



Report of the Director of Adult Social Services

Executive Board

Date: 4th November 2009

Subject: From Day Centres to Day Services - Response to the Consultation on Day Services

Electoral Wards Affected:

☒

Ward Members consulted
(referred to in report)

Specific Implications For:

Equality and Diversity ☐

Community Cohesion ☐

Narrowing the Gap ☐

Eligible for Call In

☒

Not Eligible for Call In

(Details contained in the report)

☐

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report presents a summary of the consultation undertaken by officers between August and the end of September this year, regarding the proposals set out in the report provided to Executive Board in July, entitled 'From Day Centres to Day Services'. At that meeting Executive Board endorsed the proposal to begin consultation in relation to the future role and purpose of seven of the Council's 21 day centres for older people. The proposals for the consultation programme, its extent and methodology were attached as an Appendix to the original report.

Members will recall that the July report restated the strategic context in which the Council's approach to day services needed to change to adapt to changing public expectations, changing patterns of demand and to respond to the requirements of increasing the choices for people using personal budgets and direct payments. Descriptions of the implications of this changing strategic context have been the subject of three previous Executive Board reports, originally in December 2005, latterly in November 2008 and most recently in July 2009.

The report highlights the extensive consultation which has been undertaken, with a wide and diverse range of views expressed. Analysis of the comments made has been undertaken in addition to a review of the original data and basis of the recommendations. The report highlights responses to the themes emerging from the consultation and makes alternative proposals to the original report in July, in response to the representations made.

The proposals submitted to the Executive Board for consideration include the continuation but relocation of a generic service at Otley / North West Leeds, the redesignation of Calverlands as a specialist dementia centre, the relocation of Woodhouse to the Calverlands site and the reprovision of services at Holbeck and Bramley Lawn in alternative day centre venues across Leeds.

With regard to Doreen Hamilton and Naburn Court the proposal is that these sites remain open and that they are developed as day and resource centres. Whilst each centre would have a reduced number of day care sessions these would be complemented by a range of community activities, for example luncheon clubs. It is further proposed that the buildings at Holbeck, Bramley Lawn and Woodhosue are made available for alternative use, with particular attention given to a whole-Council review of the potential use in Holbeck.

1.0 Purpose Of This Report

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to provide members with a detailed account of the consultation process and recommendations for the development of day services for older people, following consideration of comments and findings of the consultation.

2.0 Background Information

- 2.1 The Executive Board has been provided with a series of three reports outlining the future strategy and direction for Council-provided day services. The first report submitted in December 2005 highlighted the emerging strategic drivers which were starting to impact on the ways in which the need for day services was shifting. That report highlighted the challenges associated with the changing preferences being expressed by older people and their carers. The report also highlighted the changing expectations of the wider population with regard to the ways in which they expect their social care needs to be met in the future. These are closely aligned to national policy initiatives designed to provide individuals with much greater choice and control over their care.
- 2.2 From the second report presented in July 2008, based on the principles set out in the original report, Executive Board agreed a vision and strategy for reshaping older people's day services. This was to provide greater opportunities for older people to receive more personalised services with an enhanced range and quality of community based activities. This report highlighted the continuing shift in demand and expectations, drawing attention to the increasing levels of under-occupancy within Council centres. It also described the increasing demand for and uptake of direct payments as alternatives to existing provision.
- 2.3 That report was followed in November 2008 with a progress report to the Executive Board which sought approval to implement the first phase of the revised strategy, including the re provision of four day centres. That report noted that savings made from re-provision were to be re-invested within older people's services. Locality plans were to be drawn up for delivering newly shaped day services. The report specified that progress updates would be given to members, as the changes progressed.
- 2.4 The next report, submitted in July 2009 provided much more detailed information on the next steps. It proposed to further develop and implement the strategy, increasing support for the significant expansion of direct payments and universally available services (that is to say services providing support to older people and their carers which do not require a social care assessment to access). This would include a wide

range of community based organisations including Neighbourhood Networks. The report highlighted the strategic role of the Local Authority in ensuring specialist reablement and dementia services were available across the city.

- 2.5 A companion report submitted to the July Board gained approval for the future commissioning intentions and investment plan designed to improve the range and availability of support services for all older people through Neighbourhood Networks.
- 2.6 At various stages in the last year, associated reports have been provided to Executive Board highlighting the local implications of significant national policy initiatives. Most notably in October 2008 a report set out the requirements of the Government's 'Putting People First' vision and commitment to the transformation of adult social care.
- 2.7 In December 2008 the outcome of the Independence, Wellbeing and Choice Inspection of adult social care services was reported to the Executive Board along with an action plan designed to address the issues identified in that Inspection. Both the outcome of the Inspection and the actions to be adopted were agreed by the Commission for Social Care Inspection (now CQC) and endorsed by the Board, including those recommendations and actions relating to the continuing reprovision of buildings based services
- 2.8 Other reports, including the Joint Strategic Needs Analysis for Leeds (JSNA) have alerted members to some of the demographic challenges associated with increasing numbers of older people, as well as the implied service responses which will be required to meet their increasingly specialist needs and those of their carers.
- 2.9 In the light of this extensive strategic and policy background, Executive Board in July gave approval for a process of consultation on proposals for the future configuration and use of the current day care centres for older people. This report contains details of the consultation process, the responses provided by respondents and the recommendations arising out of consideration of the views expressed.
- 2.10 The service currently manages 21 day centres with 2350 generic places (Monday to Friday {450 at the weekend}) and 370 dementia places (Monday to Friday {100 at the weekend}) provided across the city each week. A total of 1324 people attend the centres and 20% are directly impacted by these proposals. A further 23,741 people attend or are in touch with the Neighbourhood Network centres across the city.

3.0 Consultation

- 3.1 The Executive Board report of July 2009 asked members to agree a consultation period concerning recommendations for change to the day services base in the city, and to receive a report on the outcome of the consultation with final recommendations for the delivery of the strategy in November 2009. The consultation period ran from 22nd July to 30th September 2009 although comments have been received and noted up until the publication of this report.
- 3.2 The consultation was designed to be as comprehensive and extensive as possible. It has focused on obtaining the views of people currently registered as using a day centre and their carers. The views of staff working in day centres, the Council partners in providing care and support to older people, the public and other stakeholders were also sought, as were the views of individual elected members and those of area committees.

- 3.3 All those older people on the register of a Leeds City Council day service received a letter at the start of the process setting out how their views were to be sought. The letter provided them with information about how and who they could contact to make their views known. A dedicated telephone helpline was provided, a dedicated web-mail address set up and a programme of meetings was arranged.
- 3.4 Those people attending the centres for which specific proposals had been made in the July report were provided with a more detailed letter, extensive background information and a questionnaire inviting their views in relation to the specific proposals for the centre they attend. The same was also provided for carers of people in those circumstances. Some 185 completed questionnaires have been returned. A further 49 letters relating to the proposals have been received and responded to.
- 3.5 To support this process, people (and their carers) using the seven centres directly affected by the proposals were invited (and encouraged) to attend meetings where the nature of the changes was explained. Senior officers were on hand to respond to questions and to note comments and concerns. Additional comments have been received from attendees of two day centres not directly affected by the proposals. One of these centres held three carers' meetings.
- 3.6 These meetings also began the process of providing individual review meetings for each person, his/her carer and/or advocate. Between the end of July and the end of September more than 300 individual review meetings have been held to focus on people's greatest concerns over their future care needs and the arrangements for meeting them.
- 3.7 More than 74 members of the general public have used the telephone helpline number to provide their views; a further 23 people have contacted the webmail address; and 18 people have written letters setting out their views. Two petitions have been received with 1453 respondents.
- 3.8 There was a programme of 12 meetings with different stakeholders including the voluntary, community and faith organisations in the city, and three carers' meetings.
- 3.9 In relation to Elected Members, 24 individual briefing meetings have been held to date (including the Adult Social Care Scrutiny Board Chair). Officers have so far attended at eight area committee meetings with a further visit offered in the month of October. The views of a further five area fora, political group meetings or Town Councils have also been obtained through attendance at their meetings. The Adult Social Services Scrutiny Board has had two full debates about the issues. In addition, two 'drop in' sessions for elected members were arranged during the main consultation period.
- 3.10 It is also the case that the proposals have received a good degree of media coverage which has undoubtedly assisted in ensuring that people who may not have been reached by the Council's own efforts to seek their views is likely to have had their awareness raised through such media reports.

4.0 Views Expressed during the Consultation

- 4.1 Attached at Appendix 1 is a summary of the comments and themes emerging from the consultation. The process has yielded a rich and diverse range of views, comments, concerns and questions, all of which have been considered in arriving at the proposals in this report. The time and commitment of customers, carers and stakeholders to attend meetings and express views has been welcomed. Whilst it is

not possible to fully replicate each comment in this report, key themes have emerged which can be summarised.

- 4.2 Overall, there were significant numbers of positive comments in support of some of the ideas being developed in the day centre strategy. Improving services for people with dementia was popular as were more flexible opening hours extending into the evening. Outreach services, reablement and support for carers were also positively received.
- 4.3 Respondents expressed concern about change but several said that if they were going to move to other venues they wanted to know quickly in order to give time to settle. Some said they had agreed to attend another centre and felt positive about it. Some did not want to consider an alternative until decisions were made. All affected individuals have had a review, with a large majority already identifying alternative venues. A very small number have expressed interest in a direct payment / personal budget.
- 4.4 It was clear from the views expressed in relation to the overall strategic approach that the local implementation of national policy initiatives (particularly in relation to personalisation, self-directed care and support and the use of direct payments), was generally not well understood and in some cases misunderstood. In particular, concerns were expressed about the possibilities of on the one hand, the exploitation of vulnerable people using direct payments by unscrupulous carers and on the other, the exploitation of the direct payments system by individuals not using the funding for the purpose it was intended.
- 4.5 The consultation attracted considerable comment and allegations from stakeholders including:
- Existing Day Services are being deliberately run down.
 - Requests for open access to day services.
 - Fears that people would lose their day services.
 - Additional responsibilities for voluntary sector organisations
 - Increased numbers of older people would require more day centre places.
 - Closures would mean longer travelling times
 - Keeping friendship groups together.
 - Day services are an important part of preventing admissions to residential care and safeguarding older people.
 - The proposals were intended to be budget cuts rather than re-investments.
 - Decisions had already been made.
- 4.6 The appendix gives a full commentary on the outcomes of discussions at each of the seven day centres under consideration. All but Woodhouse indicated they would prefer for their centre not to close / change use. The main reasons were a desire to avoid change. Allied to this was anxiety about unfamiliar surroundings, having to meet new people, concerns about the area of the city where other centres are located and the desire to stay with staff and friendship groups. Woodhouse

customers were less concerned as their centre was proposed to be moved to Calverlands which some referred to as like 'moving house'.

- 4.7 It is important to note that none of the respondents sought to comment on the range of potential financial implications which arise out of many of the views expressed. This was particularly so in relation to those recommending lower eligibility thresholds, expanding the number of day centres and providing more money to voluntary organisations to extend the services they offer.

5.0 Responses to the Consultation – Key Issues

- 5.1 The concerns expressed in paragraph 4.5 above require comment for factual accuracy, to clarify perception and provide context and reassurance leading to the revised proposals.

- 5.1.1 *Services are being run down.* During the year we have placed 436 new people in day services and 487 have ceased attending. An investigation into reasons why four named individuals did not receive a service did not substantiate the claim that there is a deliberate strategy to run down centres. There appears to be some misunderstanding about how to get extra days. This has to be authorised after an assessment of need by a social worker. The Directorate will review information to ensure this is more widely known.

- 5.1.2 *Requests for open access to day services.* In order to do this, the Authority would be required to review and lower the eligibility criteria for all services. Previous requests to do this have been investigated and found to have an additional financial requirement in excess of £7.5 million per annum.

- 5.1.3 *Fears that all day services would cease.* Adoption of the proposals in this report would leave 18 centres in operation. This is still a high number when benchmarked with other authorities. The strategy is clear that day care will remain an important part of available provision in the city especially for dementia and reablement. The overall reduction in day centre places now proposed will still leave sufficient capacity in the city to meet existing and future need.

- 5.1.4 *Additional responsibilities for voluntary organisations.* It has been stated throughout the consultation that this will not be the case. The role of the Neighbourhood Networks will be preserved to develop social and community engagement within localities, to prevent social isolation and improve outcomes for older people. Care will be taken to seamlessly provide for the continuum of need in the city by retaining sufficient day care services to meet need. The consultation has clarified that day centres are a part of the spectrum of social care with a continuing and complimentary role to Neighbourhood Networks, each providing separate and different services for older people. The nature of the consultation has emphasised that reducing the number of day services' buildings will not change the services that Neighbourhood Networks and day centres each provide. Neighbourhood Networks are not substituting for day centres.

- 5.1.5 *Increased numbers of older people.* The projected growth of older people in Leeds is 50% of the projected national increase. Additionally, with increasingly effective medical treatments, the onset of disability and illness is often delayed well into retirement. Both of these factors raise the average age at which people seek out day centres, and then often use them for shorter periods of time. This means there is reason to question whether there will in fact be a growing demand for day care places on demographic grounds. Indeed the demographic increase of older people

in Leeds has started – but the outcome to date has been that day centres are showing increasingly lower occupancy.

- 5.1.6 *Longer travelling times.* A range of practical concerns about implementation have been raised relating to reduced service, transport and friendship groups. Each customer will maintain at least their current level of service and would be offered an alternative day centre place. Currently there are more than 200 vacancies each day in day centres across the city, allowing ample choice of centre. Most people would have less than a three-mile journey to another centre, if their existing service was re-provided and some would have reduced journey times.
- 5.1.7 *Keeping friendship groups together.* This will be a top priority if the proposals are adopted. As in 5.1.6 above, there are more than sufficient vacancies to allow this to happen. The detailed written information, the individual reviews and centre meetings sought to reassure customers that they would be offered alternative provision with their friends. Some centres and especially smaller centres were encouraged to consider whether all the service should move together. At Woodhouse Centre, this suggestion was accepted, with all customers expressing a preference for the same alternative centre.
- 5.1.8 *Prevention of admission to residential and ensuring safeguarding.* Whilst day services remain an important part of care options and particularly support to carers, there is no direct evidence that, on their own, they prevent admission to residential care. The evidence is that extra care housing has a more direct and significant impact. Safeguarding is a multi agency and community responsibility and many more referrals are made and investigated from home care and voluntary sector agencies than day care.
- 5.1.9 *Budget cuts not reinvestments.* Adult Social Care has had systematic investment over a number of years to ensure that the identified needs of vulnerable adults in Leeds are met. However, alongside this investment, national and local expectation is that public services provide efficient and value for money services. Previous re-provision of day services has enabled greater investment in alternatives including voluntary sector direct access services, direct payments and personal budgets. In addition it has allowed reinvestment in day services to provide more specialist bespoke services for the most vulnerable. The proposals build on the evaluation and analysis of trends for admission to services and a review of the best use of resources in the city. Within the context of cash limited budgets and national requirements to demonstrate efficiencies, this has been a transparent and open process. The proposals in the report are directly related to needs analysis and efficiency and strive to develop a range of responses to individual need. All revenue generated from these proposals will be reinvested to improve services for older people across the city. Further information on the financial impacts is contained in section eight and Appendix 2.
- 5.1.10 *Decisions have already been made.* During the consultation it has been made clear that decisions will be made following the presentation of this report to the Executive Board.
- 5.2 Closer examination of the key issues emerging in relation to individual centres have, however, resulted in some modification to the original proposals. Whilst it is correct that there remains sufficient capacity in the whole of the city overall, nevertheless the importance of localised provision in some parts of the city has been reinforced. The significance of maintaining some local provision to enable closer community engagement in particular areas has been articulated with force and conviction. In these areas, a higher level of consultation response from customers was evident.

- 5.3 In respect of each of the centres and following careful consideration of the options, it is proposed that amendments to the original plan are considered as follows.
- 5.4 It is proposed that Naburn Court and Doreen Hamilton remain open as day and resource centres but with the number of day care sessions reduced to three per week at each centre. This is in direct response to the representations which have been made concerning the popularity of the centres, availability of generic day care in the east of the city, and the greater distances to travel in the event of reprovision of the service at Naburn Court. This proposal reflects the important role that each centre plays in its local community. This was a clear message that emerged during the consultation. Early discussions with community groups and local churches in the areas has indicated interest and support for developing wider community use and greater choice for older people in the area, through offering luncheon clubs and other social activities. This proposal will enable the Council to address value for money and the efficient use of the day care resource whilst offering both communities the opportunity of good venues for alternative use. Both Naburn Court and Doreen Hamilton centres will remain open each weekday and there are opportunities for evening and weekend community use as well.
- 5.5 It is recommended that the centre at Otley is relocated to premises which are fit for purpose and have the option of expanding from one day per week to accommodate existing users of the Calverlands centre as may be required. The option of using available accommodation at the Spring Gardens home for older people site is being evaluated.
- 5.6 It is recommended that Calverlands is redesignated as a specialist dementia service to accommodate a lack of facilities in the area. The availability of an alternative generic day service in Otley will ensure that the many people who attend Calverlands from the North West will have more options for an alternative service and will not be required to travel excessive distances.
- 5.7 It is recommended that Woodhouse day service is relocated to Calverlands. This was largely supported by staff and customers during the consultation process. Many attendees of Woodhouse live in the north west and already travel past Calverlands to attend Woodhouse.
- 5.8 It is recommended that Bramley Lawn and Holbeck cease providing traditional day services. However, it is proposed that further work is undertaken to encourage the use of the buildings for alternative purposes. Places are available in centres within close proximity to both, with sufficient capacity to enable friendship groups to remain together. Appendix 3 shows the detail of the preferencing work undertaken so far.
- 5.9 Whilst the service planning and consultation outcome support the recommendation to reprove the Holbeck day centre, our work has also emphasised the fact that the Holbeck area is one of changing yet significant need. Adult Social Care is working with other Council directorates, partners and the local community to meet that need in the most effective way. A particular focus for this directorate will be meeting the changing needs of older people in the Holbeck area.

6.0 Implementation

- 6.1 The Directorate has considerable experience of implementing successful service change. Agreement to the recommendations will necessitate immediate support to customers of Holbeck and Bramley Lawn to enable the choices of relocation already identified to be expedited and / or reviewed and changed. Every support will be

given to address immediate concerns and to move at a pace appropriate to individual circumstances.

- 6.2 Changes to Otley, Calverlands and Woodhouse will depend on the establishment of the suitable alternative venue and service for the north west of the City. The options for using Spring Gardens are being explored with the expectation of a new service starting before the end of the financial year, subject to any minor capital works which may be required. During the preparation phase, customers of Calverlands will be given the opportunity to review their preferences for alternative provision and visits to preferred venues will be arranged. Following this, Woodhouse customers will move to Calverlands. These changes are likely to take at least six months and users of the centres will be integrally involved with the planning.
- 6.3 Changes at Naburn Court and Doreen Hamilton will require further discussion with service users and the community, to establish on which days the existing service users wish the day care service to be delivered. Revised staffing arrangements will also be required.
- 6.4 It is envisaged that there will be an important transitional period in the implementation of the proposals. In order to provide reassurance to service users and to ensure continuity of care, some staff in the centres affected by the changes will move with service users to their new centres. They will then be able to support service users during the settling in period. Beyond the transitional period it is envisaged that supernumerary arrangements will allow a new staffing structure for the service to be put into place and staff to move into funded posts. Early engagement with trade union representatives has started regarding a revised staffing structure for day services.
- 6.5 Service change will be supported by a full staffing review with implementation under managing workforce change procedures. Vacancies for permanent staff already exist as recruitment to permanent posts over the last year has all but ceased as a direct result of reviewing staffing levels in each of the centres.
- 6.6 The potential alternative usage for the Holbeck, Bramley Lawn and Woodhouse buildings will be actively pursued as the implementation is progressed. Expressions of interest in potential use of each of these buildings have already been received – some from neighbourhoods and community groups. Other interest has been expressed in use of the buildings by other Adult Social Care groups and by other Council departments. Alternative use of the centres will begin to be identified following the agreement of recommendations, to minimise the period when the buildings will be under used.

7.0 Implications for Council Policy and Governance

- 7.1 In previous reports in July 2008 and July 2009 Members agreed the overall approach to day opportunities for older people, the future service model for Adult Social Care's day service and recommendations relating to individual day centres. All the work currently being undertaken in relation to modernising Adult Social Care's day service is consistent with the approvals already given.
- 7.2 The overall approach being taken fits well with the current Leeds Strategic Plan. For example the change process aims to:
- enable older people to be involved in physical exercise and cultural events;

- improve older people's access to services and their level of involvement in their communities;
- create opportunities which maximise the potential of older people and their overall wellbeing.

This will support the achievement of Strategic Outcomes in the Strategic Plan, particularly: Culture, Health and Wellbeing, Thriving Places and Harmonious Communities.

- 7.3 There are a number of risks involved with the revised proposals contained in this report. The recommendations require the establishment of a new generic provision in the Otley / Yeadon / Guiseley area. The timescales for implementation will impact on the overall change management of the service and will require further detailed work.

8.0 Legal and Resource Implications

- 8.1 An equality impact assessment has been completed and is available at [www.leeds.gov.uk/Council and democracy](http://www.leeds.gov.uk/Council_and_democracy)
- 8.2 The proposed service changes relating to the seven centres identified will release resources which can be used in other ways to support older people's day activities.
- 8.3 Appendix 2 provides a financial summary of the current position, the original proposals set out in the July report to Executive Board and the revised proposals following the outcome of the consultation that are included in this report.
- 8.4 The appendix identifies the current average unit cost of providing older people's day care at £79.57 per person per day. By taking out some of the surplus capacity, the original proposals would have led to a reduction in the unit cost by 12% to £70.19. This would provide better value for money, whilst maintaining existing service provision. With the revised proposals less surplus capacity will be removed and accordingly the unit costs will reduce by 8% to £73.09.
- 8.5 The full year gross revenue saving from the original proposals was £1.0 million (reduced by additional transport and staffing costs at other centres to give a lower net saving). The full year gross revenue savings from the revised proposals are £0.7m (also reduced by some additional transport and staffing costs) and these may take up to two years to achieve. Whilst the new savings figure for re-investment does achieve in a full year the £0.6m target figure included in the 2009/10 budget, it fails to take out the full level of over capacity.
- 8.6 The £0.6m target savings from the consolidation of day centres helps to fund the additional investment of £2.4m in direct payments and personal budgets included in the 2009/10 budget. The revised proposals contained in this report are expected to provide £0.7m in a full-year (minus additional costs for transport and staffing at other centres, some of which will be short-term) that will be available for investment in personal budgets and the development of alternative day time activities.
- 8.7 It is envisaged that there will be an important transitional period in the implementation of the proposals. In order to provide reassurance to service users and to ensure continuity of care, some staff in the centres affected by the changes will move with service users to their new centres. They will then be able to support service users during the settling in period. Beyond the transitional period it is envisaged that supernumerary arrangements will be phased out as a new staffing

structure for the service is put into place and staff move into funded posts. Early engagement with trade union representatives has started regarding a revised staffing structure for day services.

- 8.8 With regard to transport it is not envisaged that the proposed changes will result in any direct release of resources in the short term. An initial assessment of the transport implications has indicated the possibility that expenditure under the Private Hire part of the transport budget will increase because of the need for additional vehicles on some runs. This will be accommodated within the overall cost envelope.

9.0 Conclusion

- 9.1 The July 2009 Executive Board report proposing consultation on the future use of seven day centres built on a series of previous reports setting out the vision and direction for day services in the future. In turn, these were informed by national policy and local decisions implementing legislation, guidance and regulation concerning the commissioning assessment and provision of social care services.
- 9.2 There have been significant drivers influencing the purpose of the report, not least the need to demonstrate quality, value for money and efficiency. The recommendations of the Independence, Wellbeing and Choice Inspection of Adult Social Care last year also highlighted the need to offer more personalised care in alternative settings to traditional buildings based services. This report re-affirms the continued long term commitment to the provision of day care for eligible customer need.
- 9.3 A comprehensive consultation process has been undertaken involving all existing customers of the centres under consideration, their carers, elected members, partnership and representative groups.
- 9.4 The consultation yielded a rich and diverse range of views, comments, concerns and questions. The mobilisation of a campaign against closure, including high media coverage has ensured that voices in opposition have predominated. It is significant that there was little comment on the range of potential financial implications, nor policy and inspection drivers which have influenced the need for the proposals.
- 9.5 This report has set out the themes arising from the consultation in relation to overall direction, generalised fears and concerns and specific concerns about individual centres.
- 9.6 The consultation highlighted issues concerned with provision of adequate and appropriate generic day services in the north-west and east of the city. This has led to a revision of the initial proposals whilst still significantly reducing the overall capacity in line with initial budgetary and planning assumptions.
- 9.7 The proposals in the report offer an opportunity for the buildings at Bramley Lawn, Holbeck and Woodhouse to be used for alternative services reflecting community need. The proposals for Naburn Court and Doreen Hamilton develop a model of day care service being complemented by additional community activities, on different days but within the same building.
- 9.8 The overall supply and demand of day care services will be kept under review as alternatives to provision are developed using personal budgets and further reports will be presented.

10.0 Recommendations

It is recommended:

- 10.1 That the outcome of the consultation and comments received are noted.
- 10.2 That the revised proposals outlined at paragraphs 5.4 to 5.8 are agreed
- 10.3 That the implementation plan outlined in paragraph 6 is endorsed.
- 10.4 That active consideration is given to the future use of the buildings with a particular review of locally based services in the Holbeck area.
- 10.5 That further work to publicise and promote the implementation of self directed support and personal budgets is championed through the scrutiny review of Personalisation.
- 10.6 That supply and demand of day care services is kept under close review with further reports as required.

Background documents referred to in this report:

1. A Commissioning Strategy for Day Services – 14th December 2005 – Executive Board.
<http://democracy.leeds.gov.uk/CeListDocuments.aspx?Committeed=102&MeetingId=2285&DF=14/12/2005&Ver=2>
2. Older People's Day Services – Service Improvement Plan – 16th July 2008 – Executive Board
<http://democracy.leeds.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=102&MId=3682&Ver=4>
3. Older People's Day Services – Service Improvement Plan – 5th November 2008 – Executive Board
<http://democracy.leeds.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=102&MId=3378&Ver=4>
4. From Day Centres to Day Services: Responding to the needs and preferences of older people – 22nd July 2009 – Executive Board
<http://democracy.leeds.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=102&MId=4184&Ver=4>
5. Putting People First: Vision and Commitment to the Transformation of Adult Social Care – 8th October 2008 – Executive Board
<http://democracy.leeds.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=102&MId=3377&Ver=4>
6. Independence, Wellbeing and Choice Inspection of Adult Social Care
[http://democracy.leeds.gov.uk/Published/C00000102/M00003379/AI00016147/\\$InspectionofAdultSocSersOPEN241108.docA.ps.pdf](http://democracy.leeds.gov.uk/Published/C00000102/M00003379/AI00016147/$InspectionofAdultSocSersOPEN241108.docA.ps.pdf)
7. Joint Strategic Needs Analysis for Leeds.
http://www.leedsinitiative.org/healthy/page.aspx?id=12242&ekmense=cdb9b7c3_76_0_12242_8
8. 1990 NHS & Community Care Act
http://www.opsi.gov.uk/acts/acts1990/Ukpga_19900019_en_1
9. Leeds Strategic Plan <http://www.leedsinitiative.org/lsp/>

10. Equality Impact Assessment

http://www.leeds.gov.uk/Council_and_democracy/Jobs/Equalities_assessment_and_consultation.aspx

OLDER PEOPLE'S DAY SERVICE MODERNISATION

OUTCOMES OF CONSULTATION

AUGUST – SEPTEMBER 2009

October 2009

1. Introduction

Following on from the Executive Board Report on 29th July 2009, Adult Social Care commenced consultation with a range of Stakeholders on the proposals for transforming Older People's Day Services, as described in the report.

Whilst there has been ongoing consultation with older people regarding personalisation and developing the strategy for day services, this specific consultation on the proposals for specific centres identified in the Executive Board report began at the beginning of August and lasted until the end of September 2009.

The consultation was designed to be as comprehensive and extensive as possible. It has focused on obtaining the views of people currently registered as using a day centre and their carers. The views of staff working in day centres, the Council partners in providing care and support to older people, the public and other stakeholders were also sought, as were the views of individual elected members and those of area committees.

As part of the process a questionnaire was developed and participants in consultation events were invited to provide a written response to the questions. The analysis of comments was not confined to written responses however and a written record was made of all the consultation events that have taken place. The consultation has produced comments and opinions on the proposals and no boundaries were defined for the consultation. Stakeholders were informed that proposals had been made in the Executive Board report but no decision had yet been taken.

In terms of the overall response, some day centres produced a better response from the service users than others, Calverlands and Doreen Hamilton Day Centres having the highest response rate.

It would appear that very limited written responses were received from the Otley and Woodhouse Day Centres, though we did receive a number of responses from service users and carers that we could not match to a day centre (could not identify the service user or the day centre).

2. Methodology

As noted in paragraph 1 above, Adult Social Care has consulted with a range of interested parties, specifically:

Elected Members

Service Users

Carers

Members of staff

Voluntary, Community and Faith Organisations

Neighbourhood Networks

General Public

Partners

A variety of methods have been used to ascertain the views of stakeholders (timetable of activities attached for information). A free phone helpline and a general e-mail account were made available for any issues arising and for responses to the consultation.

The consultation with service users and carers concentrated on the seven centres that would be directly affected by the proposals, though the consultation was made open to all service users and carers.

Stakeholders	Methods used
Elected Members	Elected Member briefings Attendance at Area Committees Scrutiny
Service Users	Day Centre meetings One to one meetings with Day Centre Officers to look at individual needs Information and questionnaire to all service users through day services Questionnaire available on the Council's web-site Attendance at some user led forums/reference groups
Carers	Day Centre meetings Open meetings for carers Information and questionnaire to carers via day services. Questionnaire available on the Council's web-site Attendance at the Carers' Strategy Implementation Group
Members of staff	Day Centre meetings Questionnaire available to all members of staff working in day services Questionnaire available on the Council's web-site Attendance at the ASC Adult Management Group Managers meeting with Director
VCF organisations	Briefing documents and questionnaire sent out to a number of VCF organisations (challenge groups) Meetings on the 21 st and 24 th September for VCF organisations Questionnaire available on the Council's web-site Attendance at the Social Care Community Forum For Race Equality
Neighbourhood Networks	Briefing documents and questionnaire sent out to a number of VCF organisations (challenge groups) Meetings on the 21 st and 24 th September for VCF organisations Questionnaire available on the Council's web-site
General Public	Questionnaire available on the Council's Consultation Portal 'Talking Point'

3. Feedback from consultation in day centres

In total 185 responses have been received from service users and carers. In the main these were received via completed questionnaires. Three responses were received via letter or e-mail.

Notes were taken at all meetings and this report represents a summary of the recorded comments. Many of the issues raised were common to most of the consultation events and questionnaires. To avoid repetition they are not repeated in detail, although where a new point has been raised this has been included in the summary. The majority of the questionnaires and meetings have focused on service users and their carers who attend the seven centres that were identified in the Executive Board report. However a number of meetings were held with a wider range of interested groups.

3.1 Calverlands Day Centre

Fifty five (55) completed questionnaires were received; 50 from service users and 5 from carers/relatives; one carer responded by letter. Members of staff assisted many of the service users to complete their written responses.

Overall, people were not in agreement with the proposals that Calverlands should develop into a specialist dementia care centre. The majority of people were quite clear that they wanted to stay at Calverlands, because they knew and trusted the staff; that stress and anxiety caused by the changes could be detrimental to their health; that they wanted to stay with their friends and they were concerned that other centres would not be able to meet their needs. Many people saw Calverlands as their lifeline as they had no other friends or family or they had been going there for such a long time. Some people had already moved from other centres and they did not want to move again. People valued the trust they had built up with the staff team at Calverlands and did not want to lose this trust.

Many people stated they did not know enough about other services and day centres, not knowing what they were like or whether their needs could be met there. Additionally, whilst a small number of people expressed the view that they would rather stay at home than go somewhere else, some people clearly thought that a change of use for Calverlands meant that they had to stay at home.

However, some people seemed to adopt a practical approach, and recognising that the services will probably change, stated that if things changed they still wanted to attend a day centre, linking this desire to their particular needs and situations.

There were positive comments in support of some of the ideas being developed in the day centre strategy. Improving services for people with dementia was popular as was more flexible opening, particularly at weekends and into the evening. Outreach services and support for carers were also positively received. Reablement services received widespread support, although people pointed out that Calverlands already provides this service.

Direct Payments were not popular with many of the respondents. People generally did not want to organise and buy their own care and thought that other older people would not want to as well. They were concerned that they might be expected to use the payment on activities they did not want, or that they would be left to make their own arrangements without any support. There appeared to be a range of misunderstandings about direct payments with some comments made in relation to people already in receipt of a pension

A number of people thought that it was not fair that they should have to make changes for other people – they considered that their rights were just as important as other people's.

A number of people commented on the consultation process, suggesting that no one would listen to their views and that the decision had already been taken. Some people stated that they thought the process had been rushed and that they had insufficient time to understand and consider the proposals.

At a consultation meeting at Calverlands more detailed questions and points were raised regarding personalisation. One person asked why more money isn't passed to voluntary organisations so that they can arrange activities for people in their local area. One person wanted to know whether personalisation would lead to more administration and bureaucracy.

3.2 Bramley Lawn DC

Completed questionnaires were received from nineteen service users and two from carers/relatives.

Overall outcomes from the questionnaire at Bramley Lawn

Overall people were not in agreement with the proposals that were presented to them. It should be noted that some people stated that they did not understand the proposals.

Most respondents did not want things to change and they wanted their day centre to remain open. Additionally, people thought that no day centres should close. Many of the supporting comments suggested that people thought they would lose a service and that they would be

increasingly vulnerable if they were not attending a day centre. Further fears expressed concerned the loss of friendships both with people they have met at day centres and the staff they have come to know.

People were concerned about having to change day centres; some people had visited another day centre before and did not find the people welcoming. One person would only move to another day centre if the staff were going too. Another stated that they had lived all their life in that area and did not want to move out to go to another day centre. The staff were well thought of, being good at what they do and providing personal care, entertainment and making people feel safe.

Feeling safe was a theme expressed by a number of respondents who stated they felt safe at the day centre. Travel and transport were raised as issues with people not wanting to travel further to other centres.

3.3 Holbeck DC

Nine service users completed a questionnaire and one service user sent in a letter.

Only one person indicated any agreement with the proposals and that person said that they would move to another day centre but only one of their choice. The significant majority openly stated that they liked nothing about the proposals or commented on what aspects they did not like. However, as with other centres, respondents did not exclude the opportunity to attend another centre, provided they could remain with their friends or continue to attend on the same day.

A number of people commented on the consultation process, saying that they would have liked to be consulted earlier, and in other cases asked for more time to consider the options. At the time the consultation meeting took place people had not had their individual review and many of these comments were being made without going through the options that are open to individuals.

Positive comments were received from people using the Holbeck day centre including suggestions that centres could do more to support carers and a welcome for the plans to increase provision for people with dementia. Other comments concerned the opportunities to advertise the day centres to encourage older people to attend.

At a meeting held at the centre, comments suggested that some people wanted to see decisions made quickly so that they could feel settled, and others commented that they had agreed to attend another centre and felt positive about this.

3.4 Queenswood DC

Only one questionnaire was completed by a service user in respect of Queenswood Day Centre. This centre is not one of the seven centres referred to in the Executive Board report.

The respondent did not agree with the proposals, being happy at the day centre they currently attended. They would like to see young people and older people mixing together.

3.5 Naburn Court DC

Three questionnaires were completed, one by a service user and two by carers/relatives; one carer responded by letter. In addition a petition for saving the centre was signed by 54 people.

Whilst written comments were limited the strength of feeling of some people who use this service was expressed at the consultation meeting held at the centre. These feelings were focused on the consultation process, which some people felt was not a genuine one; that the plans were about saving money rather than improving services; the detrimental impact that change could have for some service users, and a concern expressed by some that other nearby centres are located in places they do not wish to go to. Suggestions were

made on how the centre could attract more service users. A number of people have already changed centres and did not want to go through the same process again.

Service users at Naburn Court do acknowledge that the centre is underused and are open to ideas on how better use can be made of the centre. Ideas included support for carers and specialist care for people with dementia.

3.6 The Green DC

This is not one of the seven centres named in the July 2009 Executive Board report. However, carers of people using this centre were keen that their views were included. The carers completed eight questionnaires. In addition, three carers' meetings were held at the centre which provides specialist dementia services

The carers generally welcomed the changes as they thought that it would improve the service for people they cared for. There was some caution expressed, in that it was suggested that no-one knew how the proposals would work out until they are tried and tested, so the changes would need to be flexible. The carers were very positive about proposals to provide training for them in caring for people with dementia.

Many practical suggestions were made for improving services for people with dementia, including increased staff levels, and specialist training for staff caring for people with dementia. Others commented that they would like to see more details to the plans for improving this area of service. More flexible services were also popular with support available into the evening and at weekends and during public holidays. Flexible arrangements when carers could drop off their relative for morning, afternoon or evening sessions were also identified, as was a rapid response when carers are struggling. Carers would also like to see outreach workers and more support in the community.

There was a view that more services are needed for older people and that where buildings are under-used they could be providing specialist dementia care. People were confused about how a direct payment or individual budget could help them, seeing the money as a cash alternative to a service that they value. There was support for more opportunities to discuss how services can be improved and developed and a wider understanding of some of the issues raised during the consultation.

3.7 Doreen Hamilton DC

A total of 53 questionnaires were received from service users, 4 from members of staff and 3 from carers/relatives. None of the people who responded was in favour of the proposals; comments revealed how strongly felt their opinions are with regard to the proposal for their centre.

Reasons for opposing the proposal for the Doreen Hamilton Centre are similar to those expressed by respondents from other centres. Most frequently mentioned were that the proposed closure would take away people's independence; that service users did not want to attend other centres and that disruption would have a detrimental impact for their health and wellbeing. Some people had already moved from other centres and did not wish to go through the process again.

There is a strong sentiment for the centre and the role that it plays in the local community, and in particular its association with a long-serving City Councillor. Attention was drawn to the money spent on improving the centre in recent years. Other respondents asked that the experience of older people who find themselves in this position is better understood.

Many people felt that alternative services people could buy with their individual budgets were not tried and tested, and that older people in particular need more time to consider the options and understand how it can work for them. Being given cash rather than a service could lead to a risk of financial abuse. Some people wrote of the need for trust, observing

that major changes of this nature need to be discussed in an atmosphere of trust, with people who are prepared to listen.

Similar to views expressed at other centres, issues for carers were frequently highlighted. Some respondents were concerned that changes to day centres could have an impact for carers' employment. Attention was also drawn to the fact that some carers themselves experience ill health and that the added stress surrounding these changes could be detrimental. Knowing that the people they care for are happy and settled at a day centre was an important re-assurance for carers.

Carers attending a consultation session at Doreen Hamilton day centre expressed concerns about the arrangements for the meeting and the time available to study information they had received. They were concerned that the proposals were being rushed and that there was no real opportunity to influence the decision about the future of the centre. Some carers claimed that as they had only a short notice of the meeting many carers and relatives had not been able to participate in the consultation.

At a subsequent meeting held at the centre, participants asked for the process for arriving at a decision to happen quickly to avoid prolonged uncertainty for those people directly affected. People also wanted more information about the alternatives that are available as soon as possible.

3.8 Otley DC

No completed questionnaires have been received from people attending this day centre. However a meeting was held at the centre with Adult Social Care officers and many similar issues were raised during the discussion to those raised at other centres.

Most comments focused on the alternatives to attending a day centre. People were not interested in personal budgets which were seen as too onerous for the service user and others did not think that Neighbourhood Network schemes could provide the same level of service. The small group attending the Otley centre wanted to stay together and accepted that they would have to travel to another centre.

3.9 Woodhouse DC

Woodhouse centre is a purpose built centre in an accessible location, and used as a 7 day centre for people with dementia. It is full with a waiting list. Over 70% of its customers come from the Otley /Rawdon/Guiseley/Yeadon area, necessitating a considerable journey. The proposal to close the Woodhouse centre and to relocate customers at Calverlands has strong support. 10 customers travel from Otley to Woodhouse and have a considerable bus journey, passing by the Calverlands centre whilst en-route. Facilitating dementia care at Horsforth is seen as a positive step forward for the staff and customers from Woodhouse centre.

Some people, notably people from Woodhouse centre, have been strongly positive about the proposals to change the buildings base of the service and indeed, some have expressed their concerns at having to wait for the period of consultation to be completed and further recommendations made. Many feel the proposals are more like "moving house", and are to be welcomed

4. General Responses.

Responses from Service Users

Twelve (12) completed questionnaires were returned from people who did not identify which centre they attended, although in most cases they seemed to be actively using services. As with most of the responses they did not support changes to day services. Again respondents frequently commented that they did not understand the detail of the proposals, or asked for more

information. Many people identified the need for greater flexibility in services and more specialist care for people to help them live independently.

Not many comments were made in respect of direct payments, but it was noted that not a lot of people would be able to use it. In addition money given for personal choices is often wasted and not used for its given purpose. A couple of people took the opportunity to ask if they could move from their present centre to one that was closer to where they live.

Responses from Carers

Six completed questionnaires were received and two general meetings held. The respondents were a mix of carers of people with dementia and those who had other more general needs and the responses reflect this background.

The carers of people with dementia stated that they welcomed the proposals whilst carers of people who did not have dementia did not like the proposals. There is consistent support for the plans to improve services for people with dementia. Again people identified more flexible services with availability 365 days a year, outreach services and more contact with carers and relatives. More information about the availability of services which people could use was also identified as an area for improvement.

Whilst a number of comments have been made across the whole consultation about the mix of people who should use a day centre, there does not seem to be a general consensus on this issue. For example some carers raised concerns that people with a mild dementia should not be sent to a centre attended by people with severe dementia, but this was not a view widely shared by other respondents.

Some carers who attended the open meeting expressed concerns that their views and those of carers who did not have someone attending a day centre were not being heard in this process. Concern was expressed by some people that the meeting was too focused on a campaign to stop day centres from closing rather than an understanding of the issues and finding other solutions. Some carers felt that ways could be found for centres to appeal to a wider group of older people if they were advertised for example. Others sought clarification on whether people were being sent to Neighbourhood Networks or not offered the opportunity to attend a day centre.

Feedback from meetings with Neighbourhood Networks and VCF organisations.

Two open meetings were held with Neighbourhood Networks and voluntary, faith and community sector organisations on the 21st and the 24th September.

Most of the participants involved in this consultation were well informed about the issues and the context for the strategy around day services. They asked a series of detailed questions, not all of which could be answered at the meeting.

Concern was expressed that current eligibility criteria might be disadvantaging a group of people who fall outside eligibility but present particular issues for Neighbourhood Networks schemes, whole rely on volunteers. People requiring physical assistance to mobilise was an example given. Others felt that the views from the sector had been sought in the past but decisions had been taken, specifically past closures of day centres, which they had advised against.

Participants were concerned to know how decisions were being arrived at in the context of demographic change and what was to be expected from the VCF sector if statutory services were closing. Whilst volunteers play an important part in delivering third sector services, more staff will be required to work alongside volunteers if they were providing for greater numbers.

Some participants were concerned that commissioning processes for new services would disadvantage VCF organisations. Some organisations were concerned that the Council was not interested in working with small local groups.

In relation to ethnic minority groups, some participants felt that the local authority did not actively engage with ethnic minority communities and that VCF organisations were needed to engage better with those communities. Concerns were also raised regarding access to individual budgets for BME older people.

5. Response from Elected Members

Twenty-four individual briefing meetings were held with elected members, in the form of briefings, drop-in sessions or attendance at 1:1 meetings and area committees.

Elected members have voiced concerns over the extent and composition of the consultation process. Members expressed concerns that the decisions on the future of day centres had already been made, and that the consultation was not genuine. Some councillors said this was a budget-led plan to make savings.

The policy on supporting carers and in particular the provision for dementia care was welcomed, although some members questioned the need to segregate people with moderate and advanced dementia. Others suggested that people with mild to moderate dementia benefited from attendance at generic centres.

Councillors expressed their support for the day centres undertaking a useful and valuable role and expressed concerns that older people did not wish for changes to be made, and that such changes were likely to be difficult for the people concerned.

Concerns were raised about the growing number of older people potentially needing more day centre usage. Concern was raised in several meetings that the day centres prevented admissions to residential care and were important means of safeguarding vulnerable adults.

Elected members queried why attendance at day centres had fallen and some expressed concern that centres were being deliberately run down. The implementation and use of the Fair Access to Care Services (FACS) eligibility criteria was raised at every meeting attended. Similarly, the care management assessment procedures and arrangements for authorisation of care plans were queried, regarding their roles in reducing numbers of people attending.

The question of whether the Neighbourhood Networks would be required to take on the role of day centres was frequently raised, as was the impact of moving day centre facilities from a particular centre. Councillors also queried the appropriateness and relevance of individual budgets and self directed support.

Elected members raised concerns about specific localities and community facilities. The lack of facilities for people in Bramley, Holbeck and the East was a common concern, alongside an issue over the isolation of the north west of Leeds. The potential of long bus journeys to alternative day centres was a considerable concern to elected members. One councillor asked why we were not reviewing the transport policy.

In noting that buildings may become vacant, several elected members asked that buildings be made available for community use if in future day centres usage ends.

DAY SERVICES FOR OLDER PEOPLE - FINANCIAL, ATTENDANCE & CAPACITY SUMMARY

	Current Position	Original Proposals	Revised Proposals	Notes
Unit Costs (notes 1 & 2)				
Average current unit cost	£79.57	£70.19	£73.09	Per person per day
Average unit costs based on capacity	£53.28			
Full-Year Revenue Savings (notes 3 & 4)		£1.0m	£0.7m	Recurring revenue savings
Value of Assets Released for Alternative Use (note 5)		£2.6m	£1.6m	Asset value (potential one off capital receipt)
Attendances				
Non-EMI Weekday Day Care				
Attendances - Weekday Non EMI 2008/09	73,458	73,458	73,458	
Capacity - Weekday Non EMI	113,910	76,920	87,358	
Non-EMI Weekend Day Care				
Attendances - Weekend Non EMI 2008/09	11,996	11,996	11,996	
Capacity - Weekend Non EMI	24,250	17,500	17,500	
EMI Day Care				
Attendances - Weekdays & Weekend EMI 2008/09	22,494	22,494	22,494	
Capacity - EMI Weekdays & Weekend (note 6)	23,064	23,334	23,334	
Total Attendances 2008/09	107,948	107,948	107,948	Total Attendances in 2008/09 for comparison
Capacity (note 7)	161,224	117,754	128,192	Annual capacity
% of Capacity Filled	67%	92%	84%	

N.B. For notes 1-7, see next page

Notes (Appendix 2):

1. Unit costs based on 2009/10 budgets and 2008/09 occupancy data
2. Unit costs include all costs, some of which would remain if use of some centres ceased
3. Full-year savings are the gross savings, which will be reduced by additional transport & staffing costs at other centres, some of which will be short-term, to give a lower net saving
4. Full-year savings are based on the direct costs that would be saved, excluding costs that would remain e.g. transport & corporate charges
5. The value of assets released reflects the current asset value of the buildings & land
6. In addition to the extra EMI places made available under the proposals, Laurel Bank has also been identified as a centre that has potential to further increase EMI capacity in the future.
7. Capacity relates to the total available number of places at all the day centres in a year.

Preferences of Destination by Day Centre – Appendix 3

Bramley

Radcliffe	25
Radcliffe/Calverlands	1
Radcliffe/Mariners	1
Springfields	1
Blanks	2
total	30

Calverlands

Burley Willows	5
Calverlands	3
Not decided	7
Queenswood Drive	49
Queenswood / Burley Willows	2
Same as Friendship Group	2
Blanks	2
total	70

Holbeck

Springfield	29
Springfield/Rose Farm	2
No preferences	2
Blanks	1
total	34

Woodhouse

Calverlands	47
Blanks	4
total	51