



Meeting **CABINET COMMITTEE:**

**REVIEW OF THE STRATEGIC DIRECTION OF COUNCIL
RESIDENTIAL CARE HOMES FOR OLDER PEOPLE AND FOR
EXTRA CARE SERVICES**

Date **MONDAY 16TH APRIL 2007 (10.00 am – 12.10 pm)**

membership

Persons absent are marked with 'A'

COUNCILLORS

Mick Storey
Alan Rhodes
Steve Carroll

A Councillor John Allin
A Councillor Steve Carr
A Councillor V. H. Dobson
Councillor Joe Lonergan MBE
Councillor The Hon Joan Taylor

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE

Grace Perry - Unison
John Kerry - OPAG
Mick Tinkler - Age Concern
Keith Dobb - Nottinghamshire Care Association
John Seale - Selston Parish Experience Group, OPAG and Tele-care
Diane Smeaton - OPAG
Carol Habibe - OPAG
Alan Knighton - OPAG

1 APPOINTMENT OF CHAIR OF THE COMMITTEE

RESOLVED: 2007/001

That the appointment  Councillor Mick Storey as Chair of the Committee be noted.

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Steve Carr.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST BY MEMBERS AND OFFICERS

None.

4. TERMS OF REFERENCE, MEMBERSHIP AND PROCESS

RESOLVED: 2007/002

1. That the Terms of Reference and membership of the Cabinet Committee as set out in the report be noted;
2. that it be recommended to Cabinet that the report from this Cabinet Committee be submitted to the 4th July meeting of Cabinet and not the 6th June.

5. BACKGROUND TO THE REVIEW OF THE RESIDENTIAL HOME STRATEGY, EXTRA CARE DEVELOPMENT AND THEIR CONTEXT

Malcolm Dillon, Service Director in the Adult Social Care and Health Department introduced the report and gave a presentation. He outlined the strategy to date and identified some key drivers and highlighted key facts from the report. He indicated that the broad options were:

1. stay as we are;
2. withdraw from providing or
3. retain a strategic share in the market and re-invest some savings in extra care.

Arising from the presentation, Members and non-Members of the Committee sought clarification/made comment as follows:-

- the Government wants Local Authorities to increase intensive home care which has led to resources being taken from elsewhere.
- The Authority is not paying enough to the independent sector to deliver residential care, and the only way to do this is to change the policy of in-house residential care.
- How could services be disaggregated? Homes provide all sorts of different services, for example intermediate care, day services.
- Clarification was sought about the Auditor's Annual Letter which had referred to problems with non-residential care.

- Residential homes were homes of people who had given up everything.
- There was a need to keep the element of choice.
- There was a need to keep people in their own homes longer than we do, and there was a need to provide more day centres.
- The possibility of choice was becoming more difficult as some independent sector homes now required a top-up to the fees as the cost of the home was greater than the County Council had agreed to pay.
- What implications would TUPE (Transfer of Undertakings (Protection of Employment) Regulations) have on the transfer of homes from the County Council to another party?
- A person could become a “prisoner” in their own home and there was a need for more day services/centres and transport to be provided.
- There was a different national charging policy for residential care than for home care. Residential care charges were set by the Government but the Local Authority set those for home care. The continuation of running a dual charging system needed to be examined.

Malcolm Dillon, the Service Director responded that there was £1.8 million extra in the current year's budget for services for older people and the expectation was that the priority for this would be for home care. There was now a lot more home care provided but it was to a more focused group which was part of a national change. The eligibility criteria had been changed in 2005 and the County Council only offered services to those assessed with needs coming in to the Fair Access to Care Services categories of critical or substantial. As Officers there were no plans to propose to change the current practice given the existing resources, which are adequate to provide to people in those categories. Intermediate care was provided in residential care homes but the same services could also be provided in a person's own home. The former Primary Care Trusts in the south of the county had said that research showed that intermediate care was more effective in their own homes so there was more of this in the south of the County. Further information on this would be provided for the next meeting.

The Chair then invited comments or questions from the members of the public who were present.

Grace Perry from UNISON stated that whilst UNISON accepted that there may need to be some radical changes, they would be opposed to the County Council ceasing to be a provider. She indicated that where other Local Authorities had done this they had found themselves left with little choice. Although the Commission for Social Care Inspection (CSCI) inspect all homes it was always private homes which received adverse comments in the press

not Local Authority ones. She felt that the cost of Local Authority homes may seem higher because day care services were included. It was pointed out that the adverse comments which Ms Perry was understood to be referring to were about independent sector home care, not care homes.

John Kerry from OPAG commented that private care was now a multi-million pound industry and that OPAG nationally had concerns. County Council provision had been exemplary and it should carry on and re-invest in the future.

Mick Tinkler from Age Concern welcomed choice and having a mixed provision. He felt there needed to be a mixed provision and also a preventative service. He wondered if the County Council had looked at the totality of the situation and the impact of decisions on the independent and voluntary sector. He felt the Local Authority had a key role to ensure that provision was in the right proportions for residential care, extra care, intermediate care etc. High occupancy showed that there was not a lot of 'slack' in the system. He wondered if there was clarity about what proportions of homes in the independent sector met the standards.

Keith Dobb, from the Nottinghamshire Care Association commented that the association had good relations with the County Council and met Malcolm Dillon regularly. This was tempered by the fact that home owners were concerned at the amount that they received from the County Council compared with the cost of running the homes. He pointed out that the difficulty of choice was finding a home with the right cost. He stressed that the County Council did not meet the full cost so many homes had introduced a top-up. He hoped that the County Council would review this. Independent homes had provided intermediate care in the past and day care and respite care. He did not feel that residential care was negative as there was comradeship and friendship there. He thought the Commission for Social Care Inspection needed to do more to push homes not meeting the standards.

John Sewell, Selston Parish Experience Group and OPAG felt that it was the happiness of people that counted. In carrying out visits he thought that the people tended to be happier in County Council homes and he asked that they not be closed.

Diane Smeaton from OPAG asked whether comparisons had been made of the unit costs for the four different levels of care in the community. She thought more research was needed and there was a need to ask older people what they wanted both those in homes and in the community.

Councillor Joan Taylor had concerns about the quality of home care and felt there was a need to improve this. She wondered if there was a role for occupational therapists to get people back to their own homes.

Councillor Lonergan pointed out that because of demographic changes there was a budget problem across England in respect of care of the elderly.

Alan Knighton from OPAG pointed out that there was time-limited funding in Nottinghamshire for preventative services to help people stay in their own homes. This funding could be withdrawn after 2008/09 which would create a problem.

In summing up the debate Councillor Mick Storey indicated that more detailed reports on the options would come to the next meeting on 15th May. He pointed out that the question of quality was important. The problem was cost and this either had to be paid by taxes or by the individual and this was a national issue.

The meeting closed at 12.10 pm.

CHAIR