

# Adults & Health Service Review 6 – Care Delivery: Care Homes, Implementation

Date: 27<sup>th</sup> July 2022

Report of: Director Adults & Health

Report to: Leeds City Council Executive Board

Will the decision be open for call in?  Yes  No

Does the report contain confidential or exempt information?  Yes  No

## What is this report about?

[Including how it contributes to the city's and council's ambitions](#)

The purpose of this report is to update Executive Board on the implementation of the decommissioning of services at Home Lea House residential long stay care home, in Rothwell, and Richmond House Short Stay Residential Care Home, in Farsley.

The [Adults & Health Service Review 6 – Care Delivery: Care Homes, Post Consultation Recommendations Report<sup>1</sup>](#), make the recommendation to decommission services at the two care homes, and the decision to decommission both care homes was taken by Executive Board on 23<sup>rd</sup> June 2021. This was due to the requirement for all council services to put forward savings proposals that would contribute towards the highlighted budget gap in 2021/22 of £118.8 million, and the financial savings of £1.531 million that would be made annually by closing the two care homes.

The decision was called in for Scrutiny and was reviewed by the Scrutiny Board for Adults, Health & Active Lifestyles on 9<sup>th</sup> July 2021. The Scrutiny Board considered whether to release the decision for implementation. A vote was subsequently held, and the Scrutiny Board agreed (by majority decision) that the decision be released for implementation.

This report provides an update following the transition of people to alternative residential services because of that decision and the closure of the two care homes.

## Recommendations

Executive Board is asked to:

- a) Note the successful transfer of all customers to alternative services where that was their preference.
- b) Note that the closure of both care homes has been achieved without any compulsory redundancies, staff having made a successful transition to their new posts within the council where they have chosen to remain in employment, supported through the council's Managing Staff Reductions policy

---

<sup>1</sup> Agenda Item 22, page 511 of public reports pack.

- c) Note the achievement of financial savings of £165k in 2021/22, and £1.531m per annum from 2022/23 following the closure of the two care homes.
- d) Note that work is ongoing in relation to the future use of the sites.

### Why is the proposal being put forward?

1. Following a period of extensive consultation, the Director of Adults and Health submitted a report "*Adults & Health Service Review 6 - Care Delivery: Care Homes, Post Consultation Recommendations Report*" that presented the findings of the consultation exercise undertaken regarding the proposals to close Home Lea House Long Stay Residential Care Home in Rothwell, and Richmond House Short Stay Residential Care Home in Farsley.
2. In considering the information within the submitted report, the Board were requested to determine the future of both care homes, with the recommended option being to decommission those care homes for the reasons as set out.
3. Executive Board approved the decommissioning of both care homes, and resolved as per the published minutes of the Executive Board meeting, that:
  - (a) That the outcome of the full consultation reports with stakeholders, (Appendix 3 to the submitted report), and the information contained within exempt Appendix 7 to the submitted report (Estimated Land Valuation), be noted;
  - (b) That the recommendation to decommission services at Home Lea House Residential Long Stay Care Home, in Rothwell, be approved;
  - (c) That the recommendation to decommission services at Richmond House Short Stay Residential Care Home, in Farsley, be approved;
  - (d) That the timescales for ceasing the services based on the timeline attached in Appendix 9 to the submitted report, be agreed;
  - (e) That it be noted that there is a commitment in principle for the sites to be used for the development of supported housing; general needs housing at the Home Lea House site in Rothwell, and supported housing for older people at the Richmond House site in Farsley;
  - (f) That it be noted that the lead officer responsible for such matters is the Director Adults and Health.
4. The decision was called in for Scrutiny and was reviewed by the Scrutiny Board for Adults, Health & Active Lifestyles on 9<sup>th</sup> July 2021. The Scrutiny Board considered whether to release the decision for implementation. A vote was subsequently held, and the Scrutiny Board agreed (by majority decision) that the decision be released for implementation.

**Wards Affected: Calverley and Farsley, Rothwell**

Have ward members been consulted?       Yes       No

## What impact will this proposal have?

- 5 Following the decision on 23<sup>rd</sup> June 2021 to decommission services at Home Lea House and Richmond House, and subsequent Scrutiny review on the 9<sup>th</sup> of July 2021, the implementation of the decision took place. Letters were issued to all affected stakeholders to advise them of the decision.
- 6 *Appendix 9 of the June 2021 report: Timeline for Implementation* estimated closure of the service at Richmond House by 1<sup>st</sup> November 2021, and closure of the service at Home Lea House by 1<sup>st</sup> February 2022, also acknowledging that the process would be carried out in line with the Assessment and Transitions Protocol and therefore it may be that all residents and service users were transferred, and the services able to close sooner than the dates estimated.

## Assessment and Transfer Process

- 7 An established, highly skilled, and experienced Assessment and Transfer team of Social Workers supported residents and service users affected by the closure of services. This has entailed carrying out person-centred assessments, considering the needs and choices of the residents and service users, their families, and carers. This work took place in line with the Council's established assessment and transfers protocols including its Care Guarantee, which provides reassurance on the service that residents, service users and their families can expect to receive. This included a guarantee that each person would receive the same level of service and a commitment that no resident would be worse off financially if they had to move.
- 8 **Home Lea House Long Stay Residential Care Home:** The assessment of residents, and the process of transition involving consultation with residents and their families began on 14<sup>th</sup> July 2021 and was completed on 28<sup>th</sup> October 2021. The home closed on 4<sup>th</sup> November 2021.
- 9 Of the 18 residents at this establishment: Nine people moved to council-run Dolphin Manor rated 'good' by CQC, one person moved to an independent provider run care home rated 'good' by CQC, six people moved to homes chosen by them and their families rated 'requires improvement' by CQC, one person returned home, and one person died prior to the start of the assessment and transition process.

10 Outcome of six-month residents' reviews:

8	Happy & settled in alternative care home
1	Returned home
2	Family has no issues or concerns.
1	Said unhappy but no specific reason given for this*.
1	6-month review not carried out yet as in hospital. At 3-month review was happy and settled.
1	Deceased prior to any assessment or move
3	Deceased prior to first 3-month review
1	Deceased prior to 6-month review**

\* When meeting with the social worker this person said she is not happy, however did not give a specific reason for this. She said most of the care staff are very good and said it is ok. The social worker noted that her care needs have increased and provided advice on next steps should the resident wish to move. A further review will take place shortly.

\*\*One resident's family expressed initial unhappiness and concern about how well their relative had settled in their new home and mentioned making a complaint about the care at that home however at the 3-month review with the resident and their relative no issues or concerns were raised. Regular visiting was an issue at times because of Covid outbreaks and at the time of this lady's move the designated single person arrangement was not yet in place.

- 11 People who moved into alternative residential homes will continue to be monitored 12 months after the move to ensure that new placements continue to meet their needs.
- 12 **Richmond House Short Stay Residential Care Home:** The service offer at Richmond House was short term care and support to people who require a period of convalescence following a hospital admission. Average length of stay was 3.5 weeks. All people in receipt of a service at Richmond House from 14<sup>th</sup> July 2021 were supported to reach their optimum with recovery focused support to return home or to undertake an assessment to support their longer-term needs. The home closed on 28<sup>th</sup> October 2021.
- 13 Social work teams who support people to access planned respite provision will support anyone who has previously used Home Lea House or Richmond House for planned respite to access this in a new location suitable to meet the individual's needs.

## Mortality

- 14 The Assessment and Transfer protocol was informed by the paper "The Impact of Relocation on care home residents: a review of evidence for Leeds City Council" produced by Public Health, which summarises as follows: "Mortality - The overall message from this body of work is of no significant difference in mortality rate between relocates and comparison groups, with a lower mortality rate reported in some cases. Morbidity - Most

studies found (perhaps surprisingly) a higher level of general health or no clear change following relocation. This was true for both inter-institutional and intra-institutional movement of residents.”

- 15 The Age UK’s report ‘Later Life in the United Kingdom’ (September 2015) notes the increasing age of admission into care homes and the high levels of care need these people require. It reports that the median period from admission to the care home to death is 462 days (15 months).
- 16 Further research carried out on care home residents across England and Wales into mortality rates following admission to residential care (Mortality in older care home residents in England and Wales - Sunil Sha, et al 2013) found that of a sample group of 9772 people entering residential care 26.2% had died within one year. The same research found that 30.8% of residents admitted to nursing care had died within one year.
- 17 This compares with a mortality rate of 22.2% for those residents from Home Lea House who moved to an alternative home. The average age of the people who died was 91.5 years.

#### Staff Outcomes

- 18 47 Adult Social Care (ASC) and 11 Civic Enterprise Leeds (CEL) staff were affected by the proposals. Extensive engagement with trade unions and staff throughout the process proved very successful in supporting staff through the process of change, using the MSR policy, and the support of trade unions through the process was welcomed and appreciated.

#### 19 Richmond House Staff Outcomes

5	Alternative care home role in Adult Social Care
3	Alternative role in Adult Social Care
2	Alternative role in a different Council directorate.
16	Left the Council through the Early Leavers Initiative (4 CEL staff)
1	Left the Council for alternative employment.

#### Home Lea House Staff Outcomes

11	Alternative care home role in Adult Social Care
9	Alternative role in Adult Social Care
2	Alternative role in a different Council directorate.
6	Left the Council through the Early Leavers Initiative (2 CEL staff)
0	Left the Council for alternative employment.
1	Left Council to pursue education (top up nursing degree)

- 20 Two Civic Enterprise Leeds staff left employment between final paper submission and implementation decision, accounting for the discrepancy in the above figures.
- 21 All the staff have transitioned successfully to new roles or left the authority voluntarily under the Early Leavers Initiative. Staff are now settled into their new roles and will be supported

through line management supervision, appraisals, training, and development opportunities appropriate to their role.

### Proposed future building use

- 22 As per the report to Executive Board in June 2021, upon the closure of each site, the sites transferred into void management with responsibility for safety, security and maintenance being managed by LCC Facilities Management, with preparatory works underway for demolition.
23. Work is ongoing, led by the Chief Officer for Asset Management & Regeneration and the Head of Asset Management, under the delegations in place to the Director of City Development to consider the future use of the surplus sites. In principle the preference is to include these sites as part of the Council Housing Growth Programme, this is subject to feasibility work which is currently underway. Subject to the outcome of this work, approval will be sought by City Development for inclusion of the sites within the programme via a separate report. Should this proposal not be viable, then alternative options for the sites will be explored.

### What consultation and engagement has taken place?

- 24 Extensive formal consultation was conducted as part of the proposals to decommission the two care homes, which service users and families contributed to. The Consultation Findings Report was considered by Executive Board and Scrutiny Board as part of the recommendations to close the two care homes.
- 25 Formal consultation with the trade unions to avoid, reduce and mitigate compulsory redundancy was undertaken. The trade union consultation was positive and constructive and resulted in all staff either leaving voluntarily or being redeployed.
- 26 In addition, detailed Equality, Diversity, Cohesion, and Integration (EDCI) Assessments were carried out and considered in the decision-making process.

### What are the resource implications?

- 27 As per the report to Executive Board, the gross budget for Home Lea House was £789k and the net budget was £547k. In a full year it would therefore be possible to save the gross budget of £789k as the client income will follow the client. Closing this facility from 1<sup>st</sup> February 2022 would save £789k by the end of 2022/23. The facility closed on 4<sup>th</sup> November 2021. During 2021/22 actual cost to run the service was £592k, a saving from £789k of £197k.
- 28 The current gross and net budget for Richmond House was £742k. There is no associated income from short term residents. The part year saving from closure on 1<sup>st</sup> November 2021 would amount to £309k, with the full saving of £742k in 2022/23. The facility closed on 28<sup>th</sup> October 2021. During 2021/22 actual cost to run the service was £545k, a saving from £742k of £197k.

- 29 There were one off severance costs of £177k for those LCC staff who left the council through the Early Leavers Initiative<sup>2</sup>. There were one-off costs of alternative independent provision (for those taking up on the care guarantee) of £51,947.
- 30 **Once these costs were offset against the 2021/22 total savings of £394k the total savings for 2021/22 was £165k.**
- 31 **From 2022/23 total financial savings of £1.531 million annually has been achieved by closing these two care homes.**
- 32 **It should also be noted that the total cost of ELI, (severance costs plus pension over 5 years) is £1.104 million, which delivers at total net saving over 5 years of £2.939 million.**
- 33 *Appendix 7 of the June 2021 report: Confidential Land Valuations* provided information to Executive Board in June 2021 relating to the estimated commercial land valuation of the two sites. As this is potentially commercially sensitive information it was provided as a confidential appendix to the main report. As detailed above, work is ongoing in relation to the potential future use of the sites. As such, additional potential additional savings may be realised depending on the outcome for the site use in the future.

### What are the legal implications?

- 34 There are no legal implications arising from this report. This report is exempt from call-in as it falls within the exception for decisions which have been the subject of a previous call-in, as provided in paragraph 5.1.2 of the Executive and Decision-Making Procedure Rules.

### What are the key risks and how are they being managed?

- 35 A detailed plan was drawn up to carefully manage the decommissioning of the two care homes. This included the management of identified risks.

### How does this proposal impact the three pillars of the Best City Ambition?

Inclusive Growth

Health and Wellbeing

Zero Carbon

- 36 As per paragraphs 74 – 78 of the June 2021 report, the closure of the two care homes supports the legal requirement for the Council to set a balanced budget and the Best Council Plan Financial Strategy aim to be “financially resilient and sustainable”, provide “value for money” and to “target resources to meet our priorities”. In particular, it supports the following elements of the council’s Best City priorities:

- Health and Wellbeing “Working as a system to ensure people get the right care, from the right people in the right place”

---

<sup>2</sup> There was also £20k severance costs for CEL staff, however this cost was funded through separate Resources budget allocation and is therefore not offset against these figures.

- Inclusive Growth “Supporting the city’s economic recovery from COVID-19 and building longer-term economic resilience”
- Housing “Providing the right housing options to support older and vulnerable residents to remain active and independent”

## Options, timescales and measuring success

### a) What other options were considered?

37 Not applicable.

### b) How will success be measured?

38 The success measures were outlined in the proposal report to Executive Board and delivery against these are shown below:

- Financial Savings of £165k during 2021/22 achieved. £1.531m pa achieved from 2022/23.
- Assessment and transfer of all current residents at Home Lea House to alternative care home provision that meets their individual needs and the needs of their family / carers, carried out in accordance with the Assessment and Closure Protocol.
- The wellbeing of people in alternatives services is ongoing as detailed above.
- The assessment and transfer of all short stay residents at Richmond House to alternative provision that meets their individual needs and the needs of their family / carers completed.
- Social work teams who support people to access planned respite provision will support anyone who has previously used Home Lea House or Richmond House for planned respite to access this in a new location suitable to meet the individual’s needs.
- All the staff have transitioned successfully to new roles or left the authority voluntarily under the Early Leavers Initiative. Staff are now settled into their new roles and will be supported through line management supervision, appraisals, training, and development opportunities appropriate to their role.
- All EDCI Assessment mitigating actions have been carried out.

### What is the timetable for implementation?

39 Implementation of the decision to decommission Home Lea House and Richmond House care homes has now been successfully completed. People who moved into alternative residential homes will continue to be monitored 12 months after the move to ensure that new placements continue to meet their needs.

40 As detailed in this report, work is ongoing, led by the Chief Officer for Asset Management & Regeneration and the Head of Asset Management to pursue the viability for the potential development of both sites with ongoing engagement with Elected Members. Further updates will be brought to Executive Board in due course.

## Appendices

41 None.

## Background papers

42 None.