

**EXECUTIVE REPORT**

**OLDER PERSONS CHANGE PROGRAMME**

**BRENDA THOMPSON - EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR  
SOCIAL CARE**

**JAN DOUGLAS - EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR**

**20 JUNE 2006**

---

**PURPOSE OF THE REPORT**

1. To provide Executive with the outcomes of consultation regarding Albert Cocks and Levick House residential care establishments.
2. To provide Executive with a number of options regarding the date for closure of Albert Cocks and Levick House.

**BACKGROUND AND EXTERNAL CONSULTATION**

3. In 2001 new regulations governing the physical facilities of residential care homes were introduced. All residential care providers have until April 2007 to meet these standards, which include provision of en suite bathrooms for all bedrooms and minimum space requirements for bedrooms.
4. It was acknowledged that the cost of bringing Council residential homes up to these standards was prohibitive, so a change programme, ultimately leading to the closure of all Council Elderly People's Homes was approved by the Executive.

In brief the aims of the Change Programme were

- The closure of Robert Huggins, Netherfields, Albert Cocks and Levick House Residential Care establishments by April 2007 (Robert Huggins and Netherfields are now closed).
  - In partnership with Tees Valley Housing, establish an Extra Care Housing Scheme on the Trinity Crescent site by April 2007.
  - Establish Extra Care Housing Schemes on the Robert Huggins and Levick sites by April 2007 with Social Care providing staff displaced from Residential Care Services.
  - Establish an Older Persons Day Care Unit on the Robert Huggins site to replace the existing provision at Newport Day Centre.
  - Reconfigure Parklands EPH to an Intermediate Care Centre, in partnership with Middlesbrough PCT (complete).
5. The Executive have received regular reports on implementation of the Change Programme, however, the plans to establish Extra Care Housing Schemes on the Robert Huggins and Levick sites proved problematic, as reported to the Executive on 22<sup>nd</sup> November, 2005.
6. On that date, Executive approved further work taking place to explore the options available to the Council, given the circumstances reported. A bid for capital funding was subsequently submitted to the Housing Corporation. As reported to the Executive on April 4 2006, we were informed in April that this bid was not successful. As a result, no Extra Care Housing facilities will be available on the Robert Huggins or Levick sites by April 2007. The only scheme certain to come to fruition at this point in time is the Trinity Centre scheme, which is anticipated to open in June 2007 at the very earliest.
7. Staff and residents of both Albert Cocks and Levick House have been aware of the closure plans for some years. The uncertainty created by the situation with Extra Care Housing was not helpful however, and Executive agreed that consultation with residents and their families regarding the options should take place.
8. As stated at paragraph 4, the intention in 2001 was that displaced staff from residential services would provide care services within the Housing with Extra Care facilities. On February 2 2006, Executive approved a report detailing Social Care's medium term commissioning intentions. The report recommended that:

- All in-house delivery services be reviewed as to their appropriateness.
  - That the outcomes of each review be reported to Executive.
9. This recommendation has been applied to the remaining in-house residential care services at Albert Cocks and Levick, with the following results :
- The services in question are delivered to at least the same standard by the Independent Sector.
  - There are no issues which would prevent the Independent Sector delivering the services in question.
  - The costs of providing the services in question are not financially competitive with those of the Independent Sector. The unit cost of Independent Sector residential care is £338 per resident per week, compared to £551 for in-house services. This comparison assumes full occupancy at Albert Cocks and Levick. The unit cost based on current occupancy is £608.
10. A comparison of the unit costs of domiciliary care (the care provision in extra care housing schemes) has also been undertaken. The cost of providing in-house services is at least £5 per hour more expensive than Independent Sector prices.
11. As a result of the issues highlighted in paragraphs 3 – 11, the Executive Member for Health & Social Care approved the following recommendations on 24 April 2006 :
- Tendering for services within the planned Trinity Crescent extra care housing scheme.
  - Consultation commencing with regard to the transfer of Albert Cocks and Levick House residents to other care establishments.
12. At the time consultation commenced, there were a total of 72 staff employed in the establishments and the number of permanent residents in each was as indicated below :

	<b>Capacity</b>	<b>Permanent Residents</b>
Albert Cocks	27	9
Levick House	27	17
<b>TOTAL</b>	54	26

## CONSULTATION OUTCOMES

13. Residents and their relatives, staff and their Trade Unions, have been fully consulted regarding the future of both Albert Cocks and Levick House. Staff and residents have received collective briefings and 1:1 briefings regarding the options for the future of their respective homes.
14. **Appendix 1** provides detail of the views expressed by individual residents during their 1:1 consultation. In summary, the outcomes are:

	<b>Arranged move to alternative home</b>	<b>Move as a group</b>	<b>No opinion expressed</b>	<b>Unable/unsuitable to respond</b>	<b>Total</b>
Levick House	1	14		2	17
Albert Cocks	1	6	1	1	9
<b>Total</b>	2	20	1	3	26
<b>%</b>	8%	77%	4%	11%	

15. It is clear that the majority of residents wish to remain together as a group. Under normal circumstances, this would be impossible to achieve as there is not sufficient capacity within the sector to allow for the number of residents involved to move as a block.
16. A window of opportunity does however exist to meet the preference expressed by the majority of residents. A new, purpose-built home in the Marton Road area is due to open mid July 2006. The home will accommodate a total of 43 residents and some discussion has taken place with the company who own the establishment. They have indicated that they would be willing to admit residents from both Albert Cocks and Levick House as a group.
17. It is important to note that there is a legislative “directive of choice” in relation to residential care. Individuals must be free to choose their home and cannot therefore be simply assigned to one. This particular home is the only one in the local area which can meet the choice of residents, to move as a group, at the present time.
18. A number of petitions have been received opposing the proposed closures of the Homes. Signatories appear to be a mixture of staff and neighbours in the vicinity of the Homes.



## **OPTIONS**

### **Option 1 – Relocation of residents as a group in July 2006**

19. This option will involve the transfer of the majority, if not all residents, to the care home identified in paragraph 17 during mid – late July 2006.
20. It would result in the closure of both Albert Cocks and Levick House by 1 August 2006. Whilst there is some significant benefit for residents in quickly resolving their future, there are staff issues which would need to be resolved.
21. A commitment has been made to try to redeploy staff from Albert Cocks and Levick to suitable vacancies within Social Care. Whilst the department is confident of achieving this prior to 1 August, other options such as early retirement, voluntary redundancy and other secondment opportunities are being progressed.

### **Option 2 – Operate Albert Cocks and Levick House until 31 March 2007**

22. Both homes can be operated until 31 March 2007 – the date at which new CSCI standards for residential care establishments come into force.
23. Whilst this would allow longer to resolve staff redeployment issues, it would not satisfy resident interests in facilitating movement of them as a group to a new establishment.

### **Option 3 – Closure of Albert Cocks and creating Extra Care Housing at Levick House**

24. This option, whilst allowing for the development of the Levick site as originally intended, is not feasible within the short term, but is worthy of consideration as a medium term development.
25. It would require in the region of £2.7 to £3 million capital to rebuild Levick House as an Extra Care Housing facility. Council may wish to consider a contribution to the capital required for Housing with Extra Care at Levick, however, further work would be necessary to submit a capital bid. Consultation with the Levick Trustees also required.

## **FINANCIAL, LEGAL AND WARD IMPLICATIONS**

26. The cost of providing residential care services in-house does not compare with those associated with the purchase of such care. Purchase of the service from the independent sector would result in cost savings of at least £600k per annum (based on full occupancy). The savings based on occupancy levels during 2005/06 is closer to £900k. These calculations are based on a unit cost for purchased care of £338 per resident per week, compared to a unit cost of in-house care of between £551 and £608 per week.
27. The Council will not be in a position to comply with Commission for Social Care inspection standards beyond March 2007.
28. Notice of deregistration of both homes has been issued to CSCI indicating potential closure in August, 2006. This notice can be withdrawn and has been issued as a precautionary measure only.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

29. It is recommended that Executive approve Option 1 – the transfer of residents to a new care home, operated by the Independent Sector, in July 2006.
30. Furthermore, it is recommended that the Executive approve in principle, the submission of a capital bid to the Council to create extra care housing on the Levick site in partnership with a registered social landlord, subject to the agreement of Levick Trustees.

## **REASONS**

31. The recommendations best meets the wishes of residents.
32. The recommendations allow for the future development of the Levick site, subject to further reports to Executive.
33. There are a number of other reasons to support the recommendations made. Briefly they are :
  - Residents have faced uncertainty regarding their future care for 2 years

- The additional costs paid by self funding clients in Albert Cocks and Levick House
- The buildings concerned are not fit for purpose and do not meet CSCI requirements
- Occupancy levels are low, leading to higher unit costs
- Staff and residents are uncertain of their future
- Commissioning lies at the heart of the Health and Social Care White Paper
- VFM considerations

## **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

**The following background papers were used in the preparation of this report:**

Executive Report – Medium Term Commissioning Proposals – 14/2/06  
Executive Report – Housing with Extra Care in Middlesbrough – 22/11/05  
Executive Report – Redevelopment of Robert Huggins Home – 25/11/04  
Executive Report – Older Persons Change Programme Update – 24/4/06  
Our Health, Our Care, Our Say – White Paper 2006

**AUTHOR: Tony Parkinson**

**TEL NO: 01642 729036**

---

*Address:*

*Webster: <http://www.middlesbrough.gov.uk>*