once they were declared as ‘surplus’. At that time (March 2016), we commented that:

‘The community impact of the closure of physical assets, i.e. buildings, should not be underestimated. It is the view of the Scrutiny Board that, far too often, decisions are made to close facilities without a clear plan for the future of the asset. The decision to close Garforth Clinic without a proper plan for disposal or redevelopment has the potential to leave the community with a significant ‘blot on the landscape’ in terms of a boarded-up property that was once used to provide local NHS services. While in a boarded-up state, Garforth Clinic will not only serve to be a constant reminder of the community asset lost, it will also have the potential to be the focus for anti-social behaviour in the area.’

40. During our consideration of LCH’s proposals, we also noted a potential financial impact for both the Trust and other partners (such as the Police), i.e. costs associated with maintaining a safe and secure environment, while a decision is made on the long-term future of a surplus building. We believe the Council is likely to face similar challenges in its disposal of physical assets declared surplus, including any decommissioned residential care homes and day-centres.
41. Therefore, **we believe it is important for the Executive Board to provide an outline of future aspirations for communities at the time of decommissioning any services in the local area.** We would also re-emphasise our specific comments in relation to Siegen Manor and the surrounding locality, set out earlier in this response.



Conclusion

42. We recognise the significance and difficulties associated with decisions around direct provision of the residential care and day centre services under consideration. We also recognise the significance of any future decision to all stakeholders.
43. To help draw some conclusions and contribute to a robust decision-making process, we have considered and tried to balance a range of information to help inform the Director of Adult Social Care and the Executive Board. We have highlighted some specific matters in some detail above, but would reiterate the following points:
- The health and well-being of current service users to be of paramount importance – be they residents within residential care homes, or users of day care services.
 - The analysis of stakeholder consultation overwhelmingly demonstrates the proposed closure of the residential care homes and day centres is not supported.
 - The quality landscape across the independent care sector in Leeds remains varied and that further work is needed to improve and sustain a good quality of care across the independent sector.
 - There should be a closer link between the Council's Quality Standards framework and the CQC assessment and rating of providers.
 - The Director of Adult Social Services, working in collaboration with the CQC, should routinely produce an annual statement on the quality of care across the City.
 - The commitment that those service users currently accessing day centre services will receive the same level of service they are currently in receipt of
- and any closures will not result in a loss of service.
- Any proposal to close Siegen Manor should be accompanied with a clearer vision for future care provision in that area of the City, with specific plans for the reuse or redevelopment of the existing facilities.
 - It is vitally important for the Director of Adult Social Services to proactively work with and engage developers to help deliver the additional 700 extra care housing units needed across the City.
 - Suitable assurance should be given about the current workforce and workforce projections across the health and social care sector, particularly focusing on how workforce planning will deliver a suitably trained and skilled workforce in order to support the need for an additional 500/600 nursing care beds across the City.
 - There should be some consideration by the Executive Board around how parts of the Council's current care workforce might be suitably developed to help address existing and future workforce pressures.
 - It is important for the Executive Board to provide an outline of future aspirations for communities at the time of decommissioning any services in the local area.
44. We are grateful to all those who have contributed to our work and deliberations; and we trust our conclusions will assist relevant decision-makers in their discussions.

Cllr Peter Gruen, Chair of the Scrutiny Board (Adult Social Services, Public Health, NHS)



Table 1: Analysis of independent sector providers

		Middlecross		Siegen Manor		The Green	
		Nursing	Residential	Nursing	Residential	Nursing	Residential
Providers	Require Improve.	9 (64%)	13 (50%)	3 (50%)	3 (60%)	10 (59%)	10 (63%)
	Good	5 (36%)	13 (50%)	3 (50%)	2 (40%)	7 (41%)	5 (31%)
	Not rated	-	-	-	-	-	1 (6%)
	Total	14	26	6	5	17	16
Beds	Require Improve.	585 (68%)	682 (61%)	93 (54%)	287 (72%)	551 (66%)	414 (70%)
	Good	272 (32%)	440 (39%)	79 (46%)	114 (28%)	284 (34%)	122 (20%)
	Not rated	-	-	-	-	-	58 (10%)
	Total	857	1122	172	401	835	594



Appendix 1

SCRUTINY BOARD (ADULT SOCIAL SERVICES, PUBLIC HEALTH, NHS)

EXTRACT OF THE MINUTES HELD ON: TUESDAY, 28TH JUNE, 2016

PRESENT: Councillor P Gruen in the Chair

Councillors C Anderson, J Chapman,
B Flynn, M Harland, A Hussain, G Hussain,
J Pryor, A Smart, P Truswell and S Varley

Co-opted Member: Dr J Beal (Healthwatch Leeds)

9 The Better Lives Strategy in Leeds

The Head of Scrutiny submitted a report which presented two requests for scrutiny, alongside a report from the Director of Adult Social Services setting out the background and findings of recent consultation regarding proposals on the future provision of Council care home and daycentre services.

The following information was appended to the report:

- Better Lives for Older People – Day centres for Older People – Consultation Report (June 2016)
- Better Lives for Older People – Residential Care for Older People (June 2016)
- Day Centre Service User Profiles (as at 15/06/16) and Alternatives
- Resident Profiles (as at 15/06/16) and Alternatives
- Better Lives Service Review – Potential Savings – Residential Care and Day centres
- Summary of all centres – Post Consultation Contact 24 December to Date
- Request for scrutiny dated 19 May 2016 in relation to Siegen Manor Care Home, Morley.

The following were in attendance:

- Councillor Rebecca Charlwood (Executive Member for Health, Wellbeing and Adults)
- Cath Roff (Director of Adult Social Services) – Leeds City Council
- Shona McFarlane (Chief Officer: Access and Care Delivery) – Adult Social Services, Leeds City Council
- Anna Clifford (Programme Manager) – Adult Social Services, Leeds City Council
- Mark Phillott (Head of Commissioning (Contracts and Business Development)), Adult Social Services, Leeds City Council
- Linda Newsome - presenting the request for scrutiny in relation to Siegen Manor Care Home
- Keith Spellman - presenting the request for scrutiny in relation to the proposed closure of all three care homes, with a particular emphasis on Middlecross Care Home



Appendix 1

The Board received the requests for scrutiny in relation to Siegen Manor Care Home and the proposed closure of all three care homes, with a particular emphasis on Middlecross Care Home.

The Board considered and discussed the report from the Director of Adult Social Services. Some of the key areas of discussion included:

- Historical practice in tender evaluations around the weighting of cost and quality.
- The need to ensure that effective commissioning of services and monitoring arrangements were in place.
- General concern about perceived poor standards of provision in the independent sector compared to Council provided care.
- The quality landscape specifically in the vicinity of the three care homes proposed for closure.
- The high level of response to the consultation and the overwhelming response not supporting the proposed closures.
- The quality of the public consultation process.
- Increased budget pressures on Adult Social Services.
- Assurances that residents who moved elsewhere would not be worse off financially, nor in terms of the quality of service provided.
- The Board was advised that while cost comparisons were based on revenue expenditure, capital expenditure was needed to refurbish Council Care homes to bring them in line with modern facilities.
- Making best use of provision, i.e. provision of dementia day care services.
- Concerns about how some CQC inspection outcomes were reported – specifically in terms of the lack of judgements around the ‘impact’ on services.
- Comparisons with other decisions made by the Council, with specific reference to the disposal of school buildings.
- Plans for the reuse or disposal of surplus buildings that may arise from future decisions.

Prior to the conclusion of the discussion, members of the Scrutiny Board agreed that in the main the Board had sufficient information to consider in making any statement on the proposals and consultation outcome: The exception being an outline of any plans for the reuse or disposal of surplus buildings that may arise from future decisions.

RESOLVED –

- (a) That the Board establishes a sub-group to consider the information presented and issues raised in more detail address some of the issues that had been raised.
- (b) That an outline of any plans for the reuse or disposal of surplus buildings that may arise from future decisions be made available and presented to the sub-group meeting of the Board.

(Councillor P Truswell left the meeting at 2.55pm during the consideration of this item.)



Appendix 2

Scrutiny Board (Adult Social Services, Public Health, NHS) Care homes – Working Group Meeting

12 July 2016

NOTES OF THE MEETING

The Chair opened the meeting and thanked everyone for attending. Introductions were given and apologies were noted – as presented at Annex A.

The following written information had been made available to those attending the meeting:

- A copy of the Director of Adult Social Services report, *'Delivering the Better Lives Strategy in Leeds – Progress Report'*, presented to the Scrutiny Board (Adult Social Services, Public health, NHS) on 28 June 2016.
- An extract from the draft minutes of the Scrutiny Board (Adult Social Services, Public health, NHS) meeting, held on 28 June 2016.
- A briefing note from Adult Social Services on 'Housing and Care Futures Programme' – 8 July 2016
- A letter from Mr K Spellman (received 6 July 2016).

Given the additional information now available to the Scrutiny Board and the change in its membership, the Chair outlined the purpose of the meeting was to provide an opportunity to comment on the future of the Council's remaining Adult Social Care Residential Care homes and Day centres, and identify any specific matters the Scrutiny Board wished to highlight to the Executive Board when making future decisions.

It was highlighted that the Scrutiny Board had specifically been asked to:

- Note the work that has been undertaken in the consultation on future proposals for the Council's residential care homes and day centres; and,
- Consider the consultation and its conclusion to ensure they are relevant, focused and purposeful.

It was noted that the Scrutiny Board had already made its views known regarding the proposed closure of The Green Care Home, via its April 2016 Statement.

The difficulties associated with any future decision were recognised, along with the depth of public feeling among communities that had become evident during the most recent public consultation (September 2015 – December 2015). The Chair also corresponded with Mr K Spellman, received since the Scrutiny Board's meeting on 28 June 2016.

The Chair also referenced the known and expected 'Good' Care Quality Commission (CQC) ratings in relation to The Green, Siegen Manor and Middlecross Care homes.



Appendix 2

The Chair also made the following observations and sought agreement from those Members present that these represented a fair summary of the current position:

- The consultation process had been fair, focused and purposeful.
- The analysis of the consultation had been fair, focused and purposeful, with the overwhelming response from those who responded was to reject the proposed closure of the Council's Day centres and Care homes.
- Despite the thoroughness of the consultation analysis, the Scrutiny Board would be unable to comment on the ultimate conclusions of the process, as these had not been presented.
- From the information presented to date and representations made to the Scrutiny Board, there appeared to be a distinction between the proposed closure of Day centres and the proposed closure of Care homes.
- The Scrutiny Board had previously expressed its concern in relation to the varied 'quality landscape' of independent sector provision of residential care services in Leeds. This remained a concern at the current time.
- The view of the Director of Adult Social Services was there was sufficient, equal or better, quality bed space within the City to meet the needs of current residents in care homes run by Leeds City Council.

The following points were subsequently confirmed and clarified by Adult Social Services:

- An estimated over supply of 1000 traditional residential care beds across the City.
- An under supply of 500/600 nursing care beds across the City.
- A need for approximately 800 Extra Care housing units.

Discussion

Following the opening remarks, members of the working group highlighted a number of matters for discussion and sought a range of points of clarification, including:

- The health and well-being of current residents within residential homes being of paramount importance.
- Current arrangements at Dolphin Manor (Rothwell) and the potential development of Extra Care Housing.
- Potential of Extra Care Housing offering a real alternative future care option for older people.
- The role and implications of planning permissions in the development of Extra Care Housing across the City.
- The benefits of Extra Care Housing as an alternative accommodation type, compared to residential care homes.
- Timing around the development of any Extra Care Housing Schemes and the potential closure of care homes.
- The potential different ownership models within general Extra Care Housing developments.
- The desire for Adult Social Services to maintain 'nomination rights' for the lifetime of future Extra Care Housing Schemes in Leeds.



Appendix 2

- Considering ‘service provision’ as a community asset not simply the ‘built environment’.
- Balancing the needs of current vulnerable older people living in care homes, while developing and delivering a model of care to meet the needs of older people in the future.
- A commitment from the Executive Board to prioritise the development of ‘specialist housing’ on appropriate sites across the City.
- Development options in the Morley area of the City.
- Extra Care Housing Options likely to be unsuitable for current residential care residents.
- Concerns around the quality of some independent sector residential care provision – particularly in East Leeds.
- Implications and potential opportunities associated with the significant housing expansion plans in East Leeds, and the need for close working relationships between Planning, Adult Social Services and Public Health.
- The ‘care guarantee’ – meaning local authority care home residents affected by any closures would not be worse off financially, nor in terms of the quality of care provided.
- The need for any proposed closures to be considered on a case-by-case basis, reflecting the needs of current residents, the local circumstances and implications of any closure. In making any cases for closure, these should be accompanied by a clear exit strategy and reuse / development/ disposal plan, with demonstrable community benefit.
- Decisions in the near future aimed at helping the Council plan tactically over the next 40 years or so – therefore any programme of closure needed to be balanced with a programme of development.
- Recent discussions within the Older People’s Forum around the Older People’s Housing Strategy.

Conclusion

The Chair thanked everyone for their attendance and contribution to the discussion, and outlined the plan to provide a short report to help inform the Director of Adult Social Services during the production of a report for the Executive Board in September 2016.

The Chair confirmed a draft report setting out the comments and observation would be produced as soon as possible, for formal consideration and agreement by the Scrutiny Board (Adult Social Services, Public Health, NHS).

The meeting was closed at 12:50pm.



Appendix 2

ANNEX A

ATTENDANCE

Members of the Scrutiny Board

- Cllr Peter Gruen (Chair)
- Cllr Shirley Varley
- Cllr D Nagle (substitute member for Cllr A Hussain)
- Cllr C Dobson (substitute member for Cllr M Dobson)

Apologies were received as follows:

- Cllr J Chapman
- Cllr M Dobson
- Cllr B Flynn
- Cllr A Hussain
- Cllr J Pryor
- Cllr A Smart
- Cllr P Truswell
- Dr J Beal - Healthwatch Leeds (Co-opted member)

Adult Social Care

- Shona McFarlane – Chief Officer (Access and Care Delivery)
- Anna Clifford – Better Lives Programme Manager

Others

- Steven Courtney – Principal Scrutiny Adviser

Scrutiny Board (Adult Social Services, Public Health, NHS)

Delivering the Better Lives Strategy in Leeds: Response to the Better Lives Strategy Update

July 2016



Report author: Steven Courtney

www.scrutiny.unit@leeds.gov.uk
www.twitter.com/scrutinyleeds