

Richard Burbidge

020 8489 2923

020 8881 2660

richard.burbidge@haringey.gov.uk

19 July 2011

To: All Members of the Cabinet

Dear Member,

Cabinet - Tuesday, 19th July, 2011

I attach a copy of a supplementary report together with additional appendices relating to the following item for consideration at the above-mentioned meeting:

9. PROPOSED CLOSURE OF THREE OLDER PEOPLE'S RESIDENTIAL CARE HOMES AND LEARNING DISABILITIES RESIDENTIAL AND RESPITE CARE HOMES (PAGES 1 - 16)

(Report of the Director of Adult and Housing Services – To be introduced by the Cabinet Member for Health and Adult Services): To inform Members of the outcome of a process of consultation in relation to the future of four separate service areas, all of which are directly provided by the Council; and to give sufficient information to enable an informed decision to be made about all four services The Red House, Broadwater Lodge, Cranwood and Whitehall Street.

Yours sincerely,

Richard Burbidge
Cabinet Committees Manager

This page is intentionally left blank

Proposed closure of Residential Day Care – Literal Responses

Question 2 To what extent do you support our proposal to close the following residential care homes owned by the council? Please tell us the reasons(s) for your answer.

- The older people need all the help they can get. Mentally disabled often get higher benefits and could therefore pay for their extended care needs
- It is costing the council more to operate the homes rather than finding alternative cheaper care in the private sector
- How the care homes are closed is more important than the fact of the closure. The independent sector is capable of providing care of equal quality. What matters is that the individual residents are treated as individuals and not just as victims of necessity.
- Whitehall Street provides an essential service to enable parents/carers to continue to provide care for people with a very high level of need. An uncertain future adds hugely to the stress on these families. People with severe learning disabilities need familiar environments and staff who know them.
- Cost
- They are all quite small in numbers and expensive
- It's wrong to cause such upset and disruption to vulnerable people
- These are services to the most vulnerable in our society. They are not able to speak out for themselves and so their wishes are not being taken into account. They should be the last people to suffer from cuts. The proposals are short sighted - there will continue to be ongoing costs for their care, so the proposed enormous upheaval in the removal of them from their home will only result in a one off saving on the premises costs.
- I do not support your decision to close any of the homes but especially Broadwater Lodge as I have a relative there who has just settled in.
- This is a vital resource for vulnerable, difficult to place adults. It has been their home for many years and to split up the grove would be very distressing. Staff have become like a family to them.
- Broadwater provides an essential service - why close it?
- Reasons being, my husband who suffers from Dementia and is presently in residential care finally settled down and is now use to his environment, so moving him would be devastating because he doesn't like change. I am afraid that he would just give up and die. Also because the homes are

local his family and friends are able to make frequent visits, but moving him out of the borough would be difficult almost impossible for such visits. However, it is shameful to take such drastic measures against vulnerable people.

- We need care homes run by the Council and owned by the Council. The care workers at The Red House are very good and I feel secure that my relative is being looked after in the best possible way.
- The standards seem higher than in many residential homes I have seen. There is a very strong profit motive in the private sector and more [?] and less qualified staff. Council run homes have always provided better career prospects for staff and residents and carers feel they can trust council run establishments. They do not always feel that way about the independent sector.
- Whitehall Street has been the home to 2 groups of very vulnerable adults with severe learning difficulties for many years. The staff who are quite constant have become their families and source of support. It would be very cruel to uproot them against their wishes and take them away from familiar staff, building and possibly separate them from their friends who they are living with.
- Reason being I do not want my husband to move away from his friends and family. I want him to stay in the Borough.
- "In your consultation update you state that you have to make 6.2 million of savings over the next 2-3 years, just over 2 million a year. In the past you had the financial resources to invest 50 million in the Icelandic banks, what other money does the council have that it is not spending? Reading in the newspapers that the average chief executives pay is well over 100k, how many of these people are losing their jobs. Councillors get salaries and expenses 2-k+ town clerks are now chief executives with salaries to match. The list goes on, web sites, data processing, it etc. we all survived in the past without these resources, in fact councils seemed more efficient. The young and old are some of the most vulnerable people in society they are the last people who should be involved in any cost cutting exercise. If these residents get moved into private care and these homes close what happens them? A freedom pass for transport costs 2.5 million that is enough to keep the homes opened. We managed years ago and very few people had cuts. Just read in the paper council paid out £427 million in mileage allowances 2009/2010. No wonder there is no money!"
- "They are essential"
- I think it is wrong for Haringey council to close these residential homes. They are not only homes but communities and to move residents will cause great distress. Especially Whitehall Street whose residents have

learning and physical disabilities and have already lost many facilities and are now looking at being farmed out to who knows where. I think it is a callous proposal and Haringey Council have a duty of care to their most vulnerable residents.

=====

Question 4: If you do not understand the reasons, or are unsure, why Haringey Council is proposing to close its residential care homes, Please tell us why?

- The council believes it will save money but could end up spending more on paying profit making companies to provide a lower level of care.
- Yes, because of the money but it is unfair to everyone
- If the service was unnecessary - then close it, but it is vital
- I understand the reason that the Council gave to close the residential homes, but what I don't understand is why in the name of God would the Council target the Social Services, especially for people with Dementia. To quote the old saying "Kick a man while he is down." Why don't you?

=====

Question 6: If you do not understand the reasons, or are unsure, why Haringey Council is proposing to close its respite facility for people with learning disabilities, Please tell us why?

- Some families will be unable to continue to maintain their relative at home. This will mean high cost residential provision being provided by profit making companies.
- As above

=====

Question 7a – Which of the following do you think we should take into account when making our final decision Other – Please specify

- The needs of ALL haringey residents must be put above the needs of the few
- The true costs of closure.
- Scope for innovation and future needs
- The effect on users and carers. The upset would ultimately make families give up being able to care and would be more costly.

- I would like to emphasise quality of care. Many private homes fall below the standards of council run homes. I have seen this from my own observations.
- These residents enjoy a good quality of care -personal budgets and private residential care will not replace what they already have. It is inhumane to send these most vulnerable people into an uncertain future.

Question 10 Is there anything not listed above in question 9 which is really important to you.

- A cheerful environment. The quality of staff is paramount and hinges on the quality of the manager. A poor manager means a poor home; a good manager means a good home.
- Staying safe. Access to good medical care. Advocacy services.
- I would like to be able to have: Pets. Having my own phone line. Having access to internet. Being able to make my own hot drinks.
- Continuity of care and the security of knowing your home is there for the long term
- Home should be local and familiar daily day centre run activities provided in care package
- Cleanliness, mutual respect, safety
- Community and friendship that has been built up over many years, consistency of care by staff who know the residents well. Particularly for residents with learning and physical disabilities. Families need to feel assured that their children are being cared for by people they trust.

Q12a Which other care services do you think people should have access to in future?

- All are desirable. I have ticked those I think most important
 - Being respected. Not having different people coming into my home for a few minutes and then leaving.
 - Telecare options. Intergenerational activities, not just with people my own age.
 - These completely depend on the persons own needs and abilities
-
-

Q13a Which other respite options do you think people should have access to in future?

- All should be available. The type of respite care has to depend on the individual circumstances.
- A reliable safe place where the staff know the needs of the person they are caring for.
- Support in own home- day and night.
- These all depend on the persons needs, their current degree of support, the current service provision they have and on the family networks available.
- I think the adult placement scheme is a good one but this has not proved to be possible for most adults with severe disabilities

=====

Q14 Use the space below to tell us any other ideas or suggestions about the future of respite care for people in Haringey

- Respite care gives a break to the carer and the person with a disability. It needs to be properly staffed and consistently monitored to ensure safety of vulnerable people. Some privately or voluntarily run provision is good but some is shamefully inadequate. Public services should lead the way in providing services not pass the buck to others.

-
-
- In own home. Use of a bank of personal assistants who know me and what I need.
 - Respite needs to be individualised according to the needs of the person and their family or carer
 - If the Council's proposal to close most of the adult social services in the Borough become a reality there would be no future of respite care for the people in Haringey. However, the Council is doing a very good job at the moment, there is no need to change.
 - Respite is both for the benefit of the client and carer. Whatever form it takes must be enjoyable for all concerned and reliable. It is a learning experience for all and necessary to prepare the person with learning difficulties to learn to live without the parent.
 - I feel there has to be good quality council run respite care as well as sue of personal budgets. What are the council doing to do if someone needs to go into respite care if there is a family crisis? Will there be adequate resources? Respite facilities are already running on bare minimum.

Respite has to be available in a well run local facility with activities , health care, community, well trained support staff who understand their residents needs and can give good quality care and understanding.

=====

Q15 How do you think residential care could be provided differently?

- Who provides the care is less important than that the care is of the highest standard, and that the Council retains responsibility for establishing and monitoring those standards. To one method of providing care is "best". It all depends on the individual's circumstances and wishes.

- I applaud the existence of a range of options but residential care is a necessary part of provision for vulnerable people.
- More extra care type settings. Retirement villages. In my own home.
- I think there should be a variety of provision. People have different levels of need. The care homes and respite services should be retained for those who cannot simply go elsewhere
- It could be recognised as providing a home for life - people with learning disabilities or mental frailty need a secure home environment, not a mish-mash of services and carers
- At present the residential care homes in Haringey are offering an excellent service, therefore there is no need to change the system. Instead the Council need to be commended for the high level of care that they are providing in their care homes. The system is working perfectly and that is the reason why I don not want the care homes to be closed.
- "The staff at Cranwood where my mother resides are excellent and the staff seem to have a very good relationship with the residents. No doubt built up over a period of time. If these residents are displaced they will have to adapt to a completely new environment. With most of them in the latter years of their lives it is not something they should be required to do. The next move might not well be their last if the home they are moved to closes. The councils should consider building purpose built homes with the emphasis on low maintenance. The residents should be allowed to move in with existing staff and residents. Just a question how much is this consultation process costing?"
- "I don't"

- I think Haringey Council has to provide good quality residential care, which maintains communities, preventing people from becoming isolated. People who have physical and learning difficulties are particularly vulnerable and it is so important they are in a safe well run and supervised community that understands the residents and their needs. Whitehall Street already provides this. Families need to know and feel assured that their children, brother, sisters etc are being well cared for and will be cared for as long as is necessary. Many private facilities are not so well regulated and often to find somewhere suitable, the family might have to travel long distances which would make it difficult to keep regular contact with their loved ones. Depending on their needs as people start coming into the residential care system maybe they could be offered support living accommodation or if the family feels it appropriate private residential could be considered if for instance the person has a specific disability. Obviously the council has to offer a range of options but they have to fit the person not try to fit the person into the budget available.

=====

Q16a How do you think services currently provided by council-run residential care homes would best be provided in future? Other, please tell us

- See comments above.
- It's wrong to push for just one type of solution
- Again, it depends on peoples needs- some may be best served by community based support but there are others whose needs will only be met by residential care and they should not feel that their home can be taken away at the stroke of a pen

=====

Q18a I am completing this survey as..... Other, please specify

- A parent of a man with learning disabilities
- Parent of a young disabled adult
- A relative/unpaid carer of young adult with learning disabilities
- I am a member of the public, have a brother with severe learning difficulties and am a trustee of a charity providing homes for adults with learning difficulties in Somerset. Also - how can you state the information from this survey will be used regardless of ability etc, when the vast majority of these residents will be totally unable to complete this questionnaire.

- Parent of person (age 39) with learning difficulties
 - A wife whose husband is suffering from dementia and is presently in residential care.
 - Relative/carer of a 40 year old daughter with learning difficulties
 - A wife
 - I am a carer, my son is now 20
-
-

Appendix 6

THE STAFF CONSULTATION PROCESS ASSOCIATED WITH THE PROPOSALS TO CEASE PROVIDING SERVICES AT THE 3 RESIDENTIAL HOMES FOR OLDER PEOPLE AND THE RESIDENTIAL HOME AND RESPITE SERVICE FOR PEOPLE WITH LEARNING DISABILITIES

On 20 December 2011 the Director of Adults Culture and Community Services (as was) wrote to all staff stating that due to the significant savings that had to be made, proposals were going to Cabinet on 21 December 2011 regarding a number of options to reorganise services, including options to close or cease a range of services.

On 21 December 2011 Cabinet gave the approval to commence formal consultation with stakeholder groups.

This paper focuses on the process that was applied in connection with the staff consultation process for the 3 Residential Homes for Older People and the Residential Home/Respite Service for People with Learning Disabilities.

The formal staff consultation process commenced on 31 January 2011 and was due to last until 30 April 2011 however this was extended until May 2011 in order to allow sufficient time for full responses to be received.

2 briefing sessions were held with the staff teams in each of the 4 Units. UNISON trade union representative also was present at these sessions. The dates are set out in the table below.

Unit	Posts	People	Briefing 1	Briefing 2
Whitehall Street	38	32	10 February 2011	7 April 2011
Red House	45	44	14 February 2011	11 May 2011
Cranwood	43	42	7 February 2011	9 May 2011
Broadwater Lodge	46	44	7 February 2011	3 May 2011

At the sessions various issues were raised regarding ways in which staff could contribute to the consultation process about the proposals as well as the timetable and process that would be applied if Cabinet did agree that these Homes would be closed. The majority of the issues that were raised by staff focussed on matters to do with the value of the service to service users and the implications if the service closed and these have been encompassed in the Cabinet Report and the Service Consultation report that are going to Cabinet on 19 July 2011. Staff also raised questions about the timetable and likelihood of deployment and/or redundancy if approval was given. Council procedures regarding reorganisations were fully explained.

Staff were handed a leaflet at each of the first briefings. This leaflet confirmed the ways in which staff could contribute to the consultation process with contact details for trade union representatives and managers and the dates of Formal Trade Union Consultation meetings so that they could feed into these via their trade union representatives. It also set out ways in which staff could make enquiries about voluntary redundancy and redeployment as well as ways staff could access support that had been put in place for staff at them at this difficult time.

In addition to the above 6 Formal Consultation meetings were held between Senior Managers of the Department and Trade Union Representatives on 25 January 2011, 17 February 2011, 15 March 2011, 6 April 2011, 7 April 2011 and 26 May 2011.

The formal Trade Union Response to the proposals was submitted on 6 May 2011 and is attached as

Throughout the process the main focus for staff and trade union was the nature of the impact of the business changes on the various user groups. These comments and the response to them have been covered in the Cabinet and Consultation report that is going to Cabinet on 19 July 2011 in connection with the service changes.

Neither staff, nor trade union representatives, have raised any issues to do with the characteristics of the workforce that is affected by these potential closures.

We have done our best to work with staff during the course of the consultation to enable them to contribute to the consultation process, to come to terms with the impact of the proposals on them and to identify ways in which we can mitigate against compulsory redundancy by identifying those employees who have decided that they was to leave voluntarily as well as identifying suitable deployment for those that don't – should the proposals be agreed.

We have also emphasised the benefits to staff of the 'supporting changes' package that has been put in place in terms of dealing with change and other forms of staff support.



Agenda item:

[No.]**Cabinet****On 19th July 2011**Report Title: **Closure of Residential and Respite Care Homes (Supplementary)**Report of: **Mun Thong Phung, Director of Adult and Housing Services**

Signed:

Contact Officer: **Lisa Redfern, Deputy Director of Adult and Community Services**Email: Lisa.redfern@haringey.gov.ukTelephone: **020 84892324**Wards(s) affected: **All**Report for: **Key****1. Purpose of the report (That is, the decision required)**

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to inform Cabinet of the outcome of consultation with residents of Cranwood, Broadwater Lodge and the Red House who had no relatives or friends to support them in actively participating in the consultation about the future of adult services. Advocates were in attendance at the meetings held with users, relatives and carers at Whitehall Street but for a number of reasons facilitated meetings could not be arranged with residents in the other homes until now.
- 1.2 The report is an addendum to the main Cabinet report and consultation findings.

2. Introduction by Cabinet Member

- 2.1 See main report.

3. State link(s) with Council Plan Priorities and actions and /or other Strategies:

- 3.1 See main report.

4. Recommendations

4.1 See main report.

4.2 Cabinet is invited to take account of the results of these facilitated consultations with residents in reaching its decision on the proposal to close Cranwood, Broadwater, the Red House and Whitehall Street residential care homes.

5. Reason for recommendation(s)

5.1 See main report.

5.2 Cabinet should have this additional information in front of them along with the other consultation findings when they make their decision on 19th July.

6. Other options considered

6.1. See main report

7. Summary

7.1. See main report

8. Chief Financial Officer Comments

8.1. See main report

9. Head of Legal Services Comments

9.1. See main report

10. Head of Procurement Comments

10.1. N/A

11. Equalities & Community Cohesion Comments

11.1 See main report

12. Consultation

12.1 This addendum represents the results of sessions facilitated by Mencap in 3 homes with residents who did not have a family member or friend able to support them and who needed support in having their say about the proposed closure of the residential care homes in which they live.

12.2 Analysis of the results:

Q1 - slightly stronger support for the proposal than among other residents, carers and relatives of the homes who participated in the consultation.

Q2 - A reasonable number of residents who participated would appear to have understood the reason for the proposals though as many did not or were unsure. The proportion who understood was some 80% among the other groups of residents who responded and whose views are reflected in the main report of findings.

Q9 - Most important to this group of residents were things like room size and friendly, well-trained staff. The latter being the most important thing for the other residents who took part in the consultation.

General comments - a couple of residents have given financial and other reasons for why the homes should close whereas others seem to be saying what other respondents to the consultation have said, that they are used to the stability and familiarity of the place or are sceptical about the consultation itself.

A key point to note is that the advocates are saying that a number of those who participated were unable to answer or did not answer the questions or had no understanding.

13. Service Financial Comments

See main report

14. Use of appendices /Tables and photographs

14.1. Appendix 1 – Report by Mencap (July 2011) – facilitated consultation with residents of Broadwater Lodge, Cranwood and the Red House who had no relatives or friends to support them in actively participating in the consultation about the future of the homes in which they lived.

15. Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

15.1. See main report

This page is intentionally left blank



Haringey Mencap Ltd
Haringey Mencap Ltd
676 High Road
Tottenham
London N17 0AE
020 8365 0251

Background

We were asked by Haringey Adult Services to undertake facilitated consultations with people who had no relatives or friends to support them in actively participating in the consultation about the future of adult services. We provided support to residents of three homes which may be facing closure; Cranwood, Broadwater Lodge and Red House.

Method

We undertook consultations at Cranwood on Thursday 7th July 2011, Broadwater Lodge on Friday 8th July 2011 and at Red House on Tuesday 12th July 2011. Information on the background to the proposed changes was given to the residents and then each person was asked to individually go through the consultation questionnaire with one of our advocates and have their views and comments recorded.

Responses

At Cranwood we met with 5 residents, at Broadwater Lodge we met with 9 residents and at Red House we met with 8 residents. Completed forms have been passed to the Interim Head of Service (Change Management).

Summary

Q1 The extent to which individuals support or not support the closures were;

- 3 strongly support,
- 3 support,
- 6 neither support or not support,
- 1 do not support,
- 5 strongly do not support.
- 4 individuals were not able to answer the question.

Q3 Of the individuals we spoke to;

- 9 understood why the Council were proposing to close homes
- 5 were not sure

- 5 had no understanding.

Q9 When looking at what was important to individuals there was a range of responses. The highest scoring choices that were ranked as a '1' were;

- 12 - 'Well trained at friendly staff'
- 6 - 'A garden or outside space'
- 6 - 'Home cooked nutritious food'
- 10 - 'Good size bedroom with its own bathroom'
- 6 - 'Plenty of social activities'
- 7 - 'Space for entertaining visitors in private'
- 8 - 'Enough space for some possessions and my own furniture'
- 6 individuals did not answer this question.

Quotes

Comments from those who supported the closure included;

"They should close it because I can move to another." (Red House resident)

"Because the council could save money" (Cranwood resident)

Comments from those who did not support the closure included;

"I'm used to the place" (Red House resident)

Comments from those who neither support or do not support the closure included;

"They going to close it anyway so why do I need to say anything?" (Red House resident)

Comments on how residential care could be provided differently included;

"They (the council) know what they are doing so leave it to them" (Red House resident)

"Do more activities, keep our brain active" (Red House resident)

"... would like staff to have more time to listen" (Broadwater Lodge resident)

"Mentally ill people should not be living with elderly people as it gets a very unsettled environment" (Broadwater Lodge resident)

"I would like to be in an environment that makes me feel younger" (Cranwood resident)

"More day trips" (Broadwater Lodge resident)