ADULT SOCIAL CARE CONSULTATION OUTCOME

Report by: Councillor Gurmail Lal, Lead Member for Adult Social Care and Health

1. RECOMMENDATION

1.1 Members to agree to progress the “in principle” decision to close Chiswick Day Centre, Acorn Day Centre, Canal House and Leaders Employment Resource, previously agreed by Council on 1 March 2011, subject to consultation.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

As a result of the provisional local authority finance settlement announcement, which shows a cumulative reduction of £35.8m in general grant over the next two years, the Council is required to make significant savings and deliver a balanced budget. The closure of these services result in £1.4m annual savings. Part year saving of £883k for 2011/12.

Members are recommended to progress the closure of Chiswick Day Centre, Acorn Day Centre, Canal House and Leaders Employment Resource. This was agreed “in principle” by Council on 1st March 2011. Service specific consultation has been undertaken and the report “Response to Scrutiny Report on Consultations: Reconfiguration of Older People’s Day Services/Cessation of Leaders Employment Resource” is also presented to Cabinet on 12th July 2011.

The national and local policy of Personalisation identified that these services were at risk of closure as people chose to use alternative support and care services. However, closure would have been at a different pace.

2. BACKGROUND

2.1 The Council is facing the most significant reduction in resources in recorded history. In the annual Local Authority Finance Settlement the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government has announced a reduction in Hounslow’s general grant allocation of £13.7m in 2011/12, with a further provisional loss of £8.4m in 2012/13. This means that, cumulatively over the next two years, the Council is facing a reduction in general grant of £35.8m. Within Community Services a saving of approximately £4.5 million needs to be made for the 2011/12 financial year. The closure of these services would have saved £1.4m p.a. However, as part year savings are only possible, this will drop to £883k for 2011/12. The shortfall will be made up from one-off savings in order to achieve this original target.
2.2 The context of the savings are that the personalisation of services does not require specialist buildings to the same extent as traditional services. Attendance at the services put forward for cessation have experienced declining attendance as personal solutions including Personal Budgets have been introduced. In line with national policy, people have greater choice and control in meeting their needs. Support can be arranged directly from home and be community based e.g. leisure facilities, shopping, meeting friends. The centre buildings are expensive to maintain and staff safely. There are programmes in Older People Resource Centres and Learning Disabilities Day Services which will make better use of modern fit for purpose services in the community. Where building based services are required they will be easily accessible and have a wide range of users e.g. Sandbanks Older People Resource Centre. The Heston Centre is centrally located and is better accessed from across the whole borough than Chiswick. Employment Services (and Community Services for people with learning disabilities) will receive an investment of £170k p.a. over 2 years and will replace the existing Leaders Services.

2.3 The Council is working hard to improve efficiency in order to reduce the impact of budget reductions on direct service delivery. However given the scale of the savings needed it is inevitable that some services will need to be changed, reduced or stopped. The Council agreed the savings proposals for Community Services for 2011/12 (see Appendix 1).

2.4 Day Services for older people and mental health service users, the employment resource service (Leaders), the Acorn Centre and the Welfare Benefits and Money Advice Unit are part of the wider range of savings being made. These services were selected and consulted on as they are discretionary services. All are also linked to wider reviews and planned changes to services (for Older People Resource Centre and Learning Disability Day Opportunities). Business Cases are attached for each saving proposal at Appendix 2 and these were used as the basis for the proposal.

2.5 The Council conducted a general budget consultation including a broad resident survey which included the majority of savings options. This was delivered to every household in the borough. Approximately 55% of respondents to the survey agreed with the ‘reconfiguration of day services’ and 32% disagreed. Concern was raised that this description had not made clear that it involved closing these 4 particular services (subsequent consultation made this explicit). There were no other obvious alternative savings proposals that did not have a greater impact on services for people assessed as needing them. No alternative savings proposals have come from consultations or petitioners.

2.6 A number of petitions were raised by residents and presented at Council on 1st March and 14th June 2011. There were also a number of referrals to Scrutiny, which were discussed at Scrutiny panel meetings.

2.7 Savings proposals discussed at Council on March 1st 2011 have been revised to include part year savings.

2.8 Council agreed in principle to make these savings subject to further consultation.
3. THE CONSULTATION

The process

3.1 The Council undertook service specific consultation on the services identified above, which included postal and web based questionnaires and a number of meetings for users, carers and stakeholders.

3.2 The service specific consultation with our service users, their family and carers, and stakeholders started on 4th February 2011 and closed on 30th April 2011 – a total of 12 weeks.

3.3 The meetings (a minimum of two per centre) were advertised in advance, both at the centres affected and by directly mailing service users. See Appendix 3.

3.4 Reports on the meetings are available on the Council website. The outcomes of the consultations are summarised at Appendix 4 with the full consultation document attached at Appendix 5.

Acorn

3.5 The issues raised were concerns over closure and the impact that would have on a vulnerable client group. A number of fears were expressed about accessing mainstream or universal services and their ability to deal with people with learning disabilities and mental health issues. Our response is that the Community Access Service provides a number of these services for vulnerable people with disabilities. We would mitigate the impact by offering drop in sessions, assistance to organise activities and help in participation through Adult Education. Information and advice is also available from 'Help in Hounslow' for people to access services offered by the voluntary sector.

---

### 2.9 Savings Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Full Year saving</th>
<th>Part Year saving</th>
<th>Posts deleted fte</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CS3</td>
<td>Welfare Benefits and Money Advice Service</td>
<td>150k</td>
<td>50k</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS13-15</td>
<td>Reconfiguration of Older People Day Care Services</td>
<td>840k</td>
<td>490k</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS17</td>
<td>Leaders Employment Services and Acorn Centre</td>
<td>550k</td>
<td>270k</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS18</td>
<td>Canal House</td>
<td>175k</td>
<td>73k</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.715k</strong></td>
<td><strong>883k</strong></td>
<td><strong>47</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Leaders

3.6 There was a general feeling that there were no other services available that could provide a similar service to that of Leaders, and that with the extra support provided by the service, those who are supported would be less likely to remain in employment. Our response is that some employment and travel training is provided from the Community Access Team. A two year supported employment service is being proposed for people with Mental Health and disabilities funded through DH reablement grant monies.

Canal House

3.7 Similarly the issues raised were concerns over closure and the impact that would have on a vulnerable client group. A number of fears were expressed about accessing mainstream or universal services and these services’ ability to deal with complex mental health issues. The closure of the Star Centre (a service for people with mental health issues) by its Board on 30th June was not anticipated at the start of, and during, the consultation. Our response is that the Star Centre is managed by a Board of Trustees who decided to close this service. The impact of closure will be mitigated as Mental Health Day Opportunities is being re-commissioned to include services previously provided for people eligible under CPA (Care Programme Approach – arrangements for the care and treatment of mentally ill people in the community) will be supported and others will be signposted and supported into community based activities e.g. provided by Watermans and other mainstream and voluntary organisations. A more targeted service to people with complex mental health needs is being considered. Canal House will run this service from September 2011 to March 2012.

Older people day services

3.8 The feelings of users and carers were for these services to remain open. There was concern raised about the services available to users should the day services be closed. Other issues raised included the issue of transporting people experiencing dementia to Heston and the potential length of time it would take. During a meeting with Chiswick GPs, they suggested an alternative community based use could be found for the Chiswick Day Centre site. They recommended it remained a community resource for the people of Chiswick. Another suggestion was a group of people use their Personal Budgets to fund use of the site. In order to keep a local site for Older People day activities, Clifton Lodge has been suggested for a small group who meet FACS eligibility. These are all at an exploratory and investigation phase and no commitment can be given. However, the Council is keen to mitigate the impact of closing Chiswick Day Centre for those who would want a local service in Chiswick. This is in line with the Big Society concept: local people taking on services. Chiswick was selected for closure as Heston is central to the borough and has a recent purpose-built day centre. Service users from Bedfont have recently moved to Heston which also has the Roshni Asian Centre. There are no outstanding transport issues from Bedfont.

Welfare Benefits & Money Advice Unit

3.9 Users expressed concerns regarding closure of the service as they highly valued the service provided by the unit. Several issues were raised regarding low awareness and confidence in seeking advice and information from other organizations providing similar
services. Users are generally happy with the service provided and many felt better off following support or contact with the team, but a substantial minority did not. In addition, users did not feel empowered to subsequently access services themselves. The impact of closing this service is mitigated by the wide range of services for Welfare Benefits and Money Advice that the Council already commissions including Citizen Advice Bureau which benefits from being independent of the Council.

4. THE PROPOSALS AND MEASURES

4.1 These proposals are being put forward as no alternatives for savings have been identified during consultation. These proposals meet the principles of the Council in making efficiencies and a number of mitigating measures have been put forward following concerns during consultation.

4.2 In taking decisions, the Council has to have due regard to the following:

• The need to make the savings necessary to deliver a balanced budget. Officers explored options and ensured they are part of a bigger package of savings for 2010/11.
• The need to redesign services to deliver personalisation and choice and the consequential reduced demand for building based services
• The need to fund services for increased numbers of older people particularly for those with cognitive impairment including dementia
• The legal obligation to provide services to meet the assessed needs of those people who meet the Fair Access to Care (FACS) criteria.

4.3 Taking all this into account and having considered the issues raised in the consultation we have taken a number of measures to accompany/mitigate the effect of the proposed closures.

4.4 For those service users who have substantial or critical needs and who will continue to receive services from the department, the concerns raised were often about losing a service and contact with people they were familiar with and about the type of service they would receive in the future. For these service users, the Council will be working with them to explore the range of services available to meet their needs and to support them through these changes and where possible to maintain friendship groups.

4.5 For those service users who have less need of intensive support from statutory care services the Council remains of the view that it is appropriate to deliver the required savings by reducing the availability of Council run services to those who do not meet FACS criteria of substantial or critical rather than to reduce services to those people in greater need.

4.6 In both cases the Council has sought to explain to service users and their families that the personalisation changes introduced by the national government in recent years mean that the way that most services are designed and delivered is changing and that these changes are not merely about delivery savings, but also result from of the introduction of personalisation and personal budgets.

4.7 Outlined below are the measures the Council proposes to take to support current service users if members decide to confirm these service closures and mitigate the impact. These are summarised for each service below.
Acorn

4.8 The Council proposes that the Acorn Centre will stop being used as a site to provide day support by the end of September 2011. The following actions will be taken:

- Each resident will be offered a review and as part of this process will be supported to complete a resident led assessment. This will enable us to work out with each individual what kind of support they may be eligible to receive.
- For some residents this could result in a personal budget which they will be able to use to access alternative services. Where help is needed to manage this it will be provided.
- For those people not eligible for a personal budget we will help them to identify other opportunities and services already available in the Community, some of which may require a modest contribution from the service user.
- The Community Access Service operating from the Triangle will offer short term support to build up skills and confidence for residents to access more ‘mainstream’ activities and services.
- The centre will not close until alternative arrangements have been discussed with each service user.
- Carers of all service users who are affected by these changes may ask for a carers assessment (including reassessment) to ensure that they are receiving appropriate support for their needs.

Leaders

4.9 The Leaders Employment Resource (LER) is a supported employment service providing a “one stop shop” for adults with learning and physical disabilities and mental health difficulties living in Hounslow. It enables them to find and maintain meaningful paid employment opportunities. The service provides help with job preparation, on the job training and support, job retention and career progression services.

4.10 The Council proposes that the existing Leaders service will stop by the end of March 2012. The following actions will be taken:

- Each service user who meets FACS (Fair Access to Care) criteria will be offered a review as part of this process and will be supported to complete a resident led assessment. This will enable us to work out with each individual what kind of support they may be eligible to receive.
- For some service users this could result in a personal budget which they will be able to use to access alternative services. Where help is needed to manage this it can be provided.
- For those people who do not meet FACS criteria and are not eligible for a personal budget, we will help them to identify other opportunities and services already available in the Community, some of which may require a modest contribution from the service user.
- The centre will not close until alternative arrangements have been discussed with each service user.
- The Travel Buddies service will be retained.
- Carers of all service users who are affected by these changes may ask for a carers assessment (including reassessment) to ensure that they are receiving appropriate support for their needs.
4.11 Care managers will provide ongoing support for service users to link users with employment and employment support and this can be funded through personal budgets.

4.12 It is also proposed that the Council continues to support vulnerable people into employment by taking the following actions:-

- Commission a Supported Employment Service for disabled people who have been assessed as moderate to substantial using the Fair Access Criteria for Adult Social Care using grant funding from the through the PCT. (This funding will be available from 2011 for 2 years only). This service to provide intensive time limited work preparation to enable vulnerable people to access mainstream employment and also to retain employment. This service will not be “building-based”. The savings identified for Leaders 2011/2012 is £300k and for 2012/2013 £550k. The Health and Wellbeing tender (Universal Services) is for £1.7 million combining a number of different voluntary service funding. Please see Appendix 6.
- Include in this service a requirement to provide specialist advice to staff in mainstream day services on supporting people into employment and also to support schools and colleges assist young people with disabilities in transition.

4.13 It is estimated that it will take approximately 6 months to procure this service and it is proposed to retain a reduced service from Leaders in the interim.

**Canal House**

4.14 Canal House is a Day Service for adults with an identified mental health need. The service currently supports 141 service users of whom just over a third are under the Care Programme Approach (CPA) which indicates a high level of complex needs. The services provided range from self help and drop-in sessions to individual specific support for a period of time.

4.15 Following the consultation the Council proposes that the day services at Canal House will stop being provided by the end of March 2012. The following actions will be taken:
- Service users who meet the Council’s Fair Access to Care Services (FACS) criteria will be offered a review and will be supported to complete a resident led assessment. This will enable us to work out with each individual what kind of support they need and can receive.
- For most service users on CPA this could result in a personal budget which they will be able to use to access alternative support. Where help is needed to manage this it can be provided.
- For those people not on CPA support and therefore unlikely to be eligible for a personal budget, we will help them to identify other opportunities and services already available in the Community, some of which may require a modest contribution from the service user.
- All service users assessed as requiring specialist mental health services will continue to have this provided through the Community Mental Health Teams. This may also include access to psychology, occupational therapy, assertive outreach, home treatment team, and a range of other services many of which are funded by the NHS.
- The centre will not close until alternative arrangements have been discussed with each service user.
Carers of all service users who are affected by these changes may ask for a carers assessment (including reassessment) to ensure that they are receiving appropriate support for their needs.

A short intensive support service will be provided from September 2011 until the end of March 2012.

Commissioned new services in place by April 2012. This is part of the tender referred to in paragraph 4.12 of this report.

4.16 A range of support services for people with less complex mental health needs are currently being tendered. These services will be available to people not on CPA. It is anticipated that these services will be available from November and therefore it is proposed to delay the Canal House closure until these alternative services are open.

Older People Day Services

4.17 The London Borough of Hounslow currently provides Day Centres on four sites. These are currently based at:
- Chiswick Day Centre
- Bedfont Day Centre (closed) – service users transferred to Heston
- Heston House Day Centre
- Roshni Day Centre

4.18 Hounslow Council currently provides 4 day centres for Older People. The service user attendance at the day centres varies and each centre is able to meet the needs of both mainstream service users and those suffering from the experience of Dementia. The centres are currently distributed across the borough and the 3 largest centres have specific Dementia units.

4.19 Transformation of services with the introduction of Personal Budgets and Direct Payments has had a significant impact on day centres. There has been a considerable reduction in the number of mainstream service users choosing to attend the centres and the trend of a reduction in demand from FACS eligible clients is expected to continue. The past 2 years have seen a significant increase in the number of people experiencing Dementia and to meet the demand we have created special units in the centres.

4.20 Chiswick Day Support is one of the largest centres and has experienced a 30% drop in attendance. Bedfont Day Service is currently closed due to the new build of Sandbanks Resource Centre and service users have already transferred to Heston. Chiswick Day Support can be relocated to Heston which has the capacity to manage people experiencing dementia. For those people eligible for services, a personal budget will be offered to them.

4.21 Daily capacity across the four sites is currently 112 places per day. (Many residents do not attend every day.) Average attendance across the four centres is 73%.

4.22 The Council therefore proposes that the Chiswick and Bedfont Day Centres will stop being used as sites to provide day support by the end of October 2011, when the new Sandbanks is due to open. All current service users from the centres who have been assessed as requiring specialist or Dementia day support service, will continue to receive a service.
4.23 The following actions will be taken:

- Each resident will be offered a review as part of this process and will be supported to complete a Resident Led Assessment (RLA) where appropriate.
- This will enable us to agree what support may be required. For some residents this could result in a personal budget which they will be able to use to access alternative services. Help and advice can be provided if required.
- Council run day services will develop and operate a model of specialist Intensive day support for those with substantial and critical needs.
- Those service users without Dementia or specialist needs, living in Extra Care Schemes will no longer receive intensive Day Care Support.
- For those people with less complex needs who do not meet FACS criteria and are not eligible for a personal budget we will help them to identify other opportunities and services already available in the Community, some of which may require a modest contribution from the service user.
- The use of Sheltered Accommodation communal facilities will be developed in consultation with Hounslow Homes and tenants.
- The centres will not close until alternative arrangements have been discussed with each service user.
- Carers of all service users who are affected by these changes may ask for a carers assessment (including reassessment) to ensure that they are receiving appropriate support for their needs.

4.24 As a result of feedback received in the consultation and concerns about the design of future services the Council has set up a working group with voluntary sector representatives to review the range of day opportunities for older people provided through the statutory and voluntary sector.

4.25 This group will urgently consider the future range and function of all these services and will design the operating model for the future statutory day services for older people. This will include consideration of whether to provide specialist day centres for those with dementia and those with other substantial needs or whether to provide an integrated service on each site. This operating model will be implemented in the autumn when the rebuilt day facility at Sandbanks is reopened, enabling the Council to provide specialist intensive day support from sites in the West and Centre of the Borough. We will work with the local voluntary sector to ensure a range of complementary services is also available.

Other support services available to support residents:

4.26 In addition to the above the following support is available to all service users where it is appropriate to their circumstances:

- The Re-ablement service can provide a period of intensive help to people to regain or develop independent living skills to be independent within the home such as ‘kitchen confidence’ and shopping.
- Our Sensory Impairment Team work with residents with sight and hearing loss to maximise their independence at home and in the community.
- Where someone is eligible for a Personal Budget they may choose to employ a personal assistant to support them to access mainstream community activities.
- Help in Hounslow provides advice, information and advocacy to all Hounslow residents.
- Carers Services – Respite, Carers Handbook etc.
Welfare Benefits and Money Advice Unit

4.27 The Welfare Benefits and Money Advice Unit is a specialist function providing a range of services to Borough residents, staff and voluntary/other organisations. The Unit deals with approximately 350 new cases each year with some outreach sessions including at Hounslow Homes, West Middlesex Hospital and Brentford County Court.

4.28 Services include:
- Casework – for vulnerable residents with complicated benefit problems or who are at greatest risk because of the nature of their debts
- Outreach surgeries at locations to meet difficult to access groups
- Helpline – a weekday helpline to support council staff and local voluntary groups
- Training programmes to improve awareness and knowledge on debt and benefits

4.29 While many users reported being happy with the service provided, a significant number reported no benefit or feeling worse off following contact with the team. There is also a concern that the service is not empowering users as much as it could to have confidence in accessing other services in line with the personalization agenda.

4.30 The Council has commissioned CAB to provide general and legal advice services, which includes advice on welfare benefits and debt. A recent financial inclusion mapping exercise undertaken as part of the Financial Inclusion Strategy identified a number of voluntary organizations who provide readily available information regarding welfare benefits and money advice. Other departments within the Council also provide advisory services including Adult Social Care and Revenue and Benefits.

4.31 There is therefore duplication of services from a number of advice providers whilst there are also gaps in service provision regarding Tribunal representation support and outreach / specialist advice targeted to vulnerable groups (e.g. Hounslow Homes tenants in rent arrears). The Council is committed to continuing to provide appropriate support in the community in a cost effective way and to address the gaps in the market.

4.32 It is proposed that the Council cease the in-house service and invest in welfare advice and representation support with local voluntary organizations to address the gaps. An Options Appraisal will be developed to identify the most appropriate way forward, with the recommendation presented to the September Cabinet. Key decisions to be included in the Options Appraisal are:

- Whether to continue with the current in-house service as is
- Whether to enter into a new contract for advisory services, and if so for what services
- Whether to vary the existing contracts with CAB on advisory and legal advice services
- How the outreach work commissioned by Hounslow Homes will continue to be provided
- Whether to continue outreach services commissioned by others as part of any ongoing arrangement
Other responses to the consultation

4.33 The Lead Member, Director of Community Services and Community Services senior officers attended Scrutiny on 11 March 2011 and have responded to ‘Response To Scrutiny Report on Consultations’: Reconfiguration of Older People’s Day Services, Cessation of Leaders Employment Resource, (attached). A separate report will be presented to Cabinet on 12 July 2011.

5. CONCLUSION

5.1 We have stated the reasons why these services have been proposed for closure, undertaken consultation and responded to individuals at meetings, met GPs and attended Scrutiny. The background and business cases have been provided. The reason for recommending closure is to continue delivery of statutory services and promote personalisation which has already seen people choose day opportunities which are not necessarily provided in a building. This has had a significant impact on attendance at day centres, which has declined by 30%. Mitigation of the impact of closure together with the continued service delivery to those with the highest needs is set out in 5.4 below.

5.2 The key criteria used for making these proposals are:
- To deliver savings in order to deliver a balanced budget while meeting strategic Community Services aims and national policy.
- Consistency with Personalisation, increased choice and recognition of the declining attendance at traditional day services.
- The provision of services to the most vulnerable service users requiring specialist services.
- The retention of 7 day service coverage at Heston and Roshni day service for Older People.
- The mitigation, as far as possible, for service users and carers of the proposals.
- Service users who cease to receive these services directly from the Council will be supported to consider and access alternatives where available.

5.3 However as noted above the Council is facing the most significant reduction in resources in recorded history and none of the responses from the consultation identified alternative proposals on how these savings could be achieved.

5.4 In addition, Members instruct officers to
- take the actions identified in paragraph 4 above to mitigate the impact of these closures and specifically
- commission a supported employment service
- develop in partnership with local voluntary organizations an integrated model for day opportunities for older people with intensive Council day centres at Sandbanks and Heston.
- ensure that current services users are supported to identify and access alternative services.
- develop options for investment in welfare advice and representation support with local voluntary organisations
- interim arrangements at Canal House are put in place until newly commissioned Mental Health Services are in place (March 2012).
6. EQUALITIES IMPACT

6.1 The duties to give due regard in the EIA are

- A public authority must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to-

  (a) Eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and eliminate any other
      conduct that is prohibited by or under the Act;
  (b) Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected
      characteristic and persons who do not share it;
  (c) Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected
      characteristic and persons who do not share it.

The relevant protected characteristics are:

  (a) Age;
  (b) Disability;
  (c) Gender reassignment;
  (d) Pregnancy and maternity;
  (e) Race;
  (f) Religion or belief;
  (g) Sex;
  (h) Sexual orientation.

To assist Members an initial EIA was undertaken prior to consultation. Full EIAs are now attached.

6.2 Due to the timing of the Government announcements on Council funding, it was not possible to undertake service specific consultation for the recommended period of 12 weeks before the March 1st Council meeting. The period was therefore extended to the end of April and a wider range of meetings was arranged to allow time for service users and other residents and stakeholders to engage in the consultation.

6.3 For the consultation, all measures were undertaken to ensure all those affected were consulted. Questionnaires were made available in various formats (including easy read and Braille) and BSL interpreters were available at the consultation meetings.

6.4 The services in the savings plan do primarily affect those in the community who are older, have mental health issues and or physical and learning disabilities.

6.5 A full equalities impact assessment has been completed for each service following the consultation. These indicate that for each service the proposals enable support to be maintained for service users with the highest need. They also identify a range of mitigating factors which can be taken to reduce the impact of these changes [for this category of service user, and for others who will not receive equivalent levels of support].

6.6 An initial equalities impact assessment has been completed for the Welfare Benefits and Money Advice Unit that advises a full equalities impact assessment is necessary. This will be completed in conjunction with the Options Appraisal with key findings presented to the September Cabinet.
7. COMMENTS OF THE ACTING BOROUGH SOLICITOR

7.1 The Acting Borough Solicitor has been consulted in the drafting of this report and his comments have been included within the body of the report.

8. COMMENTS OF THE DIRECTOR OF FINANCE

8.1 The savings proposals discussed in this report were due to deliver £1.365m savings in 2011/12 however the delays in implementing the proposals will have an impact on the level of savings achievable in year.

8.2 It is estimated that the current level of savings achievable by 31\textsuperscript{st} March 2012 is £883k as detailed in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>2011/12 Target</th>
<th>Projected Saving</th>
<th>Shortfall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£000</td>
<td>£000</td>
<td>£000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS3</td>
<td>Welfare Benefits</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS13-15</td>
<td>Day Opportunities</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS17</td>
<td>Leaders and Acorn</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS18</td>
<td>Canal House</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,365</td>
<td>883</td>
<td>482</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please note the target saving is below the full year savings identified at section 2.9 savings table, of this report.

8.3 Community Services have identified alternative savings of £300k to cover the shortfall on the day opportunities proposals. The department needs to identify further savings of £182k to ensure that the 2011/12 budget is delivered on target.

Background Papers:

Background papers and records of the consultations undertaken are available at http://www.hounslow.gov.uk/index/council_and_democracy/consultations/consultations_archive.htm

Individual impact assessments for each savings option

This report has been or is due to be considered by:
CLT – 13/6/11

This report is relevant to the following wards/areas:
All
## Community Services Savings 2011/2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>11/12 £000</th>
<th>12/13 £000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Increase percentage fees for Disabled facility grants</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Reduce high cost placements</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Welfare Benefits contract cease in-house service and reprovision</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Homecare contract efficiencies</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Retender Supporting People Contracts with WLA and Hounslow Providers</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Closure of the Calen Centre</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Reduce Adult Social Care project budgets</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Review of domiciliary care packages</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Wellbeing and involvement</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 SDS and Brokerage</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Introduction of integrated reablement services</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-15 Personalisation of Day Opportunities</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Reconfiguration of staffing in Learning Disabilities day services</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Leaders Employment Services and Acorn Centre</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Canal House Centre</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Housing reduction of non staffing budgets</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Remove housing projects budget</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Housing Restructure</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Reduce senior management team by one</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Reduce commissioning and contracts</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 HRA Funding</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Reprove and modernise laundry and commode services at lower cost</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Restructure Transformation and Performance</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Administration of grants to voluntary organisations</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Customer Financial Affairs Service (CFAS)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,121</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,576</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reconfiguration of Day Service Older People
DEMENTIA & SPECIAL NEEDS Service Provision and
COST BENEFITS FOR THE COUNCIL

The Existing Model
Hounslow Council Currently provides 4 Day Centres for Older People. The service user attendance at the Day Centres varies and each Centre is able to meet the needs of both mainstream service users and those suffering from the experience of Dementia. The centres are currently in the East, West and Centre of the Borough; the 3 largest Centres’ have specific Dementia units
Day Support services- Service users Breakdown in numbers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centre</th>
<th>Dementia</th>
<th>Mainstream</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chiswick</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedfont</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heston</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roshni</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The current cost of providing these services is approx £1,600,000

Rationale for Change
Local authorities are facing the twin challenges of social care transformation and financial constraint.

The Business Case.
Transformation of services with the introduction of Personal Budgets and Direct Payments has had a significant impact on the Day Centres. There has been a considerable reduction in the number of mainstream service users choosing to attend the centres and trend would appear to continue to reduce.
The past 2 years have seen a significant increase in the number of people experiencing Dementia and to meet demand we have created special units with the centres.
Improvement and Efficiency has taken place within the centres but the reality is these services are still expensive to provide.

Option 1.– Reduce the number of Day Care Units from 4 to 2 Centres.
To retain Heston Day Centre and the Roshni Day Centre which are both situated in the Centre of the Borough and offer a 7 day service.
To retain all current service users from all the centres who have been assessed as requiring Specialist or Dementia Service of the Day Support Services and for them to all attend Heston Day support Centre or Roshni.
Close Chiswick Day Support Centre.
  - Bedfont Day centre is currently closed due to the new build of Sandbanks Resource Centre.
  - Chiswick Day centre is one of the largest centres and has a 30% drop in attendance.
  - Chiswick is also a very congested area for transport too and from the Centre.

To action (106) Existing Mainstream Service users at Heston and Chiswick are assisted to find alternative arrangements for Day Support. There are other privately provided centres and other options that maybe available to them especially with the provision of a personal budget. When Sandbanks Resource Centre is built the option of all specialist and Dementia Day Services to be provided from the new building.

Key messages include:
Service is provided to the most vulnerable service users requiring specialist services. Retain 7 day service coverage. Frontline staffs are redeployed into existing care vacancies. 2 Managers are Redeployed/ Redundancy. Saving in the region of £885,000 (Based on current years budget) Current value of Chiswick Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Staffing (13 frontline Staff in total) (2 Managers) | • Voluntary redundancy  
• Redeployment  
• No’s of staff affected.  
• (Chiswick) 1 Manager  
• 6 care worker, (can be transferred to existing Care Vacancies)  
• (Bedfont) 1 Manager  
• Senior Care worker 1 (Redeployment)  
• 4 Care workers (can be transferred to existing Care Vacancies)  
• Domestic and assistant Cook (redeployment/redundancy) |
| Service Users | • Consultation  
• Independent Service Provision  
• Direct Payment /and individualise budgets |
| Service | • Moving to a centres that provides a 7 day service |
| Savings | • Establishment/ Building expenses  
• Reduction in the number of frontline & Management staff.  
• Sale of the site. |
| Transport | • Issues relating to length of time on the buses of those coming from Chiswick to Heston. |

**Option 2.** – Closure Chiswick Day Centre (Service Transferred to Bedfont)  
- Service User from Chiswick all to transfer to Sandbanks New building in Sept 2011  
  - Significantly reduced savings for year 2011/12 then full saving on part of the allocated Budget.  
  - Staffing levels would need to be increased at the new centre to accommodate the service needs  

**Key messages include:**  
- Significant increase of time for Service users to be on the bus.  
- Frontline staffs are redeployed into existing care vacancies.  
- 1 Managers are Redeployed/ Redundancy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staffing</td>
<td>• Voluntary redundancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Redeployment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No’s of staff affected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• (Chiswick) 1 Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 4 care worker. (can be transferred to existing Care Vacancies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Users</td>
<td>• Consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Independent Service Provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Direct Payment /and individualise budgets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>• In House Provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings</td>
<td>• Establishment/ Building expenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reduction in the number of frontline &amp; Management staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sale of the site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Full year Saving in the region of £425,000 for 12/13 onwards (Based on current years budget)

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

- That Option 1 is implemented and that Service users, carers and staff are consulted on the changes to the Service.

- An action plan is devised and implemented ASAP in order to maximise and achieve full year saving from April 2011.

Sue Witcher  
Service Manager Regulated Services. 26th November 2010
Community Services New Project Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Title</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEMENTIA &amp; SPECIAL NEEDS Day Support Service</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Purpose</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconfiguration of Day Service Older People</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hounslow Council currently provides 4 Day Centres for Older People. The service user attendance at the Day Centres varies and each Centre is able to meet the needs of both mainstream service users and those suffering from the experience of Dementia. The centres are currently in the East, West and Centre of the Borough; the 3 largest Centres have specific Dementia units. Local authorities are facing the twin challenges of social care transformation and financial constraint and need to reduce the in-house day support provision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>(what the project aims to deliver)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The objective is to reduce the cost of Day Support Service and continue to provide a specialist service to the most vulnerable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits &amp; Risks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benefits</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We will be providing a consistent service in the middle of the Borough and will be making savings by closing 2 centres.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transformation of services with the introduction of Personal Budgets and Direct Payments has had a significant impact on the Day Centres. There has been a considerable reduction in the number of mainstream service users choosing to attend the centres and the trend would appear to continue to reduce. 
The past 2 years have seen a significant increase in the number of people experiencing Dementia and to meet demand we have created special units within the centres. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Risks</strong></th>
<th>(the business/political/strategic risks in carrying out or not carrying out this piece of work)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Failure to gain support from staff, Union opposition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Inability to provide support in finding other provisions for current service users</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Inability to complete RLA process for those Service users who have not yet been reviewed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delivery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timescales</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3 Months)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Consultation** | (who needs to be consulted with as part of this work and how will the consultation be carried out) |
Current service users who will require moving to be reviewed and alternative arrangements to be made where appropriate. Staff will be consulted through meetings. HR and the Service |
Manager will meet individually with staff to look at redeployment options.

**Resources** (who needs to be involved in the work, who needs to be kept informed and how will communication be delivered)

Service Manager, HR.

**Well being and involvement**

**Equalities Impact Assessment** (indicate whether an EIA has been submitted with this form) ✓✓ ✓✓ ✓

---

**Finance**

**Costs** (any extra costs associated with the work, both in terms of people and physical (software/hardware etc))

No extra costs to be incurred.

**Funding Source** (the budget code that will fund this work)

Funded from existing resources

---

**Prioritisation**

**Business impact** (tick the areas below that will be impacted by this work)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>✓/x</th>
<th>Explanation (please complete for all Areas)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Targets (work contributes to a target or to other work linked to a target)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy or Legislation (changes may be/are required or work is directly linked to policy or legislation)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation (work could impact negatively on LBH or Partnership reputation)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Change (work requires process, system or staffing changes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource &amp; Stakeholders (large resources of staff/money and/or complex relationships involved)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement (contract/procurement activities are required)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timescale (work has a tight/definite deadline or requires a large amount of time to complete)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Approval**

**Sponsor** (the manager who has commissioned and authorised this work as a service priority)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Signature:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Lead** (the Project Manager/member of staff who is responsible for managing the completion of this work)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Signature:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Key Stakeholders** (may for example be ICT, Finance, any Senior Manager who’s approval is necessary in addition to the above)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Signature:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
**Project Governance Board** (the Departmental Board responsible for approving all new projects across the Department)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Signature:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

For Project Governance Board use only:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Risk Level</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>MEDIUM</th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>Business Case Required</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Risk Level</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>MEDIUM</th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>Business Case Required</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Community Services New Project Form**

### Overview

**Project Title** *(a name that will allow easy identification of the project and will be used by everyone to identify it)*

Canal House – Closure of Service

**Project Purpose** *(a summary of the overall project and why it is necessary)*

To close the existing day service for Mental Health service users at Canal House in order to contribute towards the departmental cost savings target and bring day service provision in line with the Personalisation agenda.

**Objectives** *(what the project aims to deliver)*

A more modern mental health day service provision and meet departmental cost savings.

### Benefits & Risks

**Benefits** *(the benefits of completing this work - in measurable terms wherever possible)*

1. We will meet the £4.5m target of cost savings
2. Day service provision for mental health service users will be more closely aligned to the Personalisation agenda
3. Will be part of a package of measures to modernise day service provision across the borough
4. Social inclusion – accessing local universal services will help reduce stigma of mental health service users
5. Potential realisation of asset in terms of existing building

**Risks** *(the business/political/strategic risks in carrying out or not carrying out this piece of work)*

1. There is not enough existing capacity in the three day centres to absorb the current Canal House service users
2. The number of Canal House service users who will take up Individual Budgets is unknown
3. Potential increase in presentations to A&E, WMUH, may impact on A&E and mental health (Home Treatment Team) services
4. Implementation of tender process for re-provision of mental health day services will not be effective until September 2011

### Delivery

**Timescales** *(when the work needs to be completed by & any reason for this)*

1. Decision made by Council (in principle) on 01/03/11
2. 1\textsuperscript{st} April – 31\textsuperscript{st} July needs of 140 – 160 existing service users at Canal House to be reviewed
3. Tendering for re-provision of current mental health day service and notice to existing providers will not be effective until 31\textsuperscript{st} August 2011

**Consultation** *(who needs to be consulted with as part of this work and how will the consultation be carried out)*

1. Service users consultation to take place on 3\textsuperscript{rd} and 24\textsuperscript{th} February 2011
2. Staff consultation took place on 2\textsuperscript{nd} February 2100
3. West London Mental Health Trust completed
4. A&E Dept. WMUH, took place on 27\textsuperscript{th} January 2011
### Resources
(who needs to be involved in the work, who needs to be kept informed and how will communication be delivered)

Existing management resources plus a temporary project worker post (at SSW level) to co-ordinate the review of need for 140 – 160 service users between April – July 2011

### Equalities Impact Assessment
(indicate whether an EIA has been submitted with this form)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim – consultation not yet completed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Finance

**Costs** *(any extra costs associated with the work, both in terms of people and physical (software/hardware etc))*

- Project worker post @ 4 months = £13k
- Additional work for care managers / co-ordinators in CMHTs as part of review process

**Funding Source** *(the budget code that will fund this work)*

- J4123 – vacant post but will need topping up or freeze on recruitment to be extended to cover the cost.

### Prioritisation

**Business impact** *(tick the areas below that will be impacted by this work)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>✓/x</th>
<th>Explanation (please complete for all Areas)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Targets <em>(work contributes to a target or to other work linked to a target)</em></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Contribute to cost savings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy or Legislation <em>(changes may be/are required or work is directly linked to policy or legislation)</em></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Implementation of Personalisation agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation <em>(work could impact negatively on LBH or Partnership reputation)</em></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Closure of a service always risks organisation’s reputation – some local media interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Change <em>(work requires process, system or staffing changes)</em></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Staff to be redeployed or made redundant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource &amp; Stakeholders <em>(large resources of staff/money and/or complex relationships involved)</em></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Part of a multi agency service provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement <em>(contract/procurement activities are required)</em></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>LBH / PCT to tender for re-provision of mental health day services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timescale <em>(work has a tight/definite deadline or requires a large amount of time to complete)</em></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Tight timescale due to legal time frames to set budget. Timescale for closure of Canal House and new provision of mental health day service not coterminous</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Approval

**Sponsor** *(the manager who has commissioned and authorised this work as a service priority)*

- Name: Martin Elliott
- Signature: 
- Date: 

**Lead** *(the Project Manager/member of staff who is responsible for managing the completion of this work)*

- Name: Martin Reynolds
- Signature: 
- Date: 
**Key Stakeholders** (may for example be ICT, Finance, any Senior Manager who’s approval is necessary in addition to the above)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Signature:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Project Governance Board** (the Departmental Board responsible for approving all new projects across the Department)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Signature:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

For Project Governance Board use only:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Risk Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Case Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Overview

**Project Title** (a name that will allow easy identification of the project and will be used by everyone to identify it)
Welfare Benefits & Money Advice tender

**Project Purpose** (a summary of the overall project and why it is necessary)
Commission advisory services from the voluntary sector and cease providing the in-house service by September 2011.

**Objectives** (what the project aims to deliver)
To provide a more cost effective service provision by commissioning existing advisory groups to deliver services savings for the Council.

### Benefits & Risks

**Benefits** (the benefits of completing this work - in measurable terms wherever possible)
- £100k savings in 2011/12
- £150k savings in 2012/13 onwards

**Risks** (the business/political/strategic risks in carrying out or not carrying out this piece of work)
Voluntary sector does not provide the same quality of service carried out in-house. Clients do not want to use an alternative organisation.

### Delivery

**Timescales** (when the work needs to be completed by & any reason for this)
Report to Executive to agree the way forward in May 2011; with a view to the tender being in place by end of September.

**Consultation** (who needs to be consulted with as part of this work and how will the consultation be carried out)
Consultation will be carried out in February, for completion by 31st March.

**Resources** (who needs to be involved in the work, who needs to be kept informed and how will communication be delivered)
- Julie Edwards (Head of Finance)
- Dugald Millar (Assistant Director of Partnerships & Commissioning)
- Uttam Gujral (Head of Community Partnerships)

**Equalities Impact Assessment** (indicate whether an EIA has been submitted with this form)

### Finance

**Costs** (any extra costs associated with the work, both in terms of people and physical (software/hardware etc)
Additional costs for project manager to assist with the implementation.

**Funding Source** (the budget code that will fund this work)
### Prioritisation

**Business impact** (tick the areas below that will be impacted by this work)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>Explanation (please complete for all Areas)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Targets</strong> (work contributes to a target or to other work linked to a target)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Contributes towards budget strategy 2011/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy or Legislation</strong> (changes may be/are required or work is directly linked to policy or legislation)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reputation</strong> (work could impact negatively on LBH or Partnership reputation)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There are many interested stakeholders this proposal could impact negatively if not well managed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisational Change</strong> (work requires process, system or staffing changes)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Service unit will be deleted with loss of 6.5 fte posts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resource &amp; Stakeholders</strong> (large resources of staff/money and/or complex relationships involved)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Procurement</strong> (contract/procurement activities are required)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Procurement will need to be involved in tendering process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timescale</strong> (work has a tight/definite deadline or requires a large amount of time to complete)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tight deadlines to deliver outcomes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Approval

- **Sponsor** (the manager who has commissioned and authorised this work as a service priority)
  - Name: Mimi Konigsberg
  - Signature:
  - Date:

- **Lead** (the Project Manager/member of staff who is responsible for managing the completion of this work)
  - Name: Julie Edwards
  - Signature:
  - Date:

- **Key Stakeholders** (may for example be ICT, Finance, any Senior Manager who’s approval is necessary in addition to the above)
  - Name: Uttam Gujral
  - Signature:
  - Date:

- **Project Governance Board** (the Departmental Board responsible for approving all new projects across the Department)
  - Name: SMT
  - Signature:
  - Date:

For Project Governance Board use only:

### Project Risk Level

- **HIGH**
  - MEDIUM
  - **LOW**

- **Business Case Required:**
  - YES
  - **NO**
## Community Services Business Case

### Overview

**Project Title** *(a name that will allow easy identification of the project to be used consistently throughout)*

Closure of Acorn Centre, Canal House and Leaders and re-provide in mainstream services

**Project Purpose** *(a summary of the overall project and why it is necessary)*

To remodel Learning Disability, Physical Disability and Mental Health Day Opportunities which will reduce dependency on building based services and promote community access and better use of services already provided by external organisations. To achieve part year savings from closing the Acorn Centre, Acorn Centre and Leaders Services by September 2011.

**Objectives** *(what the project aims to deliver)*

- Re-provision in mainstream training and employment services
- Refocus on Community Access instead of a building based day service
- Savings of £300,000 in 2011/12 and of £550,000 recurrently from 2012/13

**Approach** *(how the project will be delivered, the steps that need to be taken to deliver it)*

- Senior officers identified to lead a small project team to manage public consultation
- Consultation with staff to be linked to current Council HR timetable
- Consultation with residents, their carers and relatives will take place at the same time but within an extended 90 day timescale
- Consultation with relevant stakeholder and partnership boards
- Re-provision for residents through assessment and review programme.

**Timescales** *(when the project will be delivered with a breakdown of timescales for each milestone/stage)*

- Public Consultation end of January to mid March 2011
- Aim for closure by or before September 30th 2011

### Options Evaluation

**Options** *(describe in detail the options that were considered with positives / negatives for each)*

1. Services to remain the same at high cost and building based
2. Modernisation of services in line with personalisation and savings achieved to enable the Council to deliver a balanced budget of 2011

**Recommended Option** *(which option is the preferred option)*

Option 2

**Justification** *(reasons why the recommended option should be chosen over the other options)*

This will ensure financial balance and modernisation at the same time

### Project Delivery

**Scope** *(describe the areas, functions and processes that will / will not be included in the delivery of the project)*

- Project Group established led by Service Manager who lead on Day Opportunities (LD) and Public Engagement
- Fortnightly reports to Community Services SMT

**Benefits** *(the benefits of completing this work in measurable terms wherever possible)*

- Savings achieved
- Residents using the services will have the opportunity to access an alternative range of services and
Alternative provision and support can be more personalised for each resident who is eligible for a Personal Budget.

**Risks** *(the business/political/strategic risks in carrying out or not carrying out this piece of work)*

- Financial risks in not achieving the savings identified by late closure or re-provision costs
- Risks related to any service closure whereby staff at risk have difficulty in supporting residents during the change process due to their own positions
- HR processes and policies on posts at risk already being followed. Likely to be some redeployment opportunities at least in the short term
- Change process for residents and staff will need careful management

**Acceptance Criteria** *(a list of requirements that must be met or carried out before the project can be accepted and signed off)*

- Linked to Government Comprehensive Spending Review and personalisation
- Contributes to Day Opportunities redesign to move away from building based services toward community access and mainstream services

**Project Costs** *(any costs associated with project itself, both in terms of resource (people) and physical (software/hardware etc))*

- Incorporate planning into Day Opportunities Work-stream which is underway
- Consultations will be incorporated into this programme
- Currently no additional project management costs but there will be some costs in relation to Consultations including the production of materials etc

**Ongoing Costs** *(any costs that will continue to be applicable once the project has ended e.g. licences, rental, support charges etc)*

See above

**Funding Source** *(the budget code that will fund this work)*

Day Centres Cost Codes

**Communications Plan** *(who needs to be kept informed, how will they be informed and when will information be sent)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder (person/s to be kept informed)</th>
<th>Information Required e.g. highlight report/overview/specific detail</th>
<th>Method of communication e.g. email/meeting/newsletter</th>
<th>Frequency of communication e.g. weekly/monthly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Approval**

**Business Sponsor** *(the person who has commissioned this work)*

Name: Mimi Konigsberg  LBH  Signature: Date:

**Business Lead** *(the Project Manager who is responsible for managing this work)*

Name: Simon Mitchell  Jill Collins  Signature: Date:

**Key Stakeholders** *(for example ICT, Finance, Senior Manager who’s approval is necessary in addition to the above)*

Name: Anjana Chakraborty  Liz Ayres  Signature: Date:

**Project Governance Board** *(the Departmental Board responsible for approving all new projects across the Department)*

Community Services SMT  Signature: Date:
Appendix 3

Table 1 - Dates for circulation of consultation materials and meetings for users/carers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centre</th>
<th>Meeting flyers and posters distributed</th>
<th>Consultation brief / questionnaire (sent direct to service user unless stated)</th>
<th>Consultation meetings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chiswick</td>
<td>27th January 2011</td>
<td>4th February 2011</td>
<td>9th Feb 2011 10th Feb 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10th Mar 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedfont</td>
<td>27th January 2011</td>
<td>9th February 2011 (sent to centre)</td>
<td>22nd Feb 2011 24th Feb 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acorn</td>
<td>27th January 2011</td>
<td>1st February 2011 (sent to centre)</td>
<td>7th Feb 2011 8th Feb 2011 (x2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9th Feb 2011 10th Feb 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders</td>
<td>27th January 2011</td>
<td>1st February 2011 (sent to centre)</td>
<td>16th Feb 2011 (x2) 18th Feb 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canal House</td>
<td>27th January 2011</td>
<td>1st February 2011 (sent to centre)</td>
<td>3rd Feb 2011 24th Feb 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare Benefits &amp; Money Advice</td>
<td>10th February 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The numbers of responses were as follows

Table 2 - Responses from users and carers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaires</th>
<th>Acorn Centre</th>
<th>Leaders</th>
<th>Bedfont</th>
<th>Chiswick</th>
<th>Heston</th>
<th>Canal House</th>
<th>WBMAU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Postal</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback forms</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emails</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting attendances</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition a range of meetings for stakeholders were organised and a questionnaire circulated

Table 3 - Dates for circulation of consultation materials and meetings for stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centre</th>
<th>Consultation brief / questionnaire</th>
<th>Consultation meetings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chiswick</td>
<td>4th April 2011</td>
<td>11th April 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heston</td>
<td>4th April 2011</td>
<td>11th April 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedfont</td>
<td>4th April 2011</td>
<td>11th April 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acorn</td>
<td>4th April 2011</td>
<td>15th April 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders</td>
<td>4th April 2011</td>
<td>15th April 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canal House</td>
<td>4th April 2011</td>
<td>12th April 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare Benefits &amp; Money Advice</td>
<td>13th May 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The numbers of responses were as follows

**Table 4 - Responses from stakeholders**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Acorn Centre</th>
<th>Leaders</th>
<th>Bedfont</th>
<th>Chiswick</th>
<th>Heston</th>
<th>Canal House</th>
<th>WBMAU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder meetings</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder online</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder feedback</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The numbers of responses in petitions and on Facebook were as follows

**Table 5 - Responses from petitions and Facebook (*still open)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Acorn Centre</th>
<th>Leaders</th>
<th>Bedfont</th>
<th>Chiswick</th>
<th>Heston</th>
<th>Canal House</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LBH petitions</td>
<td>1690</td>
<td>149</td>
<td></td>
<td>1343</td>
<td>137 / 67</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBH petitions (May)</td>
<td>107*</td>
<td>410</td>
<td></td>
<td>220*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook (friends)</td>
<td>164</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The general feedback and feelings of users and carers was for all the services to remain open. There was concern raised about the services available to users should the day services be closed and the lack of clarity over what services would be available should the services which they currently access close.
SUMMARY OF ISSUES RAISED IN THE CONSULTATION

OLDER PEOPLE DAY SERVICES

The following is a summary of the views expressed by users, carers and stakeholders during the meetings held. They have been grouped according to particular subject areas.

User’s / Carer’s views

Geography / Transport issues:
- Transport issues – difficult for some to get to Heston.
- Many of the users will find it very difficult to be moved
- People would not be able to get out of the house if it wasn’t for the day centre and the transport provided.

Consultation / Decision Making Processes:
- Questions over the time scales of the process – responses now well out of date!
- How was it decided that Heston was the centre that would remain open?
- General feeling that the decision has already been made. Concerns over the consultation process.
- Why can’t the decision makers come and listen to us.

Service Satisfaction:
- Excellent services that should not be lost

Assessment Process:
- Questions regarding the process of assessment to go to the dementia service.
- Questions about the assessment process and timescales

Alternative Services:
- Vulnerable and isolated people will be just left in the community with a loss of social contact.
- Why are new services being tendered for when you are having to shut day centres.
- Frail Older People will not be able to access universal services, or even services like Age Concern.
- Replacement services (universal and individual budgets) will prove more expensive in the long run.
- Concerned about putting all dementia suffers together – there are degrees of dementia. How will you cope with the increasing number of dementia suffers with just one centre
- What will happen to the new resource centre at Bedfont? If funding is all agreed for the new centre then why can’t it be used for a day centre?

Carers Support Issues:
- There will be huge impact on the carers – in the long run this will cost more money as carers will break down.
- Impact on families who currently work whilst their relative is at the day centre.
Council’s Savings Options:
- People would be prepared to pay for aspects of the service (transport, meals, activities, attendance). Can individual budgets be used to pay to come to the day centres
- Further efficiencies within the council – printing documents in colour, less officers etc.
- Under occupancy- if this is the case there are plenty of people who would love to attend.
- Angry at why Heston was chosen – have drawn up plan on how they could run the centre themselves (Chiswick). Can’t we develop links with local businesses and faith groups to help keep the centre open

Stakeholder’s views.
- Concerned there is no alternative option on the table. If the proposal is over-ruled the alternative may be far worse.
- Concerns over the consultation process
- Concerned about the separation of dementia and mainstream clients
- For dementia clients, due to increased travel they will have less time within the service.
- Will the voluntary sector have to pick up the additional transport costs
- Concerned about the physical environment at Heston and the capacity to take extra clients.
- Out of date information is being used by council staff
- Impact on carers and organisations supporting them.
- Can the whole process be extended as it is too rushed.

CANAL HOUSE

The following is a summary of the views expressed by users, carers and stakeholders during the meetings held. They have been grouped according to particular subject areas.

User’s / Carer’s views.

Peer Support and group activities:
- Groups activities such as creative writing, cookery, drumming and art are very important to users.
- Importance of meeting with people with similar problems – peer support and guidance.
- Socialising and relationships with peers.

Carers issues:
- Respite for families and time away for the service user.
- Carers are re-assured that their cared for person has the safety net of Canal House.

Service Satisfaction:
- Angry as Canal House was previously held as a best practice example of mental health support – now going to be closed.
- Importance of link workers – worried this support will be lost. Particular concern for those not on Care Programme Approach and without a social worker.
- Importance of staff at Canal House, check up on people if not been around, help with problems at home etc. Staff at other centres are not adequately trained.
- “Canal House keeps people out of hospital beds and so saves money”.
Fear of change / accessing other services:
- Fear of change and other mental health centres/users (No 10 project / Star Centre/ Feltham Open Door).
- Concern that mental health can fluctuate daily – need drop-in services that can accommodate this.
- Worried about the overall impact of mental health services closing (psych wards / day hospital drop-in etc).
- Worried about what will happen to their personal files.
- Fear of travelling to other venues.
- Importance of giving people a routine – a reason to get out of bed.
- Need for an emergency contact point other than A&E.
- Don’t feel universal services will offer the support necessary “you can’t go into a library and say I don’t feel well today”.
- Can eat regularly at Canal House without the worry of shopping or cooking.

Knowledge of Personal Budgets:
- Need for further clarity on Personal Budgets.

Stakeholder’s views.
- Concern that Canal House proposed to be closed before future/alternative provision in place.
- Need to have a clearer idea of charging for alternative services.
- Personalisation hasn’t been promoted and explained clearly enough.
- Need for mechanism to be in place for periods of ill health (emergency).
- Are there links with neighbouring boroughs to pool resources and offer services for those living near the boundaries?
- What will be available prior to the commencement on the new contracts?
- Services at other sites will need to change considerably to match what is currently available at Canal House.
- Can Canal House become self-funding?
- Can we work with other organisation to proved similar services (Watermans, St Paul’s Church Brentford)?

ACORN CENTRE

User’s / Carer’s Views
Peer Support and group activities:
- Importance of maintaining friendships and attending classes.
- Concern about being stuck at home – isolated and bored.
- Need support to organise meeting up at alternative venue and maybe at weekends.
- Computer classes and current tutor particularly important.

Geography / Transport issues:
- Transport – will they be able to get to alternative venues.
- Worried they are losing a place where people can meet with the peers in a comfortable environment.
- Concerned that they will now have to transport users to activities / venues.
- Transport – why half empty buses.
Service Satisfaction:
- Need trained staff who understand their needs.

Fear of change / accessing other services:
- Fear of new places / people.
- Scared of large groups at mainstream colleges.
- Scared of losing one to one support.
- Adult education – courses too short and at various sites. Need longer courses so can learn and grow in confidence.
- Need for specialist activities as some people would not cope with mainstream activities and so will be overlooked.
- Across all activities there is a need for consistency and stability.

Knowledge of Personal Budgets (including Carers issues):
- Criteria and process for Individual Budgets.
- Impact on carers if an Individual Budget does not cover current level of support.
- Clarity over Individual Budgets and how the process will work, increased pressure on Carers to manage the budget.
- Concern that Individual Budgets (and administration of them) will cost more than savings made by closing the centre.

Consultation / Decision Making Processes:
- Wanted an opportunity to be heard by the decision makers (NB Cllr Lal attended an additional meeting).

LEADERS

The following is a summary of the views expressed by users, carers and stakeholders during the meetings held. They have been grouped according to particular subject areas.

User’s / Carer’s views

Service Satisfaction:
- Leaders gives a far better service than alternatives, what happens if Leaders closing and the alternatives are not adequate
- We wouldn’t have jobs if it wasn’t for Leaders
- Helps with CV’s, mock interviews, training, job searching and moral support and supports people to keep jobs
- Leaders staff understand disability issues.
- Without Leaders there will be more unemployment

Fear of change / accessing other services:
- Other services don’t give a tailored, 1:1 service
- People will be left at home doing nothing
- Other agencies take too long
- Has anyone checked if the alternative organisations can actually do the job.
- Treat clients as individuals
Knowledge of Personal Budgets (including Carers issues):

- Questions regarding assessment
- Why cutting Leaders if Incapacity Benefit is also being cut.

Consultation / Decision Making Processes:

- The decision has already been made
- Why are Councillors not present?

Stakeholder’s Views

- Leaders gives far greater support than other agencies
- We need to see the alternative services before cutting current ones
- Who will take on the role of Leaders
- Leaders is a specialist service – there is nothing like this at Job Centre or Reed
- We need to know the full extent of funding opportunities that may be coming up to help fill the gaps for vulnerable people.
- Carers need to be considered as they will be under more pressure.
- Concerned people are going to be signposted to vol orgs that will also have to close
- You will be closing good services and losing good staff then needing to open new services in the future
- There are lots of buildings that could be used to provide services

WELFARE BENEFITS AND MONEY ADVICE UNIT

The following is a summary of the views expressed by users, carers and stakeholders during the consultation. They have been grouped according to particular subject areas.

User’s / Carer’s views

Service Satisfaction:

- The team are knowledgeable, helpful and supportive
- The unit services as a lifeline to residents in Hounslow and should not be closed
- The unit helps to improve quality of life and confidence
- They understand needs and help to achieve outcomes even when they are specialized and complex
- Canal House and the Mulberry Centre are invaluable for providing practical advice
- No support provided
- The helpline is never answered

Fear of change / accessing other services:

- The CAB are not helpful and it is difficult to make appointments as they have long queues
- Do not know where else to go for information
- DWP do not answer the phone or return letters
- Worried about the service closing
Stakeholder's views

- Provides a useful service to residents in the Borough
- Invaluable source of advice and support
- Training sessions are well organised with excellent handouts
- Low awareness of the service and what it offers
- The team are knowledgeable and provide successful outcomes
- Do not know where else to go for help
- No other advice service compares
- They are the best in the field and need expanding not reducing
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Executive Summary
Community Services identified a number of savings options; including Day Services for older people and mental health, the employment resource service (Leaders), the Acorn Centre and the Welfare Benefits and Money Advice Unit and undertook service specific consultation on the services identified above, which included postal and web based questionnaires and a number of meetings for users, carers and stakeholders.

The consultation was conducted using postal and online questionnaires as well as meetings to allow users, carers and stakeholders to have the opportunity to understand the issues and discuss and ask questions.

General Budget Consultation
Approximately 55% of respondents to the General Resident Survey agreed with the 'reconfiguration of day services' and 32% disagreed.

General Overarching Issues
The general feedback and feelings of users and carers was for the services to remain open, and there was concern raised about the services available to users should the day services be closed. There was concerned raised over the lack of clarity of services that would be available to services users should the services they access close.

Older People’s Day Services
The feelings of users and carers was for the services to remain open, and there was concern raised about the services available to users should the day services be closed. Other issues raised included the issue of transporting people that would access the remaining service to Heston and the potential length of time it would take.

Leaders Employment Resource Service
There was a general feeling that there were no other services available that could provide a similar service to that of Leaders, and that with the extra support provided by the service, those that are supported would be less likely to remain in employment.

Canal House Day Services
Similarly the issues raised were concerns over closure and the impact that would have on a vulnerable client group. A number of fears were expressed about accessing mainstream or universal services and their ability to deal with mental health issues.

Acorn Training and Lifeskills Centre
Similarly the issues raised were concerns over closure and the impact that would have on a vulnerable client group. A number of fears were expressed about accessing mainstream or universal services and their ability to deal with people with learning disabilities and mental health issues.

Welfare Benefits and Money Advice Unit
There is a general level of satisfaction and confidence in accessing the service. However it does appear that the service is not empowering users, as much as it could be, to have confidence in or be able to access / use other services locally. It would seem that although the service is highly regarded in terms of helping users, it does not appear to be empowering users to be more in control of their own circumstances and would not appear to be working within the framework of Putting People First. The general consultation revealed general support for the reorganisation of the unit.
Introduction

The Council had to identify £18million savings for the financial year 2011/12 of which Community Services’ contribution was £4.5million.

Community Services identified a number of savings options including Day Services for older people and mental health, the employment resource service (Leaders), the Acorn Centre and the Welfare Benefits and Money Advice Unit.

The Council conducted a broad resident survey which included the majority of savings options; this was delivered to every household in the borough and was also available to complete online.

The department undertook service specific consultation on the services identified above, which included postal and web based questionnaires and a number of meetings for users, carers and stakeholders.

Work is underway to review all adult social care day services. Key messages on this include:

- This is consistent with Personalisation and increased choice.
- Services are provided to the most vulnerable service users requiring specialist services.
- The Council will be retaining 7 day service coverage, where it already exists.

Each service user who meets FACS (Fair Access to Care) criteria will be offered a review as part of this process and will be supported to complete a resident led assessment. This will enable us to work with each individual to identify what kind of support they may be eligible to receive. For most service users this could result in a personal budget which they will be able to use to access alternative services. Where help is needed to manage this it can be provided. For those people who do not meet FACS criteria and are not eligible for a personal budget we will help them to identify other opportunities and services already available in the Community, some of which may have a modest cost attached.

Older People’s Day Services

Hounslow Council currently provides 4 day centres for Older People. The service user attendance at the day centres varies and each centre is able to meet the needs of both mainstream service users and those suffering from the experience of Dementia. The centres are currently in the East, West and Centre of the borough; the 3 largest centres have specific Dementia units.

Transformation of services with the introduction of Personal Budgets and Direct Payments has had a significant impact on day centres. There has been a considerable reduction in the number of mainstream service users choosing to attend the centres and the trend appears to be a reduction in demand. The past 2 years have seen a significant increase in the number of people experiencing Dementia and to meet the demand, we have created special units within the existing centres.

Chiswick Day Support is one of the largest centres and has experienced a 30% drop in attendance. Bedfont Day Service is currently closed due to the new build of Sandbanks Resource Centre and service users have already transferred to Heston. The proposal was to relocate people experiencing Dementia from Chiswick Day Support to Heston which has the capacity.
The intention is to vacate the Chiswick premises, not to stop the services for people experiencing Dementia.

The proposal is to reduce the sites Older People day support is provided from. There are currently 4 sites, which will reduce to 2. All current service users from the centres who have been assessed as requiring specialist or Dementia day support service, will continue to receive a service.

The existing users of mainstream day support will be supported to find suitable alternative services. This will be through Individual Budgets, including purchasing day care if required. The proposals are consistent with the Personalisation Agenda and national policy for Adult Social Care.

### Table 1: Existing capacity across the four Day Centres

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day Service</th>
<th>Dementia Residents on Register</th>
<th>Mainstream Residents on Register</th>
<th>TOTAL Residents on Register</th>
<th>Total Weekly Attendance Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bedfont – 5 Day Service</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chiswick – 5 Day Service</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heston – 7 Day Service</strong></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roshni – 7 Day Service</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>202</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>624</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. Residents attend from 1 – 5 days a week depending on assessed need

Of the above figures:
- 26 residents have declined an RLA or are Self funders.
- 19 residents are attending other clubs.

### Table 2: Current Attendance across the Day Centres

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVICE</th>
<th>Total Daily Capacity</th>
<th>Average daily attendance (rounded up)</th>
<th>Attendance Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bedfont</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chiswick</strong></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heston</strong></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30 (9 weekend days)</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roshni</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>112</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>62.5%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(average across all centres)

PLEASE NOTE: Data in tables 1 and 2 is correct as of May 2011.
**Leaders Employment Resource Service**
The Leaders Employment Resource (LER) is a supported employment service providing a "one stop shop" which enables adults with disabilities and mental health difficulties to find and maintain open and meaningful paid employment opportunities.

The service provides job preparation, on the job training and support, job retention and career progression services and actively works with local employers in presenting the business case of employing people with disabilities.

Other support services provided include CV building, vocational profiling, providing work experience opportunities, interview technique training, job searching skills, application support, job profiling and skills matching, on the job training and support, in work benefit support, job retention and career progression support.

All service users who currently use Leaders Employment Resource would be affected. It is recognised that carers of service users of Leaders Employment Resource may also be affected by the proposed change.

It is proposed that the Leaders Employment Service will cease. Current service users will be signposted to the most appropriate local services:

- There are specific services to support people into employment; these include Jobcentre Plus, Seetec Services, Reed In Partnership, Remploy and Twinings Enterprise.
- The Council is starting to develop new services around healthy living, volunteering and social activities that will be available for everyone.
- Help in Hounslow provides advice, information and advocacy for Hounslow residents

**Canal House Day Services**
Canal House is a Day Service for adults with an identified mental health need. It is located in Brentford and service users across the London Borough of Hounslow access the service.

A variety of facilitated groups run including, IT skills, cookery, photography, relaxation, creative writing, drumming, creative hands, art, music and a women’s group. There are also drop in sessions, facilitated meals and advice sessions provided by the Welfare Rights Service.

Some groups are user led, others offer service users the opportunity to help run the group providing valuable work experience and skills for employment.

Canal House offers one to one support for those identified as requiring individual specific support for a period of time. Outreach support is provided to those who need assistance in maintaining tenancies and adapting to independent living.

The service currently supports 141 service users of whom 51 are on enhanced CPA (indicating a high level of need) and 90 who are on a standard CPA (indicating a lower level of need). Of these 31 service users have a dual diagnosis of mental health and either drug/alcohol addiction or physical or learning disability.

All service users who currently use Canal House would be affected. It is recognised that carers of service users of Canal House may be affected by the proposed change.

It is proposed that Canal House will stop being used as a site to provide day support. All service users will receive a review to assess their needs and help identify future support options. Some examples of alternative provision:

- All service users assessed as requiring specialist mental health services will continue to have this provided through the Community Mental Health Teams. This may include access to
psychology, occupational therapy, assertive outreach, home treatment team, and a range of other services.

- All service users who are eligible through the Fair Access to Care Services criteria will be assisted in completing a resident led assessment. They will then be supported to produce a support plan to meet identified need.
- Where someone is eligible for a personal budget they may choose to employ a personal assistant to support them to access mainstream community activities such as support groups, voluntary agencies, adult education and leisure service opportunities.
- There are specific services for people with mental health needs including those currently provided by Open Door and The School Road Project.
- The council is starting to develop new services around healthy living, volunteering and social activities that will be available for everyone, and some specific mental health day opportunity services that will be less focussed on one particular venue or location.
- Help in Hounslow provides advice, information and advocacy help.

**Acorn Training and Lifeskills Centre**
The Acorn Training and Lifeskills Centre offers a range of services for adults with a learning disability, physical disability or sensory impairment, or mental health issue.

The centre provides a range of activities designed to support service users in:
- maintaining and developing independent living skills
- confidently accessing the wider community
- enjoying greater independence at home
- taking positive steps towards employment

Within the current programme are courses including Computing, Kitchen Confidence, Assertiveness, Numeracy, Exercise and Yoga. Service users can join either one or a number of courses.

The centre also runs Work Skills groups and can offer more specific support for individuals who would like to get into work. Centre staff support people to access voluntary work and work experience placements.

A strong partnership with Adult Education has existed for several years. This helps to maximise the quality and range of opportunities on offer.

The staff team continuously monitor how well the courses and activities are meeting people’s expectations and focus on achieving positive outcomes and progressions for service users. All service users who currently use the Acorn Centre would be affected. It is recognised that carers of service users of the Acorn Centre may also be affected by the proposed change. It is proposed that the Acorn Centre will stop being used as a site to provide day support by September 2011.

Some examples of alternative provision:
- It is possible to gain computing and IT skills through Lifelong Learning (Adult Education) classes in the borough.
- For those interested in current affairs, exercise, yoga, reading, there are other options available through lifelong learning, classes in leisure centres, local reading groups etc.
- The council has the Community Access Service operating from the Triangle. It can offer short term support to build up skills and confidence for residents to access more ‘mainstream’ activities and services.
- Developing skills to be independent within the home such as ‘kitchen confidence’ and shopping can be offered by our home care re-ablement service designed to help people to regain or develop independent living skills within a defined timeframe.
• Our Sensory Impairment Team work with residents with sight and hearing loss to maximise their independence at home and in the community.
• Where someone is eligible for a Personal Budget they may choose to employ a personal assistant to support them to access mainstream community activities.
• The council is starting to develop new services around healthy living, volunteering and social activities that will be available for everyone.
• Help in Hounslow provides advice, information and advocacy help.

**Welfare Benefits and Money Advice Unit**
The Unit provides services to Hounslow residents and provides training to the voluntary sector to deliver advisory services. The work is highly respected across the Borough by its service users. The demand on the service is such that there is a waiting list.

The main areas of advice are:
   - **Casework** - for vulnerable residents with complicated benefit problems or who are at greatest risk because of the nature of their debts, i.e. at risk of losing their home through rent or mortgage arrears or where individuals have disabilities which would restrict access to use another advice service.
   - **Outreach** – surgeries at locations targeted to meet people with specific needs and difficult to access groups. The sessions are currently run at: Canal House (a drop in centre for people with mental ill-health), the Sexual Health Clinic at West Middlesex Hospital, the Mulberry centre for cancer patients and their carers in West London, a weekly Court advice desk at Brentford County Court, and 6 weekly sessions for Hounslow Homes at various sites across the Borough.
   - **Helpline** – a weekday helpline to support council staff and local voluntary groups with benefit and debt enquiries.
   - **Training** – two training programmes a year and also some “in house” training courses to improve awareness and knowledge for other council staff and local groups on debt and benefit issues.

There are three potential options for the future of the service:
   - Option 1 – Continue providing a Council money advice service.
   - Option 2 – Explore the development of a Social Enterprise model for the team.
   - Option 3 – Service outsourcing.
   - Option 4 – Remodel the existing service.
   - Option 5 – Cease the Council service and signpost clients to other locally provided services.
Methodology

Best practises for engagement and consultation around service changes is a 12 week period. The Corporate Budget Consultation booklet was distributed to all residents at the beginning of January 2011. The service specific consultation process with our service users, their family and carers, and stakeholders started on 27th January 2011 with the first consultation meeting held on 3rd February 2011, and closed on 30th April 2011 – a total of twelve weeks. The consultation was conducted using postal and online questionnaires as well as meetings to allow users, carers and stakeholders to have the opportunity to understand the issues and discuss and ask questions.

The meetings (a minimum of two per centre) were advertised in advance, both at the centres affected and by directly mailing service users. Meetings for users / stakeholders were not conducted as part of the consultation for the Welfare Benefits and Money Advice Unit methodology. The stakeholder meetings for the Leaders service were limited to those stakeholders already engaged with the service, and not for any employer, or potential employer that could use the service.

Following feedback from some users and carers, extra meetings were arranged and promoted.

**Key Dates for User Consultation**

The table below shows the timings for circulation of consultation materials and dates of meetings for users and carers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centre</th>
<th>Meeting flyers and posters (distributed by centre)</th>
<th>Consultation brief / questionnaire (sent direct to service user unless stated)</th>
<th>Consultation meetings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chiswick</td>
<td>27th January 2011</td>
<td>4th February 2011</td>
<td>9th Feb 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10th Feb 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10th Mar 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heston</td>
<td>27th January 2011</td>
<td>9th February 2011</td>
<td>15th Feb 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17th Feb 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedfont</td>
<td>27th January 2011</td>
<td>9th February 2011 (sent to centre)</td>
<td>22nd Feb 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24th Feb 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acorn</td>
<td>27th January 2011</td>
<td>1st February 2011 (sent to centre)</td>
<td>7th Feb 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8th Feb 2011 (x2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9th Feb 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10th Feb 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders</td>
<td>27th January 2011</td>
<td>1st February 2011 (sent to centre)</td>
<td>16th Feb 2011 (x2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18th Feb 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canal House</td>
<td>27th January 2011</td>
<td>1st February 2011 (sent to centre)</td>
<td>3rd Feb 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24th Feb 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare Benefits and Money Advice</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10th February 2011</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Dates for Stakeholder Consultation

Table 4 below shows the timings for circulation of consultation materials and dates of meetings for stakeholders.

Table 4. Dates for circulation of consultation materials and meetings for stakeholders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centre</th>
<th>Consultation brief / questionnaire</th>
<th>Consultation meetings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chiswick</td>
<td>4(^{th}) April 2011</td>
<td>11(^{th}) April 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heston</td>
<td>4(^{th}) April 2011</td>
<td>11(^{th}) April 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedfont</td>
<td>4(^{th}) April 2011</td>
<td>11(^{th}) April 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acorn</td>
<td>4(^{th}) April 2011</td>
<td>15(^{th}) April 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders</td>
<td>4(^{th}) April 2011</td>
<td>15(^{th}) April 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canal House</td>
<td>4(^{th}) April 2011</td>
<td>12(^{th}) April 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare Benefits and Money Advice</td>
<td>13(^{th}) May 2011</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A number of petitions were raised by residents and there were also a number of referrals to Scrutiny, which were taken up and a Scrutiny meeting took place on 11\(^{th}\) March 2011.
Results

The outcomes of the users, carer and stakeholder consultations are presented below. All meeting notes, questionnaire responses, letters and e-mail communications are available for viewing.

The first results on the consultation come from the Council’s General Budget Consultation. The question asked within that document asked respondents whether they agreed (or not) with the ‘reconfiguration of day services’, and did not highlight the impact of that sentence in terms of proposed building closures. Overall 55% of responses agreed, with 32% disagreeing.

Table 5. Results from the General Budget Consultation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Budget consultation</th>
<th>Related to all Day services (not individual centres)</th>
<th>Related to reorganisation of the Welfare Benefits and Money Advice Unit.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approximately 55% of respondents to the General Resident Survey agreed with the ‘reconfiguration of day services’ and 32% disagreed.</td>
<td>67% of people agreed or strongly agreed with the proposal to reorganise the Welfare Benefits team.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The service specific consultation response levels can be seen in table 6 below. There was a wide variety in levels of response, and the responses cannot be taken as all being from unique individuals, as a respondent may well have completed a questionnaire as well as attended one, or more, meetings.

Table 6. Response count by method of engagement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaires</th>
<th>Acorn Centre</th>
<th>Leaders</th>
<th>Bedfont</th>
<th>Chiswick</th>
<th>Heston</th>
<th>Canal House</th>
<th>WBMAU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Postal</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback forms</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emails</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting attendances</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBH petitions</td>
<td>1690</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>1343</td>
<td>137 / 67</td>
<td>299</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook (friends)</td>
<td>164</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder meetings</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder online</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder feedback</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following section presents the comments and views expressed through the questionnaires and meetings for each particular service area.
**Older People’s Day Services**

The following is a summary of the views expressed by users, carers and stakeholders during the meetings held. They have been grouped according to particular subject areas.

**User’s / Carer’s views**

**Geography / Transport issues:**
- Transport issues – difficult for some to get to Heston.
- Many of the users will find it very difficult to be moved.
- People would not be able to get out of the house if it wasn’t for the day centre and the transport provided.

**Consultation / Decision Making Processes:**
- How was it decided that Heston was the centre that would remain open?
- General feeling that the decision has already been made. Concerns over the consultation process.
- Why can’t the decision makers come and listen to us.

**Service Satisfaction:**
- Excellent services that should not be lost

**Assessment Process:**
- Questions regarding the process of assessment for the dementia service.
- Questions about the assessment process and timescales

**Alternative Services:**
- Vulnerable and isolated people will be just left in the community with a loss of social contact.
- Why are new services being tendered for when you are having to shut day centres.
- Frail Older People will not be able to access universal services, or even services like Age Concern.
- Replacement services (universal and individual budgets) will prove more expensive in the long run.
- Concerned about putting all the people experiencing dementia together – there are degrees of dementia. How will you cope with the increasing number of people experiencing dementia with just one centre?
- What will happen to the new resource centre at Bedfont? If funding is agreed for the new centre then why can’t it be used for a day centre?

**Carers Support Issues:**
- There will be huge impact on the carers – in the long run this will cost more money as carers will break down.
- Impact on families who currently work whilst their relative is at the day centre.

**Council’s Savings Options:**
- People would be prepared to pay for aspects of the service (transport, meals, activities, attendance). Can individual budgets be used to pay to come to the day centres.
- Further efficiencies within the council – printing documents in colour, less officers etc.
- Under occupancy- if this is the case there are plenty of people who would love to attend.
• Angry at why Heston was chosen – have drawn up plan on how they could run the centre themselves (Chiswick). Can’t we develop links with local businesses and faith groups to help keep the centre open

**Stakeholder’s views**
• Concerned there is no alternative option on the table. If the proposal is over-ruled the alternative may be far worse.
• Concerns over the consultation process
• Concerned about the separation of dementia and mainstream clients
• For dementia clients, due to increased travel they will have less time within the service.
• Will the voluntary sector have to pick up the additional transport costs
• Concerned about the physical environment at Heston and the capacity to take extra clients.
• Out of date information is being used by council staff
• Impact on carers and organisations supporting them.
• Can the whole process be extended as it is too rushed.

**Canal House**
The following is a summary of the views expressed by users, carers and stakeholders during the meetings held. They have been grouped according to particular subject areas.

**User’s / Carer’s views**
**Peer Support and group activities:**
• Groups activities such as creative writing, cookery, drumming and art are very important to users.
• Importance of meeting with people with similar problems – peer support and guidance.
• Socialising and relationships with peers.

**Carers issues:**
• Respite for families and time away for the service user.
• Carers are re-assured that their cared for person has the safety net of Canal House.

**Service Satisfaction:**
• Angry as Canal House was previously held as a best practice example of mental health support – now going to be closed.
• Importance of link workers – worried this support will be lost. Particular concern for those not on Care Programme Approach and without a social worker.
• Importance of staff at Canal House, check up on people if not been around, help with problems at home etc. Staff at other centres are not adequately trained.
• “Canal House keeps people out of hospital beds and so saves money”.

**Fear of change / accessing other services:**
• Fear of change and other mental health centres/users (No 10 project / Star Centre/ Feltham Open Door).
• Concern that mental health can fluctuate daily– need drop-in services that can accommodate this.
• Worried about the overall impact of mental health services closing (psych wards / day hospital drop-in etc).
• Worried about what will happen to their personal files.
• Fear of travelling to other venues.
• Importance of giving people a routine – a reason to get out of bed.
• Need for an emergency contact point other than A&E.
• Don’t feel universal services will offer the support necessary “you can’t go into a library and say I don’t feel well today”.
• Can eat regularly at Canal House without the worry of shopping or cooking.

Knowledge of Personal Budgets:
• Need for further clarity on Personal Budgets.

**Stakeholder’s views**
• Concern that Canal House proposed to be closed before future/alternative provision in place.
• Need to have a clearer idea of charging for alternative services.
• Personalisation hasn’t been promoted and explained clearly enough.
• Need for mechanism to be in place for periods of ill health (emergency).
• Are there links with neighbouring boroughs to pool resources and offer services for those living near the boundaries?
• What will be available prior to the commencement on the new contracts?
• Services at other sites will need to change considerably to match what is currently available at Canal House.
• Can Canal House become self-funding?
• Can we work with other organisation to proved similar services (Watermans, St Paul’s Church Brentford)?

**Acorn Centre**
The following is a summary of the views expressed by users, carers and stakeholders during the meetings held. They have been grouped according to particular subject areas.

**User’s / Carer’s Views**
Peer Support and group activities:
• Importance of maintaining friendships and attending classes.
• Concern about being stuck at home – isolated and bored.
• Need support to organise meeting up at alternative venue and maybe at weekends.
• Computer classes and current tutor particularly important.

Geography / Transport issues:
• Transport – will they be able to get to alternative venues.
• Worried they are losing a place where people can meet with the peers in a comfortable environment.
• Concerned that they will now have to transport users to activities / venues.
• Transport – why half empty buses.

Service Satisfaction:
• Need trained staff who understand their needs.

Fear of change / accessing other services:
• Fear of new places / people.
• Scared of large groups at mainstream colleges.
• Scared of losing one to one support.
• Adult education – courses too short and at various sites. Need longer courses so can learn and grow in confidence.
• Need for specialist activities as some people would not cope with mainstream activities and so will be overlooked.
• Across all activities there is a need for consistency and stability.

Knowledge of Personal Budgets (including Carers issues):
• Criteria and process for Individual Budgets.
• Impact on carers if an Individual Budget does not cover current level of support.
• Clarity over Individual Budgets and how the process will work, increased pressure on Carers to manage the budget.
• Concern that Individual Budgets (and administration of them) will cost more than savings made by closing the centre.

Consultation / Decision Making Processes:
• Wanted an opportunity to be heard by the decision makers (NOTE: Cllr Lal did attend an additional meeting).

Leaders Employment Service
The following is a summary of the views expressed by users, carers and stakeholders during the meetings held. They have been grouped according to particular subject areas.

User’s / Carer’s views

Service Satisfaction:
• Leaders gives a far better service than alternatives, what happens if Leaders closing and the alternatives are not adequate
• We wouldn’t have jobs if it wasn’t for Leaders
• Helps with CV’s, mock interviews, training, job searching and moral support and supports people to keep jobs
• Leaders staff understand disability issues.
• Without Leaders there will be more unemployment

Fear of change / accessing other services:
• Other services don’t give a tailored, 1:1 service
• People will be left at home doing nothing
• Other agencies take too long
• Has anyone checked if the alternative organisations can actually do the job.
• Treat clients as individuals

Knowledge of Personal Budgets (including Carers issues):
• Questions regarding assessment
• Why cutting Leaders if Incapacity Benefit is also being cut.

Consultation / Decision Making Processes:
• The decision has already been made
• Why are Councillors not present?

Stakeholder’s Views
• Leaders gives far greater support than other agencies
• We need to see the alternative services before cutting current ones
• Who will take on the role of Leaders
• Leaders is a specialist service – there is nothing like this at Job Centre or Reed
- We need to know the full extent of funding opportunities that may be coming up to help fill the gaps for vulnerable people.
- Carers need to be considered as they will be under more pressure.
- Concerned people are going to be signposted to vol orgs that will also have to close
- You will be closing good services and losing good staff then needing to open new services in the future
- There are lots of buildings that could be used to provide services

**Welfare Benefits and Money Advice Unit**

The Welfare Benefits and Money Advice questionnaire was structured very differently to that of the services dealt with above. There were a number of questions to try and ascertain the levels of satisfaction with the service, how the service had helped the users in terms of outcomes in their daily lives. There were also questions to ascertain user's confidence in accessing other services available locally.

Generally users were happy with the service provided by the unit (see chart 1). The level of satisfaction ranged from 82% to 93%. The lowest level of satisfaction (82%) was with the service supporting users through Brentford County Court.

In terms of the service improving outcomes for the users, the services was highly rated in terms of informing users of their rights (82%) felt they were better off following support or contact with the team. Conversely it seems the service is not empowering users, as much as it could be, to have confidence or be able to access / use other services locally just over half (56%) of users felt more able, with 44% of users feeling either no more, or even less confidence in accessing, using other services (see chart 2). Other areas where a significant proportion of users (10% or greater) felt their outcomes were ‘much worse’ following support from the team were ‘helping them to do things they enjoy’, and ‘feeling safe at home’. So it would seem that although the service is highly regarded in terms of helping users, it does not appear to be empowering users to be more in control of their own circumstances.

**Chart 1. Shows the level of satisfaction with the services provided by the Welfare Benefits and Money Advice Unit.**

![Chart 1. Shows the level of satisfaction with the services provided by the Welfare Benefits and Money Advice Unit.](image-url)
Chart 2. Shows the outcome of any interventions by the Welfare Benefits and Money Advice Unit.

Users of the service were asked to indicate what other services they had accessed and how recently. Both the Unit and Help in Hounslow had been used within the last year both more than 4 in 5 of the respondents (see chart 3).

Chart 3. Shows the respondent's use of Advice and Support services.

When asked what other services the respondents would have confidence in using services in the future the majority of respondents felt confident in accessing services from the Unit again. Citizens Advice Bureau were the service with the highest confidence levels after the Unit.
Chart 4. Shows respondent’s confidence in accessing other similar advice and support services.
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UNIVERSAL PREVENTATIVE HEALTH AND WELL-BEING SERVICES

Report by: Simon Mitchell, Head of Well-Being and Involvement

This report seeks agreement to re-start the tender process for services that will deliver improved outcomes for adults, enabling them to live as independently as possible, ideally in their own homes. The maximum amount available is £1.7million over three years.

1. RECOMMENDATION

1.1 To commence the process for the universal preventative health and well-being services tender, as part of the ‘Putting People First’ agenda

1.2 To note that, as bids will be encouraged from the Charities and Voluntary Sector, the Council will test for financial ability to deliver the contracts in a flexible manner appropriate to that sector, including replacing the test of the service provider being able to demonstrate that the contract value is only 30% of their total turnover with an analysis of an organisation’s last three years annual accounts, and a consideration of the use of performance bonds etc.

2. BACKGROUND

2.1 At present the Council funds a number of services for older people with contracts that ended in March 2010 (and have been subsequently extended). These services include luncheon clubs, advice and information services; services to meet the needs of specific groups e.g. day opportunities, a foot-care service and a handy person scheme.

2.2 The current contracts are not consistent with the Putting People First agenda and other key Council priorities. It is the intention to procure services that are Universal (open to all Hounslow residents) and Preventative in nature (with the aim of keeping Hounslow residents healthier and able to live independently for longer).

2.3 A review of the services highlighted a requirement to have a more coordinated approach to the commissioning of services to ensure that they would meet identified need, put people first, demonstrate how they improve outcomes through effective monitoring of contracts and provide value for money.
2.1 The review included consulting users and carers and seeking the views of those who may require services in the future to inform future commissioning plans.

2.2 The review and user/carer consultation concluded that there needs to be a range of services available. These need to prevent people from becoming isolated and delay, as long as is possible, the debilitating impact of long term health conditions or sudden life changes on individuals, their social network and their carers. The services need to be adaptable to respond to changing need and responsive to the needs that many experience with increasing age or disability.

2.3 The proposals support the following Corporate priorities and objectives in the Community Services Business Plan:
- Delivery of a sustainable financial balance
- Delivery of the ‘Putting People First’ agenda
- Delivery of national priorities – especially for Public Health as stated in Our Health, Our Care, Our Say
- Strengthen approaches to supporting people to live independently in their own homes
- Support people to stay healthy
- Provide support to carers of vulnerable people
- Develop and strengthen involvement approaches
- Support the development of healthy & engaged communities
- Develop a thriving local voluntary and community sector

2.4 The maximum value of the services tendered is estimated to be £1,700,000 over a period of three years.

2.5 A Programme Board has been set up to oversee this procurement process and includes representatives from Joint Commissioning, Putting People First, Leisure, Lifelong learning, Finance, Procurement, Contracts, and Legal. The Board will monitor all work streams to ensure delivery of the contracts. Overview and Scrutiny will be informed of the process from the outset and given the opportunity to comment on the approach, process and service design.

2.6 The Board’s priorities are to ensure that the new services provide improved value for money, new opportunities for the third sector and offer a range of services that will improve the health and well-being of residents while actively supporting delivery of the ‘Putting People First’ agenda.

2.7 Under the government’s approach to Personalisation all Councils are expected to move towards outcome-focused contracts. Future arrangements for these services could take the form of a framework agreement or a series of contracts.

2.8 Service providers submitting a tender(s) will be asked to demonstrate how the services they provide will meet the outcomes described below:
- Improved health and emotional well-being,
- Improved quality of life,
- Making a positive contribution,
- Increased choice and control,
• Economic well-being,
• Maintaining personal dignity and respect
• Safeguarding

2.9 Performance and financial audit data will be required to be provided by service providers so that their performance can be monitored. A price and quality matrix will be used to evaluate the bids.

2.10 Authority to tender for these services has previously been granted (Hounslow Executive meeting – July 14th 2009) however, the procurement exercise was aborted at the PQQ stage due to the majority of smaller voluntary sector providers failing the financial assessment.

2.11 It is proposed, with the re-started process, to use a more appropriate set of tests for financial ability, under paragraph 4.18 of the Financial Regulations, and, rather than requiring that that the contract value is 30% of a service provider’s total turnover to consider an organisation’s last three years annual accounts, to assess financial sustainability, and to consider the use of performance bonds etc. Also to mitigate financial risks the total funding available for the services will be split into 3 lots which, dependant on successful bids, could be 3 individual contracts and the payment mechanisms will be appropriately drawn in order to balance the risk correctly.

3. **EQUALITIES IMPACT ANALYSIS**

3.1 A number of services provided currently are targeted with specific community groups in mind. The main focus for the proposed tendering process will be for universal services for all, with some emphasis on people in need of services to keep them out of social care / and or health services for longer. Only where there is clear evidence of needs which cannot be met by universal services will services be targeted to support a specific community or group of people.

3.2 A full assessment has been completed on the impact of the current services being decommissioned and is a background paper to this report. This concludes that the proposals will reduce inequalities in service provision.

3.3 There has been and will continue to be involvement of residents in designing and commissioning services throughout the process to help ensure that the needs of all groups are considered. This involvement will include people with a physical and/or sensory disability.

3.4 The successful providers will deliver services to support improved access to services across the whole borough and across a wider age range and vulnerable people.

4. **COMMENTS OF BOROUGH SOLICITOR**

4.1 The Borough Solicitors comments are incorporated in the report.
5. COMMENTS OF DIRECTOR OF FINANCE

5.1 The cost of the existing services that this report is seeking to tender is fully provided for within the Community Services Department budget. Additional funding from Sport England (£18k pa), Independent Living Fund (£95k) and NHS Hounslow (£18k pa) has been identified since this report was considered by the Executive in July 2009.

5.2 This report requests approval to waive Financial Regulations and replace the requirement for the contract value to be 30% of a service provider’s total turnover and replace this with an analysis of an organisation’s last three years annual accounts, to assess financial sustainability prior to a contract being issued.

5.3 This regulation often presents difficulties for voluntary organisations that are often reliant on the Council for funding. This option is considered to be a reasonable alternative to the 30% criteria, provided that the analysis is carried out or reviewed by appropriately qualified finance staff to ensure that the Council is not put at risk of service failure.

SIGNATURES AND AGREEMENT

Using the authority delegated to me as the relevant Executive member, I agree to the recommendations.

........................................
Councillor Jagdish Sharma

........................................
Dated

Background Papers:
EIA Adult Health and Well Being Tender 2009

This report has been or is due to be considered by:
CLT – 30/9/10
Executive Briefing Meeting – 6/10/10

This report is relevant to the following wards/areas:
All wards