

REPORT FOR: CABINET

Date of Meeting:	14 March 2013
Subject:	Strategic Review of Learning Disability Accommodation
Key Decision:	Yes
Responsible Officer:	Paul Najsarek, Corporate Director of Community Health and Wellbeing
Portfolio Holder:	Councillor Margaret Davine, Portfolio Holder for Adult Social Care, Health and Wellbeing
Exempt:	No
Decision subject to Call-in:	Yes
Enclosures:	Appendix 1: Information about each service under review Appendix 2: Consultation Summary Report Appendix 3: Equalities Impact Assessment

Section 1 – Summary and Recommendations

This report sets out recommendations to reconfigure six residential care services for people with learning disabilities provided by the Borough. As part of this review extensive consultation has taken place with service users, families, advocates and staff working in the services.

The aim of this review is to deliver a modernised service that offers improved outcomes and excellent value for money. It aims to ensure that local needs are met in the most effective way possible based on national policy guidance and best practice.

Supporting the most vulnerable in the 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.

These recommendations form part of the Transformation 2 project – Residential Care Strategic Review and contribute to the council's Medium Term Financial Strategy.

Recommendations:

Cabinet is requested to agree the new service model described in section 2.5.3. Specifically this involves the following changes to services:

A. Bedford House - work to achieve separation between the long-term residential, respite and day services at Bedford House. Work with the Council's Estates Department to identify a longer term option for the efficient use of Bedford House. This may include the potential sale of the building and the purchase of an alternative building which meets the needs of the long-term residents in a high quality environment.

B Gordon Avenue – to change the model of the service and identify a choice of alternative housing options for the service users living at the home. To use the service as a Residential Respite provision in the future. In addition to increase the use of alternative respite options including Harrow Shared Lives Service and communicate the range of options to families and service users.

C. Woodlands Drive - to change the model of the service and identify a choice of alternative housing options for the service users living at the home.

D. Southdown Crescent - de-register the service and support people to live in a supported living environment

E. Roxborough Park - maintain and develop the current model of the service delivering high quality care to people with complex autism and severe challenging behaviour. This will mean that some people who do not have complex autism and severe challenging behaviour who currently live at the service may be supported to move to alternative provision that meets their assessed eligible needs.

Cabinet are asked to authorise the Corporate Director for Community Health and Wellbeing in consultation with the relevant Portfolio Holder(s) to: -

- Agree the future model and use for Woodlands Drive. The vacant building could be considered for young adults in transition who need support to remain close to home.

Reason: (For recommendation)

The development of this new model for Harrow council provided care and support for people with learning disabilities will:

- Enable local residential service provision for adult with learning disabilities that responds to current and future demand for specialist residential services
- Contribute between £600k-£1m to the achievement of Medium Term Financial Strategy savings of £2.275m in relation to residential care
- 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 modernisation of adult social care services in the Borough. It aims to deliver efficient and effective services that are sustainable and provide excellent care to vulnerable adults.

The council's strategic review of residential services 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.

In September 2012 Cabinet approved a report into a review of residential care services. The report led to a detailed consultation with residents, carer's, staff Unions and the voluntary sector. The report considered options for re-specifying each home's purpose to ensure that where Harrow provides services we are making the best use of them. It suggested that services

provided directly by the council be used to support the people with the most complex needs, many of who are currently being placed out of borough at a higher cost than can be achieved via the internally provided provision. The report also indicated that the Council is able to offer value for money with excellent outcomes when providing supported housing services.

The report reflected the fact that this focus would mean that some people who have a lower level of need may need to be supported to move to alternative accommodation which is able to support them to be more independent and focuses on improved outcomes.

The Council has now completed a twelve-week statutory consultation on proposed changes. This report outlines the responses to that consultation, the potential impacts on vulnerable people and resulting recommendations. These recommendations take account of the feedback that has been received from service users, family members, advocates, staff and unions.

The options set out in this report were developed following consultation and engagement with service users, their families, advocates and staff working in the homes under review. The report sets out the ways that feedback received during consultation has contributed to the final recommendations. In addition to a summary of the consultation described in Section 3 below a more detailed consultation report has been produced and is found in Appendix 2.

Changes to residential services are complex, particularly in circumstances where people have lived in their home for a long time and they have built social networks and routines that are valued. This is an important consideration for the implementation of this review, and will be central to the way that changes are managed.

It is important to note that the council has a legal duty to continue to provide support to the residents of the services in this review, based on an assessment of their needs. Within any recommendations for changes to services therefore the council will continue to ensure that high quality care and support is available to all residents, based on an up to date assessment of needs and a support plan which meets these.

If proposals are approved that mean that service users have to move to alternative accommodation the Council will need to demonstrate that it has met the “choice directive”. The choice directive of the National Assistance Act 1948 (Choice of Accommodation) Directions 1992. The Government were anxious to ensure that individuals had a reasonable right to choose where they were accommodated. Accordingly a Statutory Direction, commonly known as the “Choice Directive” was issued. The Directive only applies where the outcome of the assessment and care planning process has been that the person’s needs makes them eligible to receive residential or nursing home care. If the person concerned expresses a preference for particular accommodation, within the UK, the Council must arrange for care in that home, provided:

- a) The preferred accommodation appears suitable to meet need;
- b) The cost of the preferred accommodation would not require the Local Authority to pay more than it would usually pay for accommodation to meet

the assessed need (and that accommodation at this usual level of cost is available elsewhere than at the preferred accommodation resource):

c) The preferred accommodation is available

d) The person in charge of the accommodation is willing to provide accommodation subject to the authority's usual terms and conditions for such accommodation

As part of the process to review the in-house learning disability services all service users will be assessed by an experienced, qualified social worker. The social worker will assess each individual's capacity to make decisions regarding where to live. This assessment will be undertaken in accordance with the Mental Capacity Act 2005. If an individual is assessed as not having capacity to choose then someone would need to make a decision on their behalf based on what is in their best interest. If there is a disagreement about what is in the service user's best interest then an Independent Mental Capacity Advocate (IMCA) would be involved.

This review suggests changes to the model of services and the way that they work. The council will monitor the implementation of changes which take place as a result, and may review the model of delivery again in future years.

2.1.1 Background

A detailed background of Harrow's internally provided residential care services was provided in the September Cabinet report. The homes under review are:

- Gordon Avenue - Registered care home for up to 8 people with learning disabilities aged 18-65 or 65+. A small on site day service for people with profound learning disabilities that will be considered in a separate review of day opportunities
- Southdown Crescent - Registered care home for up to 7 people with learning disabilities
- Roxborough Park - Registered care home for up to 8 people with learning disabilities and autism
- Woodlands Drive – Two small residential homes for three people each.

The services current provides residential care to three people with moderate learning disabilities

- Bedford House - 10 long-term residential beds, 9 residential respite beds. There is a small day service for up to 9 people with autism that is being considered in a separate review of day opportunities

There are a mix of people with different levels and types of needs in a number of these services. This is because in the past, in order to maximise the use of the homes when vacancies occurred, they were filled without delay, rather than waiting for a referral for someone with the most appropriate needs for the service. This has led to some people being placed in services that may not be

the best fit for them, for example someone living in an autism service who needs 24-hour care but does not make use of the specialist autism support.

2.2 Current situation

A detailed description of the current situation was included in the September Cabinet report.

In summary the information provided in September's Cabinet report was as follows:

- The review focuses on six residential services directly provided by the London Borough of Harrow for people with learning disabilities;
- All of the services are regulated by the Care Quality Commission (CQC). Roxborough, Gordon Avenue and Southdown were inspected recently and all were found 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 support 40 people in a long-term capacity in addition to the provision of nine respite beds;
- The total net budgeted cost of the current services is £3,725,944¹ including all management recharges;
- Income from client contributions equals £174k per year
- Unit costs of the services vary considerably due to different factors. Units with fewer beds often have a higher unit cost because they still need staff cover at all times

The consultation approved by Cabinet in September 2012 was concluded in December 2012. The detail on this consultation and its conclusions are described in section 3 below.

In November 2012 there was a Collective Agreement to modernise terms and conditions of employment for Harrow Council employees. This agreement has impacted upon staff in the residential services included in this review. The impacts have come into effect from 7 January 2013. The changes affect enhancements paid for working nights, weekend and bank holidays, which are particularly important in residential services.

In order to mitigate the loss of contractual pay for those staff most affected by the Collective Agreement the Council has put in place actions to compensate staff. Transitional arrangements will be in effect for a two year period and will impact the level of savings that are achieved through the outcomes of this review. This potential double counting issue was raised by adult services during the terms and conditions discussions. These issues will be considered in more detail in the Financial Impact section on page 40.

A table providing basic details about each service is located in Appendix 3.

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.

¹ Based on net budget for 2011-12

The September Cabinet paper set out adult social care guidance in some detail, and this is not replicated here. However the key policies and guidance that relate to the review include:

- Putting People First - 2007
- Think Local, Act Personal - 2011
- Valuing People Now - 2009

Since September however, highly important additional guidance has been issued by Government in the form of its final report in response to the abuse at Winterbourne View private hospital. **Transforming care: A national response to Winterbourne View Hospital** *Department of Health Review: Final Report (December 2012)* has implications for the way that people with learning disabilities or autism who have behaviour described as “challenging” are supported and cared for.

The review found that children and adults with learning disability or autism and who have mental health conditions or challenging behaviour have too often received poor quality and inappropriate care. The report acknowledged examples of good practice around the country but also found that many people are admitted to hospital unnecessarily and once in hospital they stay too long.

Some of the key findings are relevant to this review, including:

- People with challenging behaviours have a right to be offered the support and care that they need in a community-based setting, as near as possible to family and other connections.
- Far too many people are sent a long way from their home and families
- A failure to design, commission and provide services which give people the support they need, in line with well established best practice

Following the Winterbourne View report, Clinical Commissioning Groups and local authorities need to set out a joint strategic plan to commission the range of local health, housing and care support services to meet the needs of people with challenging behaviour. This plan needs to be completed by April 2014 and it is important that the final recommendations in this report reflect this requirement.

2.4 Why a change is needed

Detailed information setting out the need for change was included in September’s Cabinet report. This is not set out in such detail in this report.

In summary the need for change relates to:

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.

2.4.2 Service Availability

- 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 eight placements made for young people aged 18-25 in 2011 and 2012 six were placed out of the Borough as there was no local provision that could meet the complex needs presented.

2.4.3 Market Financial Analysis

- Analysis concluded 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.
- Analysis 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 analyses of recent placements suggest that it would be less expensive for the council to provide than the external market. In addition evidence shows that the council is able to provide supported housing that demonstrates value for money.

The service model proposed in the September Cabinet paper was based on these findings. Notably the proposals reached a clear conclusion that it is important for the council to focus services to those with high or complex needs and that we should be seeking alternatives, such as supported living for those with lower needs but who still need accommodation based services. These conclusions were communicated to key stakeholders during the consultation.

2.5 Proposed Service Model

In the report to Cabinet in September 2012 we outlined proposals for the development of a new service model based on the following principles:

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 for example individuals whose behaviour is

described as challenging. 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 more 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.

The report included specific recommendations about each of the services in this review. In section three of this report we will look in detail at these proposals, the findings of the consultation and the final recommendation for each service.

Section 3 – Consultation Findings & Recommendation

3.1 About the Consultation

The Council has carried out statutory consultation over a twelve-week period from September 2012 to December 2012. This review focuses on six residential services, directly provided by the London Borough of Harrow, for people with learning disabilities. These services support a total of 36 people in long-term residential care and a further 49 people who access the nine respite beds at Bedford House.

This consultation included:

- **Speaking directly to 164 people.** Of these 97 were service users, family members or advocates. Meetings were held at each of the five learning disability homes focussed on service users, families and advocates. A separate meeting was held at each home for staff members. These meetings were designed to support people to be involved in the consultation process and speak to them face to face about their views.
- We spoke to 27 (75%) users of the long-term residential services. In addition 18 family members of the residential respite service responded to the consultation; two respite service users attended meetings.
- An event at Harrow Civic Centre in the evening to enable people who could not attend a meeting during the day to engage in the consultation process.
- A separate session for people who use respite services to enable issues specific to this service to be discussed and enable users of respite to give their views.
- Issuing two hundred easy read questionnaires to service users, family members, advocates and staff, from which we had 39 responses, a 19% response rate.

A report of the consultation results is attached at Appendix 2.

Consultation sessions were well attended and service users were meaningfully engaged in discussions about options. The support of family members, advocates and in some cases key workers assisted with this process.

Officers found particular challenges engaging with service users with profound and multiple needs and sought the assistance of advocates, family members and keyworkers to ascertain views.

All consultation sessions were aimed at both service users and their families. Sessions were held in people's homes to ensure that they felt at ease. In addition language used outlining the ideas for each home was aimed at service users to assist with understanding. Additional consultation activities were included to ensure that consultation was meaningful this included:

- 1:1 sessions with a service user and his advocate to communicate the options for his home;
- Staff at Bedford House have spent time with individual service users regarding proposals. It was noted that six residents do not have capacity to understand proposals or provide feedback

We received a number of comments regarding the consultation itself including acknowledgment that proposals were communicated in a sensitive manner. One carer said

'I can see that a lot of care has gone into this consultation'.

We have received consultation responses from Harrow Association of Disabled People (HAD) and Harrow Mencap. These can be found in the consultation document in Appendix 2 of this report.

In arriving at the recommendations made in this report we have sought to address concerns raised by service users, family members, advocates and staff. However it is possible that there will continue to be questions raised at cabinet about the impact of the recommendations for each home and any implementation should a decision be made by Cabinet.

3.2 Consultation Results for Each Service

This section considers each of the residential care homes, feedback from the consultation undertaken and arrives at a final recommendation.

A. Bedford House

Information about each of the services included in Appendix 1 on page 52

Option consulted upon

“that we consider remodelling the service to focus on long-term residential care only and move the respite and day care to other locations. The proposed location for the respite service is Gordon Avenue. This would lead to a reduction in respite beds from nine to eight.”

Equality Act 2010

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. This is a requirement of the Equalities Act 2010.

There are eleven people living at Bedford House on a long-term basis i.e. Bedford House is their home. In addition a further 49 service users use the residential respite provision. Service users would all fall within the following protected characteristics of the Equalities Act 2010:

(a) Long-term Service Users:

Age: one service user is over the age of 65

Disability: all eleven service users have a learning disability or difficulty.

There are seven men and four women. In terms of ethnicity six service users are White British, two are Asian British (Indian), two are Asian or Asian British (other) and one person is from a Mixed background

Five service users have English as a first language, one person uses sign language, one person uses Urdu and one person speaks Gujarati.

(b) Respite service users:

Age: There are no service users aged over 65 using the respite service at Bedford House. There are seven service user between the ages of 18 and 24.

Disability: all 49 service users have a learning disability or difficulty

There are twenty-four men and twenty-five women. In terms of ethnicity nineteen service users are White British, one is White (Irish), two are Black or Black British (Caribbean), fifteen are Asian British (Indian), four are Asian or Asian British (Pakistani) one is from a mixed background and seven people are from other ethnic groups (not stated).

Thirty-four service users have English as a first language, twelve speak Gujarati, one Punjabi and one other (not stated).

We have used consultation feedback, best practice and research to assess the possible impacts of each option. Consideration of any possible adverse impacts are included in full in the Equalities Impact Assessment in Appendix 3

and in summary in Section 4.1 of this report. We compared this information to what we know about the people living in each home. In order to meet its equality duty the Council will need to take measures to eliminate or reduce these adverse impacts. If a decision is made that necessitates a move, each service user will have their needs reassessed and a care plan drawn up in consultation with service user, family and where appropriate an advocate. In drawing up the care plan there will be a need to use a person-centred approach to a package of care that meets all eligible assessed needs.

What people told us during the consultation

We invited all service users, their advocates and family members to a meeting at Bedford House. In response the meeting was attended by four of the eleven long-term service users, no respite service users, six long-term family members, ten respite family members, two members of the Friends of Bedford House and the local ward Councillor. A further meeting was organised for respite users and family members only, this was attended by two service users and twelve family members.

The consultation meeting was very long and at times it was difficult to keep discussions at a level that many service users could engage with. Key workers at the home were asked to talk to long-term service users about the proposal in a more informal and accessible way. Bedford House reported that six of the eleven service users were unable to provide feedback as they were unable to understand the proposal due a lack of capacity. Two service users provided clear feedback. They both have personal experience of using the respite unit before moving into the residential service. Both service users were concerned about the proposal and in particular as they enjoy the everyday contact with respite clients. Another resident indicated that they are happy with the current arrangement. One service users indicated that he would prefer the respite service to be located in another unit as he is disturbed by respite clients. There was no additional feedback provided from respite service users.

The majority of responses from family members were linked to the respite service at Bedford House. This is unsurprising as the proposal would have a greater impact on respite users than on service users living at Bedford House. In total 18 (39%) different (respite) families responded to the consultation, therefore 31 families opted not to respond to the consultation or give their views on the proposals for Bedford House.

Separating residential from respite and day services

Many family members and advocates of the respite service thought that having long-term residential, respite and day services under one roof complement each other. People commented that they “are economical, vibrant and good for visitors and friends”. The following remarks were made by two family members:

‘The services at Bedford House should be the norm and spread across the country’

‘Residents [of the home] will feel isolated and bored without the other services being present’

Another family member said that there would be reassurance if there were no changes in the amount of respite care hours for service users and that the change of geography would suit some families more than others.

In its response to the consultation, Harrow Mencap agreed with the proposal for the separation of day services, respite and residential care at Bedford House. They stated that a growing population of service users and other people feel it does not meet their individual needs or requirements and is too large and 'institutional'. In developing the option regarding residential respite we have looked at the model of service at The Firs; Harrow's residential respite for children. This six-bedded service provides short breaks in a homely environment. There is an opportunity to assimilate the positive aspects of The Firs model once the adult residential respite service is re-located. This will assist with an easier transition for young people moving between the two residential respite services.

Some attendees thought that the proposal to separate services could lead to higher costs.

Some people thought that the current space at Bedford House would be excessively large for eleven residential service users, and effectively be under-utilised. One family member thought that the council should consider turning Bedford House into a 20 bed respite unit and that residential clients are moved to alternative accommodation.

In addition to the consultation meeting all service users, family members, advocates and members of staff were offered a questionnaire to complete.

Nine responses to the questionnaire came from people directly linked to the respite service at Bedford House. There were no responses from the long-term part of the service this is unsurprising as the proposal would have a greater impact on respite users than on service users living at Bedford House

There were two questions posed in the questionnaire that related to Bedford House. The first was about the proposal to separate out the three different services at Bedford House (long-term, respite and day services). The second question was about using other type of short break services e.g. Harrow Shared Lives.

The following table gives the results of a question on this issue in the questionnaires received:

Q3. At Bedford House the Council would like to separate – where you live for a long time we call this residential care, places you go for a short break we call this respite, places you go to during the day but don't stay the night we call this day services. This would mean the respite and the day services would be in different buildings	
Agree	11 (28%)
Disagree	15 (39%)
Do not know	11 (28%)
Did not answer	2 (5%)

Nine people of the people who responded to the questionnaire identified themselves as having a direct link with the Bedford House respite service. Of these three respondents agreed with the proposal, three disagreed and three did not know or did not answer.

How the respite service operates

Harrow Mencap urged the council to think more creatively about ‘respite’/‘breaks’, as well as looking at a building based option and work with providers to develop the market to provide a range of flexible and individualised options.

The consultation included a question about whether we should increase the choice of places used for short breaks including an increase in the use of the Harrow Shared Lives Service.

Q5. The council would like to use other places you can go to for a short break like Harrow Shared Lives Scheme. Shared Lives is where you would go and stay with a family in their home

Agree	7 (18%)
Disagree	19 (49%)
Do not know	9 (23%)
Did not answer	4 (10%)

Responses highlighted a need to do more work with service users and family members about the different short break options available including Harrow Shared Lives. Many respondents, irrespective of how they answered the question, wanted more detailed information and assurances about the auditing of care that would be delivered through Shared Lives. Several respondents also noted that the Shared Lives Scheme would be suitable to some but not all service users.

There was concern raised about the use of respite beds for emergency placements and the impact this has on the availability of respite care for non emergency service users. The following feedback was received via a questionnaire regarding the option to move the respite service from Bedford House to Gordon Avenue:

‘This in theory would be acceptable provided that the full capacity is used for respite and is not encroached upon by other emergency users, especially those staying over extended periods, as has happened at Bedford House’ (service user with support from family member)

There was some feedback that at times regular respite care has had to be cancelled to accommodate the emergency need. It was suggested that often the use of emergency respite care is longer than initially agreed which has an impact on the smooth running of the respite service. Analysis conducted during the review found that in December 2012, eleven planned overnight respite stays were cancelled due to emergency respite stays.

Other issues raised

The high quality of the service and highly skilled staff were noted by family members and advocates.

The council's recognition and appreciation of the important role of family members was communicated during the consultation, as was the commitment to the provision of a range of respite services including Harrow's Shared Lives Service.

Our response to what people told us

We address the concerns raised by service users, family members, advocates and organisations during the consultation below:

- a. It was suggested that we do not separate residential from respite and day services and therefore do not change services at Bedford Road

The majority of parents of clients who use the respite service who attended the consultation meetings were opposed to separating out the respite, day and long-term services. However responses to the questionnaires were more evenly distributed. Harrow Mencap indicated that from their experience and feedback a growing number of service users do not feel that Bedford House respite service meets their individual needs or requirement as it is too large and 'institutional'. This is particularly felt by families who have been accessing The Firs short break service. Having so many services operating within one unit is not considered to be best practice due to the impacts that each part of the service can have on the service users who use them. We believe that separating the long stay and respite services will have a positive impact upon the people living at Bedford House both in terms of a quieter, less busy environment and by giving service users more communal space, which at the moment is limited. Whilst the majority of long-term service users were unable to give a view on the proposal; some were concerned about losing friendships if the respite service moved to another site. If a decision is made leading to a change in location for the respite service these issues will need to be considered so that people can still maintain valued friendships.

- b. A suggestion that the whole unit should be used either for respite services or long-term residential care.

Whilst Bedford House is a large building it has been reported by member of staff that there is a lack of communal space particularly when service users are present e.g. during the evening. Whilst moving the respite service would leave nine vacant bedrooms it would also offer more space and increased choice for people living at Bedford House.

It would not be appropriate to utilise any empty space left by moving respite services to an alternative site for long-term residential care as the service would be too big. Whilst it is not ideal to effectively 'close' nine beds it would not be appropriate to fill the space with more people. In best practice terms a ten-bedded residential home for people with learning disabilities is considered to be rather large, and the same would be true of a twenty-bedded respite service. The Council's Estates Department have identified that in the longer-

term leaving the nine beds spaces vacant would not be an efficient use of the asset. They have identified longer terms options including the potential sale of the building and purchase of an alternative building which meets the needs of the long-term residents in a high quality environment.

- c. “this in theory would be acceptable provided that the full capacity is used for respite and is not encroached upon by other emergency users, especially those staying over extended periods , as has happened at Bedford House”

This issue was raised at both consultation meetings. The over-riding concerns for parents was that they could still access the same level of respite provision and that it would not be reduced if the number of respite beds reduced from nine to eight. The process used for planning respite/short stays is on the staff support needs of individual service users rather on the number of beds available. For example there may be empty beds within the respite service when service users with a need for intensive staff support are staying at the service. This will not change if the service moves to another location.

The issue of emergency placements is a complex one and it is true that at times they have impacted on the availability of planned respite. As part of the review we have undertaken to review the use of respite beds for emergency placements and in particular the need to reduce the length of stay to a minimum.

Recommendations for Bedford House

We have carefully considered feedback provided during consultation. As outlined above there was a mixed response to the questions asked. On the basis of this mixed response, and given the strong case for separation to improve the lives of permanent residents, our final recommendations are:

1. to separate the long-term residential, respite and day services at Bedford House
2. to focus Bedford House on providing specialist support to people who have complex physical and sensory needs
3. that the range of options for short breaks is increased and more information is made available to service users and their families in order to support an informed choice regarding what services would be most appropriate
4. To ensure that all mitigating actions to reduce any adverse impacts are followed through for each service user affected

Impacts of recommendations

We recognise that these recommendations will potentially lead to change for a number of people. We will ensure that we support people through these changes, and that they are based on individual needs, choices and aspirations.

Recommendation 2 above may mean that current residents without a need for this type of specialist service may be supported to move to a different home that is able to meet their assessed needs.

It is acknowledged that these recommendations will lead to parts of the building not being used. There will be further consideration about whether alternative, high quality accommodation could be identified for the residents in the longer-term.

Rationale for recommendations

- There have been a number of concerns and issues with Bedford House expressed over a number of years. These focus mainly on the nature of the building and service design and the impact that this has upon service user satisfaction.
- The arrangement of having residential respite 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 respite plays an important part in ensuring that people are able to continue to live with their families. We believe that moving the respite service into a separate unit will improve the experience for service users and make it more attractive to young families who at present are unwilling to access the service at Bedford House. Improving residential respite needs to be a priority if we are to successfully support as many people as possible to live outside of residential care.

B. Gordon Avenue

Information about each of the services included in Appendix 1 on Page 52.

Option consulted upon

“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 Bedford House.”

Linked to this option we also considered whether older people with learning disabilities could be supported to live with older people who do not have a learning disability.

Equalities Act 2010

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. This is a requirement of the Equalities Act 2010.

There are eight people living at Gordon Avenue. They would all fall within the following protected characteristics of the Equalities Act 2010:

Age: four service users are between 65 and 69 years, two are between 70 and 75 years, two are between 76 and 80 years

Disability: all eight service users have a learning disability or difficulty

There are four men and four women. In terms of ethnicity all eight service users are white British with English as a first language.

We have used consultation feedback, best practice and research to assess the possible impacts of each option. We compared this information to what we know about the people living in each home. Consideration of any possible adverse impacts are included in full in the Equalities Impact Assessment in Appendix 3 and in summary in Section 4.1 of this report.

In order to meet its equality duty the Council will need to take measures to eliminate or reduce these adverse impacts. If a decision is made that necessitates a move, each service user will have their needs reassessed and a care plan drawn up in consultation with service user, family and where appropriate an advocate. In drawing up the care plan there will be a need to use a person-centred approach to a package of care that meets all eligible assessed needs.

What people told us during the consultation

We invited all service users, their advocates and family members to a meeting at Gordon Avenue. In response the meeting was attended by all eight service users, three family members and advocates and four members of staff who were supporting service users in their role as key worker.

All of the service users who spoke at the meeting stated that they did not want to move from Gordon Avenue. Service users said:

*'I have been happy since I moved here, I have lots of things to do'
'I would like to stay here'*

Family members and advocates told us that they felt that the proposal to support people to move was based on the need to reduce costs rather than on individual needs. On the question about supporting people from Gordon Avenue moving into homes where non learning disabled service users live, family members and advocates were concerned that these homes support people who are on average much older and in some cases close to death. They expressed concern that this would result in a poorer quality of life for services users. Comments included:

*'People with learning disabilities, regardless of age have 'special needs' which could not be catered for in elderly residential home, Will staff have the experience, knowledge and skills?'
'I am deeply concerned that separating these residents now, would be deeply traumatic for them'*

Harrow Mencap in their response accepted that there is an argument that older people with learning disabilities should be living with other older people, but identified the following points that must be taken in consideration:

- a) Older people with learning disabilities should be afforded the same range of housing choices as those offered to other older people
- b) If the council is defining older people with learning disabilities as over 65 it should be noted that this is significantly lower than the current population of older people in care homes. This could mean them living with people older and frailer than they are
- c) Funding for older people's care homes and requirements are different from those for people with learning disabilities therefore the council will need to ensure that there is funding available to maintain people's social lives and activities.

In their response Harrow Association of Disabled People (HAD) stated that if the consultation indicated that moving could be a positive option for the people who live there, the following issues are important:

- People must have realistic and informed choices, in a way which is accessible to them
- Support planning for options need to be very creative and include visits and other means of people being able to understand options to the best level possible
- Service users would need to be supported to move, including proper transitional arrangements, appropriate to each person's needs.
- There must be guarantees that where support is needed to maintain essential relationships (with people, pets etc), or activities, that a move will not jeopardise this. However, steps must be taken to find out what really matters to people, so that they are not forced to stay in touch with people they would actually be quite relieved to leave behind.

In addition to the consultation meeting all service users, family members, advocates and members of staff were offered a questionnaire to complete.

Eight responses came from people directly linked to Gordon Avenue. One of the questions in questionnaire was of particular relevance to Gordon Avenue as follows:

Q8. The council thinks it would be good if older people with learning disabilities live with older people who do not have a learning disability. We are thinking about this for some of the service users at Gordon Avenue and Woodlands Drive	
Agree	1 (3%)
Disagree	25 (64%)
Do not know	7 (18%)
Did not answer	6 (15%)

In the questionnaire responses almost two thirds (64%) of respondents disagreed with the proposal and a third did not know or did not answer (33%). One respondent agreed.

Of the 14 respondents that identified themselves as having a direct link to Gordon Avenue or Woodlands Drive, nine disagreed with the proposal, one agreed, two did not know and two did not answer.

Other issues raised

Family members and advocates suggested that as the service users at Gordon Avenue were all aged over 65 they have fewer people that speak up and advocate on their behalf. However during the consultation meeting and at service user reviews a family member or key worker was present for each client.

The quality of care at Gordon Avenue was acknowledged by many of the family members and advocates and some voiced concerns about the quality of care in private homes and the need to ensure that monitoring was carried out.

Our response to what people told us

It is acknowledged that a move for any vulnerable person may cause stress and anxiety and requires careful planning. Some of the service users at Gordon Avenue have lived together for many years and have formed friendships in a familiar and homely environment. We address the concerns and suggestions raised by service users, family members, advocates and organisations during the consultation below:

1. The suggestion is that we do not make decisions based upon the need to save money but rather on the needs of individual service users

The service at Gordon Avenue is of a high standard as mentioned a number of times during the consultation. Gordon Avenue operates with staffing levels at 1.63:1; much higher than residential care homes for older people where service users may be more vulnerable and frail than the service users at Gordon Avenue.

As referred to in section 2.4 above there is an increasing demand for services at a time when budgets are decreasing. There is therefore a need to efficiently distribute resources when meeting need so that no one group is disproportionately resourced at the potential expense of other service users. It could be argued that this is the case at Gordon Avenue where the current service is highly expensive and levels of support are too high considering the level of needs of some of the 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 per week on residential care for older people. Gordon Avenue currently costs £1,622². The council needs to consider its ability to support all service users alongside the wishes of those currently using services. It is not equitable for the council to pay very high prices to support a small group at the expense of others.

2. People will have to move out of their homes the suggestion was made that the Council does not proceed with this option so that people can remain in their home.

As people grow older they worry about what will happen to them as their circumstances or health change. People with learning disabilities are no different. The Joseph Rowntree Foundation conducted a study on the perspectives on ageing with a learning disability (JRF 2012)³ that identifies a number of important issues for older people with learning disabilities including: where they live, who supports them, staying in touch with family and friends, keeping active, staying well, coping with loss and facing death. It is important to consider all of these areas when considering a recommendation for the future of Gordon Avenue service.

It is understandable that people do not want to move home. Most of the service users have lived at Gordon Avenue for many years and they would need skilled support in understanding the concept of change and in considering the range of housing options that they may have. Should the proposal be approved the council will ensure that this level of support is provided to each service user living at Gordon Avenue.

The Council has a duty to meet assessed eligible needs and should regularly review those needs. If a decision is approved each service user will have their needs reassessed and a care plan drawn up in consultation with service user, family and where appropriate an advocate. In drawing up the care plan there will be a need to use a person-centred approach to a package of care that meets all eligible assessed needs.

3. Concerns that people with learning disabilities will be moved to residential care for older people who do not have a learning disability.

² Based on the gross cost per week for 2013/14 including organisational overhead charges but excluding client income

³ Perspectives on ageing with a learning disability – Joseph Rowntree Foundation (January 2012)

In response to concerns raised, the council will clarify housing options available to people rather than basing decision purely upon chronological age as research⁴ shows that this is not a useful indicator of a person's age-related needs. Some people in their 50s with chronic health conditions can feel prematurely old and have restricted lifestyles, whilst other people in their 80s and 90s can still be robust, active and very healthy. If a decision is approved to change the service at Gordon Avenue then a full range of housing options will be considered for each person based upon their eligible assessed needs. This addresses concerns raised by Harrow Mencap in their response to the consultation.

Family members raised concerns regarding the quality of older people residential provision. Harrow Council will only place its residents in homes that are judged by the Care Quality Commission to be meeting the standards of care required. In addition the Council has a duty to regularly review individuals in order to check that care provision is meeting assessed needs.

Recommendations for Gordon Avenue

We have carefully considered feedback provided during consultation and acknowledge that there is significant resistance and concern to the proposed changes at Gordon Avenue.

However Officers are recommending to Cabinet that we should change the model of service in order to deliver the most effective mix of value for money and opportunities to improve outcomes. Our final recommendations are therefore:

1. To change the model and seek to use Gordon Avenue as a centre for residential respite care
2. Provide intensive professional support to current residents of Gordon Avenue to identify a choice of alternative housing options to meet their needs
3. To ensure that all mitigating actions to reduce any adverse impacts are followed through for each service user affected.

Impacts of the recommendations

One key impact of the recommendation will be that people who currently live in the service will no longer be able to live there on a long-term basis. The council has a duty to meet needs; up to date assessments and person-centred planning will ensure people's needs are still met. Having taken on board the feedback from the review we will ensure that person-centred plans support service user's need to maintain existing friendships, hobbies and interests in addition to a well managed transition.

The development of a self-contained residential respite service in Gordon Avenue will ensure that there is high quality, specialist respite available for people in the borough, without the noise and disruption that can sometimes be caused in Bedford House. Improving residential respite needs to be a priority if we are to successfully support as many people as possible to live outside of

⁴ Perspectives on ageing with a learning disability – Joseph Rowntree Foundation (January 2012)

residential care. Residential respite plays an important part in ensuring that people are able to continue to live with their families.

Rationale for recommendations

- The current service is highly expensive and levels of support are too high considering the level of needs of some of the people supported.
- The Council needs to act in an equitable way and ensure resources are used to support everyone with eligible needs. The current model meets needs in an unfairly expensive way.
- Service users would be supported to move to a housing option that suits their needs. This would give those who are more able an opportunity to gain independence and improved outcomes.

C. Woodlands Drive

Information about each of the services included in Appendix 1 on Page 52.

Option consulted upon

“that we consider changing the model of the service and assess 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 people living at the unit”

Linked to this option we also considered whether older people with learning disabilities could be supported to live with older people who do not have a learning disability. This may affect two of the three people living at Woodlands Drive.

Equalities Act 2010

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. This is a requirement of the Equalities Act 2010.

There are three people living at Woodlands Drive. They would all fall within the following protected characteristics of the Equalities Act 2010:

Age: two service users are over the age of 60.

Disability: all three service users have a learning disability or difficulty

There are two women and one man living at the service. In terms of ethnicity all three service users are white British with English as a first language.

We have used consultation feedback, best practice and research to assess the possible impacts of each option. We compared this information to what we know about the people living in each home. Consideration of any possible adverse impacts are included in full in the Equalities Impact Assessment in Appendix 3 and in summary in Section 4.1 of this report.

In order to meet its equality duty the Council will need to take measures to eliminate or reduce these adverse impacts. If a decision is made that necessitates a move, each service user will have their needs reassessed and a care plan drawn up in consultation with service user, family and where appropriate an advocate. In drawing up the care plan there will be a need to use a person-centred approach to a package of care that meets all eligible assessed needs. A practical example of the type of support that might be identified is for individuals to remain in contact if they are placed in different homes. We have evidence that this has been successfully managed in Harrow for example where a service user moved to another part of the country a number of her friends were supported to visit her combining it with a short holiday.

The Council will need to demonstrate that it has met the “Choice Directive” if people at Woodlands Drive need to move home. Information on this directive is included on page 4 and 5 of this report.

What people told us during the consultation

We invited all service users, their advocates and family members to a meeting at Woodlands Drive. In response the meeting was attended by all three service users, five family members and three advocates.

Most people at the consultation meeting opposed a change of model for Woodlands Drive, and in particular felt that it was unfair to move service users that have been living there for up to 23 years.

Family members and advocates felt that the proposal was based on the need to reduce costs.

A number of people suggested changes to the building to make it more accessible and less cramped for example 'knocking through' to create one space for use by other service user groups or to use the building for use as a respite care service.

Family members and advocates were concerned that if service users had to move, they may not be placed in the borough or close to where existing links with the community have been formed.

During the meeting a family member remarked that *'I can see that a lot of care has gone into this consultation'*.

In addition to the consultation meeting all service users, family members, advocates and members of staff were offered questionnaires to complete. We had six responses from people directly linked to Woodlands Drive.

Our response to what people told us

It is acknowledged that a move for any vulnerable person may cause stress and anxiety and requires careful planning. Some of the service users at Woodlands Drive have lived together for many years after moving out of long-term hospitals and have formed friendships in a familiar and homely environment. We address the concerns and suggestions raised by service users, family members, advocates and organisations during the consultation below:

1. People should remain at the home they have shared for 23 years

It is recognised that people at Woodlands Drive have lived together for many years and friendships have been formed by some residents. Service users would need skilled support in understanding the concept of change and in considering the range of housing options that they may have. Unfortunately it is not always possible for people to remain together indefinitely as people age at different rates and needs may not be compatible. For this reason it is sometimes not possible for people to move to a new home together particularly if people's assessed needs are so disparate that they would require different provision. However we will need to ensure that where appropriate people are moved together and where this is not possible that people are supported to maintain links and friendships. This would be done as part of the planning process that would take place should a decision be approved.

The accommodation at Woodlands Drive is cramped and has no ground floor bedrooms or bathrooms. The stairs are very steep and are causing some difficulty for some but not all service users living at the service.

The Council has a duty to meet assessed eligible needs and regularly review those needs. If a decision is approved each service user will have their needs reassessed and a care plan drawn up in consultation with service user, family and where appropriate an advocate. In drawing up the care plan there will be a need to use a person-centred approach to a package of care that meets all eligible assessed needs.

2. The suggestion is that we do not make decisions based upon the need to save money but rather on the needs of individual service users

The service at Woodlands Drive is of a high standard as was mentioned a number of times during the consultation. Woodlands Drive operates with staffing levels at 1.33:1, much higher than residential care homes for older people where service users may be more vulnerable and frail than the service users at Woodlands Drive.

The Council has a duty to meet assessed eligible needs and should regularly review those needs. If a decision is approved each service user will have their needs reassessed and a care plan drawn up in consultation with service user, family and where appropriate an advocate. In drawing up the care plan there will be a need to use a person-centred approach to a package of care that meets all eligible assessed needs.

As referred to in section 2.4 above there is an increasing demand for services at a time when budgets are decreasing. There is therefore a need to efficiently distribute resources when meeting need so that no one group is disproportionately resourced at the potential expense of other service users. It could be argued that this is the case at Woodlands Drive where the current service is highly expensive and levels of support are too high considering the level of needs of some of the people supported. Woodlands Drive costs £1,519 per week.

The council needs to consider its ability to support all service users alongside the wishes of those currently using services. It is not equitable for the council to pay very high prices to support a small group at the expense of others.

The Council will need to demonstrate that it has met the "Choice Directive" if people at Woodlands need to move home. Information on this directive is included on page 4 and 5 of this report.

3. A number of people suggested changes to the building to make it more accessible and less cramped for example 'knocking through' to create one space for use by other service user groups or to use the building for use as a respite care service.

The Council has considered this suggestion but knocking the houses into one would require extensive and expensive remodelling downstairs to make the

space work effectively. We understand that the wall joining the two properties is a load bearing so that would have consequences for the cost and complexity of any work. Even if the houses were 'knocked together' the outcome would still only be a five bedded unit; with four bedrooms on the first floor and one on the ground floor. The remaining two bedrooms would not meet current registration requirements regarding space. In addition it would be necessary to move service users from 66 Woodlands whilst any work was undertaken.

4. Concerns that people with learning disabilities will be moved to residential care for older people who do not have a learning disability.

In response to concerns raised, the council will clarify housing options available to people rather than basing decision purely upon chronological age as research⁵ shows that this is not a useful indicator of a person's age-related needs. Some people in their 50s with chronic health conditions can feel prematurely old and have restricted lifestyles, whilst other people in their 80s and 90s can still be robust, active and very healthy. If a decision is approved to change the service at Woodlands Drive then a full range of housing options will be considered for each person based upon their eligible assessed needs. This addresses concerns raised by Harrow Mencap in their response to the consultation.

Family members raised concerns regarding the quality of older people residential provision. Harrow Council will only place its residents in homes that are judged by the Care Quality Commission to be meeting the standards of care required. In addition the Council has a duty to regularly review individuals in order to check that care provision is meeting assessed needs.

Recommendations for Woodlands Drive

We have carefully considered feedback and suggestions provided during consultation and acknowledge that there is significant resistance to the proposed changes at Woodlands Drive. However officers are recommending to Cabinet that we should change the model of service in order to deliver the most effective mix of value for money and opportunities to improve outcomes. The environment at Woodlands Drive is not accessible and work to extend it would be prohibitively expensive and may not deliver accommodation that is fit for purpose. Our final recommendations are therefore:

1. To change the model at 64 and 66 Woodlands Drive and consider its use for young people in transition in need of support. This would provide further capacity to respond to the known increase in the numbers of young people in need of accommodation over the next three years.
2. Provide intensive professional support to current residents at 66 Woodlands Drive to identify a choice of alternative housing options to meet their needs
3. To ensure that all mitigating actions to reduce any adverse impacts are followed through for each service user affected

⁵ Perspectives on ageing with a learning disability – Joseph Rowntree Foundation (January 2012)

Impacts of the recommendations

One key impact of the recommendation will be that people who currently live in the service will no longer be able to live there permanently. Having taken on board the feedback received during consultation we will ensure that person-centred plans support service users' need to maintain existing friendships, hobbies and interests in addition to a well managed transition.

Rationale for recommendations

- 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 service users at Woodlands Drive increase, health deteriorates and mobility becomes more of an issue the building is becoming increasingly unsuitable.
- Service users would be supported to move to a housing option that suits their needs. This would give those who are more able an opportunity to gain independence and improved outcomes. For example for some an option may be a move to a 24-hour supported living provision.
- The current service is highly expensive and levels of support are too high considering the level of needs of some of the 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. Woodlands Drive currently costs £1,576 per week.
- The Council needs to act in an equitable way and ensure resources are used to support everyone with eligible needs. The current model meets needs in an unfairly expensive way.
- 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.

D. Southdown Crescent

Information about each of the services included in Appendix 1 on Page 52.

Option consulted upon

“that we consider de-registering Southdown Crescent and operating the service as a supported living provision”

Equalities Act 2010

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. This is a requirement of the Equalities Act 2010.

There are seven people living at Southdown Crescent. The following protected characteristics of the Equalities Act 2010 would apply:

Age: one of the service users is over the age of 65.

Disability: all seven service users have a learning disability or difficulty. Four people are identified as having a visual impairment.

Sex/Gender: all seven service users are women

In terms of ethnicity five service users are white British, one person is White British/Irish and the other person is from a mixed background (White and Black Caribbean). All seven service users have English as a first language.

We have used consultation feedback, best practice and research to assess the possible impacts of each option. We compared this information to what we know about the people living in each home. Consideration of any possible adverse impacts are included in full in the Equalities Impact Assessment in Appendix 3 and in summary in Section 4.1 of this report.

In order to meet its equality duty the Council will need to take measures to eliminate or reduce these adverse impacts. If a decision is made that necessitates a move, each service user will have their needs reassessed and a care plan drawn up in consultation with service user, family and where appropriate an advocate. In drawing up the care plan there will be a need to use a person-centred approach to a package of care that meets all eligible assessed needs. A practical example of the type of support that might be identified is for individuals to remain in contact if they are placed in different homes. We have evidence that this has been successfully managed in Harrow for example where a service user moved to another part of the country a number of her friends were supported to visit her combining it with a short holiday.

The Council will need to demonstrate that it has met the “Choice Directive” if people at Southdown Crescent need to move home in the future. Information on this directive is included on page 4 and 5 of this report.

What people told us during the consultation

We invited all service users, their advocates and family members to a meeting at Southdown Crescent. In response the meeting was attended by five of the seven service users and three family members.

At the consultation meeting there was support for a move towards a model of supported living, when the benefits of this were explained, particularly around choice and control and the benefits of having a tenancy.

The need to support service users with money management and understanding and maintaining a tenancy was raised. It was noted that there is already a culture of supporting independence within Southdown which may help with a smooth transition to a supported living model should a decision be made to de-register the home.

One family member who was unable to attend the meeting sent a letter outlining some concerns that she had about the proposal to de-register Southdown Crescent. Her concerns centred around a need for more information on supported living and what that would mean for her family member. She went on to state that if de-registration means that staffing would be reduced she would be opposed to the proposal. A detailed response was sent to the family member providing further information on the supported living model, confirming that staffing would be directly linked to her family member's assessed needs and that we would envisage that Southdown Crescent would continue to be staffed over a 24-hour period if a decision was made to de-register the service.

Harrow Mencap stressed that deregistering a care home does not make it a supported living home. They stressed the importance of working with people to understand their rights and responsibilities and work with staff teams on the fundamental differences between residential care and supported living. They also stressed the need for openness, honesty and transparency in any changes – for example people will not have total control over who lives with them or support them.

In addition to the consultation meeting all service users, family members, advocates and member of staff were offered a questionnaire to complete.

Three responses came from people directly linked to Southdown Crescent, two agreed with the proposal and one disagreed.

There were two questions posed in the questionnaire about supported living. The first was about the Council wanting to increase the use of supported living in place of residential care. The second question was about the proposal to de-register Southdown and for it to be a 24-hour staff supported living service.

The majority of the 21 (54%) respondents who disagreed with this proposal were concerned about aspects of supported living and potential risks linked to issues such as managing money. Comments included:

'People who are vulnerable will be exploited when they are in supported living. They will not have a say as to who will support them and the staff will take full advantage of their disability' (not stated)

A number of respondents, irrespective of whether they agreed or disagreed with the question said that supported living would be appropriate for some, but not all, service users.

In response to the question proposing the de-registration of Southdown almost half of the respondents (46%) said they 'do not know' or did not answer the questions; a third (33%) disagreed whilst two out of the five respondents (21%) agreed.

Respondents that disagreed with the proposal were mainly concerned that some of the existing service users at Southdown may have to move.

It appeared that many people did not truly understand the supported housing model indicating a need for additional information to be made available to service users, family members and advocates.

If supported living is not considered to be the most appropriate housing option for an individual then a more appropriate housing option will be identified for the service user and a care plan would be drawn up in consultation with service user, family and where appropriate an advocate. In drawing up the care plan there will be a need to use a person-centred approach to a package of care that meets all eligible assessed needs.

Our response to what people told us

We address the concerns raised by service users, family member and organisations during the consultation below:

1. People may be more vulnerable when they live in supported living

The Joseph Rowntree Foundation considered the area of risk and abuse in supported living compared to residential care in its report 'Support for Living?' (Joseph Rowntree Foundation, 2007) and concluded that risks occur in both supported living and residential care settings. Good quality assessment and care planning alongside regular reviews will help to safeguard service users wherever they live. All Harrow service users are reviewed at least once per year and more often if needs change. It is important to stress that even if a decision is approved to de-register Southdown Crescent, the council still has a duty to regularly review individuals in order to check that care provision is meeting assessed needs.

2. *'What happens to the people in Southdown who are not suitable? Presumably they would have to move?'* (advocate)

Unless a service user has indicated that they want to move from Southdown Crescent it is not expected that anyone is likely to move if the service is deregistered. Over time service users may be supported to move on to alternative housing options either as a response to further support independence or where assessed needs indicate a need for change. A small

number of service users have already indicated that they would like to move to a new home rather than remain at Southdown Crescent.

As part of the process to review the in-house learning disability services all service users have been assessed by an experienced, qualified social worker. If a decision is approved to de-register Southdown Crescent each service user a care plan drawn up in consultation with service user, family and where appropriate an advocate. In drawing up the care plan there will be a need to use a person-centred approach to a package of care that meets all eligible assessed needs. In addition the Council will need to demonstrate that it has met the “Choice Directive” if people at Southdown Crescent need to move home.

Recommendations for Southdown Crescent

We have carefully considered feedback provided during consultation and our response to some of the concerns raised is included above. Officers are recommending to Cabinet that we should de-register Southdown Crescent in order to deliver the most effective mix of value for money and opportunities to improve outcomes. De-registration would be dependent upon an agreement with both CQC and the housing provider; Stadium Housing. In implementing any decision the council will need to ensure that all mitigating actions to reduce any adverse impacts are followed through for each service user affected.

Impacts of the recommendations

One key impact of the recommendation will be that people living at Southdown Crescent who are assessed as being suitable for supported living will have the opportunity to live more independently with staffing levels tailored to their individual needs. Service users will be tenants and have the right to full welfare benefits including housing benefit. In addition service users will have access to direct payments and personal budgets for support.

The development of a supported living service in Southdown Crescent will increase the housing options for people with learning disabilities living in Harrow.

Rationale for recommendations

- 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.
- Staffing at the home is historic and provides for 1:1 staffing for the residents, the majority of whom do not have that level of need. If the service is de-registered the support needs of service users will be individually assessed with an indication of shared support and individual support hours required. This enables individual service users to continue to receive support on an individualised basis.

- There are clear advantages that supported living has over residential care for giving people more choice, control, rights and independence.
- We may be disempowering service users by supporting them in residential care when they have the skills to live more independently this may create a culture of dependency and is not conducive to the service users needs.
- The Council would ensure that all mitigating actions to reduce any adverse impacts are followed through for each service user affected

Roxborough Park

Information about each of the services included in Appendix 1 on Page 52.

Option consulted upon

“that we consider maintaining the current model of the service delivering high quality care to people with autism and challenging behaviour. This may mean that people who do not have autism or the need for the intensive support provided at Roxborough Park may be supported to move to another service that will meet assessed needs”

Equalities Act 2010

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. This is a requirement of the Equalities Act 2010.

There are eight people living at Roxborough Park. The following protected characteristics of the Equalities Act 2010 would apply:

Age: one of the service users is over the age of 65.

Disability: all eight service users have a learning disability or difficulty

Sex/Gender: there are six men and two women living at the service

In terms of ethnicity four service users are white British, one person is Black or Black British (Caribbean) and two service users are Asian or Asian British (Indian). Seven service users have English as a first language and one has Gujarati.

We have used consultation feedback, best practice and research to assess the possible impacts of each option. We compared this information to what we know about the people living in each home. Consideration of any possible adverse impacts are included in full in the Equalities Impact Assessment in Appendix 3 and in summary in Section 4.1 of this report.

In order to meet its equality duty the Council will need to take measures to eliminate or reduce these adverse impacts. If a decision is made that necessitates a move, each service user will have their needs reassessed and a care plan drawn up in consultation with service user, family and where appropriate an advocate. In drawing up the care plan there will be a need to use a person-centred approach to a package of care that meets all eligible assessed needs. A practical example of the type of support that might be identified is for individuals to remain in contact if they are placed in different homes. We have evidence that this has been successfully managed in Harrow for example where a service user moved to another part of the country a number of her friends were supported to visit her combining it with a short holiday.

The Council will need to demonstrate that it has met the “Choice Directive” if people at Roxborough Park need to move home in the future. Information on this directive is included on page 4 and 5 of this report.

What people told us during the consultation

We invited all service users, their advocates and family members to a meeting at Roxborough Park. In response the meeting was attended by seven of the eight service users and twelve family members.

The service quality at Roxborough Park was commended, which is the only National Autistic Society accredited adult residential service in the south of England.

Whilst the need to provide residential options in Harrow for people with the most complex needs was acknowledged in the meeting, there was general opposition that some current service users may need to move if the service is focussed on people with complex autism and severe challenging behaviour.

There were also concerns around that would need to be addressed in the client assessments, the following comments were made in the meeting by family members

'People are very settled here, to start again is very difficult for the service users and their families'

'My son does not like change'

'Some service users have challenging behaviour, its not always apparent because of the good quality of staff, this should not count against the service users'

'Many residents cannot articulate or make a decision'

In addition to the consultation meeting all service users, family members, advocates and member of staff were offered a questionnaire to complete.

Five responses came from people directly linked to Roxborough Park.

There were two questions regarding the support for people with a higher level or complex needs in Harrow's residential services in the questionnaire. The first question asked:

'Council services need to give better support to people with higher needs. The Council would like to think about using the residential homes on supporting people with higher needs. This would mean that people with less need that live in homes may need to move to another home'

Around one in five (21%) of all respondents agreed, just over a third (36%) said that they do not know or did not answer whilst 43% disagreed.

Comments from respondents that disagreed, or said that they did not know, revealed three main concerns with the proposal.

1. The effect on the service users that would have to move from their existing home to accommodate people with higher needs

I like it where I am, I don't want to move, it's my home' (service user)

Moving service users to other homes is very disruptive for them they like stability with carers who they know (family member)

2. The limited information and uncertainty about how client 'needs' would be assessed to distinguish service users with 'higher' and 'less needs'.

'I would like to know how you categorize or prioritise needs. I think it is very difficult to compare the needs of different groups in society and arrive at a fair outcome. All service users should be treated as equals - so the needs of the young and old should be given equal weighting regardless of whether they have a long life ahead of them or not' (family member)

3. The lack of detail of where service users with 'lower needs' would move to

The second question focussed on supporting young people with severe autism and challenging behaviour to staying living in Harrow near to their families rather than moving out of the borough. This echoes one of the key issues identified in the Government's response to the abuse at Winterbourne View.

Over half (54%) respondents agreed with supporting younger people closer to home, whilst around a quarter (26%) disagreed, a fifth (20%) did not know or did not answer.

Comments from respondents included:

'People with learning disabilities will feel safer and more secure if they remain close to family and local links. The families of these people will be able to visit them more frequently and be more involved with their care leading to greater peace of mind of both service users and the family. It would save money to accommodate people in Harrow' (family member)

'A perfectly acceptable idea in theory but not acceptable in practice if it involves other existing Harrow residents with learning disabilities who are living in one of the council's homes already, having to be moved and thus lose their homes, security and everything that is familiar to them' (service user with support from a family member)

Harrow Mencap's view is that the council's residential care homes should not be used solely for people with higher support needs as residential care should be part of a range of housing options open to people with higher needs. However, priority or consideration of use of existing provisions should be given to those with higher needs on an individual basis. Young adults with complex needs and those on the autistic spectrum should be living as full citizens and be part of their local community. Moving people out of borough isolates them from families and friends and makes them more vulnerable to

poor care and at greater risk of abuse. The Winterbourne View final report guides councils to plan provision from childhood for the care and support needs of people with challenging needs.

Our response to what people told us

We address the concerns and suggestions raised by service users, family members, advocates and organisations during the consultation below:

1. People in the Council's homes should not have to move to enable people with higher level needs to be supported.

In carrying out the review of in-house services we have needed to balance the needs of the service users living in the services against the need to efficiently distribute resources when meeting need so that no one group is disproportionately resourced at the potential expense of other service users.

Staff at Roxborough Park are experienced practitioners and have the necessary skills to support service users who have severe autism and behaviour described as challenging. As identified in section 2.4 specialist autism services are in great demand in Harrow but there is a limited supply locally this has meant that we have had to place people with these type of needs outside of Harrow. If a service user does not have an assessed need for the type of specialist support provided by Roxborough Park then they may be being over-provided for and they may need to be supported to move alternative provision more appropriate to meet their assessed eligible needs. This may deliver improved outcomes particularly where service users are able to exercise more choice and control.

Research⁶ has shown that when an individual's needs are met then their quality of life will improve and any behaviours of concern will be reduced or eliminated.

In its response to the consultation Harrow Mencap stated that priority or consideration of use of existing provisions should be given to those with higher needs on an individual basis. As part of the process to review the in-house learning disability services all service users will be assessed by an experienced, qualified social worker. If an assessment indicates that a service user is not in the need for intensive specialist like the service provided at Roxborough Park a care plan will be drawn up in consultation with service user, family and where appropriate an advocate. In drawing up the care plan there will be a need to use a person-centred approach to a package of care that meets all eligible assessed needs this will be then used to identify a range of housing options for the service user. In addition the Council will need to demonstrate that it has met the "Choice Directive" if people at Roxborough Park need to move home.

2. "There is a lack of information about where service users would move to"

⁶ Dimensions website. Dimensions is a charitable, industrial and provident society focussed on the needs of people with learning disabilities and autism.

Information about options for any service user who may need to move will be discussed with the service user, their family and advocate (if involved). A range of housing options would be identified to meet all assessed eligible needs.

3. “Many residents cannot articulate or make a decision”

If an individual is assessed as not having capacity to choose then someone would need to make a decision on their behalf based on what is in their best interest. This issue is explored further in Section 2.1.

Recommendations for Roxborough Park

We have carefully considered feedback and suggestions provided during consultation and acknowledge that there is significant resistance to anyone being moved to alternative provision if they are assessed as not requiring the intensive and specialist support provided at Roxborough Park.

Our final recommendations are therefore:

1. To maintain the specialist model delivering high quality care for people with complex autism and severe challenging behaviour.
2. To identify service users not in need of the specialist support provided at Roxborough Park and through intensive professional support identify a range of alternative housing options to meet their needs.
3. That social workers develop detailed care plans in conjunction with individual service users, their families and advocates to ensure that assessed needs continue to be met.
4. To ensure that all mitigating actions to reduce any adverse impacts are followed through for each service user affected

Impacts of the recommendations

One key impact would be that Harrow will have a local provision that is focussed on supported people with learning disabilities and autism who have behaviour described as challenging. In addition if a decision is approved to support those service users who do not have a need for the specialist support at Roxborough Park there will be an opportunity to consider supporting a service user placed out of borough to return closer to home or to place young people in transition in need of specialist residential care locally. Individual service users identified as not requiring the level of support currently provided may have more opportunity for choice and control in their lives particularly if they are able to move to a supported housing option.

Rationale for recommendations

- 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.

- 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 move to alternative accommodation that is more suited to their support needs would be appropriate this may lead to improved outcomes for individuals including the opportunity gain skills to enable them to live more independently.
- The average cost of placements for people with complex autism and challenging behaviour placed in 2011/12 is £2000 per week compared to £1,695 per week at Roxborough Park. The opportunity to either bring a small number of people back from out-of-borough or to place young people in need of specialist provision at Roxborough Park would contribute significantly to the overall Medium Term Financial Saving target.
- The Council would ensure that all mitigating actions to reduce any adverse impacts are followed through for each service user affected.

Summary of the Recommendations for each service

A table showing a summary of the recommendation for each service is included below

Service	Recommendations	Number of service users living at the service
Bedford House	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To separate the long-term residential, respite and day services at Bedford House; 2. To focus Bedford House on providing specialist support to people who have complex physical and sensory needs; and 3. Increase the range of options for short breaks. 	<p>11 long-term service users</p> <p>49 respite service users</p>
Gordon Avenue	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To change the model and seek to use Gordon Avenue as a centre for residential respite care; and 2. Provide intensive professional support to current residents of Gordon Avenue to identify a choice of alternative housing options to meet their needs 	8
Woodlands Drive (two adjoining properties)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To change the model at Woodlands Drive and consider its use for young people in transition in need of support; and 2. Provide intensive professional support to current residents at Woodlands Drive to identify a choice of alternative housing options to meet their needs 	3 (the other property is vacant)
Southdown Crescent	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. de-register Southdown Crescent and operate the service as a supported living provision 	7
Roxborough Park	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To maintain the specialist model delivering high quality care for people with complex autism and severe challenging behaviour; and 2. To identify service users not in need of the specialist support provided at Roxborough Park and through intensive professional support identify a range of alternative housing options to meet their needs. 	8

Section 4 - Implications of Recommendations

4.1 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.

A project group has developed the full Equalities Impact Assessment; this included representatives from Harrow Mencap and Harrow Association for Disabled People. The following key impacts were identified through a full Equalities Impact Assessment:

Age

- There are a significant number of older service users within the services covered by the review. They may be particularly affected by the recommended changes to Gordon Avenue and Woodlands Drive. These recommendations would lead to a number of older people having to move from their current home to a different home. Potential adverse impacts have been identified including the loss of existing friendships, familiar routines and environments and opportunities to access the community and services like day centres.
- To mitigate impacts Officers will ensure that each service user has a person-centred plan and a range of housing options will be considered. These options will include residential care homes if appropriate but may also include: Harrow Shared Lives, supported housing and specialist learning disability services.
- Research has shown that older people with learning disabilities moving into care homes for people without a learning disability may experience harassment and bullying and may be viewed as being different. To mitigate we will work with providers to pay particular attention to supporting the relationships between residents. Individuals will be able

to maintain their skills and interests in services that supports their health and wellbeing and enable them to lead an active and fulfilling life. Service users will settle in to a new home, be valued and develop new relationships

- There is an under-representation of service users under the age of 40 in the services under review. The services include many people who have lived in the same place for a number of years and there is very little move-on to enable younger people access to these specialist provisions.
- The in-house services have not been accessible to young people coming through transition. The result of this is that those people who have required accommodation are frequently placed out-of-borough away from local connections and family. Supporting people to move to alternative housing options will provide an opportunity for a small number of younger adults to return to live in Harrow and be close to their families. This is particularly true of those with the most complex needs.
- In addition Harrow Mencap have reported that many young people do not want to access the residential respite service at Bedford House due to its size and institutional feel. By working to separate the respite/short breaks service from Bedford House and re-site it at Gordon Avenue, we will ensure that services are provided in ways that make them accessible and sensitive to age, gender, ethnicity, religion, sexuality and disability. There is a potential positive impact on younger people as the future design of services can better address their specific requirements.

Disability

- There were concerns expressed in the consultation that people currently using the respite service at Bedford House may experience a loss in their level of respite provision if the service moves to Gordon Avenue. This is due to a reduction in the number of beds from nine to eight. There is a potential adverse impact on some users if these receive less respite.
- A measure of mitigation will be to review the way the emergency placements are managed. These currently impact negatively on respite bed availability. In addition the range of short break options will be reviewed including an increase in the provision of short breaks via the Harrow Shared Lives Service.
- The implementation plan for changes following this review will include a review of the use of respite beds for emergency placements to enable families to continue to access short breaks/respite in order to support their caring role. Information regarding the range of short break options will be made available to all families.

4.2 Implementation process

Following the decision from Cabinet about the future shape of services Officers will develop a detailed implementation plan.

Implementation will be a complex procedure given the potential impact upon individuals, the vulnerable nature of the service user group, and the legal and financial constraints upon making changes to roles and services. It will include the following steps:

- A project group will be set up comprising of Officers covering project management, social work, management of residential services, human resources and advocacy organisations.
- Officers will inform service users, families, advocates and staff of the final decisions. Information and FAQs will be shared and relevant groups/services engaged to ensure support for people through any change.
- Officers will begin formal consultation with staff in accordance with the Corporate Change Management Protocol.
- Social work staff will commence work with service users, family members and advocates to plan any moves that follow on from decisions to change services.

Officers will work to implement changes quickly and effectively as appropriate, this is both to minimise impacts for service users and to achieve necessary MTFS savings. Key milestones from the outline timetable are: -

1. First meeting of Steering Group – February 2013
2. Communications to all service users & carer's – March 2013
3. Care planning with affected service users – April - June 2013
4. Changes to services – From June 2013
5. Full implementation of all changes – March 2014

4.3 Financial Implications

In November 2012 there was a Collective Agreement to modernise terms and conditions of employment for Harrow Council employees. This agreement has impacted upon staff in the residential services included in this review. The impacts have come into effect from 7 January 2013. The changes affect enhancements paid for working nights, weekend and bank holidays, which are particularly important in residential services.

In order to mitigate the loss of contractual pay for those staff most affected by the Collective Agreement the Council has put in place actions to compensate staff. Transitional arrangements will be in effect for a two year period and will impact the level of savings that are achieved through the outcomes of this review.

Changes to terms and conditions will have a significant impact on residential services; figures from finance suggest approximately a £207k reduction in costs in 2013/14.

Adult services expressed the risk of double counting the savings from terms and conditions and those from the review of the in-house learning disability services during terms and conditions consultation. The changes will impact on the level of savings that can be achieved through this review. Further detail is included in section 4.3.2 below.

4.3.1 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 Bedford House and the two properties in Woodlands Drive.

Name of home	Address	Beds	Capital Implications of Recommendation	Property owner
Bedford House	Pinner	20	The recommendation would leave parts of the building un-used. In the longer-term we will seek alternative accommodation for the permanent residents in the service.	Harrow Council
Gordon Avenue	Stanmore	8	The building would be used for respite rather than permanent accommodation – some minor capital works may be needed to facilitate this.	Genesis
Woodlands Drive	Stanmore	3	The implications would be defined based upon the final agreement on the future use of the building.	Harrow Council
Woodlands Drive	Stanmore	3		Harrow Council
Southdown Crescent	South Harrow	7	There would be no/minor implications as the service use is broadly similar.	Stadium Housing (Formerly Network)
Roxborough Park	Harrow	8	There will be no capital implications.	Genesis

There are potentially substantial capital implications of the recommendations in this report. Most notably these relate to Bedford House and Woodlands Drive. Officers from Adult Services will work closely with colleagues in the finance department to consider the capital implications including opportunities

to roll forward any capital resources, if available and not needed for other purposes.

The changes to Bedford House will mean that parts of the building (nine bedrooms currently used for respite) will not be used. This will have benefits for the permanent residents in the service as it will provide them with more communal spaces to use and a more relaxed environment. However the Council's Estates Department have identified that in the longer-term this would not be the most efficient use of the asset. They have identified longer-term options including potential sale of the building and purchase of an alternative building which meets the needs of the long-term residents in a high quality environment.

Capital changes to Woodlands Avenue will be determined by a decision on the long-term model of support to be delivered from the building. There are approved resources set aside to undertake capital works on the building subject to this decision.

As outlined in the September report, the recommendations 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 review of properties used 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.

4.3.2 Revenue - Financial model

As outlined in our paper to Cabinet in September, there are significant pressures on spending in the public sector at present. The review of council provided residential care homes is a part of the council's response to these challenges and needs to contribute between £600k and £1m towards Medium Term Financial Strategy plans to save £2.275m from residential care services across all client groups.

During consultation we had a significant amount of feedback that savings were disproportionate, or that they should be targeted to other services that did not support such vulnerable people. In response to these suggestions it is important to reflect that the council has identified savings from these services so that it can continue to provide quality services to as many vulnerable adults as possible. As reflected in the September report to Cabinet the cost of providing some of the services in this review means the council are meeting needs of a small group of people in an unfairly expensive way. Continuing to provide these services in the same way therefore would result in a loss of service or a loss of quality services to other people.

It is not possible to determine the exact level of savings that the recommendations in this review will achieve. This is because the service for each individual who moves to new accommodation will be based on an individual assessment of their need, and up to date care plan. The cost of these services cannot be determined in advance.

It has however been necessary to estimate savings that will be achieved through the recommendations. These total approximately £600k on conservative estimates in a full year as set out in the table below, and could rise depending on the outcome of individual assessments of need. Additional savings may also be achieved following potential moves for clients assessed as being able to be supported in alternative accommodation:

Service	Current net Cost (2013/14 budget)	Cost estimate of recommended option (provisional)	Estimated saving in full year
	£000	£000	£000
Southdown Crescent	273	196	(77)
Roxborough Park	611	617	6
Gordon Avenue	584	533	(51)
Bedford House	1,169	967	(202)
Woodlands Drive	400	126	(274)
Total	3,037	2,439	(598)

Implementation would be a complex procedure given the potential impact upon individuals, the vulnerable nature of the service user group, and the legal and financial constraints upon making changes to roles and services therefore there would be a part-year effect of any savings on 2013/14 budgets. Officers will work to implement changes quickly and effectively as appropriate, this is both to minimise impacts for service users and to achieve necessary MTFS savings.

Further proposals in respect of other client groups will need to be considered in order to achieve the full MTFS savings of £775k in 2013/14, and £2.275m in a full year from 2014/15. These additional proposals include a review of residential accommodation for service users of working age (£700k to £1m), Move-on schemes including night care and the transfer of service users from high cost placements to lower cost placements where needs can still be met (target saving of £500k), and the Shared Lives service (target saving of £300k).

It is important to note, as above, that council terms and conditions have changed since this review was discussed in September. This has resulted in a reduction of the overall budget for the service from £ 3.482m to £ 3.275m Including the savings from new terms and conditions increases the estimated savings by £207k, but these have already been built into the 2013/14 base budget.

⁷ These figures represent the direct controllable costs and exclude organisational overhead charges and client income.

Officers from Adult Services will work closely with colleagues in the finance department to monitor expenditure and track the savings achieved through the implementation of the savings.

4.3.3 Implementation costs

As outlined above the implementation of recommendations will be complex and will involve a range of council officers.

The majority of these costs will be met from existing adult services budgets for social care operations, commissioning and providers services. In addition there will be a requirement for project support from both human resources and finance.

There will be some small additional costs incurred through communications and engagement. These will be considered by the Project Group on a case by case basis and will be contained within existing budgetary resources.

4.3.4 Staffing Implications

A key principle of the review has been to avoid redundancies wherever possible. The original proposals were shaped with this in mind.

As suggested in the September report to Cabinet we do not expect there to be a need for redundancies for care staff if the recommendations are approved. This is because services currently include a number of agency 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 further efficiencies.

Staff meetings were held at each of the residential homes during the consultation period. Staff were informed that the aim of the meetings was for informal staff engagement to enable their views to be fed into the consultation process. If a decision is made necessitating changes to staff roles, responsibilities or work place, a formal consultation will be carried out in accordance with the Council's Protocol for Managing Change.

All meetings were well attended with 80%⁸ of all residential staff attending a meeting. Meetings with staff took place before meetings with service users (except at Bedford House) to ensure staff had information and an ability to support service users with questions and anxieties. This approach was positively acknowledged by a number of staff.

It was noted that it is not possible to definitively state the implications for all staff within the residential homes, but the council is trying to avoid redundancies. There is likely to be a need for a restructure of staff teams and further training if recommendations are accepted.

It will not be possible to accurately identify full staffing implications until after a decision by Cabinet. Following this the development of new service specifications will shape a clear understanding of staffing requirements.

⁸ 65 staff attended the sessions out of a possible 81

The Council is aware of a possible risk of limited redundancies and have provided for these costs as part of the budget setting process for 2013/14. 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.

4.4 Legal implications

In determining service provision, local authorities are obliged to consider their overarching statutory duties, including equality duties which are set out above.

When deciding to change the way a service is provided, the Council must take account of all relevant material, including financial resources, consultation responses and potential equality impact in order to reach a decision. This paper proposes a set of recommendations to Cabinet, however this does not preclude Cabinet from determining that another option for one, or more of the services is the most appropriate way forward. In an extreme case, if Cabinet felt that the severity of the impact of the proposed options on particular groups of individuals was such that none of the options are appropriate and that additional resources are required to fund these services, then it should refer the matter up to full Council with a recommendation that further spending resources be allocated to the Directorate (either from Council reserves or from other budgets).

The Council has carried out a full consultation process to seek the views of stakeholders and users of the services. Summary details of the consultation responses have been set out in the main report and Appendix 2 and copies of all consultation responses are available as background information. Case law has confirmed that when determining whether to change service provision, the Council must be receptive to reasonable arguments against the proposals. However this does not simply involve a head count of those for and against the proposals. The Council must take all views into account, as well as other relevant information. Even if the respondents to consultation have strong views against the proposals, Cabinet may decide to introduce the proposals if justified for proper policy and operational reasons.

The Local Authority has a duty to meet assessed eligible needs for community care provision, and where there is an existing care plan identified to meet a service user's needs, that plan should not be changed without a prior review of need.

In terms of choice for service users when identifying appropriate residential accommodation to meet an assessed need under s21 National Assistance Act, 1948 (Choice Accommodation) Directions 1992 requires the Local Authority to meet the service user's preference when the following conditions are satisfied:

1. the preferred accommodation appears suitable to meet need;
2. the cost of the preferred accommodation would not require the Local Authority to pay more than it would usually pay for accommodation to meet the assessed need (and that accommodation at this usual level of cost is available elsewhere than at the preferred accommodation resource)

3. the preferred accommodation is available;
4. the preferred accommodation will be provided subject to the Local Authority's usual terms and conditions, (having regard to the nature of the accommodation), for providing accommodation under s21 of the 1948 Act.

4.5 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 have not reached this target (66% at Q3 2012-13), however the recommendations would contribute to an improvement in performance in this area and therefore support more people to achieve independent living. The proposed changes would have a estimated positive impact on the indicator of around 2 percentage points and there could be a further significant shift as complex cases are provided with support to live in the community.

There are no negative impacts on performance indicators as a result of the proposed changes. Performance targets will be set for services and they will monitored both 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 performance monitoring arrangements for local and national indicators.

4.6 Environmental Impact

Improving the energy efficiency of all these buildings will need to be taken into account in the future development of these services to help deliver the council's climate change strategy.

Bedford House has been included in the RE:FIT programme (which improves the energy performance of public sector buildings) for the current year. This work will need to be re-phased into 2013/14 to take into account the proposed changes.

4.7 Risk Management Implications

Risk included on Directorate risk register? No

Separate risk register in place? Yes

4.8 Equalities implications

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

4.9 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 Council's vision for adult social care is:

By working together with all stakeholders and within available resources, to ensure that adult residents of Harrow have the opportunity to achieve the best possible health and wellbeing, are able to have as much choice and control in their lives as they wish, are able to make an active contribution to the community, and are effectively safeguarded from abuse.

Section 5 - Statutory Officer Clearance

Name: Roger Hampson	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of Chief Financial Officer
Date: 8 February 2013		

Name: Sharon Clarke	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the Monitoring Officer
Date: 6 February 2013		

Section 6 – Performance Officer Clearance

Name: David Harrington	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the Divisional Director Partnership, Development and Performance
Date: 7 February 2013		

Section 7 – Environmental Impact Officer Clearance

Name: Andrew Baker

on behalf of
Divisional Director
(Environmental
Services)

Date: 8 February 2013

Section 8 - Contact Details and Background Papers

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

Background Papers:

- a) “Stuck 869 People With Learning disabilities Resident in Care Homes for older people” (Learning Disability alliance Scotland)
<http://www.ldascotland.org/docs/STUCK.pdf>
- b) *Perspectives on ageing with a learning disability* (Joseph Rowntree Foundation January 2012) report
<http://www.jrf.org.uk/publications/perspectives-ageing-learning-disability>
- c) Strategic Review of Learning Disability Accommodation – Report to Cabinet 13 September 2012
<http://www.harrow.gov.uk/www2/documents/g61071/Public%20reports%20pack,%20Thursday%2013-Sep-2012%2019.30,%20Cabinet.pdf?T=10>
- d) Learning Disability Homes – consultation summary (Appendix 2)
- e) Full Equalities Impact Assessment (Appendix 3)

**Call-In Waived by the
Chairman of Overview
and Scrutiny
Committee**

NOT APPLICABLE

[Call-in applies]

Appendix 1 – Basic information about services

Bedford House

This is a registered service providing Residential care for 11 adults with low, medium and high needs and 9 adults with low, medium and high needs requiring short stay/respite services. The current gross cost per bed per week is £1,301.

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.

Gordon Avenue

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 inspected this service in (add) and found that all standards were being met. The current gross cost per bed per week is £1,622

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.

Woodlands Avenue

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 Woodlands Drive supports three people with medium support needs and does not have wheelchair access. One of the properties 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 £1,396 (64) and £1,576 (66).

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.

Southdown Crescent

This is a registered service providing residential care for up to seven adults with low to medium support needs who require support.

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.

CQC have inspected this service in (add) and found that all standards were being met. The gross cost per bed per week is £880 with a staff to client ratio of 1:1.

Roxborough Park

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 (need to check this with BK). 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 £1,695

There is a staff to client ratio of 2.88:1.