

HAMPSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL**Report**

Committee:	Safe and Healthy People Select Committee
Date:	22 November 2013
Title:	Outcome of the Consultation on the Future of Four Residential Care Homes and One Day Centre and Proposed Recommendations
Reference:	5383
Report From:	Director of Adult Services

Contact name: Gill Duncan

Tel: 01962 847287

Email: gill.duncan@hants.gov.uk

1. Purpose of Report

1.1. To give the Safe and Healthy People Select Committee the opportunity to consider the outcomes of a consultation on the proposed closure of four Residential Care Homes and one Day Centre, prior to the Cabinet decision on 9 December 2013.

2. Recommendation

That the Safe and Healthy People Select Committee:

- 2.1. Consider the attached draft Cabinet report on the outcomes of the consultation on the proposed closure of four Residential Care Homes and one Day Centre.
- 2.2. Consider and agree a recommendation on the decision being proposed to Cabinet in section 20 of the attached draft report, and report the Committee's recommendations to the Cabinet for consideration at their meeting on 9 December 2013.

HAMPSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL**Decision Report**

Decision Maker:	Cabinet
Date:	9 December 2013
Title:	Outcome of the Consultation on the proposed closure of four Residential Care Homes and One Day Centre
Reference:	5258
Report From:	Director of Adult Social Services

Contact name: Gill Duncan

Tel: 01962 847287

Email: Gill.duncan@hants.gov.uk

1. Executive Summary

- 1.1. The purpose of this paper is to report to the Safe and Healthy People Select Committee the outcomes of the consultation and the proposed recommendations to Cabinet on the future of four residential care homes and one older persons' day centre in Hampshire. The homes are Bulmer House in Petersfield, Cranleigh Paddock in Lyndhurst, Deeside in Basingstoke and Nightingale Lodge in Romsey. The day centre is Cranleigh Paddock Day Centre in Lyndhurst. The report outlines the options that have been considered in relation to the four homes, the availability of alternative care provision in the four locations, the impact on existing residents in the homes and the feedback from the public consultation.
- 1.2. On 26 July 2013 the Executive Member for Adult Social Care agreed proposals to open a public consultation on the future of these four homes and one day centre. Whilst the report of 26 July 2013 recommended that a further report be presented to the Executive Member for Adult Social Care in November 2013, the decision was made by the Leader of Hampshire County Council during the consultation that the report be presented to Cabinet in December 2013 taking into account the scope of the emerging issues.
- 1.3. Hampshire County Council's long term strategic approach is to develop a wider range of services to meet the changing needs of an ageing population. The County Council is focussing on supporting people to have their wish to remain living independently for as long as possible and also supporting the increasing numbers of people living with dementia, including developing specialist dementia accommodation. Developing countywide affordable Extra Care assisted living is part of that strategy, ensuring the right balance of care is available across the county.

- 1.4. The investment in Extra Care assisted living and other models of care is the next phase in transforming the services the Council provides for older people. That transformation is necessary to ensure that services are able to meet both the needs of the county's current older people, as well as those of a future ageing population, and take account of changing aspirations for greater independence, and more choice and control.
- 1.5. This proposal was designed to provide more effective and relevant services for residents now and into the future. The consultation has therefore presented an opportunity to rethink some of the services that the Council provides for older people. Over the last quarter of a century the County Council has been faced on several occasions with the issue of home closures. This comes about as the assets, which provide the base for their service come to the end of their design life. The components within those assets come towards obsolescence and the cost of repair and refurbishment becomes unrealistic alongside the cost of alternative new provision. In order to assess the ongoing viability of the homes economic and operational viability have been considered including any maintenance costs as well as depreciation costs associated with running an older building. Due to the levels of staffing required to provide safe and adequate cover and the associated costs as well as overhead costs it is not economically viable to run smaller homes. New homes in the independent sector are typically built with a minimum of 60 rooms. At the same time standards of care, choice and options increase, making the original assets less able to provide effective accommodation, despite the very fine effort made by staff, residents, families and others to ensure that these buildings remain comfortable and calm places to live.
- 1.6. Bulmer House and Cranleigh Paddock were identified as being the only viable sites suitable for the development of Extra Care assisted living in Petersfield and Lyndhurst respectively. In Romsey, Nightingale Lodge was assessed as being the only site available to the Council for the development of Extra Care at this time. In Basingstoke it was proposed to develop a new Extra Care assisted living scheme, using the value of the Deeside site.
- 1.7. Extensive consultation was held from 29 July to 18 October, including consultation events for the relatives of residents, sessions with independent advocates held for residents at the homes, engagement with stakeholders, consultation with staff and public meetings, with responses being accepted until the 22 October. After this time all the consultation responses were analysed and a report produced which is available at <http://www3.hants.gov.uk/residential-care-consultation.htm> (under the 'supporting documents' tab).
- 1.8. Feedback received during the consultations has indicated that the majority of people who took part in the consultation were opposed to the closure of the four homes. There was significant support for investing in Extra Care assisted living, although even amongst those in favour of such investment, the majority of people were opposed to the home closures. However, a similar number of people were not in favour of investing more in Extra Care at the expense of traditional residential care.

- 1.9. Other key themes that arose during the consultation were the need to ensure that there is adequate suitable care provision for people with dementia and the need to ensure the welfare, care and support of the residents of the homes under consultation. These are covered in greater detail in section 7 of this report.

Summary of Recommendations

- 1.10. The decision has to be a balanced consideration of all of the factors including the responses to the consultation, the needs and welfare of the current residents, the future needs of older people in Hampshire, and the availability, quality, and market capacity of alternative provision in the four areas, both now and in the future.
- 1.11. Having considered the consultation responses in detail, the care needs and wellbeing of the homes' current residents as well as the future needs of the county's ageing population, and reviewed the options for each site, the report seeks approval for the closure of the following three homes:
- Bulmer House in Petersfield
 - Deeside in Basingstoke
 - Nightingale Lodge in Romsey
- In response to specific points made during the consultation, it is recommended that the closure of Deeside is delayed until the new extension to Oakridge House is open and ready to receive residents in Autumn 2014.
- These recommendations are proposed on the understanding that suitable alternative accommodation for current residents is found and that their care needs are fully met.
- 1.12. In response to issues raised during the consultation on specialist dementia provision in the area and further work on the site potential, this report recommends that Cranleigh Paddock residential care home remains open and that Hampshire County Council works with New Forest District Council to explore the possibility of further developing specialist dementia provision utilising the whole site including the adjacent sheltered housing unit. The reasons for this change of proposal are contained in section 6.
- 1.13. The report also seeks approval for the closure of Cranleigh Paddock Day Centre, with the service being re-provided by the independent sector in the locality, subject to suitable alternative day services being found for the people who currently use it.
- 1.14. In making these recommendations, the care and support and welfare of the residents of the homes and day centre under consultation have been, and continue to be, a key consideration for Hampshire County Council.
- 1.15. The recommendations for the closure of the three homes are made on the basis that the buildings do not meet the standards of accommodation that Hampshire County Council would wish to provide, will not meet the future needs and expectations of older people, and that the limitations of the buildings are such that it is not possible to bring them up to these standards, whilst maintaining their economic viability. The recommendations have also

taken into account the availability of good quality alternative provision for older people, including those with dementia, in the three locations.

- 1.16. The County Council also has to give consideration to the mix and availability of care services across the county. Whilst there are approximately 450 residential and nursing homes in Hampshire, of which approximately half are dementia registered, there are only 18 recognised affordable Extra Care assisted living schemes. Of these, only 5 are purpose built. Hampshire County Council currently commissions care in 329 of the independent sector homes, including in 83 homes that are registered to provide care for people with dementia.
- 1.17. Cranleigh Paddock residential care home was built later than the other three homes and serves as a specialist dementia facility. Were Cranleigh Paddock to close, there would not be sufficient dementia provision in the Lyndhurst area. The making of a modest investment in Cranleigh Paddock therefore becomes the most cost-effective option for maintaining sufficient dementia provision in the Lyndhurst area.
- 1.18. With regards to Bulmer House, this is the only site in Petersfield that Hampshire County Council has identified where it is possible for it to build an Extra Care assisted living scheme.
- 1.19. In Romsey, Nightingale Lodge is the only site available for Hampshire County Council to construct Extra Care assisted living at this time.
- 1.20. The Deeside site is not suitable for the development of Extra Care assisted living, however two more suitable sites have been identified in Basingstoke. During the course of the consultation the Deeside site has been identified as a potential site for affordable housing.

2. Contextual information

- 2.1. The way social care is provided is changing in England, with service users wanting control and independence over their care and new services being developed to meet their individual needs. Hampshire County Council aims to build resilient communities, including dementia-friendly communities, which enable a culture of participation, so that people can look outwards to their communities for support, and to develop cost effective care solutions, as well as providing good quality residential and nursing home services.
- 2.2. Within Hampshire the current over 75 population of 116,400 (based on the 2011 census information) is forecast to increase by 13% by 2017, and by over 80% by 2030. By 2017, 10% of Hampshire's population is expected to be over 75.
- 2.3. The needs of older people with care needs are met by a range of services and only a small proportion are directly provided by the County Council. Hampshire County Council directly provides re-ablement services and commissions around 100,000 domiciliary care visits per week. It directly provides 775 older persons residential and nursing beds, but commissions in excess of 3,500 from the independent sector.

- 2.4. In order to meet the challenges of an ageing population it is vital that older people's services are sustainable, cost effective and offer people choice and control. Increasing numbers of older people are choosing to remain independent and be cared for at home, rather than go into residential care. This is borne out by occupancy rates in residential care which have reduced over a number of years. Since 2008/09 the number of older people requiring permanent nursing care has increased by 10%. Whilst there are an increasing number of people with dementia requiring residential care, the overall number of people in residential care at any one time has reduced by 4% over the last 2 years. In comparison, the number of people receiving personal domiciliary care and support work has increased by 13% between 2008/09 and 2012/13, with the complexity of care packages increasing.
- 2.5. In the last financial year, we have also seen a significant increase in the complexity of people's care needs that are appropriately supported at home as evidenced by the following:
- The percentage of clients requiring 22 or more visits a week (3 a day) increasing from 19.9% in April 2012 to 21.6% March 2013
 - The percentage of clients requiring double up care (two carers) has increased from 10.3% in April 2012 to 11.7% March 2013
 - The percentage of clients whose needs could be met with 7 hours or less of domiciliary care a week has reduced from 63.3% in April 2012 to 61.1% in March 2013
- 2.6. Hampshire County Council is also not immune from the current significant cuts in funding for local government. The Council's overall grant funding has seen a 33% cut in government support since 2011, and expects further cuts of around 10% each year for the next two years. The Council therefore has to consider carefully how it uses its resources, both revenue and capital, and focuses on those services that deliver the best outcomes and value for money. In social care, programmes such as Project Extra Care are aimed at achieving both of these aims.
- 2.7. This process of prioritising individual choice and control has been ongoing since the reforms introduced by the NHS and Community Care Act 1990, which emphasised the role of local authorities as commissioners rather than providers of care services. Hampshire County Council is committed to ensuring there is a mixed economy of care provision across the county which offers people a wide range of choices. This includes working closely with the independent sector (which provides about 86% of the residential and nursing care commissioned by the Council) to provide care which meets the future needs of older people in Hampshire.
- 2.8. The County Council continues to be responsible for the safety of clients placed in independent sector homes and ensuring that the care provided there meets their needs. Robust processes to monitor the quality of homes

and respond to any issues or concerns are in place, and the Council also works closely with providers to develop and train their workforce to ensure they provide a high standard of care. The draft Care and Support Bill¹ indicates that local authorities will be given further responsibilities to oversee the care market in their areas.

3. Investing in Services for Older People

- 3.1. Hampshire County Council is unusual in that, despite the NHS and Community Care Act changes, it has retained a high level of in-house services (approximately 14% of the market) compared with other local authorities. As part of this mixed economy of care, Hampshire County Council retains a commitment to investing in in-house care homes, and has responded to the challenge of meeting increased needs and expectations through significant investment in nursing care services with £60m invested in new in-house nursing homes in partnership with the NHS in 2006. These new nursing homes provide modern facilities, with large rooms with the space to seat visitors, private toilet facilities and high quality communal and outdoor areas.
- 3.2. In January 2013 permission was granted by the Executive Member for Policy and Resources to build extensions to two of these homes. The extension to Oakridge House in Basingstoke will create a 10 bed specialist wing for people with dementia, as well as extensive refurbishment to the communal areas and the extension to Westholme in Winchester will create an additional 6 rooms built to nursing standards.
- 3.3. The Council has also significantly invested in the upgrade of other residential homes, however many of these were built in the 1960s and 1970s and several present restrictions as to the ability to provide suitable environments for the future. The older buildings cannot meet higher levels of care need, often meaning that residents need to be moved to other homes if their care needs increase. In particular, since these homes were built, there has been considerable progress made in researching the best environments for supporting people with dementia. People with dementia require buildings which are simply laid out so they are easily oriented with space to wander and easy access to outdoor space. Appropriate lighting, use of colour and texture, and the location of easily identifiable toilet facilities and communal spaces are also important, as is the space for people to have familiar items such as their own furniture with them. The narrow corridors, small rooms, and complex layouts make this difficult in some older homes.
- 3.4. With more people choosing to remain in their own homes and reductions in national funding support for adult social care, there is a need to develop alternatives to residential care and to shift the balance of resources towards the choices people are making. The County Council provides a range of other services to support people to continue living at home, in addition to the

¹ Department of Health, Draft Care and Support Bill
<http://www.dh.gov.uk/health/2012/07/careandsupportbill/>

provision of personal care in the home and community services. These include providing specialised equipment through the occupational therapy team and support to help people to make adaptations to their home. The Council is investing in telecare solutions to support people living in their own homes, entering into a strategic partnership with Argenti, a consortium of some of the UK's most experienced telecare providers, to deliver this. Hampshire County Council recognises the vital role played by carers, and supports them with advice, training, local support groups, and the provision of respite care. People leaving hospital, who meet the re-ablement criteria, are offered an intensive period of re-ablement intended to help them regain their independence and confidence in living at home.

- 3.5. These services provide better outcomes and actively promote independence and choice. The County Council also recognises the importance of services which promote the well-being of older people and help them stay active and independent for longer: the older people's well-being strategy, *Ageing Well in Hampshire*,² was developed in consultation with older people and includes an action plan to address the priorities identified by older people, including access to information, feeling safe at home and being able to participate in activities in the community.
- 3.6. Taking into account the context of in-house services and modern alternatives, a review was undertaken of the range of provision for older people across the county. As a result of this review a public consultation commenced on proposals to close residential homes in Basingstoke, Lyndhurst, Petersfield and Romsey.

4. Provision for People with Dementia

- 4.1. Supporting people with dementia is of central importance to Adult Services. The Hampshire Joint Strategic Needs Assessment, which forms the basis for the Council's planning of services, has identified that approximately 18,500 people in Hampshire, or 7.5% of the over 65 population, are currently diagnosed with dementia and that this number is likely to increase by 31% to just over 24,000 people by 2020. Within the 85 and over population group, the increase will be almost 40%, with half the people with dementia being 85 or over. Supporting people with dementia, their families and carers is core to the work we do in Adult Services. Over the last year supporting people with dementia is the most common reason for increasing care and support, whether that is care at home or residential or nursing care.
- 4.2. There are around 225 private residential and nursing homes in Hampshire registered for the care of people with dementia. Hampshire County Council regularly commissions care in 83 of them; these 83 homes have a total of 3272 beds.

² Ageing well in Hampshire: Older People's Well-Being Strategy (2011) Available from: <http://www3.hants.gov.uk/bettertime/cx-olderpeoplesstrategy.htm>

- 4.3. In addition to using evidence from research and best practice, the Council has worked with individuals and groups of older people, including those who have dementia, and their carers to plan and develop a range of services that can best support people at the different stages of the illness. This work ranges from the development of dementia friendly communities, the funding of dementia advisors across the county, dementia café and carer support services through to complex personal support at home and provision of specialist residential and nursing care. Whilst some of the residential and nursing care is provided by County Council run services, most of this care is purchased from independent sector care homes.
- 4.4. In terms of the voluntary sector, Hampshire County Council provides grants to organisations such as the Princess Royal Trust for Carers to provide services for people with dementia and their carers.
- 4.5. The Council is committed to ensuring that its staff, whether working in the community or in residential and nursing homes have training, expertise and understanding of the needs of people with dementia and their families. There is a dementia training pathway for staff which leads to nationally recognised qualifications. Conferences and training courses are also provided for private and voluntary organisations. Adult Services has also developed its own carers training group called Voices for Change.
- 4.6. There is a specific programme which is offered to care homes in the private sector called Carers in Partnership and which is seeing significant improvements to care delivery through the improvements in relationships between families and care staff. Another recent development is a training course for Hampshire County Council staff as well as staff from private and voluntary organisations to deliver dementia training to the community, with the family carer input being invaluable in shaping the training that is delivered.
- 4.7. During the consultation, the need to ensure that there is adequate provision for people with dementia was raised by a large number of people. Of the four homes that were under consultation, only Cranleigh Paddock operates as a specialist dementia unit, although staff in all Hampshire County Council-run care homes receive dementia training. There are two other residential care homes, run by Hampshire County Council, that are run as specialist dementia units; Copper Beeches in Andover and Malmesbury Lawn in Havant, as well as the specialist dementia wing under development at Oakridge.
- 4.8. During the consultation period, the current residential and nursing care provision for people with dementia for the areas surrounding the homes under consultation has been reviewed. This has shown that there is adequate provision in Basingstoke, Petersfield, Romsey and the surrounding areas, however the closure of Cranleigh Paddock would leave a gap in provision in the New Forest and western Hampshire (see section 13 of this report).
- 4.9. Questions have been raised during the consultation about the need to provide modern facilities for people with dementia. Whilst in homes like Bulmer House, Deeside and Nightingale Lodge care is provided for people with dementia, the physical infrastructure of the buildings make it difficult to deliver the care with the dignity that individual residents deserve.

- 4.10. A number of people raised the issue of whether facilities such as en-suite toilets and bathrooms may actually pose a risk to people living with dementia. The provision of en-suite facilities is a requirement from the Department of Health in their National Minimum Standards (Care Homes Regulations). The specific standard is number 21 and in sub-section 21.6 it says "En-suite facilities (at minimum a toilet and hand-basin) are provided to all service users in all new build, extensions and all first time registrations from 1 April 2002".
- 4.11. Experience of caring for people with dementia has shown that it is a deteriorating condition and takes many forms. There is no single way of treating and caring for people with the condition, rather there is a need to respond to their needs as their condition progresses and develops. So far as their toileting needs are concerned, there is no hard and fast rule and everyone will be different. The staff have to respond as appropriate by monitoring the condition of residents and then recommending a course of action that will suit their needs. There has never been cause to raise safety concerns about en-suite facilities and their potential use by residents with dementia despite a rigorous reporting regime that feeds back any concerns about their care. Most often-learned experiences from life seem to stay with all but the most advanced cases of dementia; that would include use of the toilet. When that cognition is lost to them they will usually be at a stage where a different continence regime is needed. Whatever support with toileting is needed is enhanced by using private facilities.

5. Extra Care Assisted Living

- 5.1. Extra Care assisted living schemes consist of purpose-built apartments, offering a modern, safe environment, allowing people to live in a home of their own, with enhanced communal facilities and with the security of 24 hour care and support on site in accordance with their assessed care needs. Whilst the County Council commissions a minimum number of care hours, there is no upper limit per scheme. The levels of care commissioned reflect the needs of each individual resident as set out in their support plan.
- 5.2. For individuals living in Extra Care schemes there are a number of financial benefits, compared to living in a residential care home. For those individuals for whom Hampshire County Council is financially responsible, there is an increase in their financial autonomy. Those people living in Extra Care schemes retain greater control over the use of their income, whilst those in residential care have all state benefits, including their retirement pension, taken into account when calculating their financial contribution, leaving them with £23.90 a week.
- 5.3. By developing schemes which enable people to both rent apartments and to buy on a shared ownership basis, Hampshire is providing people with an opportunity to exercise choice based on an assessment of their individual financial position. For those who currently live in rented accommodation, the provision of socially rented Extra Care apartments enables them to access such accommodation at an affordable rent, and retain any eligibility to housing benefit. For those who currently own their own property the provision of apartments to purchase on a shared ownership or rent on an affordable

rent basis enables them to exercise choice as to the use of their property asset. By opting to purchase an apartment in an Extra Care scheme they can protect the value of the asset, unlikely in the case of residential care where the value of any retained property is taken into account when assessing the individual's contribution to their care including the hotel costs of residential care.

- 5.4. The assessment of need for Extra Care provision in any given location across Hampshire is based on three core elements; population size, locations of delivered care and levels of alternative provision. While Extra Care schemes may be open to people younger (typically 55+), the population aged 75 years or older is used as a guide to the levels of older persons population in an area. We estimate the demand for Extra Care as being 20 units for every 1000 people over the age of 75. Based on this analysis, there is a total need for 117 units of Extra Care in Romsey and close surrounding wards, 79 in Lyndhurst, 77 in Petersfield and 211 in Basingstoke.
- 5.5. Since 2007, four new build Extra Care assisted living schemes, which offer 240 units of accommodation have been developed across Hampshire (see table 1). Additionally, 257 units of sheltered housing across Hampshire, have had their levels of service enhanced to the standards expected in Extra Care assisted living, through multi-agency working with partner organisations (See Appendix E).

Table 1: New build Extra Care assisted living schemes in Hampshire

Scheme	Location	Units
Lion Oak Court	Andover	52
Juniper Court	Gosport	50
Campbell Place	Fleet	74
Newman Court	Basingstoke	64

- 5.6. In October 2011, Cabinet approved Project Extra Care, an ongoing programme of capital investment to deliver further Extra Care assisted living across the county over an 8 year period, with the aim that Extra Care will become a viable alternative to residential care for older people across Hampshire. In recognition of the levels of home ownership amongst older people across the county, there is a presumption that all new schemes will offer a range of tenures beyond just rental, to include shared ownership, shared equity, or outright ownership. This policy decision and approved investment of £45m included capital investment and required the department to review existing sites and assets to be included in the total sum available. The recommendations in this report are part of this process.
- 5.7. In addition to these schemes detailed in table 1 (above), Hampshire County Council has purchased land at Oak Park in Havant and is tendering for

development of the site, which includes an Extra Care assisted living scheme of at least 50 apartments and a 60 bed nursing home. It is expected that the successful consortium for this development will be announced in January 2014, with the submission of a planning application anticipated in Autumn 2014.

- 5.8. A purpose built Extra Care assisted living scheme in Eastleigh, which is partly funded by Hampshire County Council, is being built on the site of a previous sheltered housing scheme. The first phase of this development, called Surrey Court, is due to open in January 2014, with a subsequent phase due to open early 2015.
- 5.9. Hampshire County Council is in discussion with a number of developers, and in some cases the Department of Health in relation to funding, regarding potential Extra Care assisted living developments. In central Winchester, a planning application for a 50 apartment scheme is due to be submitted in May 2014. In New Milton and Gosport, sites owned by the Council will be offered to framework partners for development as an Extra Care scheme in early 2014. During the course of 2014 it is also proposed to bring forward plans for the development of schemes in Farnborough, Hythe, and a second scheme in Basingstoke. Future sites for Extra Care schemes have also been secured as part of the major developments at West of Waterlooville, Barton Farm in Winchester and Aldershot Urban Expansion, with discussions currently ongoing to secure a similar opportunity as part of the Welborne development (North Fareham). See Appendix F for map showing locations.
- 5.10. The programme has also stimulated the market by encouraging developers to invest in Extra Care schemes for those people able to fully fund their housing and care needs.
- 5.11. Extra Care assisted living is proving popular and demonstrating its effectiveness, both in Hampshire and nationally. Qualitative research reports overall improved outcomes for residents in relation to health, social life, confidence, and general wellbeing. Demand for all four of the new-build schemes has exceeded capacity, and they are demonstrating that they can meet the needs of a wide range of clients including those with dementia, physical frailty and of clients with large care packages (in excess of 30 hours a week) in a flexible way, varying care as required to meet clients changing needs.
- 5.12. The levels of care of the people moving into Hampshire's current Extra Care schemes is being monitored, with early results showing an average reduction of between 2.5 and 4.5 care hours per week required by clients with medium and high levels of need across a diverse range of clients. It also shows that clients have been able to remain independent in a home of their own until the end of their lives

- 5.13. Research undertaken at one of the Extra Care schemes in Hampshire, Juniper Court³ in Gosport found that the benefits to individuals who had moved into the scheme were wide and varied. They included carers living in the scheme with partners or relatives, for whom they care, feeling that they have benefited from living in Juniper Court by being both supported and reassured that they can go out for periods and their relative will be looked after. This they reported had led to improvements in both their own wellbeing and that of the person they care for.
- 5.14. Individuals who had previously lived on their own and who had experienced difficulties before moving to Juniper Court, reported that they have regained independence and dignity as they could manage much more for themselves in flats that are designed for their needs.
- 5.15. The University of Southampton has recently carried out research on the impacts of moving into Extra Care assisted living. The paper, which is due to be published shortly, focusses on a group of residents living in Campbell Place, Fleet, and comments positively on the experiences and outcomes of living in Extra Care assisted living schemes.
- 5.16. At a national level, a Department of Health-funded evaluation of 19 Extra Care assisted living schemes carried out by the Personal Social Services Research Unit (PSSRU)⁴ reports that outcomes for individuals were generally very positive, with most people reporting a good quality of life. The research summary comments include:
- A year after moving in most residents enjoyed a good social life, valued the social activities and events on offer, and had made new friends.
 - People had a range of functional abilities on moving in to the scheme and were generally less dependent than people moving into residential care, particularly with respect to cognitive impairment.
 - For most of those who were followed-up, physical functional ability appeared to improve or remain stable over the first 18 months compared with when they moved in. Although more residents had a lower level of functioning at 30 months, more than a half had still either improved or remained stable by 30 months.
 - Cognitive functioning remained stable for the majority of those followed-up, but at 30 months a larger proportion had improved than had deteriorated.
- 5.17. The benefits of Extra Care assisted living are not restricted to older people and Hampshire County Council has had some success with two schemes aimed at people with Learning Disabilities (Byways in Odiham and Whitewings in Denmead). These schemes are typically of 6-12 apartments

³ Oona Hickson, Juniper Court Extra Care Impact Assessment Study Guinness Hermitage/Hampshire County Council May 2012

⁴ Improving housing with care choices for older people: an evaluation of extra care housing: Ann Netten, Robin Darton, Theresia Bäumker and Lisa Callaghan, PSSRU, 2011

with some communal space. They provide greater independence than shared houses, are most cost effective in the use of care staff and deliver good outcomes for the residents. Analysis has shown that there is demand for at least fourteen schemes around the county. Whilst there is more work to do on location, site reviews for the older persons programme suggests that there are suitable sites available.

- 5.18. As the Older Persons Extra Care programme is progressing well within the £45m capital envelope agreed by Cabinet, this report seeks permission to use up to £10m of this fund to support the development of smaller schemes for younger adults with learning and physical disabilities, and mental health issues. If agreed, each scheme would be subject to a business case and separate approval to spend. For the avoidance of misunderstanding, these developments are not linked to any current Hampshire County Council units.

6. The Consultation

- 6.1. The consultation on the future of the four homes and one day centre took place from 29 July 2013 to 18 October 2013. Information about the consultation proposals and the questionnaire were published on dedicated pages on *Hantsweb* (the website of Hampshire County Council), with copies also available on paper and in alternative formats. The consultation website was kept open until midnight on 22 October and submissions were accepted until that time.
- 6.2. A series of meetings took place in each of the homes with residents, those relatives who were able to attend, and staff, when the proposals were announced on 18 July in order to explain the proposals. Residents were supported by the unit managers within the homes as well as dedicated care managers. Further meetings took place in the days following the announcement.
- 6.3. Two consultation events for each of the homes (one in August and one in September) took place for the families of residents, for respite users and users of the day centre. These events were held in community venues, with families having the opportunity to meet with staff on a one-to-one basis to raise any concerns and to discuss the consultation process. Representatives of independent advocacy organisations also attended each event. It was decided to hold the events in both August and September to ensure that people had every opportunity to attend. If people were unable to attend they were offered the opportunity of individual meetings outside of these events.
- 6.4. A significant amount of social worker time was allocated to the project. There was one social worker (care manager) dedicated to each home, with one also covering Cranleigh Paddock Day Centre. Social workers have met individually with many residents and their families.
- 6.5. Independent advocates were engaged to offer additional support to all residents of the homes and users of Cranleigh Paddock Day Centre to participate in the consultation if they had the capacity to do so. Relatives

were also encouraged to help the residents take part in the consultation. 58 residents participated in this way as well as 8 day centre users.

- 6.6. Where there was doubt as to an individual's capacity to participate in the consultation, mental capacity to take part in the consultation was considered. It was found that 23 residents were not able to take part in the consultation as they lacked capacity to do so. In addition, 3 residents and 1 day centre user did not wish to participate in the consultation.
- 6.7. Paper copies of the consultation were distributed to residents and were sent to the families of all residents, users of the day services and respite users. A number of stakeholder groups were contacted by letter, including relevant voluntary organisations, local GPs, the Chairs of the Clinical Commissioning Groups, Southern Health NHS Foundation Trust, and Solent NHS Trust.
- 6.8. Briefings were sent to all County Councillors, to local MPs and to district councillors. Face to face briefings were offered to County Councillors in the areas local to the four homes, and regular updates were provided on progress with the consultation. Local councillors were also invited to the consultation events for families. Visits to the four homes were organised for County Councillors, local MPs and District Councillors.
- 6.9. A number of public events were held across the county to discuss the proposals under consultation. Some were organised by the Council, some by the groups established to campaign against the home closures, whilst others were organised by organisations such as Petersfield Town Council, which organised an event to discuss the proposed closure of Bulmer House. All events were well attended by members of the public, including relatives of people living in the homes and in some cases staff who work in the homes, as well as by local councillors and trade union representatives. The key messages from these events were noted and have been considered as part of the consultation.
- 6.10. Local organisations and forums representing older people were approached to see if they wanted a presentation or discussion about the proposals under consultation. These forums are attended by representatives from a significant number of organisations, therefore this was seen as an effective way of engaging with as many organisations representing older people and their interests as possible and reaching as wide an audience as possible.
- 6.11. Extensive consultation also took place with staff. The trade unions were also consulted, and were involved in supporting staff during the consultation period (see Section 16).
- 6.12. Responses to the consultation were accepted via letter and email to the Executive Member for Adult Social Care, the Leader of Hampshire County Council, officers within Adult Services and the Chief Executive.
- 6.13. A detailed summary of the public and stakeholder events that took place as part of the consultation can be found at Appendix C.

7. Responses to the consultation

- 7.1. Following the closure of the consultation, there has been a period of extensive evaluation of the feedback received. This has prompted a review of the homes closure proposal in relation to Cranleigh Paddock residential home, where the recommendation will be changed for it to remain open with some potential adjustment to the relevant services. Otherwise, the recommendation is for the other three homes to close in due course.
- 7.2. Overall, 282 people submitted a consultation questionnaire 248 letters or emails were received and are considered as consultation responses Letters and emails were mainly from individuals or families, but also some organisations including local voluntary organisations, Clinical Commissioning Groups, a parish council, a district council, a town council and private care providers.
- 7.3. Petitions were received objecting to the proposed closure of the following homes:
- Bulmer House – 36 signatures
 - Cranleigh Paddock – 1719 signatures, 904 of which were standard letters objecting to the proposed closure of the home
 - Deeside – 7301 signatures, 979 of which were standard letters objecting to the proposed closure of the home

Key Themes

- 7.4. The most common viewpoint was that there has been too little consideration of the residents, their choices and wishes and the impact moving might have on them. The majority of residents who took part said they were happy in their home and did not want to move. There was a strong opinion from other respondents that residents are happy where they are. There was concern that moving would have a negative impact on the health of frail elderly residents, and in many cases might hasten death. This is considered in section 12 of this report.
- 7.5. There was marked concern for the wellbeing of residents with dementia, because they find it very difficult to cope with change. This is also considered in section 12 of this report; section 4 sets out in detail the Council's approach to provision for people with dementia.
- 7.6. There was a large response arguing that the homes should not be closed because 'they work' and are very good. Many considered them a valuable resource to the local community. Particular features highlighted were the cleanliness, safety and security, homeliness, activities, gardens and most particularly, the quality of care, including dementia care, provided by dedicated and trained staff who have strong relationships with the residents. In recommending that the decision is made to close the three homes, the Council has taken into account the provision of alternative quality accommodation in these locations, as well as the care needs and wellbeing of the current residents (see section 13).
- 7.7. There was a strong response that residential care homes are still needed particularly for people with dementia and others such as frail elderly people

who cannot live independently but do not need nursing care. It was argued that residential care should not be an either/or option with Extra Care and that both are needed. People said Council-run homes are needed because they are accountable and provide good quality, affordable care. Some felt that more residential and nursing homes are needed. Hampshire County Council is committed to ensuring that there is an appropriate balance of good quality care provision across the county. This includes working closely with the independent sector, which provides about 86% of the residential and nursing care commissioned by the Council (see sections 1.15, 2.3 and 2.7).

- 7.8. Many people wrote that Extra Care assisted living and independent living is not suitable for most of the current residents. People who largely need 24 hour need care could not safely live independently and need human contact and company. It was argued that they would need more care than can actually be provided through care packages and would be at risk and socially isolated in Extra Care. Many gave the view that Extra Care assisted living is not suitable for people with dementia. Some suggested there is a lack of consideration of people with dementia in the proposals and that if these homes were closed the Council would be abandoning them in favour of less vulnerable people. Hampshire County Council is committed to ensuring that there is suitable good quality care provision across the county. Details of alternative provision can be found in section 13.
- 7.9. Many felt that the reasons given for closure relating to the costs of modernisation are not good enough. Many said that the homes are fit for purpose and meet the needs of current residents: en-suites are not needed and the rooms are big enough. A few expressed the view that costs had been overestimated or that options had not been properly costed. Many residents and their relatives, though certainly not all, said they were happy with the facilities. It was argued that the facilities as they stand suit those residents who have dementia. Several said the benefits of these smaller homes, such as quality of care and homeliness, outweigh some of the drawbacks of having older buildings. The costs of upgrading the buildings are summarised in sections 8 – 11 of this report. Full details are available at <http://www3.hants.gov.uk/residential-care-consultation.htm>
- 7.10. Many people considered there to be a lack of suitable alternative accommodation locally. There was concern that residents would be moved to different villages or towns, making it difficult or impossible for relatives and friends to visit. This concern was marked from relatives and friends who live nearby or use public transport. There were also concerns about the quality of care and standards in four of the homes that had been identified as possible alternatives, particularly Oakridge and Forest Court. The impact on current residents in terms of location of alternative provision and the need to maintain relationships with spouses, partners, family members and friends is considered in the Equalities Impact Assessment which can be found at Integral Appendix B of this report.
- 7.11. There was concern about the proposed closure of Cranleigh Paddock Day Centre, largely from attendees. People wrote how important it is to retain their independence, give their carer a break, how it contributes to their wellbeing,

and stops them from being completely housebound or socially isolated. They did not want it to close and there was a view that it should be considered separately from the care home as it meets their needs. They did not want to be separated from their friends and the staff by being sent to different services. Some said they would choose Cranleigh Paddock over any other service and that it was better than certain others. Consideration of issues relating to the proposed closure of Cranleigh Paddock Day Centre is detailed in section 14.

- 7.12. Some respondents also made comments about the consultation process (see Responses to Consultation document, in particular pages 78 - 81). In particular questions were raised as to whether the then Executive Member for Adult Social Care had a conflict of interest in the decision-making process. It should be recognised that the consultation process was carried out by the County Council and not any individual Executive Member. It is accepted by the County Council that the former Executive Member's decision to resign was not as a result of a conflict of interest in the decision-making process. Her resignation and the appointment of her successor does not impact in any way on the decision-making process, nor does it impact on the validity or the value of the consultation.
- 7.13. It is recognised that the way the County Council invests in adult social care is one of the biggest and most important tasks facing the Council. The scope of the issues which emerged during the consultation and the fact that the proposals include matters outside the remit of the single Executive Member led to the decision that the recommendations should be considered by Cabinet as a whole.
- 7.14. The full report on the consultation (Response to Consultation) is available from <http://www3.hants.gov.uk/residential-care-consultation.htm> (under the 'supporting documents' tab). The department has taken into account all responses received in making its recommendations.

8. Bulmer House

- 8.1. Bulmer House is a 44 bed residential care home in Petersfield providing support to older people. Due to a lack of demand, the decision was made in October 2012 to close one wing of the building and therefore reduce the number of beds available from 44 to 33. Currently there are 15 people living there. The home also offers respite provision.
- 8.2. The building was built in 1973 for people with much lower dependency needs and was not designed to take service users with complex needs. The bedrooms are very small which means it is difficult to provide access for moving and handling equipment to enable care staff to assist service users in their rooms. The room layout and size means it is increasingly difficult to maintain privacy and dignity for residents as their care needs increase. Access to bedrooms for those in wheelchairs is also a major issue with restrictive access. The layout of the building with long narrow corridors also presents difficulties for those with mobility problems.

- 8.3. The recommendation for Bulmer House is that permission is granted for the home to be closed and the site developed for Extra Care assisted living, subject to suitable alternative accommodation for residents being found and their care needs met. The current on-site day centre would be temporarily relocated until such time as the new Extra Care assisted living scheme is opened.

Extra Care site testing options

- 8.4. During the consultation period, testing was carried out on the site at Bulmer House to determine its suitability for the development of an Extra Care assisted living scheme. Three options for new Extra Care residential accommodation were prepared, taking account of site constraints and planning policy advice.
- 8.5. Option One. This retains the existing care home and day services accommodation on site and adds a new build Extra Care accommodation within the grounds. This would give a maximum of 12 units within a 3 storey proposal or 8 units within a 2 storey proposal.
- 8.6. Option Two. This retains the existing care home accommodation, but demolishes the day centre provision and adds a new build Extra Care accommodation in its place linked to the existing retained accommodation. This would give a maximum of 21 units of accommodation within a 3 storey proposal or 12 units in a 2 storey proposal.
- 8.7. Option Three. This assumes that all existing accommodation is demolished and a new 3 storey Extra Care development is built across the whole site. A 43 flat scheme could be accommodated along with a range of communal facilities, including lounge, dining and activity spaces. The 43 units would comprise of 12 one-bed and 31 two-bed units.
- 8.8. Other sites have been considered for the development of Extra Care in Petersfield, however no suitable alternative sites have been identified. The old Adult Services' offices and registry office site was rejected as being too small as well as having the presence of a listed building. A previous potential site, included in a larger development at Causeway Way, was rejected by East Hampshire District Council planners, a decision upheld on appeal by the Planning Inspector. Given the location of Petersfield within the South Downs National Park, it is unlikely further affordable development opportunities will arise in the foreseeable future.

Options Considered

- 8.9. Do nothing. Bulmer House would remain a 44 bed residential care home. The proposed Extra Care assisted living scheme would not be developed on the Bulmer House site.
- 8.10. Upgrade to modern standards. Prior to the consultation it was identified that works totalling approximately £2.6m would be required to bring the building up to modern standards. It would require complete rebuilding of the

home to bring it up to the standard required. This would mean closing the home and moving the residents out during the building works. It is estimated that this would result in the number of beds being reduced to 20 which would not be economic size at which to operate. This reduction in rooms would equate to an investment of approximately £130k per remaining bed.

- 8.11. By comparison the average cost of building an apartment in one of the four new-build Extra Care schemes in Hampshire was approximately £167k, although only part of this cost would be met by the County Council. The Hampshire County Council contribution will vary between £13k to £30k per unit, depending on the level of Government grant available.
- 8.12. It was concluded that investing in new models of care to help support people in a home of their own for as long as possible and also investing in Extra Care assisted living, modern nursing homes and services for people with high-end dementia would not only be more cost effective but would also be better able to meet people's care needs and to deliver a better standard of accommodation.
- 8.13. Keep the home open whilst the current residents remain there and only then develop Extra Care assisted living on its site. This option was considered, but was not considered viable because experience has shown that it becomes difficult to maintain the level of care and respond to future care needs when the number of residents falls too low, particularly in relation to maintaining an activity programme and a suitable atmosphere, as well as retaining staff and ensuring vacancies are available for them in other homes when the home did eventually close. Past experience has shown that once a decision to close is made, the majority of residents wish to move fairly quickly. There would, however, be no fixed timescale for the closure process, which would be dependent on suitable alternatives being available for each of the current residents.
- 8.14. Develop Extra Care units on site whilst retaining the current residential care home building. This option was raised by several members of the public during the consultation. Due to the constraints of the site, and its location within the South Downs National Park, the ability to add extensively to the existing buildings, was considered unlikely to be acceptable to the planning authority. Taking these factors into account it has been assessed that, even by reducing the number of 2 bed apartments in favour of smaller 1 bed apartments, the maximum number of extra care apartments that could be constructed would be 12 across 2 storeys, the height of the existing buildings, or 21 if a full 3 story height building were to be permitted. Given this would be in addition to the current building, planners would raise the question of over development and with the increase in storey height and consequently there is no confidence planners would find it acceptable. Neither of these options would meet the minimum number of units of accommodation (42) that Hampshire County Council considers necessary for a standard Extra Care scheme to be economically viable on an ongoing basis; nor would it be possible to develop and sustain the full range of communal facilities which are key to the ethos of Extra Care assisted living. Therefore this option has been rejected.

- 8.15. Sell Bulmer House as a going concern. During the consultation period the Council was approached with an informal offer to purchase Bulmer House, with a view to upgrading rooms on an ad hoc basis. Should Hampshire County Council take a decision not to close Bulmer but to sell it as a going concern, it would have to openly market the building with existing residents and staff in situ, unless there was a potential purchaser who had special purchaser status, which the person in question does not. The Council does not wish to sell Bulmer House as a going concern as it is the only suitable site identified for investing in and developing Extra Care assisted living in Petersfield.
- 8.16. Close Bulmer House and develop Extra Care assisted living on site. Bulmer House remains the only site in Petersfield that meets the Council's agreed criteria for developing Extra Care. There is currently no affordable Extra Care assisted living in Petersfield, whereas there are 12 residential and nursing homes in the area. This is also the only option that would allow for the development of a viable Extra Care assisted living scheme; it meets the council's requirements in terms of the size of the site, its location and the number of units of accommodation that could be built there. This is therefore the preferred option.

9. Cranleigh Paddock

- 9.1. Cranleigh Paddock is a 30 bed residential care home in Lyndhurst providing support to older people with dementia. Cranleigh Paddock also offers respite provision. Currently there are 22 people living there. Cranleigh Paddock was built in 1980.
- 9.2. It is proposed that Cranleigh Paddock Day Centre is closed. There is sufficient good quality alternative provision locally in Lyndhurst to meet current and future needs. It is proposed that service users be offered a range of appropriate day care alternatives, including at Fenwick 2 a nearby centre run by Southampton Care Association (SCA), on the site of the former Fenwick hospital. Hampshire County Council already spot purchases a number of places at Fenwick 2, and would seek to extend the places it commissions there should the decision be made to close Cranleigh Paddock Day Centre.
- 9.3. The recommendation for Cranleigh Paddock Care Home is that it remains open and that the Council works with New Forest District Council to explore the possibility of further developing the combined site (incorporating the adjacent sheltered housing scheme) as specialist dementia care facilities. During the consultation a number of concerns were raised about the gap in dementia provision that would be left in the New Forest and the western part of Hampshire were Cranleigh Paddock to close. The proposal was to develop dementia care at Forest Court, a Hampshire County Council site in Calmore. However, this was reconsidered during the consultation as it was felt that the available space located on an upper floor is not ideal for dementia care.
- 9.4. Additionally, the site surveys undertaken in respect of the Hampshire County Council owned site during the consultation highlighted that whilst it would be

possible to develop Extra Care on the site, there would be a number of difficulties, outlined in sections 9.7 and 9.8, which would mean that such a development would not be certain. It was concluded that more viable solutions could be developed if the Hampshire County Council and New Forest District Council sites were considered as a whole, and that a comprehensive proposal regarding the whole site was more likely to meet planning requirements.

Extra Care site testing options

- 9.5. At 0.43 hectares for the Hampshire County Council-owned site, Cranleigh Paddock is small for the development of an Extra Care scheme. However inclusion of the adjacent site occupied by a New Forest District Council (NFDC) sheltered housing scheme (which is physically attached to the care home and shares a number of services) could increase the overall site size to 0.79 hectares for the combined site.
- 9.6. Even if the Cranleigh Paddock site met the minimum size requirements, the development of an Extra Care assisted living scheme would have to deal with a number of challenges:
- Restrictive covenants exist regarding use of the site. These restrict the use of the land to a residence for older people, or private housing not exceeding 8 dwellings. They do not place any restrictions on the size or scale of a residence for older people. Any such restrictions in this area would be a matter for the planning authority, and would be informed by the nature of the surrounding buildings the majority of which are two storeys with some reaching three.
 - Restrictive covenants exist regarding access to the site, limiting any changes to the access road.
 - Potential constraints exist on developments due to the locations of existing trees.
- 9.7. Other sites local to Lyndhurst have been considered for the development of Extra Care assisted living. Whilst the former magistrates court and police station sites in Lyndhurst have been raised and considered neither are considered to be viable alternatives. Individually neither site is large enough, and whilst as adjoining sites they could be considered together, the police station site is not currently available, with its future use being considered by the Police and Crime Commissioner. Additionally it is unclear whether the planning authority, the New Forest National Park Authority (NFNPA) would agree to a change of use from employment to housing. NFNPA planning policy CP15: Existing Employment Sites states “*Existing employment sites will be retained throughout the National Park to contribute to the sustainability of local communities.*” Whilst exceptions can be argued to achieve other wider objectives, it would be unlikely to be straightforward.
- 9.8. Whilst there are a number of independent sector residential and nursing homes within Lyndhurst and surrounding villages, the number of beds available for people with dementia is relatively low. It has been identified during the consultation that the loss of Cranleigh Paddock would impact upon

the provision of care for people with dementia in the New Forest in a way that closure of the other homes would not impact on dementia provision in their respective areas.

Options Considered

- 9.9. Do nothing. Cranleigh Paddock would remain a 30 bed, specialist dementia residential care home and the day centre remain open. The proposed Extra Care assisted living scheme would not be developed on the Cranleigh Paddock site.
- 9.10. Upgrade to modern standards. Prior to the consultation it was identified that works totalling approximately £2.6m would be required to bring the building up to modern standards. It is estimated that this would result in the number of beds being reduced to 16 which would not be an economic size at which to operate.
- 9.11. Close Cranleigh Paddock residential care home once a specialist dementia facility at Forest Court is developed, then develop Extra Care assisted living on the site of Cranleigh Paddock. This option has been explored, but has been rejected for a number of reasons. During the consultation a number of concerns were raised about the gap in dementia provision that would be left in the New Forest and the western part of Hampshire in the event that Cranleigh Paddock were to close. This was considered to be of particular relevance given the relatively low numbers of dementia beds provided by the private sector in Lyndhurst and its surrounding villages. Concerns have been raised about the suitability of operating a specialist dementia unit within the first floor wing at Forest Court, especially with regards to residents being able to access the outdoor spaces. In addition, there are concerns about the feasibility of getting the relevant permissions, including planning permission to build a viable Extra Care assisted living scheme solely on the Hampshire County Council part of the site at Cranleigh Paddock.
- 9.12. Keep the home open whilst the current residents remain there and then develop an Extra Care assisted living scheme on site. This option was considered, but was not deemed a viable option because of the limitations of the site in terms of developing an Extra Care scheme and the need to maintain levels of provision for people with dementia in Lyndhurst and the surrounding area.
- 9.13. Keep Cranleigh Paddock open and work with New Forest District Council to explore the possibility of further developing the service as a dementia-specialist combined site. This option may require a small investment on the part of Hampshire County Council, however this would not constitute a full upgrade, which has been estimated to cost £2.6m and which would result in reducing the number of rooms in the home to 16. Further work and discussion with NFDC is required to establish the best solution for the site, but the recommendation is that the solution will include the continuation of the current residential home.
- 9.14. Cranleigh Paddock residential care home is one of three specialist dementia residential homes operated by Hampshire County Council. During the consultation period, the need for this type of provision to continue within

Lyndhurst was raised, particularly in the light of the development of Lyndhurst as a dementia-friendly community. Due to the specialist nature of providing higher-end dementia care within an Extra Care environment and the associated increased sizes of care packages, it is viable to operate such schemes with a smaller number of units of accommodation. Taking all factors into account, this is therefore the preferred option.

10. Deeside

- 10.1. Deeside is a 33 bed residential care home in Basingstoke providing support to older people with physical frailty and/or dementia. Currently there are 25 people living there.
- 10.2. The building was built in 1965 for people with much lower dependency needs and was not designed to take service users with higher dependencies. As with the other homes, the size of bedrooms and size and layout of corridors present particular difficulties.
- 10.3. The recommendation for Deeside is that permission is granted for the home to close, subject to suitable alternative accommodation for residents being found and their care needs met. The value of the site would be invested in developing a new Extra Care assisted living scheme in Basingstoke.
- 10.4. It is proposed that the closure is deferred until the new specialist dementia wing at Oakridge opens by Autumn 2014. This facility will offer accommodation for up to ten of the current residents of Deeside, whose care needs can be met there and who wish to move there.
- 10.5. Whilst need for a second extra care scheme in Basingstoke has been identified, Deeside is not considered to be the right location.
- 10.6. During the course of the consultation an informal approach regarding the potential future use of the Deeside site has been received from a housing association.

Extra Care Site Testing Options

- 10.7. Testing has shown that the Deeside site is not suitable for the development of Extra Care assisted living, however two more potential suitable sites have been identified in Basingstoke. During the course of the consultation the Deeside site has been identified as a potential site for affordable housing.

Options Considered

- 10.8. Do nothing. Deeside would remain a 33 bed residential care home. The proposed sale of the Deeside site, to give the capital investment for an Extra Care assisted living scheme elsewhere in Basingstoke would not be considered.
- 10.9. Upgrade to modern standards. Prior to the consultation it was identified that works totalling approximately £2.3m are required to bring the building up to modern standards. It would require complete rebuilding of the homes to bring it up to the standard required. This would mean closing the home and moving the residents out during the building works. It is estimated that this

would result in the number of beds being reduced to 19 which would not be an economic size at which to operate. This reduction in rooms would equate to an investment of approximately £121k per remaining bed.

- 10.10. By comparison the average cost of building an apartment in one of the four new-build Extra Care schemes in Hampshire was approximately £167k, although only part of this cost would be met by the County Council. The Hampshire County Council contribution will vary between £13k to £30k per unit, depending on the level of Government grant available.
- 10.11. It was concluded that investing in new models of care to help support people in a home of their own for as long as possible and investing in Extra Care assisted living, modern nursing homes and services for people with high-end dementia would not only be more cost effective but would also be better able to meet people's care needs and to deliver a better standard of accommodation..
- 10.12. Keep the home open whilst the current residents remain there, then close the home and re-invest the value of the site into developing a new Extra Care scheme elsewhere in Basingstoke. This option was considered, but was not considered viable because experience has shown that it becomes difficult to maintain the level of care and respond to future care needs when the number of residents falls too low, particularly in relation to maintaining an activity programme and a suitable atmosphere, as well as retaining staff and ensuring vacancies are available for them in other homes when the home did eventually close. Past experience has shown that once a decision to close is made, the majority of residents wish to move fairly quickly. There would, however, be no fixed timescale for the closure process, which would be dependent on suitable alternatives being available for each of the current residents.
- 10.13. Close Deeside residential care home, once the construction of the extension at Hampshire County Council's Oakridge care home is opened (by Autumn 2014). There are only two recognised affordable Extra Care schemes in Basingstoke, of which only one is purpose built. In addition to Oakridge, there are nine independent residential and nursing homes in Basingstoke that Hampshire County Council regularly places people in, including seven that are dementia registered. The value of the site at Deeside can be re-invested into developing a second new build Extra Care assisted living scheme in Basingstoke to meet the local demand. This is therefore the preferred option.

11. Nightingale Lodge

- 11.1. Nightingale Lodge is a 39 bed residential care home in Romsey providing support to older people. Currently there are 20 people living there.
- 11.2. The building was built in 1973 for people with much lower dependency needs and was not designed to take service users with complex needs. The bedrooms are very small which means it is difficult to provide access for moving and handling equipment to enable care staff to assist service users in their rooms.

11.3. The recommendation for Nightingale Lodge is that permission is granted for the home to close and the site developed for Extra Care assisted living, subject to suitable alternative accommodation for residents being found and their care needs met. Masters House, the current on-site day centre would be temporarily relocated until such time as the new Extra Care assisted living scheme is opened.

Extra Care site testing options

11.4. During the consultation period, testing was carried out on the site at Nightingale Lodge to determine its suitability for the development of an Extra Care assisted living scheme. Two options for new Extra Care residential accommodation were prepared, taking account of site constraints and planning policy advice.

11.5. Option One. Work undertaken by property services indicates that an extra care scheme of the required size could be developed on the Nightingale Lodge site within a 3 storey building. This would include a range of communal facilities, including lounge, dining and activity spaces.

11.6. Option Two. Demolishing Masters House and developing an Extra Care scheme on this and the adjacent car park site. This option was raised by a member of the public during the consultation. This would result in a maximum of 14 units of Extra Care assisted living.

11.7. A number of other sites in Romsey have also been considered for development of Extra Care assisted living, however they have been deemed not to be suitable for a number of reasons.

- Romsey Infants School was rejected due to site constraints and issues around access rights.
- Abbottswood was rejected on grounds of its location, lack of local facilities and the lack of an established community.
- The Old Brewery site was considered, however it is already under private development, although the pace of development is very slow with completion estimated to be 7-8 years. There is no current engagement by the developers with Test Valley Borough Council.
- The Duttons Road site was deemed suitable, however it was disposed of for private development by Test Valley Borough Council.

Options Considered

11.8. Do nothing. Nightingale Lodge would remain a 39 bed residential care home. The proposed Extra Care assisted living scheme would not be developed on the Nightingale Lodge site.

11.9. Upgrade to modern standards. Prior to the consultation it was identified that works totalling approximately £2.54m would be required to bring the building up to modern standards. It would require complete rebuilding of the homes to bring it up to the standard required. This would mean closing the home and moving the residents out during the building works. It is estimated that this would result in the number of beds being reduced to 20 which would

not be an economic size at which to operate. This reduction in rooms would equate to an investment of approximately £127k per remaining bed.

- 11.10. By comparison, the average cost of building an apartment in one of the four new-build Extra Care schemes in Hampshire was approximately £167k, although only part of this cost would be met by the County Council. The Hampshire County Council contribution will vary between £13k to £30k per unit, depending on the level of Government grant available.
- 11.11. It was concluded that investing in new models of care to help support people in a home of their own for as long as possible and also investing in Extra Care assisted living, modern nursing homes and services for people with high-end dementia would not only be more cost effective but would also be better able to meet people's care needs and to deliver a better standard of accommodation.
- 11.12. Demolish Masters House and develop an Extra Care scheme on this and the adjacent car park site. This option was raised by a member of the public during the consultation. It assumes that no on site car parking is retained in relation to the existing home or the new Extra Care accommodation. By extending the existing building the construction of a maximum of 14 units of Extra Care assisted living should be possible. A scheme of this nature has assumed that in planning terms an alternative location can be identified for both the existing parking and additional parking that would be needed to support the redevelopment of the site. Although the County Council owns the freehold of the nearby car park this is for the exclusive use of the neighbouring doctor's surgery (reflecting both the planning consent for this facility and also their acquisition of the freehold of the surgery site). Their use is formally specified in the sale transfer and this use persists whilst the surgery continues to operate from their building. There is no provision for the County Council to rescind this use through exercising landownership powers. Additionally, this option would not meet the minimum number of units of accommodation (42) that Hampshire County Council considers necessary for a standard Extra Care scheme to be economically viable on an ongoing basis; nor would it be possible to develop and sustain the full range of communal facilities which are key to the ethos of Extra Care assisted living. Therefore this option has been rejected.
- 11.13. Keep the home open whilst the current residents remain there and then close it and develop an Extra Care scheme on site. This option was considered, but was not considered viable because experience has shown that it becomes difficult to maintain the level of care and respond to future care needs when the number of residents falls too low, particularly in relation to maintaining an activity programme and a suitable atmosphere, as well as retaining staff and ensuring vacancies are available for them in other homes when the home did eventually close. Past experience has shown that once a decision to close is made, the majority of residents wish to move fairly quickly. There would, however, be no fixed timescale for the closure process, which would be dependent on suitable alternatives being available for each of the current residents.

11.14. Close Nightingale Lodge and develop as Extra Care assisted living. The Nightingale Lodge site remains the only suitable site identified for the development of extra care in Romsey. There are no affordable Extra Care schemes in Romsey, whereas there are fourteen residential and nursing homes in the town and surrounding villages. Work undertaken by property services indicates that an Extra Care scheme of the required size could be developed on the Nightingale Lodge site within a 3 storey building. Given the additional presence on the site of the day centre at Masters House, a phased development could be considered. However any phasing of the development would add to the costs. A more cost effective solution would be to temporarily relocate the day centre to an alternative location within Romsey during the course of the redevelopment and incorporate space for it to return to the site in the new Extra Care scheme. This is therefore the preferred option.

12. Caring for current residents

12.1. During the consultation period, a number of concerns were raised about the impact of moving older people, particularly the fact that it may shorten their lives. Whilst it is acknowledged that moving frail older people does have risks, it has been proved that these can be minimised, and if managed properly that there is no significant risk posed to them by moving.

12.2. In August 2011 the University of Birmingham's Health Services Management Centre published a report entitled *An Evaluation of the Modernisation of Older People's Services in Birmingham – final report*. <http://www.birmingham.ac.uk/Documents/college-social-sciences/social-policy/HSMC/research/Modernisation-of-Older-Peoples-Services-in-Birmingham-%E2%80%93-final-report.pdf> The report examines the impact of the closure of Birmingham City Council's 14 care homes and linked day centres on the residents of those homes and the people using the day centres. Contained within the report are a series of recommendations based on the experiences in Birmingham for other authorities carrying out similar processes which Hampshire County Council is following, as evidenced in sections 12.7 to 12.14.

12.3. Having managed a number of home closures over the years, both in-house and when independent sector homes have closed down, Adult Services has good experience of handling this sensitively. It is the department's experience that, if handled correctly, the distress can be minimised and is outweighed by the improved outcomes achieved by moving to a more appropriate environment. It is often the case that older people need to move homes when their care needs increase, meaning that they may need to move from residential to nursing care, so social workers are used to managing this process and providing high quality intensive support to people who need to move.

12.4. Hampshire County Council has closed four older persons' residential care homes since 2011. The closure of Cherry Orchard in 2011 and Addenbrooke, Cornerways and Thurlston House in 2012 resulted in 72 residents moving to a different home. Monitoring has established that 24 of these people have since died, of which 21 died within 12 months of moving. Meaning 29% of

people died within 12 months of the closure. In order to compare this figure table 2 shows the number of long stay residents who died in the 12 months prior to the home closure.

Table 2: Number and percentage of clients who died in the 12 months prior and post the home closures.

Home	12 months before closure		12 months after closure	
	Number	%	Number	%
Addenbrook	11	39%	4	31%
Cherry Orchard	11	33%	4	21%
Cornerways	8	25%	5	33%
Thurlston House	7	17%	8	32%
TOTAL	37	29%	21	29%

- 12.5. This comparison shows that there is no overall difference in the percentage of people who died within 12 months of being moved compared to the 12 months prior to the homes closing (29%). Whilst there is some variation at an individual home level (2 reducing post closures and 2 increasing) as the numbers involved are small, particularly deaths post closure, any small change in deaths would have a big effect on the percentage figure.
- 12.6. By reviewing the details for all of the 24 people who died following the closure it reveals that their average age at time of death was 89.8 years old, of which the oldest was 102 and the youngest 81. This is greater than the average age of all the people who died within a permanent older person's residential placement over the last 12 months, where the average age is 88.8 years. On average they had lived in a residential setting for almost four and half years, which is greater than the national average, and were all suffering from underlying medical conditions. For 11 of the people their needs had increased to such an extent that they moved into nursing care following the home closures.
- 12.7. Social workers have been allocated specifically to work alongside the residents of the four homes under consultation this year to support them through the consultation period. As part of the consultation process, all residents have had an opportunity with their relatives to have meetings with social worker (supported by staff from the home) to discuss alternative accommodation options.
- 12.8. Where individuals have wanted to and have had the capacity to, discussions with relatives and residents have taken place to enable a full understanding of people's preferences for their future care, allowing the project team to reserve beds in the appropriate in-house and independent sector homes, and establish that the quality of potential alternatives is high.
- 12.9. Some residents have chosen to move home during the consultation period, in most cases where their needs are higher and they have chosen to move to a home which provides nursing care. Other people have taken the opportunity to move closer to their family. The dedicated care managers,

allocated to each of the four homes, are closely monitoring these people. Additionally, the Council has commissioned advocacy services to independently ask for feedback from the relatives of people who have moved during the consultation about why the move was made, what they felt the outcome had been for their relative and whether they felt there had been any pressure to move. Although some people raised concerns about the reasons behind the proposals to close the homes, most so far have been very positive about the outcomes for their relatives and no-one has indicated that they felt in any way pressurised to move their relative.

- 12.10. If the decision to close is made, social workers will carry out full care assessments for all residents. These will generate an up-to-date person-centred support plan for each resident. They will help to ensure that residents, their families and the social work staff, are fully informed of their care needs when residents come to make decisions on future accommodation, should the home close.
- 12.11. The social workers are currently working with residents, their relatives and staff to identify friendship groups amongst the residents. These would be used to help ensure that wherever possible and appropriate, residents will be able to move with other members of their friendship groups, should the need arise. Sufficient capacity has been identified in the local area, such that we are confident that we could offer a choice of homes and the opportunity for friends to stay together.
- 12.12. Arrangements would be made to ensure that residents would be fully supported if they were to move to alternative accommodation. Staff from the home would assist residents in their moves if required to do so by relatives or residents, and would be encouraged to visit after each move to ensure that the residents are settling in and their needs are fully understood.
- 12.13. Details of alternative provision are provided in section 13. Vacancies have been reserved in a number of homes to ensure there is sufficient capacity to accommodate people in the homes of their choice should the decision be to close the homes.
- 12.14. Should the decision be made to close the homes, there would be no fixed timescale for the closure process. This would be handled sensitively, working at the pace of the residents and their families, and would be dependent on suitable alternatives being available for each of the current residents. Before any move, an individual would be assessed to ensure that they are fit to move; this would include a medical assessment by a General Practitioner.

13. Market Capacity

- 13.1. When taking into account the population data from the 2011 Census (provided in section 2) there is sufficient provision in each of the three areas both for the current residents and for the increasing number of older people in the future, should the decision be made to close the three homes. For many of the current residents the most suitable alternatives are other residential or nursing homes. In terms of provision for the future however, older people who might formerly have moved into residential care are now choosing to remain

in a home of their own for longer, and often move straight into nursing care, meaning that availability of nursing care and Extra Care assisted living are the key considerations.

Basingstoke (Deeside)

- 13.2. As many of the current residents of Deeside have high levels of care need and have lived in an institutional environment for some time, the preferred alternative for most is other residential or nursing care.
- 13.3. Hampshire County Council currently commissions nursing and residential care for older people in 9 independent sector care homes in Basingstoke and the surrounding area (within 5 mile radius), providing a total of 454 beds. Of these, 3 residential homes and 4 homes that are registered to provide both residential and nursing care, offer dementia care with 388 beds in total.
- 13.4. There is sufficient alternative provision for older people in the Basingstoke area, including the Newman Court new-build Extra Care scheme which has 64 units and opened in November 2012. Newman Court significantly adds to the provision of alternative accommodation for older people in Basingstoke and is providing a real alternative to traditional residential care for many.
- 13.5. Hampshire County Council also commissions the care and support at Abbey Court in Basingstoke. Abbey Court is a former sheltered housing scheme that has had enhanced care and support contract put in place to provide similar levels of care packages expected within an Extra Care assisted living scheme. It has 51 units of accommodation and is run by Sentinel Housing.
- 13.6. McCarthy and Stone have recently developed a new assisted living scheme in Basingstoke, Lady Susan Court, which offers 60 one- and two-bedroom apartments, however this scheme does not offer affordable housing. They also operate Emma Court, a scheme for people with higher care needs on the same site.
- 13.7. It is therefore considered that, with the development of the new affordable Extra Care assisted living scheme in Basingstoke, there is sufficient accommodation in the Basingstoke area to meet the needs of both current residents and older people in the future.

Lyndhurst (Cranleigh Paddock)

- 13.8. There are 10 independent sector residential and nursing homes in Lyndhurst and the surrounding villages (within a 5 mile radius) that are currently commissioned by Adult Services. These provide a total of 304 beds. Of these homes, 4 residential homes and 1 joint residential and nursing home offer dementia care with 132 beds.
- 13.9. This relatively low number of beds means that at this time, it would not be appropriate to further deplete the provision for people with dementia in the Lyndhurst area. The making of a modest investment in Cranleigh Paddock

therefore becomes the most cost-effective option for maintaining sufficient dementia provision in the Lyndhurst area.

Petersfield (Bulmer House)

- 13.10. Hampshire County Council commissions nursing and residential care for older people in twelve independent sector care homes in Petersfield and the surrounding area (within 5 mile radius) which includes Liss, providing a total of 401 beds. Nine of these homes (six residential, one nursing and two joint residential and nursing), with a total of 333 beds provide for people with dementia.
- 13.11. Hampshire County Council also runs a number of other residential and nursing homes for older people in the east of the county, including Emsworth House in Emsworth (48 nursing beds and 31 residential beds), Green Meadows in Denmead (42 residential beds), Marlfield House in Alton (40 nursing beds and 34 residential beds) and Malmesbury Lawn in Havant (35 residential beds) which is a specialist dementia residential care home. Whilst these are further away from Bulmer House (between 12 and 15 miles), they may also offer alternative accommodation for current residents of Bulmer House, depending upon individual circumstances and choice.
- 13.12. It is therefore considered that there is sufficient accommodation in the Petersfield area to meet the needs of both current residents and with the development of a new Extra Care assisted living scheme, older people in the future.

Romsey (Nightingale Lodge)

- 13.13. Hampshire County Council commissions nursing and residential care for older people in 10 independent sector care homes in Romsey and the surrounding area (within 5 mile radius), which offer a total of 346 beds. In the villages surrounding Romsey, (between 5 and 7 miles from the centre) Hampshire County Council commissions nursing and residential care for older people in 4 independent sector care homes, which offer a total of 134 beds, and in neighbouring Chandlers Ford, the Council commissions nursing and residential care in 4 residential homes offering a total of 144 beds. Of these 18 homes, 7 residential homes and 4 joint residential and nursing homes provide dementia care offering 371 beds in total.
- 13.14. Fleming House, another Hampshire County Council home with 25 residential and 30 nursing beds in Eastleigh (10.5 miles from Nightingale Lodge) could potentially offer an alternative choice for those who may prefer a smaller home environment. This is an option that a number of residents of Nightingale Lodge have expressed an interest in, should the decision be made to close Nightingale Lodge. Additionally, for those people who may require nursing care, Hampshire County Council operates Forest Court, an 80 bed nursing home in Calmore, 6 miles from Nightingale Lodge.

13.15. It is therefore considered that there is sufficient accommodation in Romsey and its surrounding area to meet the needs of both current residents and older people in the future in Romsey.

14. Day Care

14.1. Bulmer House Day Centre, in Petersfield would have to be temporarily relocated until the proposed new Extra Care assisted living scheme is built. It is not proposed that the day service provided be reduced in any way.

14.2. Master's House Day Centre, in Romsey, may have to be temporarily relocated until the proposed new Extra Care assisted living scheme is built. It is not proposed that the day service provided be reduced in any way.

14.3. It is proposed that Cranleigh Paddock Day Centre is closed with the service being reprovided for users in the voluntary sector. It is proposed that service users are offered a range of appropriate day care alternatives, including at Fenwick 2 a nearby centre run by SCA, an independent provider. Hampshire County Council already spot purchases a number of places at Fenwick 2, and would seek to extend the places it commissions there should the decision be made to close Cranleigh Paddock Day Centre.

15. Respite Provision

15.1. Currently two beds at Bulmer House and two beds at Nightingale Lodge are available for respite. During 2012/13, on average only one of the beds at Bulmer House was used at any one time, whilst both beds were occupied at Nightingale Lodge. If the proposals to close these homes are agreed, this in-house respite provision will be reprovided. The number of respite beds at Fleming House in Eastleigh has been increased, and should the decision be taken to close Bulmer House, then additional respite beds will be provided at Marfield House in Alton.

15.2. A number of other Hampshire County Council homes provide respite beds (in Andover, the New Forest, Alton, Denmead, Bishops Waltham and Aldershot) and levels of occupancy are such that, with the additional capacity at Fleming House and Marfield, they can provide sufficient capacity to meet demand. This would maintain the current provision of 21 in-house respite beds.

15.3. It is planned to work with current respite users to identify suitable alternatives through the care management process. The respite users at these homes are from quite a wide area and in some cases it may be possible to provide respite more locally. Respite users were invited to take part in the consultation. Alternative options for people include our other in-house homes, independent sector homes, or Shared Lives.

16. Staff implications

16.1. At the outset of the consultation there were a total of 191 staff (124.89 full time equivalents) working across the four homes and one day centre potentially affected by the proposals. As was strenuously communicated to

staff, it is commonly acknowledged that they provide a high standard of care and the recommendations for closure are in no way a reflection of the care provided by staff. This high standard of care was also recognised by many respondents during the consultation period.

- 16.2. A formal HR consultation process ran alongside the public consultation, which closed on 25 October 2015. The statutory time frame required to consult with staff in these circumstances has been reduced by statute to a total of 45 days, however, given the duration of the public consultation and the numbers of staff involved, it was agreed that an extended timeframe was likely to provide the greatest opportunity for full and meaningful consultation.
- 16.3. The trade unions have been consulted regularly throughout the process, meeting both as part of the Departmental Joint Consultative Committee (JCC), but also in specifically arranged meetings to ensure staff working in the homes were given every opportunity to discuss the proposals. Additionally, there has been regular email contact to ensure that all the questions raised by staff have been answered.
- 16.4. Staff were also offered the opportunity to contribute to the public consultation if they chose. One-to-one sessions with HR staff were offered on a drop-in basis at all the homes on a regular basis throughout the consultation period so that staff could raise any concerns and discuss their individual circumstances. In total there were approximately 160 individual staff meetings, in addition to specifically arranged meetings with management.
- 16.5. A Voluntary Redundancy (VR) window was opened during the HR consultation period. It was made explicitly clear to all the staff that no decisions would be taken about any VR applications until after the formal decision making process had been completed. However, opening the VR window in advance of the decision would enable the department to maximise any redeployment opportunities in the department, and more broadly within Hampshire County Council.
- 16.6. If proposals are taken forward, every effort will be made to identify suitable alternative employment within Hampshire County Council for those people who have opted for redeployment. The regular one-to-one meetings with HR professionals have enabled intelligence to be gathered to support redeployment. Those staff who continue to work for Hampshire County Council will be offered additional training, if required, to ensure they are fully supported in their new roles. Additionally, coaching support will be made available to assist staff with the preparation of CVs, job applications and interview skills.
- 16.7. A full Equalities Impact Assessment on the impact of these proposals on the staff working in the homes and day centre has been carried out. The key findings are detailed below. The full assessment can be found at <http://www3.hants.gov.uk/residential-care-consultation.htm> (under 'supporting documents' tab)
- 16.8. In carrying out the Equalities Impact Assessment those characteristics that relate specifically to the staff working in the homes and the day centre have

been specifically considered. These are age, gender, disability, marital status and ethnicity.

- 16.9. At the outset of the consultation an age profile analysis was undertaken. The profile confirmed that the 15% of the staff were aged between 41 and 50 and a further 23% aged over 51. One of the key means of reducing the impact of the potential home closures and possible job losses is the offer of an enhanced voluntary redundancy scheme, applicable to all staff with more than 2 years service. During the staff consultation period a voluntary redundancy window was opened and staff invited to express an interest. It was noted at the outset the Council's enhanced voluntary redundancy scheme could provide a potentially attractive alternative for staff who may find themselves without a job. It is notable that length of service would be recognised in the financial package offered (as with all redundancy schemes).
- 16.10. Only 1% of the overall cohort of potentially affected staff were recorded on the HR management information system as having a disability at the outset of the consultation. The high number of one-to-one meetings with HR representatives provided an opportunity for staff to highlight the impact of the proposed home closures. This was particularly pertinent if the individual member of staff had a disability (which may not have been recorded on the HR management information system). As a consequence specific issues were identified and addressed.
- 16.11. At the outset of the consultation a gender profile analysis was undertaken. The profile confirmed that the 85% of the staff are female and 15% male. It was acknowledged that this represents a clear gender bias, but one that is reflected in the Adult Services' department's overall profile. As part of the consultation process staff have requested consideration for redeployment or enhanced voluntary redundancy. The age distribution of the staff is represented fairly evenly across both the requests for redeployment and voluntary redundancy. As noted above the key action was to ensure that all staff had as much opportunity as possible to be actively involved in the staff consultation to ensure that any disproportionate effect could be addressed.
- 16.12. There are a few married couples who work in the homes potentially affected. Clearly, if these homes close it will potentially affect the employment of both partners. One couple in particular are very keen to remain employed by Hampshire County Council. Both are willing and able to travel (including relocation) so every effort will be made to find them suitable alternative employment if that proves necessary. The other couples affected have opted to be considered for enhanced voluntary redundancy should the home close, thus mitigating the effect of their potential job loss.
- 16.13. At the outset of the consultation, 92% of the staff potentially affected recorded their ethnic origin as "White". A further 5% of the workforce recorded their ethnic origin as "Mixed White/Caribbean/Asian and Black African. The remaining 3% were recorded as either 'refused' or 'not obtained'. The on-going focus on regular communication and meetings with staff provided an opportunity for staff to raise any issues specific to their circumstances, and to ensure these issues were taken account of as part of the consultation process.

17. Financial Implications

- 17.1. These proposals form part of Adult Services' overall strategy to ensure that it can manage demand for its services and target resources at areas where there is greatest need.
- 17.2. The development of new Extra Care assisted living schemes will have no additional financial implications for the Council, over those agreed by Cabinet in October 2011. A typical 50 unit Extra Care scheme is more cost effective than other options, including residential care. A typical 50 unit scheme saves Hampshire County Council around £174k in annual revenue costs compared to the alternative mix of home care and residential care, based on a third otherwise being placed into residential care. The savings derive from a number of sources including eligibility of rents for housing benefit and a more efficient use of care time than in care delivered to individual homes.
- 17.3. It was agreed at this time that an overall capital funding envelope of no more than £45m would be made available for the development of Extra Care. This would be made up of existing reserves as well as from the sale of surplus assets. Extra Care developments typically require a capital contribution (cash or land) of between £800k to £1.2m depending on the size of the scheme and communal facilities. This compares favourably to the £2.3m-£2.6m required to upgrade the three homes recommended for closure, and will create high quality accommodation with a longer lifespan than an upgraded home.
- 17.4. To date a total of £5.85m of the £45m has been incurred or committed to the following developments:
- £3m for the expansion of Westholme and Oakridge nursing homes
 - £0.85m for the Surrey Court Extra Care development in Eastleigh
 - £2m for the purchase of the site at Oak Park in Havant, for the development of the new Extra Care scheme and nursing home
- 17.5. Whilst the amount required for each new development will vary according to scheme location and size, the availability of other sources of housing finance, not available for the development of residential care homes, means that the levels of funding required from Hampshire County Council will be substantially lower than for developing new residential care provision. Whilst the levels of contribution required from the Council are unlikely to be as low as those it contributed to the first four developments, it is not anticipated that it will be required to exceed 30% of the overall development costs. All proposals for the funding of new developments will be supported by a business case which will be submitted to the Executive Member for Policy and Resources for approval.

18. Legal and Governance Implications

- 18.1. The County Council has a duty under Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 to have due regard in the exercise of its functions to the need to:
- a). Eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation and any other conduct prohibited under the Act;
 - b). Advance equality of opportunity between the persons who share a

relevant protected characteristic (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, gender and sexual orientation) and those who do not share it;

c). Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it

Due regard in this context involves having due regard in particular, to the need to remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons sharing a relevant characteristic connected to that characteristic, to take steps to meet the needs of persons sharing a relevant protected characteristic different from the needs of persons who do not share it and to encourage persons sharing a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life of in any other activity which participation by such persons is disproportionately low.

Exercising the duty includes the relevant decision maker considering the Equality Impact Assessment.

18.2. The relevant process in respect of the consultation is determined by case law, government guidance, and Hampshire County Council procedure rather than legislation. The courts have confirmed the general principles as being:

- That consultation must take place at a time when proposals are still at formative stage
- That there must be sufficient reasons for any proposals to permit consideration and response
- That adequate time must be allowed
- The product of consultation must be conscientiously taken into account in finalising proposals

18.3. Legal Services have assessed the process followed in this consultation. The Head of Legal Services and the Head of Governance have confirmed that the consultation and associated process meet the above legal requirements, that it was conducted in accordance with sound governance arrangements and that the proposals are within the budget and policy framework of the County Council. The outcome of the consultation will need to be taken conscientiously into account in finalising proposals.

19. Equalities Impact Assessment

19.1. A comprehensive Equalities Impact Assessment on the impact of these proposals on the people who live in these homes and use the day centre has been carried out.

19.2. Each of the homes, as well as the day centre, were considered individually, however the issues that arose were common to all of the services.

19.3. In carrying out the Equalities Impact Assessment, those characteristics that relate specifically to the people living in the homes as well as the users of the day centre have been specifically considered. These are age, gender, disability and the need to maintain significant relationships with spouses, partners, wider family members, friends or other social connections.

- 19.4. The average age of the residents in the 4 homes is 84. Concerns have been raised during the consultation about the impact of moving older people. It is acknowledged that moving frail older people does pose risks, however it has been proved that when the moves are managed properly there is no significant risk.
- 19.5. A number of the people affected by these proposals are either physically frail, have physical disabilities or suffer with dementia. If the decision is taken to close the homes or the day centre, detailed assessments for each individual would be carried out in order that a range of suitable alternative accommodation or services be identified to meet each person's specific needs.
- 19.6. It is acknowledged that these changes would have a disproportionate impact on women. This however, is due to the fact there are more women than men living in the homes and using the day centre.
- 19.7. There is a requirement to ensure that these proposals do not impact upon the ability of the residents in these homes to maintain their relationships with their spouses, partners, wider family members, friends or other social connections.
- 19.8. A full copy of the Equalities Impact Assessment can be found at <http://www3.hants.gov.uk/residential-care-consultation.htm> (under 'supporting documents' tab). The main conclusions of the assessment are detailed below:
- 19.9. The immediate impact of these proposals would focus on small groups of service users in the residential homes and day centre affected. Alternative services would be available and would not exclude anyone who meets the eligibility criteria for these services (i.e. older people who meet the Adult Services eligibility criteria).
- 19.10. Effective person-centred transition plans would be put into place for each of the residents. Residents would be supported before, during and after their move to another residential home or care setting. This would include familiarisation visits and support from staff that the residents know. The families of the residents would be fully involved where appropriate. Friendship groups within the homes are being identified so that they can be taken into account should people want to move together.
- 19.11. In order to minimise any risks associated with moving older people, Hampshire County Council would follow best practice in terms of supporting residents through use of advocacy services, effective communication, dedicated care management resource and robust person-centred planning.
- 19.12. Due to the high proportion of women who use these services, many of those affected would be women, and actions would be taken to mitigate any impact on this group. This would involve carrying out individual person-centred planning, and providing dedicated support from social workers within the project team.

- 19.13. Should there be any issues relating to an individual's faith, race, sexual orientation or gender identity, then appropriate guidance and training (if necessary) would be sought from the Community Development Officers.
- 19.14. A separate Equalities Impact Assessment has been carried out for the staff affected by these proposals, details of which can be found in section 16.

20. Recommendations

- 20.1. That Cabinet considers the responses to the consultation and considers the Equalities Impact Assessment including the proposed best practice associated with any moves for current residents in relation to the proposals contained in this paper.
- 20.2. That Cabinet recognises that Cranleigh Paddock residential care home makes a significant contribution to specialist dementia care in the New Forest and that it should remain open.
- 20.3. That permission is granted by Cabinet to work with New Forest District Council to explore the possibility of developing the combined site for specialist dementia care.
- 20.4. That permission is granted by Cabinet to close Cranleigh Paddock Day Centre, subject to suitable alternative day care provision being found for the current users of this service in the local area.
- 20.5. That permission is granted by Cabinet to close Deeside residential care home in Basingstoke and suitable alternative accommodation is sought for residents that meets their care needs.
- 20.6. That current residents that are assessed as suitable, should be allowed to remain in situ at Deeside, until such time as the new residential dementia facility opens at Oakridge, should this be their preferred choice of home.
- 20.7. That permission is granted by Cabinet to dispose of the site at Deeside for the provision of social housing and that any capital receipt is ring-fenced for the development of Extra Care assisted living in Basingstoke.
- 20.8. That permission is granted by Cabinet to urgently pursue the development of a second Extra Care assisted living scheme in Basingstoke.
- 20.9. That permission is granted by Cabinet to close Bulmer House residential care home in Petersfield and suitable alternative accommodation is sought for residents that meets their care needs.
- 20.10. That permission is granted by Cabinet to dispose of the Bulmer House site for the purposes of developing an Extra Care assisted living scheme and that the proposed new Extra Care assisted living scheme should incorporate facilities for older persons' day services.
- 20.11. That Bulmer House Day Centre is temporarily relocated within Petersfield during the redevelopment of the Bulmer House site, until such time as the proposed new Extra Care assisted living scheme is completed.

- 20.12. That permission is granted by Cabinet to close Nightingale Lodge residential care home in Romsey, and suitable alternative accommodation is sought for residents that meets their care needs.
- 20.13. That permission is granted by Cabinet to dispose of the Nightingale Lodge site for the purposes of developing an Extra Care assisted living scheme and that the proposed new Extra Care assisted living scheme should incorporate facilities for older persons' day services.
- 20.14. That Master's House Day Centre is temporarily relocated within Romsey during the redevelopment of the Nightingale Lodge site, until such time as the proposed new Extra Care assisted living scheme is completed.
- 20.15. That Cabinet recognises the significant contribution made by the staff at all four of the homes and the associated day centres.
- 20.16. That Cabinet supports efforts in the homes and day centre that are recommended for closure, to redeploy those staff that choose this option and to offer enhanced redundancy terms should the decision be made to close the three homes and Cranleigh Paddock Day Centre.
- 20.17. That Cabinet approves the use of up to £10m of the £45m Extra Care funding to support the development of smaller Extra Care schemes around the county to meet the needs of younger adults with care needs.

CORPORATE OR LEGAL INFORMATION:**Links to the Corporate Strategy**

Hampshire safer and more secure for all:	yes
Corporate Improvement plan link number (if appropriate):	
Maximising well-being:	yes
Corporate Improvement plan link number (if appropriate):	
Enhancing our quality of place:	no
Corporate Improvement plan link number (if appropriate):	

Other Significant Links

Links to previous Member decisions:		
<u>Title</u>	<u>Reference</u>	<u>Date</u>
Development of Extra Care Sheltered Housing		24 September 2007
Better Housing Solutions for Older People Cherry Orchard residential home, Andover	2166 3004	16 May 2011 23 September 2011
Modernisation of Adult Social Care: Project Extra-Care	3175	24 October 2011
Transforming adult social care: improving outcomes for older people through modernisation of care and support	3772	25 May 2012
Proposals to Consult on the Closure of Four Residential Care Homes and One Day Centre	5089	26 July 2013
Direct links to specific legislation or Government Directives		
<u>Title</u>	<u>Date</u>	

Section 100 D - Local Government Act 1972 - background documents

The following documents discuss facts or matters on which this report, or an important part of it, is based and have been relied upon to a material extent in the preparation of this report. (NB: the list excludes published works and any documents which disclose exempt or confidential information as defined in the Act.)

DocumentLocation

Residential Care for Older People in
Hampshire: Responses to the Consultation

EII Court West, The Castle,
Winchester
<http://www3.hants.gov.uk/residential-care-consultation.htm>

IMPACT ASSESSMENTS:

1. Equalities Impact Assessment:

The full equality impact assessment is detailed below:

Main purpose and aims of the policy, plan or project

With more people choosing to remain in their own homes, there is a need to invest in and develop alternatives to residential care and to shift the balance of investment towards those alternatives. This includes services such as Extra Care housing as well as community-based services such as reablement from hospital, Community Response teams (CRT), Hampshire Integrated Community Equipment Service, support for carers and telecare.

In October 2011, Cabinet approved Project Extra Care, a £45m programme of capital investment to deliver further Extra Care housing across the county over an 8 year period, with the aim that Extra Care will become a viable alternative to residential care for older people across Hampshire.

On 26 July 2013, the Executive Member for Adult Social Care granted permission to consult on the closure of 4 older persons' residential homes: Cranleigh Paddock (Lyndhurst), Bulmer House (Petersfield), Deeside (Basingstoke) and Nightingale Lodge (Romsey), as well as Cranleigh Paddock Day Centre. A full Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) was carried out to help inform the decision to consult on these proposals. The main issues identified in this were around age, disability and gender. The actions identified during the assessment focussed on introducing dedicated care management resource as well as advocacy services into the 4 homes and day centre to support the residents, their families and other users of the services.

A twelve week public consultation started on 29 July 2013 and finished on 18 October 2013, however the consultation website was kept open until 22 October and responses received up until then were considered.

Within Lyndhurst, Petersfield and Romsey site searches and evaluation identified the sites of the current residential homes as the optimum development opportunities for Extra Care housing in those areas. Initial feasibility studies were carried out on the sites and identified the potential to develop Extra Care schemes on them. In the case of Basingstoke, alternative sites have been identified to develop Extra Care, but the capital receipt from the sale of the land at Deeside would be required to support such a development

Main elements of the policy, plan or project

Following assessment of the results of the consultation, the Director for Adult Services is recommending that Cranleigh Paddock remain open, although its Day Centre close,

whilst Bulmer House, Deeside and Nightingale Lodge residential care homes are closed, subject to suitable alternative accommodation for residents being found and their care needs being met.

The final decision on this will be taken by the Cabinet of Hampshire County Council on 9 December 2013.

Should the decision be taken to close the homes, the staff will be offered voluntary redundancy. A staff consultation ran alongside the public consultation on the home closures and a separate EIA has been carried out on the impacts of these proposals on staff.

Detailed Assessment

Age:

Specific Issues:

This will affect older people.

Older people might find it difficult to adapt to change and might find change worrying.

Concerns have been raised during the consultation that moving older people may result in their lives being shortened.

Actions:

The average age of the residents in the four homes is (81 years Bulmer House, 85 years Cranleigh paddock, 85 years Deeside and 88 years Nightingale Lodge). Since the start of the consultation process dedicated care management resource (social workers) have been working in each of the homes to support the residents and their families through this period, including carrying out care assessments with individuals.

It is acknowledged that moving frail older people does have risks, it has been proved that these can be minimised, and if managed properly that there is no significant risk posed to them by moving.

In August 2011 the University of Birmingham's Health Services Management Centre published a report entitled *An Evaluation of the Modernisation of Older People's Services in Birmingham – final report*. The report examines the impact of the closure of Birmingham City Council's 14 care homes and linked day centres on the residents of those homes and the people using the day centres.

The key findings collected one month and one year after resettlement showed that for most people the process did not have a negative effect on their lives. The majority of respondents suggested they felt valued and were happy with the control they had over their life at all stages of the study.

Contained within the report are a series of recommendations based on the experiences in Birmingham for other authorities carrying out similar processes; which Hampshire County Council is following.

- *Preparation and strategy*: Having a clear strategy and policy that could be easily articulated to stakeholder groups was seen as important.
- *Engagement and involvement*: Involving key stakeholders, such as service users and their families, upfront in initial decisions about services is important to success. Anxiety and stress is often increased when service users are facing a perceived loss or change to services, and it is important that people feel able to influence what happens to them during resettlement, even if they cannot influence the original decision to close a service.
- *Implementation and operational capacity*: Giving service users adequate assessment is crucial to making sure new services are effective. A key strength of the Birmingham process was a dedicated group of assessors with time and space to carry out detailed assessments, get to know people well, work closely with care staff and provide information and reassurance.

The author of the University of Birmingham report, Professor Glasby states: “*Closing homes is never something to be embarked upon lightly – but this study suggests that the risks of a major decline in quality of life can be reduced and that some positive outcomes can be achieved if the process is conducted well. This needs high levels of respect, communication and empathy, as well as plenty of time and space to follow good practice*”.

During the consultation period, we have also employed independent advocacy services to ensure that the residents of the homes were able to understand the Council’s proposals and the consultation process and to ensure that they were able to participate in the consultation to the best of their ability.

Should the decision be made to close the homes, the dedicated social workers would continue to work with the residents and their families to help identify suitable alternative accommodation for them. Effective person-centred transition plans would be put into place for each of the residents. Residents would be supported before, during and after their move to another residential home or care setting. This will include familiarisation visits and support from staff that the residents know. The families of the residents will be fully involved where it is appropriate. Friendship groups within the homes are being identified so that they can be taken into account should people want to move together. Adequate care management resource is available to support this.

Disability:

Specific Issues:

A number of the residents are either physically frail or have physical disabilities.

There is a high level of people who have dementia in the homes

Actions:

With regards to people’s physical disabilities as well as their dementia, detailed dependency assessments for each individual would be carried out in order that a range of

suitable alternative accommodation can be identified to meet each person's specific needs.

Effective person-centred transition plans would be put into place for each of the residents. Residents would be supported before, during and after their move to another residential home or care setting. This will include familiarisation visits and support from staff that the residents know. The families of the residents will be fully involved where it is appropriate. Friendship groups within the homes are being identified so that they can be taken into account should people want to move together.

Supporting people with dementia, their families and carers is central to the work Adult Services does and over the last year supporting people with dementia is the most common reason for increasing care and support, whether that is care at home or residential or nursing care.

The extension to Oakridge House in Basingstoke will create a 10 bed specialist wing for people with dementia, as well as extensive refurbishment to the communal areas. This facility will offer accommodation for up to ten of the current residents of Deeside, whose care needs can be met there and who wish to move there.

In addition to ensuring we use evidence from research and best practice we have worked with individuals and groups of older people, including those who have dementia, and their carers to plan and develop a range of services that can best support people at the different stages of the illness. This work ranges from the development of dementia friendly communities; the funding of dementia advisors across the county and dementia café and carer support services through to complex personal support at home and provision of specialist residential and nursing care. Whilst some of the residential and nursing care is provided by County Council run services, most of this care is purchased from independent sector care homes.

Gender:

Specific Issues:

We acknowledge that these changes will have a disproportionate impact on women. This however, is due to the fact there are more women than men living in the four homes, and using Cranleigh Paddock day centre.

Marital Status / Relationships:

Specific Issues:

There is a requirement to ensure that these proposals do not impact upon the ability of the residents in these homes to maintain their relationships with their spouses, partners, wider family members, friends or other social connections.

Actions:

Should the decision be made to close these homes, person-centred transition plans would be put into place for each of the residents.

In developing the transition plans, every reasonable effort would be made to ensure that relationships with spouses, partners, wider family members, friends or other social connections are supported. The families of the residents would be fully involved where it is appropriate. Friendship groups within the homes are being identified so that they can be taken into account should people want to move together.

Every reasonable effort would be taken to ensure that people are able to move into new accommodation of their choice within a geographic location of their choice. No date would be set for the closure of a specific home; rather they would close at the pace of the residents moving out. We would work on an individual basis with the families and immediate support networks of the residents to address any issues they may have regarding maintaining contact.

Details of why some groups are low and/or no impact

The proposals will mainly affect the residents of the 4 homes, who are all over 65 and physically frail. Person centred planning will ensure that the needs of people in terms of their faith, race, sexual orientation or gender identity are fully met in any alternative services. If required, appropriate guidance and training in addressing these needs will be sought from the Community Development Officers.

Conclusion

The immediate impact of these proposals would focus on small groups of service users in the residential homes and day centre affected. Alternative services would be available and would not exclude anyone who meets the eligibility criteria for these services (ie. older people who meet the Adult Services eligibility criteria).

Effective person-centred transition plans would be put into place for each of the residents. Residents would be supported before, during and after their move to another residential home or care setting. This would include familiarisation visits and support from staff that the residents know. The families of the residents would be fully involved where appropriate. Friendship groups within the homes are being identified so that they can be taken into account should people want to move together.

In order to minimise any risks associated with moving older people, Hampshire County Council would follow best practice in terms of supporting residents through use of advocacy services, effective communication, dedicated care management resource and robust person-centred planning.

Due to the high proportion of women who both work in and use these services, many of those affected would be women, and actions would be taken to mitigate any impact on this group. In terms of the service users, this would involve carrying out individual person-centred planning, and providing dedicated support from social workers within the project team.

Should there be any issues relating to an individual's faith, race, sexual orientation or gender identity, then appropriate guidance and training (if necessary) would be sought from the Community Development Officers.

2. Staff Equalities Impact Assessment

A separate Equalities Impact Assessment has been carried out for the staff affected by these proposals (see below):

Main purpose and aims of the policy, plan or project

In October 2011, Cabinet approved Project Extra Care, a £45m programme of capital investment to deliver further Extra Care housing across the county over an 8 year period, with the aim that Extra Care will become a viable alternative to residential care for older people across Hampshire.

On 26 July 2013, the Executive Member for Adult Social Care granted permission to consult on the closure of 4 older persons' residential homes: Cranleigh Paddock (Lyndhurst), Bulmer House (Petersfield), Deeside (Basingstoke) and Nightingale Lodge (Romsey), as well as Cranleigh Paddock Day Centre. A twelve week public consultation started on 29 July 2013 and finished on 18 October 2013, however the consultation website was kept open until 22 October and responses received up until then were considered.

Main elements of the policy, plan or project

Following assessment of the results of the consultation, the Director for Adult Services is recommending that Cranleigh Paddock remain open, although its Day Centre close, whilst Bulmer House, Deeside and Nightingale Lodge residential care homes are closed, subject to suitable alternative accommodation for residents being found and their care needs being met.

The final decision on this will be taken by the Cabinet of Hampshire County Council on 9 December 2013.

Should the decision be taken to close the homes, the staff affected will be offered voluntary redundancy. A staff consultation ran alongside the public consultation about the proposed home closures. The staff consultation started on 29 July and finished on 25 October 2013, a total of 13 weeks. During this period approximately 160 one-to-one meetings took place with staff in the homes to provide them with every opportunity to discuss the proposals with representatives from HR to ensure that any pertinent issues could be addressed. Additionally, there were on-going meetings with the relevant trade union representatives throughout the consultation period. These meetings included formal Joint Consultation Committees plus other meetings arranged on a more informal basis to ensure the trade unions had regular access to discuss and consult with management about the proposals.

Detailed Assessment

Age:

Specific Issues:

At the outset of the consultation an age profile analysis was undertaken. The profile confirmed that the 15% of the staff were aged between 41 and 50 and a further 23% aged over 51.

Actions:

One of the key means of reducing the impact of the potential home closures and possible job losses is the offer of an enhanced voluntary redundancy scheme, applicable to all staff with more than 2 years service. During the staff consultation period a voluntary redundancy window was opened and staff invited to express an interest. It was noted at the outset the HCC's enhanced voluntary redundancy scheme could provide a potentially attractive alternative for staff who may find themselves without a job. It is notable that length of service would be recognised in the financial package offered (as with all redundancy schemes). Reviewing the VR requests received it is clear that an overall majority of the staff have asked to be considered for voluntary redundancy (the mean average being 70% of the staff have requested VR).

Disability:

Specific Issues:

Only 1% of the overall cohort of potentially affected staff were recorded on the HR management information system as having a disability at the outset of the consultation.

Actions:

The proliferation of 1:1 meetings with HR representatives provided an opportunity for staff to highlight the impact of the proposed home closures. This was particularly pertinent if the individual member of staff had a disability (which may not have been recorded on the HR management information system). As a consequence specific issues were identified and addressed.

Gender:

Specific Issues:

At the outset of the consultation a gender profile analysis was undertaken. The profile confirmed that the 85% of the staff are female and 15% male. It was acknowledged that this represents a clear gender bias, but one that is reflected in the Department's overall profile (the department figures in 2013 confirming a 81.15% female/18.15% male ratio).

Actions:

As part of the consultation process staff have requested consideration for redeployment or enhanced voluntary redundancy. The age distribution of the staff is represented fairly evenly across both the requests for redeployment and voluntary redundancy. As noted above the key action was to ensure that all staff had as much opportunity as possible to be actively involved in the staff consultation to ensure that any disproportionate effect could be addressed.

Marital Status / Relationships:

Specific Issues:

There are a few married couples who work in the homes potentially affected. Clearly, if these homes close it will potentially affect the employment of both partners.

Actions:

One couple in particular are very keen to remain employed by HCC. Both are willing and able to travel (including relocation) so every effort will be made to find them suitable alternative employment if that proves necessary. The other couples affected have opted to be considered for enhanced voluntary redundancy should the home close, thus mitigating the effect of their potential job loss.

Ethnicity

Specific Issues:

At the outset of the consultation, 92% of the staff potentially affected recorded their ethnic origin as "White". A further 5% of the workforce recorded their ethnic origin as "Mixed White/Caribbean/Asian and Black African". The remaining 3% were recorded as either 'refused' or 'not obtained'.

Actions:

As noted above the on-going focus on regular communication and meetings with staff provided an opportunity for staff to raise any issues specific to their circumstances, and to ensure these issues were taken account of as part of the consultation process.

Conclusion

At the outset of the consultation a detailed analysis took place to identify any potential issues in relation to the staff affected by the potential home closures. A deliberate decision was taken to allow a longer time period than the statutory minimum to give all the staff affected as much opportunity as possible to talk to HR staff and managers about the potential impact of the proposals. In addition to the specific HR meetings, there were several management/staff meetings also.

3. Impact on Crime and Disorder:

3.1. There will be no significant impact on crime and disorder.

4. Climate Change:

How does what is being proposed impact on our carbon footprint / energy consumption?

There are a number of issues in relation to the three residential homes which have a negative impact on the environment given the poor levels of insulation and inefficient equipment due to the age of the buildings. All new Extra-Care Housing developments have been built to meet as a minimum all current building, environmental, insulation and climate change standards.

How does what is being proposed consider the need to adapt to climate change, and be resilient to its longer term impacts?

The proposals include providing for the long-term needs of the older population of Hampshire with appropriate housing to meet their needs and with on-site support that will enable them to adapt to the effects of climate change, such as extremes of temperature or the effects of extreme weather events.

Appendix C: List of public meetings where presentations were made/discussions took place regarding the proposals under consultation.

- Bulmer House Consultation Event for Public and Family– 15 August
- Deeside Consultation Event for Public and Family – 21 August
- Nightingale Lodge Consultation Event for Public and Family – 27 August
- Cranleigh Paddock Consultation Event for Public and Family – 29 August
- Bulmer House Consultation Event for Public and Family – 5 September
- Deeside Consultation Event for Public and Family – 10 September
- Nightingale Lodge Consultation Event for Public and Family – 18 September
- Cranleigh Paddock Consultation Event for Public and Family – 25 September
- Briefing for the 5 Hampshire Clinical Commissioning Groups – 18 September
- New Forest Access Group – 24 September
- Romsey Forum – 26 September
- Hampshire Older Persons Forum – 27 September
- Romsey Older Persons Forum – 27 September
- ‘Save Bulmer House’ Meeting – 30 September
- Cranleigh Paddock relatives meeting – 2 October
- Petersfield Community Forum – 9 October
- Cranleigh Paddock Public Meeting – 10 October
- Basingstoke Disability Forum – 14 October
- Basingstoke and Deane over 55s Forum – 7 October
- Deeside Public Meeting – 14 October
- West Hampshire Clinical Commissioning Group Clinical Team Meeting – 17 October
- Joint Older Persons Well Being Steering Group – 17 October
- Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council Housing Overview Scrutiny Committee – 17 October

There were a number of representatives from different organisations present at the large public meetings/briefings across the county who were provided questionnaires, and the opportunity to obtain further information about the proposals if they wished to do so.

- Neighbourhood Watch
- One Community
- Department of Work and Pensions
- Bredoncare Club Hampshire

- Hampshire Association of Older People
- British Red Cross
- Community Action Hampshire
- Carers Together
- Hampshire Library Services
- Hampshire Fire and Rescue
- Age Concern Hampshire
- Age UK
- Alzheimer's Society
- Princess Royal Trust for Carers
- Basingstoke and Deane Over 55s Forum
- Hartley Wintney and District Over 55s Forum
- ESPOPF (Eastleigh Southern Parishes)
- Andover and District Older People's Forum
- Winchester District Over 55s Forum
- Gosport Older Persons Forum
- Meon Valley Active Retirement Association
- Havant 50+ Forum

There has been an extensive amount of media/press coverage surrounding the consultation. At every opportunity, Adult Services have provided details of how people can get involved.

Appendix D: Glossary of Terms

Residential Care Home - A home registered as a care home (residential) will provide personal care only - help with washing, dressing and giving medication. Some care homes are registered to meet a specific care need, for example dementia or terminal illness.

Nursing Care Home - A home registered as a nursing home will provide personal care (help with washing, dressing and giving medication), and will also have a qualified nurse on duty twenty-four hours a day to carry out nursing tasks. These homes are for people who are physically or mentally frail or people who need regular attention from a nurse.

Domiciliary Care - Domiciliary care (also referred to as home care) is supportive care provided in the home. Care may be given by care workers or registered nursing staff, who can provide help with washing, dressing or giving of medication through to nurses who can deliver nursing tasks.

Extra Care - Extra Care describes retirement housing, for rent, owned or part owned, where care is available. As residents' needs change, the level of care they receive can also change without the resident having to move

Appendix E:**Sheltered Housing Schemes Enhanced to Extra Care**

Scheme	Location	Capacity	Open Date
Abbey Court	Basingstoke	51	September 2011
Warner Court	Andover	39	January 2012
Barfields	Lymington	52	August 2012
Gore Grange	New Milton	37	August 2012
Winifrid House	Totton	26	August 2012
Place Court	Aldershot	53	April 2013
St Johns	Farnborough	40	April 2013
Rowan Court	Chandlers Ford	21	June 2013
Fernhill Court	Chandlers Ford	27	June 2013
Laburnhan Court	Hedge End	56	June 2013
Danemark House	Winchester	35	July 2013
Matilda House	Winchester	20	July 2013

Phase One New-Build Extra Care Schemes

Scheme	Location	Capacity	Open Date
Lion Oak Court	Andover	52	January 2011
Juniper Court	Gosport	50	March 2011
Campbell Place	Fleet	74	August 2011
Newman Court	Basingstoke	64	February 2012

Appendix F
 Hampshire County Council Existing and Future Extra Care Locations

