

APPENDIX FOUR

BUDGET OPTION: RESIDENTIAL AND RESPITE CARE

1.0 OUTLINE OF PROPOSAL

- 1.1 This option proposes a modernisation to short breaks for people with disabilities and mental health needs, and will involve the following:

LONG STAY AND RESPITE SERVICES FOR PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES

- 1.2 In the short term, progress the move of the 8 residents from Girtrell Court and 'mothball' 50% of Sylvandale.
- 1.3 In the longer term, subject to consultation with service users and carers and staff, the closure of Sylvandale will result in a further release of resources that will be reinvested into the Community Care Budget, thus making this proposal cost neutral.

RESPITE SERVICES FOR PEOPLE WITH MENTAL HEALTH NEEDS

- 1.4 Funding of £500,000 to maintain the service at Fernleigh was allocated as a one year policy option until 31 March 2013. If the service remains unchanged this will result in a budget pressure in 2013/14. The closure of Fernleigh will require the commissioning of 7 beds in the independent sector at an estimated cost of £160,000; this will need to be accommodated from within the Community Care Budget. However, revenue pressures of £340,000 and capital investment of £900,000 will be avoided.
- 1.5 In the longer term, the closure of both Sylvandale and Fernleigh will result in sufficient release of resources in to the Community Care budget to ensure that the provision of short stay places, for people with learning and physical disabilities and mental health need will become cost neutral and contained within the Community Care Budget.
- 1.2 The re-commissioning of these services will allow the disposal of the Fernleigh and Sylvandale buildings.

2.0 RATIONALE FOR PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The Council currently provides residential respite and crisis services for people with mental health needs. It also provides long stay residential and short breaks services for people with physical disabilities and learning disabilities from three locations. Fernleigh is located in Leasowe, Girtrell Court in Saughall Massie and Sylvandale in Bromborough.
- 2.2 Council run residential services have not been maintained to market standard and have sometimes been seen as less flexible and innovative than alternative types of provision.

APPENDIX FOUR

- 2.3 The Department is seeking to balance the needs of those known to the services and the cost pressure of continuing to provide all three services. The proposals would allow sufficient capacity to “lease” four beds to the NHS to enable them to relocate their crisis bed service to Girtrell Court. It is anticipated that this would generate additional income of £320,000 in a full year.
- 2.4 An analysis of the type of short breaks provided by neighbouring Councils has revealed a different pattern of services to that provided, again reinforcing the need for change.
- 2.5 The proposed changes will seek to offer choice and control to people and to make best use of available resources. The model is predominantly one of Councils purchasing short breaks beds from other providers on an “as needs” basis. No Council maintains more than 2 short breaks beds compared to Wirral’s 8.
- 2.6 Fernleigh currently provides crisis and respite/a short breaks service. NHS Wirral will commission the specific element of the service relating to crisis intervention and the council seeking to offer short breaks/ respite separately. During consultation service users expressed a view that they would prefer a cohesive and combined service to continue, however this is not considered to be best use of council resources

3.0 ACCESSIBILITY OF PROPOSAL

- 3.1 The option in relation to Residential and Respite Care was published alongside a series of other options from the Chief Executive on November 9th 2012. These options were published following an extensive period of consultation during September and October 2012, which focussed on broad principles of policy to gather initial views on how options should be developed.
- 3.2 Residents, staff and stakeholders were provided with a range of information detailing the background, level of savings, potential impact and methods of mitigating any potential negative impact for this and all other options. This information included:

Questionnaire: Split into three sections, the questionnaire provided a one paragraph summary of each option and provided the opportunity for respondents to select one of three choices indicating their opinion on the option.

Summary Paper: Three summary papers (one per ‘theme’) were produced and were available online, at Council buildings and at consultation events. These papers provided a summary of each option, including the level of savings involved and some background information.

Option Paper: For each of the published options, a detailed option paper was available. This paper provided information regarding the background

APPENDIX FOUR

to the option, the potential impact if the option was implemented, proposed methods to mitigate that impact and also the potential savings associated with the option.

- 3.3 The Questionnaire was the primary research tool used in this consultation, and as such it was essential that the document was designed in a way to ensure robust, clear and actionable results. It was also vital to the success of the project to ensure that the questionnaire was produced in a fashion that was accessible, clear and neutral. To ensure that this was the case, Council officers took a number of steps to ensure the questionnaire was externally validated as an effective research and consultation tool.
- 3.4 A draft version of the questionnaire was analysed by an external agency through the Market Research Society. The final draft of the questionnaire was also presented to the members of the Children in Care Council and a group of people with learning disabilities at a Council Day Centre who made further suggestions as to the design and wording of the document.
- 3.5 Further work was also done to ensure accessibility including publishing an interactive Easy Read version, and developing three individual videos, which were used at consultation events, on the Council website and also played through the network of 30 LCD screens in One Stop Shops and Libraries. These videos were designed to more fully explain the context of the options and also provide guidance for how to complete the questionnaire document.

4.0 CONSULTATION PROCESS

- 4.1 An extensive programme of public consultation was completed in relation to all options which were published in November 2012. This programme included over 100 community events at locations such as libraries, supermarkets, cinemas, community centres and children's centres.
- 4.2 Extensive online promotion of the consultation was also completed, with emails being sent to over 13,000 residents, and the consultation also featured prominently on the Council's website which receives in excess of 1,000 hits per day.
- 4.3 Organisations from the Voluntary, Community and Faith sectors were also actively encouraged to take part in this consultation process. Consultation responses were received from organisations such as Wirral Mencap and the Association for Carers' Executive (ACE), based in Wallasey.
- 4.4 A series of detailed meetings, covering all budget options, was also held with key organisations. These organisations included the Carers' Development Committee, Carers Association and the Enabling Fulfilling Lives Group among others.

APPENDIX FOUR

- 4.5 A full programme of presentations and workshops were held in Council Day Centres, which were extremely well attended and involved a full discussion of the proposed option, its potential impact and the mitigation which could be implemented.
- 4.6 These meetings are listed below:

Group / Centre	Date
Carers Association	28.11.12
Carers Development Committee	30.11.12
Highcroft	14.12.12
Eastham Day Centre	7.1.13
Heswall Day Centre	10.1.13
Highcroft	14.1.13
Moreton Day Centre	17.1.13
Enabling Fulfilling Lives Group	18.1.13
Beaconsfield	29.1.13
Fernleigh	30.1.13
Sylvandale	4.2.13
Girtrell Court	7.2.13

- 4.7 The meetings in Fernleigh, Sylvandale and Girtrell Court focussed almost entirely on the option regarding residential and respite care. People attending had been provided with detailed information as to the option well in advance of the meetings and were further provided with a presentation from the Director outlining the issues and rationale behind the option, and were encouraged to ask questions and provide their views.
- 4.8 People using services were also assisted throughout the consultation period to complete the online and paper based questionnaire, in easy read format, with help from other people using services, staff and the videos which were produced.

5.0 CONSULTATION FEEDBACK

- 5.1 In terms of the public consultation process, the response to the questionnaire demonstrated broad approval from Wirral residents, staff and other stakeholders as to the implementation of the options. The table below shows the response to the public consultation:

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
I support this under the circumstances	25.2%	1215
I accept this if it is absolutely necessary	29.6%	1426
I find this completely unacceptable	45.2%	2179

- 5.2 The public consultation also asked people to identify if they considered themselves to be a disabled person. 468 people answered 'Yes' to this

APPENDIX FOUR

question, and the response from those people to the question relating to Residential and Respite Care is provided below. This table shows that people answering the questionnaire who state they have a disability are in fact slightly more in favour of this option than the overall consultation sample.

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
I support this under the circumstances	30.8%	144
I accept this if it is absolutely necessary	23.5%	110
I find this completely unacceptable	45.7%	214

- 5.3 At the series of meetings within the centres affected by this option, listed above, people were provided with a presentation from the Director, which was then followed by a question and answer session with people attending.
- 5.4 Prior to the meeting, following the publication of the budget proposal in November 2012, questionnaires and detailed information relating to this option was distributed throughout the centres to ensure people using the services were provided more than adequate information as to the proposal and sufficient time to submit their response.
- 5.5 This took place throughout November 2012, December 2012 and January 2013, and people were encouraged to either complete a questionnaire, which they were assisted to do by Council officers, or to make their views known in any other fashion which they may prefer. In addition to the public consultation period of November 9th – January 31st, a further series of meetings were held in affected centres, as detailed above.
- 5.6 At the meetings described, a number of concerns and suggestions were provided by people attending, which were answered by the Director who further assured people attending that he would return for further consultation and discussions with people following the Council decision in March.
- 5.7 The physical environment, particularly at Fernleigh, was poor and required substantial investment. However, the support provided at the centres was highly valued, as were the Council employees working there.
- 5.8 The majority of comments received at the meetings stated that people were not concerned where the service was provided, only that the service was continued to be provided and at the same quality. However, people would prefer that all sites remained open and were invested in.

6.0 POTENTIAL IMPACT IDENTIFIED

APPENDIX FOUR

- 6.1 Should recommendations not be agreed, the Council runs the risk of providing services at Sylvandale and Girtrell that people will not use. This will result in additional financial pressure as resources will be locked into empty buildings rather than being reinvested into supporting people in the community.
- 6.2 With regard to Fernleigh the risk is that the Council will miss the opportunity to modernise the service in line with current best practice. This will result in the Council not being able to run the service, not only due to the significant capital investment required to bring the building up to an acceptable standard but also the additional unbudgeted revenue expenditure.
- 6.3 Both of these proposals involve the closure of Council run buildings with the resultant risk to staff employed. Whilst management has been covering vacancies with agency staff there is still a potential impact on the 100 staff directly employed by the Council.

7.0 PROPOSED MITIGATION

- 7.1 A market analysis exercise has been undertaken with a number of Wirral residential providers to ascertain whether there was the capacity within the current market to provide respite care. Although only one of the providers had current capacity, 5 of the 6 contacted indicated that they would be interested in providing a short breaks service.
- 7.2 In addition all people able to access secondary mental health services are now offered a self directed assessment and personal budget which enables them to purchase their own care through a personal assistant or agency.
- 7.3 There is also the potential for the VCF sector to be involved in the provision of these services, in particular as the Department will be looking to commission short stay services within the independent sector.

8.0 SUMMARY

- 8.1 The rationale for the proposal of this option is outlined within this report, in that to ensure the best level of service for people requiring residential and respite care in Wirral then savings must be realised to allow for re-investment into the Community Care budget.
- 8.2 The proposal was widely distributed, allowing for people using the service to respond intelligently within an extended timeframe. The Director of Adult Social Services further attended a series of events within the centres and ensured that everyone wishing to provide their view was provided adequate opportunities to do so.
- 8.3 The consultation and engagement exercise has demonstrated that people using these services, their families and carers are more

APPENDIX FOUR

concerned about ensuring the level of service provision is maintained and improved than preserving the physical buildings the service is provided from.

- 8.4 Therefore it is felt appropriate that a decision can be taken to recommend this option for Council approval, and delegate to the Director of Adult Social Services the responsibility for ensuring that before any closures take place adequate re-provision of support has been identified and agreed for each person using the services affected.