

6 Appleton Drive,
Cresaby,
Wival,
CH49 1SJ.
8th June 2007.

Dear Mrs Ricketts,

I am writing in response to the summary of comments made from feedback of the Meetings of Carers at Meadowcroft.

I would like to reinforce some points already made;

- The correct procedure for consultation was not followed and I feel we were not advised specifically ^{on} how to organise the changes for our relatives i.e more direct information on residential FMI for the future (where, when?)
- Meadowcroft already appears to have mixed respite and residential as new faces have been seen. Why can this not continue? You quoted 10 million pounds
- Minutes of previous meetings suggest you were planning the changes in Sept '06 - why was my mother then given a permanent place in Oct '06? We would then have at least some choice
- Meadowcroft was made permanent in May '06 and by Sept '06 changes were being considered - which means the

My final point, and I feel the one which is most important is that Meadowcroft provides a caring, well-organised and calm environment for my 83 year old Mother and it is not without a great deal of effort that I will be content to uproot her. The relatives of the elderly who reside there are discerning people who have been through emotional turmoil to a) decide to leave their relatives ^{in a home} there and b) have now got to do so again. However, our thoughts are not for ourselves but for the anxiety and possible worsening health ~~wise~~ of our relatives.

I am sure we are a small 'drop in the ocean' budget-wise - and maybe I know nothing about financial matters - but I urge you to reconsider and balance the effects of what you are suggesting. Spend an hour or two at Meadowcroft, then you will fully understand why myself and other carers were so strong in condemning your proposals.

Yours faithfully,
H.L. Coombes

22 Arkborn Drive
Upton
CH49 6J5.

7 June 2007

Dear Ms Ricketts,

I wish to oppose the move to return Meadowcroft to Respite and challenge the fact that due process and practice has not been followed by you. As service users we expect transparency and openness. You have not considered the impact of closure on our relatives in Meadowcroft or indeed of us, their families.

I do not wish my mother to be moved again. I viewed the homes on the list that was originally given and could not consider them for mum. I visited all these homes on 3 occasions. You say that residential care is readily available in the independent sector but it is limited and unacceptable and will stay so if this list remains the same. Places available in the 'future' mean nothing until the names and addresses are available. TIMESCALES mean nothing if this list remains the same.

The only acceptable home on this list is Meadowcroft. If our relatives could stay on at Meadowcroft and no future permanent places offered, ultimately you would meet the demand for respite care as our loved ones are, in the majority, elderly, vulnerable and very ill.

Yours sincerely
Margaret Saffers (and family)

copy to: The Quality Assurance Unit.

16 Waverley Nook Road,
Liverpool
L15 7LQ.
0151 722 4260.

Re MEADOWCROFT

Dear

I am writing to indicate my very grave disquiet at the news given to the families, on 15th May, that Meadowcroft was to become respite care in October 2008, result being the present residents will have to make other arrangements

This move would be very distressing and could play a part in a decline in their condition. The families attended meetings with Jenny Ricketts and were informed plans had begun before Christmas 01 - we were told on 15th May - Mrs Ricketts reading from a single copy of a consultative document.

Last year I visited homes on Wirral very limited number and sufficient to say the relief on finding Meadowcroft was indescribable

The professional standards of all staff and a natural respect for residents is outstanding - The responsibility and sorrow of having to find residential care for my mother was helped by her entering Meadowcroft.

We ask as families of the residents, who in their youth have been good neighbours and contributed much to their communities be allowed to stay at Meadowcroft, perhaps by a phasing in scheme. As they are elderly and ill the respite care situation would be resolved without the residents losing a constancy in the confusion of their lives as victims of dementia

Yours sincerely
Ann Hamada Mrs.

Department of Adult Social Services
Jenny Ricketts Care Service Manger
Westminster House
Hamilton Street Birkenhead CH41 5FN

Mrs E M Price
80 Heygarth Road Eastham Wirral
CH62 8AF
Ref. No JR/EB/MCROFT 2

11th June 2007

Dear Jenny Ricketts,

In reply to your letter "Feedback "Feedback from meetings held at Meadowcroft"

I cannot understand why relatives have not been involved in your consultation Re. "The Closures "

I would be most grateful if you could tell me where these new E.M.I. residential homes will be situated and availability.

At the moment in Meadow, there are several new residents for a short stay period; surely this is mixing respite care with permanent residents, why can it not be continued, as it seems to be working well at this moment in time.

You state that Meadowcroft will have provided permanent care for the two and a half years.

My husband will need permanent care for many more years to come, so why close Meadowcroft to accommodate respite care when Fernlea was providing adequate care for them.

The question is, why move my husband and others from their home at Meadowcroft ?

I have gone through the respite care period with my husband and now I desperately need permanent care for him, I do not understand the logic of all this disruption.

I can only think that we are all numbers not humans.

Yours Sincerely

E.M. Price

