

REPORT FOR: CABINET

Date of Meeting:	13 September 2012
Subject:	Strategic Review of Learning Disability Accommodation
Key Decision:	Yes [More than £500k savings]
Responsible Officer:	Paul Najsarek, Corporate Director, Community Health and Wellbeing
Portfolio Holder:	Councillor Margaret Davine, Portfolio Holder for Adult Social Care, Health and Wellbeing
Exempt:	No, apart from Appendix 3, which is exempt by virtue of paragraph 1 of Part 1 of Schedule 12 A to the Local Government Act 1972 in that it contains information relating to individuals
Decision subject to Call-in:	Yes
Enclosures:	Appendix 1: Definition of registered care and supported living Appendix 2: Reviews in other areas Appendix 3: Client Information - confidential information Appendix 4: Initial Equalities Impact Assessment

Section 1 – Summary and Recommendations

This report sets out recommendations for a review of six residential care services for people with learning disabilities provided by the Borough. Work undertaken so far has considered the model of care and support that is needed in the future, ensuring that local needs are met in the most effective way possible and based on national policy guidance and best practice. The aim is to deliver a modernised service that offers improved outcomes and excellent value for money.

Supporting the most vulnerable in community is a key priority for Harrow council. The council will continue to ensure that people receive the care and support they need to be as independent as possible and to be treated with dignity and respect. Through this report we are seeking to ensure that we continue to safeguard the needs of people with a learning disability by ensuring that services are as high quality, efficient and effective as possible.

These recommendations will form one part of an emerging Community Living Strategy for the Community, Health and Wellbeing department. This links together a range of support and accommodation services designed to support adults with social care needs to live independently within the community.

Recommendations:

Cabinet is requested to approve the following:

1. The development of a model for care and support within the residential care homes provided by the borough. This model will focus on providing high quality, individually tailored support to service users who are most vulnerable
2. That through the development and implementation of this new service model the council achieves between £600k and £1m towards Medium Term Financial Strategy savings of £2.25m from residential services
3. A formal consultation exercise is carried out on service proposals with current service users, their families and potential users of services, e.g. young people and their families in transition from children to adult services
4. Staff and unions are consulted on the proposals for each service
5. The Corporate Director for Community Health and Wellbeing is authorised, in consultation with the relevant Portfolio Holder(s), to:
 - Design and implement the consultation plan for residents, families, staff and unions
 - Undertake more detailed work to fully develop the model of respite care to ensure that it has the most positive impact
 - Prepare a final report with the results of the consultation and detailed recommendations for consideration by Cabinet in February 2013.

Reason: (For recommendation)

To develop a new model for in-house care and support for people with learning disabilities that will:

- Enable local residential service provision for adult with learning disabilities that responds to current and future demand for specialist residential services
- Contribute to the achievement of Medium Term Financial Strategy savings of £2.275m in relation to residential care
- Ensure that meaningful consultation is carried out prior to the reconfiguration of in-house residential services
- Consider whether there are any residents who may be supported to live more independently.

Section 2 – Report

2.1 Introduction

Supporting and protecting people who are most in need is a key priority for the London Borough of Harrow.

This report is one part of a Community Living Strategy for the Community, Health and Wellbeing department. This strategy will support the achievement of £775k saving from residential care services in 2013/14 and £1.5m in 2014/15 as set out in the council's Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS). These savings will be achieved through a wider strategic review of residential and nursing care services for all groups of vulnerable adults.

The strategic review will focus on opportunities to improve efficiency and support more people to be independent through improved use of telecare, forms of independent living with housing and support and initiatives to further develop the local market of services.

At present we provide a range of accommodation options for people with a learning disability, including direct provision of a number of residential care homes. These internally provided services support a range of vulnerable people, including some who have very complex and challenging needs. These services are the main focus of this review.

Through our robust quality assurance processes we know that the services we provide are of a high standard and deliver excellent support to those that use them. Through this review we will ensure that we are able to continue to provide high quality care and support to those most in need. We believe that by improving the way services work and making them more efficient we can enhance the outcomes that they are able to achieve and make them more financially efficient.

2.1.1 Background

Harrow's internally provided residential care services were previously managed externally from the council through a block contract with an organisation known as Support for Living, previously called "the Consortium" or HCSN.

These external arrangements were in place for more than 10 years, they were established as a direct consequence of financial regulations relating to service user charges. These charges, which later changed, had meant that council run services were deprived of income that was available to other service providers. In this way the decision to outsource the service was appropriate at the time, however over time the service became costly and inefficient.

They were brought back in-house, in March 2010 in order to support the following objectives:

- Align service provision with the commissioning direction for learning disability
- Achieve cost efficiencies
- Shift the balance of residential care and supported living provision
- To reduce out of area placements, plan for transition and other local initiatives

In 2009 lead commissioning responsibility for learning disability services passed to the local authority, with a transfer of social care funding from the PCT under a section 75 arrangement. This transfer has provided a strengthened role for the local authority and has simplified many of the arrangements in relation to learning disabilities. This places a clearer strategic focus on the local authority to manage commissioning arrangements and improve services for people with learning disabilities.

In addition to these residential care services we also directly provide supported living services for people with learning disabilities, and Shared Lives which is an adult placements service for adults with disabilities. People with learning disabilities in the borough also live in a range of housing types including nursing care, sheltered housing, extra care and independent accommodation with floating support. All adults with a learning disability in the Borough have a person centred review each year, with the aim of supporting them to make choices about where they would wish to live amongst other things.

2.2 Current situation

This review focuses on six residential services, directly provided by the London Borough of Harrow, for people with learning disabilities. These services can support a total of 40 people permanently and include the provision of residential 9 respite beds. The total net budgeted cost of the current services is £3,725,944¹ including all management recharges. We receive £174k of income from client contributions. At least one of the services we are reviewing may be deregistered in the future. Service user contributions are calculated differently for these types of services and would be calculated

¹ Based on net budget for 2011-12

under the Council's Fairer Contributions Policy. The unit costs of the services vary considerably due to different factors. For example units with fewer beds often have a higher unit cost because they still need staff cover at all times. However some variations are due to historical staffing arrangements and are one reason that we need to review the way that services work.

All of these services are registered to ensure compliance with national standards on the health, safety and well being of service users. They focus on safeguarding those most vulnerable and at risk in society. The principal aims are to treat people as individuals and offer support in a person centred way. They aim to enable service users to acquire the emotional, psychological, social and practical skills needed to allow them to enjoy the quality of life they aspire to, participating in their local community in a safe, secure and stimulating environment.

All of the services are regulated by the Care Quality Commission (CQC). At their last inspections all of the homes were rated as performing well, and have high standards of living. All were seen to be meeting all required standards and to be protecting residents from harm. Inspections have identified good practice in a number of areas.

The services undergo robust quality assurance processes. These include residents surveys, face to face meetings with families and carers, audits to ensure continuous adherence to all CQC standards.

Within this review there are different ways of describing the level of needs of people with a learning disability. One way is of describing needs in terms of Fair Access to Care (FACs). FACs is an assessment of the risk to someone's independence, their eligibility to receive social care in order to keep them safe from harm. We currently support people with critical and substantial needs under FACs. On the other hand descriptions of high, medium and low needs relate to the level of support that people need in their day to day lives. These often correspond, but frequently do not. This is because people with a learning disability may be quite independent and be able to do most things for themselves, but also be at great and imminent risk if left unsupported. Everyone who uses the services in this review have been assessed as eligible for social care support under FACs.

This report focuses on the care and support delivered in services. In the report we refer to accommodation including some of which is not fit for purpose. In the longer-term we will seek to undertake further work to identify more suitable properties.

The table below gives the basic details of these services:

Name of home	Address	Bed No.	Level of need	Property owner	Total Budget 11/12 £	Net Cost per head inc client contr £/wk	Gross Cost per week excl client contribution £/wk	Provision
Home A	South Harrow	7	Medium / Low	Stadium Housing (Formerly Network)	374,654	1,029	1,094	Registered care home for up to 7 people with learning disabilities
Home B	Pinner	20	High	Harrow Council	1,395,900	1,342	1,393	11 long term residential beds, 9 residential respite beds. There is a small day service for up to nine people – which will be considered in a separate review.
Home C	Stanmore	8	Medium / High	Genesis	643,174	1,546	1,636	Registered care home for up to 8 people with learning disabilities aged 18-65 or 65+. A small on site day service is also provided.
Home D	Harrow	8	High	Genesis	774,045	1,861	1,932	Registered care home for up to 8 people with learning disabilities and autism.
Home E	Stanmore	3	Medium / Low	Harrow Council	264,795	1,697	1,788	This service provides residential care to three people with moderate learning disabilities.
Home F	Stanmore	3	Medium / Low	Harrow Council	273,376	1,752	1,861	This service is currently empty, as residents have moved out. We are currently identifying people who would be appropriate placements.
Total		49			3,725,944			

2.3 Statutory Framework and Guidance

The council has a statutory duty to provide, or procure access to, residential services to those who are assessed as eligible. The council is also legally required to consult on proposed changes to residential care services. Please see the Legal Implications section below for further details.

The personalisation agenda as outlined in **Putting People First** in 2007 continues to provide the driving strategic force for adult social care in England. One of the key expectations of this agenda is that people will be supported to live as independently as possible, providing them maximum choice and control. Within this there is an assumption to provide as many people as possible with support to live in settings other than residential care, and that where residential care is provided that it should be a “personalised” as possible.

In January 2011 the **Think Local, Act Personal** Partnership built upon Putting People First with an updated framework for delivering more personalised social care. This framework expressed the need for improvements in a range of areas, including more flexible alternatives to residential care, more personalisation with residential settings and greater control and flexibility for children in transition to adult services.

In relation to Learning Disabilities the key strategic framework for local authorities is **Valuing People Now** which was published in 2009. This places accommodation as one of The Big Priorities for people with a learning disability. This repeats the importance of people being given choice about where they live, and to have their needs considered in the plans of local authorities for local housing.

In 2010, best practice guidance was published by the Department of Health on setting eligibility criteria for adult social care (“the Prioritising Need Guidance”). This guidance is published in the context of promoting personalisation and choice and makes clear that this will only be appropriate when support is put into universal services and early intervention and prevention. It also highlights the importance of utilising all relevant community resources, including the voluntary sector.

This framework sets out clearly the importance of ensuring that people are supported to be as independent as possible and to ensure that services are tailored to individual needs and abilities. It will be important to ensure that changes implemented following consultation are in line with this framework.

2.4 Why a change is needed

2.4.1 Increasing Demand

There are a number of demographic and social factors affecting the population of people with learning disabilities which demand more effective use of resources to meet growing and changing needs and aspirations.

We have used a range of data sources including local sources and the national (Projecting Adult Needs and Service Information) dataset to understand demographic and demand changes. This section provides a short summary of the key factors relevant to this review:

- The number of people in Harrow aged 18-64 predicted to have a learning disability is projected to increase from 3,650 in 2011 to 3,772 by 2015. This is an increase of approximately 30 people in each year.
- Those expected to have a severe learning disability and therefore most likely to require residential or nursing care is set to increase from 217 in 2011 to 227 in 2014.
- The number of people with a moderate learning disability, who are likely to require some form of housing with support will increase from 598 to 626.
- The number of people aged over 65 with a moderate or severe learning disability will increase by 20% from 89 to 107. This will present a challenge for services as people with learning disabilities frequently have increasingly complex and multiple needs as they grow older.
- The number of people with an autistic spectrum disorder in Harrow is expected to increase by 96 between 2011 and 2020. In addition improved diagnosis, identification and understanding will mean that more people with spectrum conditions become known to adult services.
- We already know of 19 young people who will be coming through transition to adult services and needing accommodation based services in the next three years. They are children with very complex needs who will need specialist care and support. We also know that there are many other children who we do not yet know about if they will need accommodation.
- Advances in medical treatment mean more young people with very complex; multiple needs are surviving into adulthood. More young people are being assessed with more complex and dual disabilities such as learning disability and mental health, autism, challenging behaviour or severe physical disabilities.
- Changing aspirations among younger people with learning disabilities and their families, are leading to demands for housing within the communities rather than institutional settings. The use of Personal Budgets is particularly important for this group of young people.
- We are expecting further demand from new families moving into the borough as a result of welfare support changes – particularly as a result of recent changes to housing benefit which may encourage families to move to Harrow from inner London.

All of these factors point to a picture of increasing demand for services, with a particular focus on services for those with profound and complex learning disabilities and those young people transitioning into adulthood. This demonstrates a need for a wider range of housing options and increased specialisation. Overwhelmingly this also makes it very clear that the council

must be as efficient as possible in ensuring that it is able to meet the needs of the most vulnerable people in Harrow.

2.4.3 Service Availability

Alongside the council there are a further 194 units of accommodation for people with a learning disability in the borough. These units provide an alternative to directly provided services.

We have a considerable experience of working with these services, both in terms of making placements, quality assuring them, and dealing with any safeguarding issues that arise.

Our analysis of these services includes the following findings:

- The majority of local services are provided by a small number of local providers, with very few national or larger providers who have more experience and skills in managing specialist needs. High property prices and lack of land within the borough means that specialist providers have not been opening services in recent years.
- Only three local services focus on supporting people with challenging needs. Given the personalisation agenda the council only seeks residential care for those with particularly challenging needs including severe challenging behaviour, severe autism, and profound and multiple needs
- There is a lack of availability in services currently. Of the four placements made for young people aged 18-25 in 2011/12 all were placed out of the Borough as there was no local provision that could meet the complex needs presented.
- Despite a number of services being available locally, the majority do not provide for the sorts of needs that are needed for Harrow services users. A number of out of borough placements are made because it is difficult to find a local service that is fit for purpose, and tailored to provide high quality services to meet individual needs.
- There are 58 people living in 40 residential services outside of the borough. These out of area placements tend to be more costly than those in Harrow. These placements may be far from the community and the families of the service user.
- Supported Living² encompasses a range of services designed to help people to retain their independence in their local community. The market for Supported Living services is relatively new both locally and across the country. They are not regulated by the Care Quality Commission and at present we do not have full confidence in a number of them. The council is often involved in investigating safeguarding incidents or concerns that relate to clients of other councils.

² See Appendix 1 for definition of registered care and supported living

2.4.4 Market Financial Analysis

The table below is an analysis of the costs of Harrow based accommodation services for people with a learning disability. This table identifies the costs of services that focus on supporting people with high, medium/high and medium/low needs.

Service-Needs Level	Internal - weekly cost	Internal median - weekly cost	External Range - weekly cost	External median - weekly cost
High	£1,393-£1,932	£1,662	£1,392 - £2029	£1,600
Medium/High	£1,636	£1,636	992 - 1325	£1,287
Medium/Low	£1,094-£1,861	£1,477	563 - 1585	£1,245

It should be noted that these comparisons are based on small numbers of services, and simplistic descriptions. The variation in costs shown in the table above relate to a number of different factors. These include the number of residents in the service, the level and specialisation of support being provided, along with issues such as building location and value. For the external services potential profit or budget surpluses can be additional factors.

Another way to benchmark the costs of services is to look at the most recent placements made and analyse their costs. In the past year we have placed five young people in transition into residential services. These packages have been subject to detailed negotiation to manage costs, but have cost between £1875 per week and £2300 per week (median cost of £1950). If we had been able to place all of these five people in the services in this review we may have saved approximately £288 per week per placement or the equivalent of £75,168 per year. We know that there are at least three more young people who will need this type of support in the coming year.

We can take the following findings from this data:

- A clear conclusion from the information is that the council is not able to compete with the external market of services when providing residential care services for people with lower levels of needs.
- The table suggests that the costs of services to accommodate adults with high level needs, such as those with autism or challenging behaviour are broadly comparable in the council to external services. However analysis of recent placements suggest that it would be less expensive for the council to provide than the external market.
- The council only provides one service to people with medium/high level of needs. The table suggests that the price of providing this support is significantly higher than the market place.
- The conclusion from this information would be that where the council directly provides residential services then they may be most cost effective or competitively priced, when focusing on high and complex needs

Findings from sections 2.4.3 and 2.4.4 suggest some key points. Firstly it is clear that there is continued demand for the services being delivered and that there is not a readily available market of local services to replace them.

Secondly we can make a clear conclusion that it is important for the council to focus services to those with high or complex needs. It also suggests that we should be seeking alternatives, such as supported living for those with lower needs but who still need accommodation based services.

2.5 The Service Model

This report recommends the development of a coherent model of services that focuses on supporting people with learning disabilities in the borough who have the most complex needs.

This model has been arrived at through ongoing consultation and engagement with service users over a number of years and engagements with staff of the services as well as detailed analysis that have formed part of this review.

The following principles are key aspects of the model we propose to deliver through the review:

1. To improve outcomes for individuals and enable them to live as independently as they are able. Services should be more tailored to individual clients needs and support them to have more choice and control over their lives
2. To support people to continue to live with their families where possible by providing good quality residential respite. We are striving to support as many people as possible to live outside of residential care. Improving residential respite services is therefore a priority
3. Services will continue to enable service users to acquire the emotional, psychological, social and practical skills needed to allow them to enjoy the quality of life they aspire to, participating in their local community in a safe, secure and stimulating environment
4. In-house services should be focused on supporting people with the high or complex needs. Market analysis and financial comparisons undertaken for this review have shown that where the council directly provides services to people with the most complex needs that they are most cost effective and commercially viable.
5. That we should seek alternative ways to support people who have lower levels of support needs such as supported living, or other community based services.

2.6 Options considered

2.6.1 Options

There have been a number of options considered for each of the services covered by this review. In shaping the proposals that follow in this report, and

upon which we intend to consult we have assessed how to achieve the best outcomes and best value.

In arriving at these proposals we have considered the following potential options for each:

- **Maintain the current model** – where the service is clearly meeting needs and delivering the model required by the borough. We will seek to continuously improve these services
- **Change model** – where building use is not considered best or fitting the needs of the service users within the unit but could be used to meet other needs
- **De-registration** – where the service supports clients who are more able and could live within a supported living environment and so have greater opportunities to gain independence, choice and control
- **Closure** – where a building or service is not fit for purpose and/or surplus to need
- **Outsource** – where evidence suggests that the market is able to provide a similar or improved service at less cost or a higher quality

Within each of the services detailed below we have outlined which option has been proposed and the rationale.

As part of the analysis for this review we have looked at the approaches taken in other areas of the country in relation to learning disability services. Due to the financial climate many areas are undertaking similar reviews and are pursuing a range of options including closures, out-sourcing and introducing additional charges. Appendix 2 gives a summary of some of these.

2.6.4 Service Analysis & Options

The following section includes information and evaluation of the services and the proposed options for consultation:

2.6.2.1 Home A

This is a registered service providing residential care for up to seven adults with low to medium support needs who require support and would be suitable for a supported living plus service.

There is wheelchair access into the service; however once inside the accommodation is too cramped to allow access to other areas. The building is rather cramped, communal areas are small, and is not suitable to be a residential care home.

When the service was initially established it was intended as a unit for adults with challenging behaviour.

The staff team account for 87% of service expenditure, with 2% on premises costs and 10% on other costs. The gross cost per bed per week is £1094 with a staff to client ratio of 1:1.

Clients

A summary of the service user group and their needs is set out in Appendix 3

Conclusion and proposal – Home A

The proposal is to consider **de-registration** for Home A and for the service to operate as a supported living environment. This would require an application to CQC to achieve in addition to statutory consultation with service users and families.

Rationale

This proposal is in line with the Statutory Framework and Guidance contexts as set out in sections 2.3 of this report and in particular the opportunity for people to be more independent within their own home. This also supports the findings of section 2.4 of the report that the council should seek alternatives to residential care for people with lower support needs.

Service User Outcomes

This proposal is expected to support significantly improved outcomes for the users of the service. People will be supported to gain independence and to have much greater choice and control over their day to day activities, finance and support.

Financial Impact - see Section 3.1.2

Staffing Implications – see Section 3.1.4

2.6.2.2 Home B

This is a registered service providing Residential care for 11 adults with low, medium and high needs and nine adults with low, medium and high needs requiring short stay/respice services.

The building has recently been refurbished and has wheel-chair access. It is large and also has a day care facility. The building feels impersonal due to size. It is not considered to be of good quality, or in-line with the type of accommodation we could be providing for people with learning disabilities. The day service element is funded through a separate budget is not covered in this review. This is subject to a separate review.

When the service was initially established it was intended to be for adults with multiple and complex needs. The day service was intended to focus on people with autism. The gross cost per bed per week is £1393.

The staff team account for 83% of service expenditure, with 2% on premises costs and 15% on other costs. There is a staff to client ratio of 1:0.8.

Current Clients

A summary of the service user group and their needs is set out in Appendix 3

Conclusion & Proposal – Home B

The proposal is to **change** the **model** of the service to separate the residential, respice and day care elements. We will consider how the separation of the different service elements can be achieved.

Rationale

There have been and are a number of concerns and issues with Home B expressed over a number of years. These feature mainly on the nature of the building and service design and the impact that this has upon service user satisfaction.

There has been specific feedback from service users, carers and staff about the respice service being co-located with the residential service. This arrangements of having residential respice alongside the permanent residential accommodation, makes it harder to achieve a settled environment in the house necessary to support people to achieve their potential.

Residential respice plays an important part in ensuring that people are able to continue to live with their families. As outlined in Section 2.4 of this report we are striving to support as many people as possible to live outside of residential care. Therefore improving residential respice needs to be a priority.

Service User Outcomes

The quality of residential respice provision in the Borough has been a source of concern for service users and carers in transition as well as other ages. The proposal to move residential respice to another, more suitable property will significantly improve this.

Separating the different elements of the service is expected to impact on residents in a very positive way due to significantly improved living environment. The effect of this should not be under-estimated, a stable environment is a key factor in supporting adults with a learning disability to feel safe and secure and to be able to realise their potential.

Financial Impact - see Section 3.1.2

Staffing Implications – see Section 3.1.4

2.6.2.3 Home C

This is a registered service providing residential and day care for eight adults with medium to high level needs. The service has developed a specialism for supporting older people with learning disabilities and additional support needs. The service has been commended in the past for high quality support, and for the lifestyle it supports its residents to have.

The service has wheel chair access. The accommodation is generally considered to be in good condition, although the lay-out is not currently practical for communal use. When the service was initially established it was intended to be an assessment service to support people to move on to greater independence.

CQC have not inspected this service yet. However all standards were found to be met during their assessment of declarations and evidence supplied by the service during registration. The current gross cost per bed per week is £1636.

The home also has a day care facility. This is funded through a separate budget and is not covered in this review. However this is subject to a separate review.

The staff team account for 86% of service expenditure, with 3% on premises costs and 11% on other costs such as central over-heads. There is a staff to client ratio of 1.63:1

Current Clients

A summary of the service user group and their needs is set out in Appendix 3

Conclusion & Proposal – Home C

The proposal is that we consider **changing the model** of the service and considering whether the needs of the current residents are being appropriately met including whether the service can respond to the expected increase in dependency of the older people living at the unit. In addition we would like to consider the future use of the building for example whether it could be considered as part of the change of model for Home B

Rationale

The current service is highly expensive considering the level of needs of people supported. As an indication, the Borough has recently signed up to the West London Alliance Accredited Provider Scheme for residential accommodation for older people, which puts a ceiling price of £466 on residential care for older people as opposed to £1,546 which is the cost of the current service. This option would deliver 57% (£435k) of the required MTFS saving for this review.

Service User Outcomes

The current residents of the service will continue to receive support tailored to their current needs. We do need to consider the likelihood of need increasing and therefore services will need to be able to respond to increased complexity as people's health deteriorates and their needs increase.

Financial Impact - see Section 3.1.2

Staffing Implications – see Section 3.1.4

2.6.2.4 Home D

This is a registered service providing care for eight adults with medium to high level needs. The service specialises in supporting adults with Autistic Spectrum Disorders, some with challenging needs, and is currently accredited with the National Autistic Society.

The building is old with large spaces downstairs. There is some wheelchair access. When the service was initially established it was intended to support adults with severe autism and challenging needs.

CQC have not inspected this service yet. However all standards were found to be met during their assessment of declarations and evidence supplied by the service during registration. The gross cost per bed per week is currently £1,932.

The staff team account for 83% of service expenditure, with 4% on premises costs and 13% on other costs such as central over-heads. There is a staff to client ratio of 2.88:1.

Current Clients

A summary of the service user group and their needs is set out in Appendix 3

Conclusion & Proposal – Home D

The proposal is to continue to **maintain the current model** of the service delivering high quality care to people with autism and challenging behaviour. The service would be further developed to become a flagship complex autism specialist service. The market and demography information in this report clearly demonstrate the need for services for those with autism. This is a local, high quality service, which has the potential to support those with the most complex needs effectively in the community.

There would be a need to review the needs of individuals and consider alternative alternatives that are more appropriate to support those with moderate rather than complex needs.

Rationale

There is a clear need for services for people with autism in the Borough as stated earlier in this report, in particular there is a need for people with complex and challenging needs which demonstrate both a lack of local provision and that the council should focus services on providing support to those with highest needs.

Service User Outcomes

The proposal is expected to support service users to continue to achieve positive outcomes. The increasing specialisation of the service will ensure that it is able to support people effectively and in line with best practice.

If there are residents, who have lower or moderate support needs we would want to consider whether a more to alternative accommodation that is more suited to their support needs would be appropriate. This would be social work led on the basis of individual assessments involving the service user and their family. It is expected that any move would improve outcomes for individuals involved and will enable them to live more independently.

Financial Impact - see Section 3.1.2

Staffing Implications – see Section 3.1.4

2.6.2.5 Homes E and F

This service is provided in two adjoining semi-detached properties. It was formally considered as a six bed residential unit – though now considered as two separate, but linked, three bedded establishments. The service at Home F supports three people with medium support needs and does not have wheelchair access. Home E currently has no residents as we have been planning for changes to meet the needs of younger people with high needs.

When the service was initially established it was intended to provide long-term accommodation for people moving out of institutionalised settings. The buildings are small, terraced houses with steep stairs, which do not lend themselves well to residential care. In each the communal areas are limited because a down-stair room is needed as the third bedroom due to the limited size of upstairs rooms. The gross cost per bed per week is £1788 (Home E) and £1861 (Home F).

The staff team account for 86% of service expenditure, with 7% on premises costs and 7% on other costs such as central over-heads. There is a staff to client ratio of 1.33:1.

Current Clients

A summary of the service user group and their needs is set out in Appendix 3

Conclusion & Proposal – Homes E and F

The proposal is to **change the model** of the service and assess whether the needs of the current residents are being appropriately met at Home F. We would then want to consider the best option for Homes E and F.

One of the options may be to use Homes E and F to accommodate young people in transition from children to adult services who have a need for housing with support. The building is not suitable for people with mobility issues and is becoming unsuitable for the current user group.

In addition to whether the unit meets the needs of the residents at Home F we need to consider whether the unit should still have six bed spaces or whether these should be reduced to four. In addition whether the unit needs to be registered care or supported living.

Rationale

We do not believe that the current accommodation is suited to the needs of those that currently live in the service. As needs of the clients at Home F increase, health deteriorates and mobility becomes more of an issue the building is becoming increasingly unsuitable. We would like to consider whether alternative accommodation would meet their increasing needs.

Demographic information earlier in the report clearly demonstrates there is an urgent need for services for young people with complex needs that are coming through transition. This group represent the best solution for the use of this building, as their mobility is less of an issue for a younger age group who often flourish in smaller units with fewer people living in them.

Service User Outcomes

A summary of the service user group, their needs and outcomes is set out in Appendix 3

Financial Impact - see Section 3.1.2

Staffing Implications – see Section 3.1.4

2.7 Summary of Proposed Options for each service

Home A – consider whether to **deregister** the service to supported living accommodation.

Home B – consider options to **change the model** of the service and separate the residential, respite and day services to refocus the service as a registered residential service for people with profound and complex needs.

Home C – consider **changing the model** of the service and considering whether the needs of the current residents are being appropriately met.

Home D – **maintain the current model** of the service to enable it to become a flagship complex autism specialist service.

Homes E and F – consider **changing the model** of the service and assess whether the needs of the current residents are being appropriately met

2.7.1 Impacts of proposals

Financial Savings – the proposals would achieve significant savings whilst improving services and improving outcomes for service users. In the proposals as set out these would come from:

- de-registration
- reducing the beds in one service
- supporting people to move to services more suitable to their needs

It is anticipated that the proposals as set out would save in the region of £600k to £1m per year. Should these proposals be changed following consultation, alternative proposals would be required to achieve similar levels of saving.

Service User Impacts – the proposals are designed to have positive impacts on service users, and are all based upon tailored approaches to meeting their individual needs.

These changes would all be made sensitively and with social work input to ensure that they are handled properly. However they still have potential to cause significant concern to individuals and their families as a change such as a home move can cause disruption. This issue is one that will be central to consultation.

An important aspect of these moves is expected to move people to services which are designed to meet needs of a particular level. For example at present there are a number of people living in services designed for those with high or complex needs, but whose needs are significantly lower. This type of arrangement can not only be dis-empowering for the individual, but is also inefficient and fails to fully utilise a specialist resource.

Supporting Demographic Pressures – as outlined in section 2.4 of this report there are significant challenges for the council to face in meeting changing needs in the coming years. In particular we are expecting to need to support more people with complex needs, and more young people who are coming through transition into adulthood.

The current proposals would support these challenges by focusing services increasingly upon those with complex needs, and those coming through transition. The proposed changes to Homes E and F would increase the number of places for young adults with a learning disability, whilst the changes to other services to focus more on complex needs will enable more people to remain in the borough and therefore close to family and other connections. The proposal to transform the respite service is also expected to support more families of young adults with a learning disability to support them to live at home with support.

2.8 Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA)

The Council is yet to carry out formal consultation regarding these proposals - approval to do so is one recommendation of this report.

Full consultation will take place subject to Cabinet agreement to carry out consultation with service users, families and staff. As part of the consultation we would carry out a further EqIA, building upon the initial EqIA reported below.

2.8.1 Equalities

Section 149 of the Equalities Act 2010 created the public sector equality duty.

Section 149 states:-

- (1) A public authority must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to:*
 - (a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;*
 - (b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;*
 - (c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.*

When making decisions in relation to service provision and in particular changing policies and the way services are provided, the Council must take account of the equality duty and in particular any potential impact on protected groups.

An initial equalities impact assessment (EqIA) has been carried out. The key impacts identified were as follows:

- (Age) A number of residents living within the in-house residential services are over the age of 64 years. This is a particularly the case at Home C where there is a proposal consider whether the current accommodation will be able to continue to meet needs as they are likely to increase in the future. This may lead to the recommendation that people be supported to move to alternative accommodation that would be able to meet future needs as they increase. The impact will depend upon the response of each individual service user and his/her family/advocate to the proposed change. For some people the proposal could be very difficult, whilst for others it could be viewed as extremely positive and an opportunity for better outcomes. With the recommendation of refocusing in-house services on people with the most

complex needs there is likely to be a positive impact on young people who currently have to move out of the Borough in order to have their needs met. Staying local is likely to support young people to maintain local links and make keeping in touch with family more manageable **All changes would need to be undertaken sensitively; working alongside staff and service users and carers to manage change effectively and to undertake all required processes. This will involve consultation as appropriate with families as well as service users, transition plans for those expected to move and training plans for staff. Decisions will be social work led on the basis of individual assessments**

- (Disability) All people living in the in-house residential care homes have a learning disability and some people have additional physical or sensory needs. Impacts will be different in each of the services affected by the review. Some people may need to move to alternative accommodation more suited to their assessed needs. For some people even the thought of change may be very difficult, whilst for others it could be viewed as extremely positive. Some people have already indicated that they would like to experience more choice and control over their lives and this is one of the overall aims of the residential review. Refocusing of residential respite service is likely to have a positive impact for those people who use it. In particular young people with disabilities may be supported to remain at home with their families supported by the provision of high quality respite services. **All changes will need to be undertaken sensitively; working alongside staff and service users and carers to manage change effectively and to undertake all required processes. This will involve consultation as appropriate with families as well as service users, transition plans for those expected to move and training plans for staff. Decisions will be social work led on the basis of individual assessments**

This initial Equality Impact Assessment identifies the needs for a further EqIA to be undertaken in conjunction with the consultation exercise propose by this report. The review of current service provision carried out to date has considered the demography, trends and current service provision against individual service user needs and gives an overall case for the proposed changes. There are expected to be service user and staff impacts but owing to the sensitive nature of the proposals full and open consultation requires approval by Cabinet.

2.9 Consultation process

Adult services undertake a large amount of service user consultation on an on-going basis and as part of their quality assurance systems – this is a fundamental aspect of the way that the department works. Within any year we have more that 50 ways to receive feedback from service users and/or carers.

This report requests permission from Cabinet to undertake a full formal consultation on significant changes to residential care services. As such we have not undertaken formal consultation on the recommendations to date. However the proposals in the

review have been shaped and influenced by feedback from service users, carers and staff over a long period of time.

2.9.1 Pre-report consultation

Meetings with staff and home managers took place at Home D on 18 June 2012 where staff from other homes also attended and Home B on 19 June 2012. At these meetings staff were told about this review, and asked for their views about the key principles they felt we should take into account. The principles identified include those set out below, and have influenced the service model and proposals set out earlier in this report:

- The review must focus on service user's needs and outcomes;
- Links to other services e.g. health should be considered;
- Ensure that service users are supported throughout any change with transition plans and clear pathways;
- Consider the cumulative impact of other changes including reduction in day care for people living in 24-hour residential care and special needs transport review;
- The need to focus on continuous improvement and the quality of care;
- Avoid staff redundancies where possible
- Consider creating a separate respite facility

Staff indicated their understanding of the need for the review and their support if it results in benefits for service users. They felt it is important for redundancies to be avoided where possible and that staff, service users and families were consulted with throughout the process.

Service users and carers have given their views in regular forums over a number of years. In particular there has been feedback about the service model in Home B. There has been strong feedback from young people in transition and their carers that they do not want to use Home B because of its institutional feel. Concerns about the co-location were backed up by staff at the staff meeting.

2.9.2 Full Consultation Process

This report requests Cabinet approval to undertake formal consultation on the proposals. This consultation would be about the model of services to be implemented and the most appropriate way to achieve savings from internal residential care services. The consultation would include the underlying principles of the service model and the way that changes would be managed.

A Cabinet decision has already been made, in the Medium Term Financial Strategy in February 2012, to achieve savings from residential care services. Therefore subject to Cabinet approval of recommendations the consultation will not be about whether to remodel and achieve savings, but about the detail of doing so.

Subject to Cabinet agreement the consultation will include service users, potential service users, carers, staff and Unions. The timetable would be as follows:

Service Users and their families

Consultation if approved by Cabinet will start on 24 September and go through until 14 December 2012. A whole day consultation will be arranged for each of the homes. The morning will be dedicated to meeting with staff and the afternoon with service users, their families and advocates. In addition we will arrange focus group

for potential service users and their families including young people in transition from children to adult services.

Information in accessible formats such as easy read will be available from September to outline the reason for the review and the consultation process.

Staff

Meetings will take place for each staff team on the same day as the meetings for service users and their families. It is important to ensure that staff are aware of the review and its potential implications at the same time as service users so that they are able to provide service users with support if they want to ask questions following their meeting. Meetings will also take place with Unions.

Following the 12 week consultation period a report would be prepared summarising the consultation responses and this would be presented in together with detailed proposals to Cabinet in February 2013 for further consideration.

3. Implications of the Recommendation

3.1 Financial Implications

3.1.1 Capital

The services under consideration in this review are delivered from six separate residential addresses as set out below. Of these six there are only three which are owned by the council. These are Homes B, E and F.

Name of home	Address	Beds	Property owner
Home A	South Harrow	7	Stadium Housing (Formerly Network)
Home B	Pinner	20	Harrow Council
Home C	Stanmore	8	Genesis
Home D	Harrow	8	Genesis
Home E	Stanmore	3	Harrow Council
Home F	Stanmore	3	Harrow Council

The proposals made in this document would establish a new model of services which builds upon the current practice. In the longer-term we will look to undertake a more radical review of properties to ensure that we have modern, high quality, fit-for-purpose accommodation that meets the needs of adults with learning disabilities. This will ensure that we have property that is fully accessible, enabling and supports people to be as independent as possible.

In relation to existing properties, there are some planned small scale capital works to the buildings which would require some capital expenditure. In addition there is a need for further capital expenditure of approximately £15k at home B and large scale capital works at home E and F to include complete decoration and the replacement of kitchens and bathrooms. These would need to be considered alongside an options

appraisal for the future use of these buildings. These are factored into current thinking around adult capital requirements.

3.1.2 Revenue

Spending on public services across the whole of the public sector, and local government in particular, is in a period of decline. The London Borough of Harrow has a target to achieve a 30% reduction in controllable spend from 2010 to 2015. Further savings will be required between 2015 and 2017, the earliest at which the current period of austerity is anticipated to end.

Support and accommodation for people with learning disabilities will continue to be a key priority for the council throughout this period. It will though be increasingly important that this, along with all other priorities, is delivered in the most cost effective and efficient manner possible.

The total net budgeted cost of the services in the review is £3,725,944 including all management recharges and income from client contributions. The gross cost is £3,900,816 including all management recharges, or £3,612,814. This means that the proposed savings are between 16% and 27%.

The cost of the services in this review represents approximately 20% of the £21m net expenditure by the council in meeting the needs of adults with a learning disability. Overall residential care services represent approximately 44% of net learning disability expenditure. Residential care services for those with learning disabilities with the highest needs are resource intensive, but strategically critical to the council, given the essential nature of safeguarding this group.

There are specific savings targets that have been agreed for adult social care which are linked to Learning Disability accommodation. In 2012/13 there is a requirement for the internal residential service (which also includes mental health services) to achieve a £150k saving. This saving is on course to be achieved through efficiencies without the need to reduce service levels.

In addition there is a substantial £2.25m saving to be achieved from all residential care services for all client groups. These savings include £775k to be saved in 2013/14 and £1.5m to be saved in 2014/15. It is expected that implementing the current proposals would contribute between £600k and £1m towards this target.

3.1.3 Staffing Implications

One of the key principles that staff of services requested is that we try to avoid redundancies as a result of this review. This has been taken on board by management as proposals have been shaped, and initial analysis has been carried out to consider the likely configuration of the teams required to deliver the proposed model. As a result of this analysis we have identified that we do not expect there to be a need for redundancies for care staff. We would however need to consider the management structure for the new model of in-house residential services and whether this may result in efficiencies.

The services currently include a large number of agency staff, which would enable us to implement the proposals without the need for substantial redundancies. However we would expect that in shaping the staff team to deliver the new service

model a full staffing restructure would be required to ensure that people are deployed in the appropriate services and whether additional training is required once services have been refocused and re-specified.

It will not be possible to accurately identify staffing implications until consultation has been completed and updated recommendations are available to be considered by Cabinet. Following this identification of the detail in the new service specifications will shape a clear understanding of staffing requirement.

The Council is aware of a possible risk of limited redundancies. Once reconfiguration plans have been confirmed, the full detail of these implications will be identified. Officers will work to mitigate costs arising from changes and keep any redundancies to a minimum.

3.2 Legal implications

Residential accommodation is provided under s21 National Assistance Act 1948 and once identified as an assessed eligible need (following assessment under s47 NHS and Community Care Act 1990) the council has a duty to meet that need. Service users preferences should be considered and met unless the local authority can meet the need in another resource in a more cost effective manner (see The National Assistance Act (Choice of Accommodation) Directions 1992).

As well as applying general public law principles in respect of consultation, case law has highlighted the need to review service users' care needs before any change in provision, also taking into account the service users rights under human rights legislation.

3.3. Performance Issues

National Measures

Harrow is an acknowledged national leader in personalisation and has developed a pathway and a range of services to ensure that people have as much choice and control over their care and support as possible. The borough has a substantial track record of improvement and an approach that focuses on supporting people to be as independent as possible.

The borough has a local target to achieve at least 70% of people with a learning disability living in their own homes or with family. At present we are achieving this target, however wish to continue to improve and to increase this percentage and therefore to support more people to achieve independent living.

Two key areas of focus in adult social care within Harrow are the flag-ship Reablement service, which is supporting people to regain their independence, and carer's support in which performance is amongst the highest in the country.

This paper aims to extend this learning into accommodation options for people with a learning disability. With this in mind this review seeks to ensure that people are supported to be as independent as possible, to develop independent living skills. We will aim to support people to remain living with their families wherever possible, by ensuring that carers have the support they need to carry out their caring roles.

In implementing these recommendations we will build upon current arrangements to develop a quality assurance model based on the borough's MJ magazine's highly

commended 'QAQ' model and will utilise the insight of partners, users, carers and Council officers to track delivery.

Performance targets will be set for services and they will be monitored as individual services and as a group. Individual clients will have their outcomes reviewed to ensure services are meeting individual needs. The impact of all the services will be tracked through the Council's robust performance monitoring arrangements for local and national indicators set out above.

3.4. Environmental Impact

The environmental impacts arising from the recommended option are as follows: -

- There are no environmental impacts at present as the recommendation is for approval to consult rather than enact changes.
- Environmental impacts will be re-assessed in the report that is expected to follow in February.

3.5. Risk Management Implications

Risk included on Directorate risk register? No

Separate risk register in place? Yes

The risks that are outlined in this section relate to the proposed period of consultation rather than of implementing proposals. These will be updated with operational risks if recommendations are approved and a new report is considered in February 2013.

The key risks for the project are listed below with a rating of their impact and likelihood. Mitigating actions are in place for all and the risks are manageable: -

- That the consultation is not adequate – in that it fails to fully explain the consequences or fails to include all necessary parties
- That the consultation is not representative and reflects the views of only a section of affected people
- That care management capacity is not sufficient to undertake all necessary reviews and assessments in time for February 2013 cabinet

3.6. Equalities implications

The equality implications are set out in the main body of the report.

3.7 Corporate Priorities

This review relates to the following Corporate Priorities 2011/12:

- United and involved communities: a Council that listens and leads
- Supporting and protecting people who are most in need

The Community, Health and Wellbeing Directorate's vision is:

“Enhancing our resident's quality of life, and offering excellent service”

Section 3 - Statutory Officer Clearance

Name: Roger Hampson	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the Chief Financial Officer
Date: 17 August 2012		

Name: Matthew Adams	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the Monitoring Officer
Date: 17 August 2012		

Section 4 – Performance Officer Clearance

		on behalf of the
Name: Liz Defries	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Divisional Director
Date: 17 August 2012		Partnership, Development and Performance

Section 5 – Environmental Impact Officer Clearance

Name: John Edwards		Divisional Director
Date: 16 August 2012	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	(Environmental Services)

Section 6 - Contact Details and Background Papers

Contact: Thom Wilson, Head of Commissioning & Partnerships
Tel: 020 8736 6022

Background Papers: None.

Call-In Waived by the Chairman of Overview and Scrutiny Committee	NOT APPLICABLE <i>[Call in applies]</i>
--	---