



Central Bedfordshire Council Greenacre Older Persons Home Consultation

Response to Formal Consultation

Appendix 10

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Central Bedfordshire Council wants the best possible quality of life for all its residents and is committed to developing and improving accommodation with care for older people. The Council owns and operates six care homes which were built several decades ago and which currently no longer meet the expectations of customers and regulators in terms of facilities and accommodation.
- 1.2 Therefore when better options become available elsewhere, the Council will consult with residents and/or relatives about the future of these homes.
- 1.3 The Council has undertaken a consultation on the future of Greenacre Older Persons Home. Having reviewed a number of options for the future of the home, the Council's preferred option is to offer and arrange accommodation for the existing residents in good alternative care homes and then to close Greenacre Older Persons Home.
- 1.4 The Council has considered the following options in relation to the future of Greenacre Older Persons Home including:
 - Doing nothing – continue to run Greenacre Older Persons Home in its present form.
 - Relocating existing residents to better homes and closing Greenacre Older Persons Home – the Council's preferred option.
 - Transferring Greenacre Older Persons Home to another organisation to run as a going concern.
 - Building a new home on the Greenacre Older Persons Home site – moving residents to alternative homes, demolishing the old home and building a new one.
 - Running the home down – stopping new admissions to the home but keeping it open for an agreed period of time or until it had no residents.
 - Refurbishing the home so that it meets modern standards.
- 1.5 The Council's preferred option is to offer and arrange accommodation for the existing residents in good alternative care homes and then to close Greenacre Older Persons Home.
- 1.6 The formal consultation began on 14th October and ran for 13 weeks, ending on 13th January 2016.
- 1.7 Informal consultation meetings took place on a face-to-face basis with residents and/or their family members/next of kin and members of staff. At these meetings officers answered questions and encouraged people to complete the consultation.
- 1.8 Particular attention was given to supporting residents to be involved in the consultation process even though some lacked mental capacity to fully understand the Council's proposals. The ability of all residents to

Appendix 10

participate in the consultation was assessed by a social worker by undertaking an assessment in accordance with the principles of the Mental Capacity Act 2005. The assessments undertaken during the course of the consultation period showed that eight residents had capacity to take part in the consultation and were assisted to do so. 12 residents were assessed not to have capacity to participate meaningfully in the consultation, however of those, seven could give a view to a limited extent. The majority of residents had friends or relatives who were able to support them in participating in the consultation or contribute on their behalf. In no cases was it judged or requested that independent advocacy was required to enable a resident to participate.

- 1.9 The formal consultation was managed via a formal consultation document. This was available in paper format; downloadable from the CBC website, or was obtainable by telephoning or writing to the contact details provided in the letters to stakeholders.
- 1.10 CBC staff and elected members were informed about the formal consultation and external communications were made raise public awareness of the consultation with Central Bedfordshire residents. Key external organisations, MP's and town councillors were also informed.
- 1.11 This report includes an overview of the feedback received during the consultation period.
- 1.12 Further feedback has been received from stakeholders in addition to the formal consultation document. This is set out in Appendix 3.

2. RESPONSE RECEIVED

- 2.1 The formal consultation was designed to capture both quantitative and qualitative data from respondents, with results summarised as follows (percentages are rounded up or down as appropriate).
- 2.2 In total 26 people responded to the formal consultation.
- 2.3 6 (23.1%) of respondents were residents, 9 (34.6%) were family members of residents, 2 (7.7%) were members of staff from Greenacre Older Persons Home, 7 (26.9%) were members of the public and 2 (7.7%) were 'other' people.
- 2.4 12 (46.2%) of respondents were male, 14 (53.8%) were female
- 2.5 Respondents in age groups

20-29	1	(3.8%)
30-44	3	(11.5%)
45-59	8	(30.8%)

Appendix 10

60-64	1	(3.8%)
65-74	8	(30.8%)
75+	5	(19.2%)
Preferred not to say or did not answer	0	

- 2.6 3 (11.5%) of respondents stated that they had a disability, 22 (84.6%) of respondents stated they did not have a disability and 1 (3.8%) preferred not to say or did not answer.
- 2.7 25 (96.2%) of respondents were White: British, 1 (3.8%) of Respondents stated "Other" and 0 (00.0%) of respondents preferred not to state or did not answer.
- 2.8 Appendix 1 provides a full demographic statistical profile of respondents

3. RESULTS OF CONSULTATION: QUESTION RESPONSES

The formal consultation was designed to capture both quantitative and qualitative data from respondents, with results summarised as follows

3.1 Q1 How far do you agree or disagree with the Council's preferred option?

Strongly agree	2	(7.7%)
Agree	11	(42.3%)
Neither agree or disagree	2	(7.7%)
Disagree	4	(15.4%)
Strongly disagree	7	(26.9%)

3.2 Q2 What are your views on our preferred option?

There is general agreement that the facilities offered by Greenacre Older Persons Home are not modern and the Council is right to be looking at options for the future. While half of respondents agree with the Council's preferred option a number of concerns have been raised about the impact moving to alternative accommodation would have on current residents and whether or not this would result in increased costs.

It is positive that a majority of the respondents were supportive of the proposals and recognised that the facilities offered by Greenacre Older Persons Home do not meet modern standards.

If the decision is made to close the home all residents would have their care and support needs assessed and the risk associated with a move would be fully assessed and managed. We would follow best practice for relocating residents and would coordinate the moves to ensure that everyone would receive the time and support they needed before, during and after the move.

Appendix 10

The potential financial implications of relocation to a new home were explained in the consultation update issued on 25th November 2015. The Council would be recommending alternative care homes that it currently contracts with and the rates for these are between £473.19 and £501.91 per week, depending on the quality banding the home is on. Those people who are not currently paying the full cost of their care would not have to pay any more than they do at Greenacre Older Persons Home For those who are paying the full cost (currently £477.16 per week), the Council has agreed that they would pay the same as the rate the Council would pay to the home for a person with similar needs who cannot afford to pay the full cost. As everyone's circumstances and preferences are unique we would discuss the financial implications and options with residents and/or their representatives.

3.3 Q3 Are there any options we have considered that you think we have not correctly evaluated?

Yes	2	(7.7%)
No	20	(76.9%)
Don't know	4	(15.4%)

20 (76.9%) of respondents agreed that options had been evaluated correctly.

3.4 Q4 If yes, please state which options and why you think they should be evaluated differently.

Options from the respondents included:-

- Land-swop with a developer.
- Further research into refurbishment costs of Greenacre.

We do not think that a 'land swap' arrangement in these circumstances would be an effective solution to meeting the need for care home places in the Dunstable area.

The refurbishment of Greenacre Older Persons Home was one of the options in the consultation document and estimations of the cost were made. Given the feedback on this option we consider that it would not be appropriate to further investigate the cost of a refurbishment.

3.5 Q5 Are there any options listed that you think the Council should investigate in more detail?

Yes	6	(24.0%)
No	15	(60.0%)
Don't know	4	(16.4%)

15 (60%) of respondents felt the Council had investigated all options fully.

Appendix 10

3.6 Q6 If yes, please state which options and say what further information or investigation is needed.

Options that respondents stated they would like to see further information or investigation on:

- Further development on the timeline to support current residents should the Council continue with the preferred
- Redistribution of Council Tax money to fund refurbishment of Greenacre
- The views and opinions of the wider ageing population of Dunstable residents should be sought.

If a decision is made to relocate residents and close Greenacre Older Persons Home a detailed timeline will be developed. The project team will work with residents, relatives, staff from Greenacre Older Persons Home and staff from the new home to develop a realistic timetable that takes into account the needs of the residents. We would follow best practice for relocating residents and would coordinate the moves to ensure that everyone would receive the time and support they needed before, during and after the move. The move timetable would be flexible to take into account changes in the health and needs of residents.

The refurbishment of Greenacre Older Persons Home was one of the options in the consultation document.

Wider stakeholder engagement took place as part of the consultation. In particular we invited the Older People's Reference Group, the local U3A, the Dunstable Association of Senior Citizens and Dunstable and Houghton Regis Town Councils to contribute to the consultation.

3.7 Q7 Are there any other option(s) that you think we should consider that are not in the document?

Yes	2	(8.0%)
No	21	(84.0%)
Don't know	2	(8.0%)

21 (84.0%) of respondents felt all options had been considered

3.8 Q8 If yes, please explain what these options are.

No new options identified

3.9 Q9 Do you have any further comments about the future of the home?

Comments included:

- The need for Greenacre to be modernised

Appendix 10

- For the council to consider the impact and support offered to residents and families should the home close and the offer of alternative accommodation made
- Clarification over re-development and sale of the site.

If a decision is made to close the home then support would be made available to residents, their families and the staff at Greenacre. Older Persons Home This is made clear in the report to the Executive.

The decision on the future of the home is a separate one from what would happen to the site in the event that the home closes. There are no proposals in the Executive report about the future of the building and the site as a whole. Any changes on the site may require planning permission and the usual planning permission process followed.

3.10 Welfare of residents at Greenacre Older Persons Home

Q10 Throughout the process we will be conducting individual meetings with residents and their relatives, and providing advocates where necessary. Are there any other actions you think we should be taking to minimise the impact of the proposals on the residents at Greenacre Older Persons Home?

- Residents and family members asked that they are kept fully informed and updated at regular intervals, that action plan is drawn up and stuck to. To record and report the outcomes of the meetings accurately, and act on them.
- Request to view alternative accommodation in advance of closure.
- The transitional arrangements are imperative as good relationships have been forged with residents, relatives and staff over time and they may be fear of losing this, if the Council decides to close the home.

As stated above we would work with residents and relatives and keep them informed throughout the process if there was a decision to close Greenacre Older Persons Home. This would involve the agreeing and sharing of plans and timetables which we would endeavour to adhere to.

Part of the process would be to arrange visits to alternative homes for residents and relatives.

3.11 Other comments

Q11 Please write any other comments here:

Comments from respondents reiterated suggestions and statements made in the questions above i.e. Greenacre Older Persons Home remaining a Care Home. Reassurance of the wellbeing and independence of residents being maintained.

4. SUMMARY

Appendix 10

- 4.1 In summary, 50% of the 26 respondents support the preferred option to close the home and re-locate current residents and many mentioned the need for improved facilities in more modern homes. 11 people disagreed (42%) and 2 were neutral (8%). Some of those who disagreed would like the Council to pursue the refurbishment option but others stated that they did not accept that the home needed modernisation. Some were concerned about the long term need to suitable accommodation for older people.
- 4.2 Other comments received included the request for ongoing communication between the Council and those people affected as well as clarification and reassurance over possible impact on residents, cost implications and the redevelopment of the site.

Appendix 10

Appendix 1:

Results of Consultation: Demographic Profile of Respondents

	No.	Percentage
Q12: Are you a: (please select one option)		
Resident	6	23.1%
Relative of a Resident	9	34.6%
Member of Staff	2	7.7%
Member of the Public	7	26.9%
Charity or Organisation	0	00.0%
Other	2	7.7%
No Response	0	00.0%

Q13: Are you male or female? (please select one option)

Male	12	46.2%
Female	14	53.8%
No response	0	00.0%

Q14: What is your age? (please select one option)

Under 16	0	00.0%
16-19	0	00.0%
20-29	1	3.8%
30-44	3	11.5%
45-59	8	30.8%
60-64	1	3.8%
65-74	8	30.8%
75+	5	19.2%
Preferred not to say or did not answer	0	00.0%

Q15: Do you consider yourself to be disabled?

Under the Equality Act 2010 a person is considered to have a disability if he/she has a physical or mental impairment which has a sustained and long-term adverse effect on his/her ability to carry out normal day to day activities.

Yes	3	11.5%
No	22	84.6%
Preferred not to say or did not answer	1	3.8%

Q16: Please tell us your ethnicity

White: British	25	96.2%
White: Irish	0	00.0%
White: Gypsy or traveller	0	00.0%

Appendix 10

Mixed: White and Black Caribbean		00.0%
Mixed: White and Black African		00.0%
Mixed: White and Asian		00.0%
Mixed: other		00.0%
Asian or Asian British: Indian		00.0%
Asian or Asian British: Pakistani		00.0%
Asian or Asian British: Bangladeshi		00.0%
Asian or Asian British: Chinese		00.0%
Asian or Asian British: other		00.0%
Black or Black British: Caribbean		00.0%
Black or Black British: African		00.0%
Black or Black British: other		00.0%
Other	1	3.8%
Preferred not to say or no response		00.0%

Appendix 10

Appendix 2 - Results of Consultation: Qualitative Feedback

3.1 Q2 What are your views on our preferred option?

- My concern is not that closing Greenacre is a poor decision; the case is well made but that 'value for money' for the Council will result in clients ending up paying more for residential care in privately owned homes.
- Whilst I can see the sense of moving the residents to a better unit and I understand why this is more cost effective, it seems a shame to close down a care home when the numbers of elderly population are constantly increasing and will do for ever. Surely the council needs to invest in INCREASING the number of spaces available instead of merging homes etc. I imagine the site would be sold for residential, but it would only be releasing money for the short term because within the next 10 years they will have to build another home anyway which will cost significantly more than the £6million mentioned. Surely a refurb would be cheaper in the long run. Or, turn it into some other healthcare provision.
- I appreciate the reasons behind this. however, I am very concerned about the impact on the residents, especially those who sadly have dementia
- That full consultation be carried out with residents and their families to ensure their new placement is to their complete satisfaction. That a move be done as smoothly as possible. That staff be given help to find new employment within the sector. That nothing is rushed.
- Option 4, demolish and re build in the future....or Do a land swop with a developer for a New Care home site in a more selected area, as Dunstable as enough...
- Not sure how it would effect the existing residents by moving them especially as its mainly a dementia home it could be a huge disruption in their life causing them more stress
- This is the best option but must be handled very sympathetically with lots of consultation with residents and families.
- It would be too much hassle and too disruptive moving out of Greenacre. I think it would be a good idea to have an ensuite bathroom but I don't need a bigger bedroom as it's big enough. The Council can refurbish Greenacre while the residents stay in it. I think Option 6 is the best option- refurbishing the home so that it meets modern standards.
- I think Greenacre needs modernising but a lot of people are happy here and don't mind if they have to share a bathroom or if there are better facilities elsewhere. A move will be very disruptive for my sister.
- I agree that Greenacre is old but I would like it to stay as it is.
- I agree that Greenacre is not modern enough. I would be happy to move to a new home in Dunstable with an ensuite bathroom. I do not really like communal bathrooms as they are not very private.
- I agree that Greenacre needs to be modernised.
- I would like to question the thinking behind coming to this decision... why is too expensive to renovate the home, and why is it not fit for purpose in its current state? This has not been explained.
- Moving to a new home will give a new outlook for people and more modern facilities and things to do
- the residents have a lovely home where they are and this is to save money pure and simple
- Continuity is very important for people suffering from dementia and they regard Greenacre as their home. They have, in my view, little interest in improved facilities if it results in the upheaval of losing their existing home.
- Not really the best option but better than doing nothing

Appendix 10

- Greenacre does not need modernising, it is fine the way it is. I do not need an ensuite bathroom. I prefer it separate as it's nicer when people come to visit, if you don't have an ensuite bathroom next to the bedroom. The Council's crazy. Why do they have to ruin everything for nothing?
- Well think I rather prefer to hold out to see if green acre can be modernised.
- The closure of Greenacre should not have any financial impact on my mother's circumstances.

Q4 If yes, please state which options and why you think they should be evaluated differently.

- Land swap with a developer, for a New Care home site in a more selected area.
- Refurbishment option - how can a 1960's building be so costly to refurbish when so many care homes that the council pays to accommodate people in are in converted Victorian buildings????

Q6 If yes, please state which options and say what further information or investigation is needed.

- I think that the council needs to re-evaluate all of the options and speak to the local people in more depth - what about conducting surveys of residents in Dunstable who are in their early 70's now, who potentially within the next 10 years might be needing to use these services. I know that some friends of mine care for their parents at their own home, but there appears to be very limited provisions for respite breaks for members of the public who are caring for elderly persons in their own home. Surely we need more of these provisions.
- Somewhere in between the preferred option and allowing the home to be run down naturally. Allowing those who are happy to move to new places to do so and then giving additional support to those remaining, over a slightly longer period, without pressure, to aid their relocation. Each individual being treated as such.
- as said....land swap with a Developer, Dunstable location for a more sort after area for a care Home in central Beds..
- The cost of modernising the home and leaving the building up
- Yes, again refurbishment. Will it really cost more in the long term than paying private providers to accommodate residents?
- Keeping the current home open. You now have the chance to add a 2% surcharge to the council tax bill so why not use it for the good of the old

Q8 If yes, please explain what these options are.

- See my earlier comments
- YES See my answer to Q 6, land swap

Q9 Do you have any further comments about the future of the home?

- Will the existing residents of Greenacre get priority of choice in the two new care homes?
- No
- The home is unsuitable for purpose as it stands. My father was transferred there, from

Appendix 10

hospital, following a hip replacement, and the unsupervised nature of the rooms and the low staffing levels meant that he fell and broke his thigh within his first 45 minutes there, leading to his death a few months later. I would not send my worst enemy to live out their days at Greenacres and will be very happy when it has finally been demolished.

- Now is the time to do something once you have recognised the HIGH annual costs, almost a MILLION, compared with New home costs.....do it...dont dally..
- I am quite concerned about the home being knocked down as the home is at the back of my property and I would like to know what the council will put there instead of the home I'm pretty sure that the council has already made up its mind
- Care promised to residents during any move needs to be maintained
- Having been the manager of Abbotsbury in Biggleswade from 1982 until my retirement in 2010, I remember Greenarces opening in the 80's. The way residents needs have moved on then the home is no longer fit for purpose. The running of homes by otter companies requires considerable investment because they are needing to make profit, this I experience for 12 years during my career.
- Refurbishing the home so that it meets modern standards.
- No
- I agree that home could be in need of modernising.
- I would like it to stay as it is.
- No
- I would like to move to somewhere more comfortable and with an ensuite bathroom.
- Surely it makes sense at a time of increased pressure on care home places to keep a small provision of our own homes?
- Try to sell it to somebody else so the Council gets some of their money back to relieve some of the pressures.
- it should stay open. What do you really know about the private providers?
- The consultation seems to have been brought about for financial reasons- what about increasing the council tax to provide extra funding?
- The Council should leave Greenacre the way it is unless everyone agrees that it should close.
- Well would like to be kept up to date with the position of green acres.
- I can understand that comparing Greenacre to other more up-to-date care homes shows Greenacre to be lacking in facilities; however there seems to be a good atmosphere within the home and feel it's a shame that Greenacre cannot be updated. I would have thought that with the ageing population there would have been a need for more accommodation in Dunstable.

Welfare of residents at Greenacre Older Persons Home

Q10 Throughout the process we will be conducting individual meetings with residents and their relatives, and providing advocates where necessary. Are there any other actions you think we should be taking to minimise the impact of the proposals on the residents at Greenacre Older Persons Home?

- How about speaking to the social services team in the NHS. I recently attended an event about the expansion and re-development of the Luton and Dunstable Hospital. One of the speakers admitted that one of the reasons why the waiting lists in the NHS are so long is because 20% of the bed space in a hospital is taken up by patients who cannot be discharged because there is nowhere to discharge them to (no temporary

Appendix 10

rehab or care home spaces). How about running a joint venture with the NHS to help resolve this issue.

- I welcome the Council's commitment to conduct individual meetings with residents and their relatives. The transitional arrangements are imperative as good relationships have been forged with residents, relatives and staff over time and they may be fearful of losing this, if the Council decides to close the home.
- We have seen how such meetings go. It is vital that residents and the families be listened to and their worries and concerns taken into account. No action should be taken that residents or families are not totally in agreement with. No pressure should be exerted. Where possible visits should take place or, where not, staff from the new home should visit the resident and family. Transport should be as untraumatic as possible. Planning and forethought to ease transitions. Treat people as if they were your own loved ones.
- You have to be honest and straight, The home is very costly to maintain, almost a million, and it's very much out of date, also there is BETTER accommodation available in the area. It's for the quality and long term comfort of the residents and to comply with the CQC. It's unfortunate that residents will have to move, a huge sorry. BUT make it easy for residents by making the staff secure, where possible. GOOD staff are hard to get, don't kill morale. No one likes to move, unless it's for a better more secure future...
- No
- When writing to residents and relatives, in first instances don't mention the closure of Greenarces but say you wish to give them details of the new homes. If you have drawings or pictures present them at your meetings. Selling a new home will have a much less impact on them than just telling Greenarces is closing.
- It's important that friendships are kept.
- No
- The Council could help organise visits to new homes.
- Not at the moment.
- Yes, don't move them. Moving elderly people is always traumatic.
- People need to see new homes beforehand. The Council needs to support with this and provide transport for this.
- Make sure that every issue raised at council meetings is fully resolved before you close the consultation
- Ensuring that care is taken to replace any carers that leave in the belief that the home may close
- I think just keeping everybody updated on what's going on for the future of Green Acre.

Other comments

Q11 Please write any other comments here:

- Robust care plans need to be in place to support any changes that may be made in the future, especially transitional arrangements.
- Don't ditch the STAFF; it will kill morale throughout the Care Home community in Central Beds.
- Once you have made your plans for the close, you should stop taking in residents so there are less people affected. You should also consider the fact that residents will have made friends within the homes and would like to move with them, however in my experience they do cope with loss very well.
- I would like to know that any new home would have the same level of care and will be easy for my sons to visit. I also prefer to be on an unit for people who are physically

Appendix 10

disabled.

- Is this a political decision, based on the fact that Greenacres is council owned and run and not private? There did not seem to be any rush to close these homes when they were operated by Bupa on the council's behalf...
- no other comments
- As the present home is past its sell by date I can only hope that moving residents to a newer better home will benefit them.
- Not much to say been updated by the council on what they might do and the options they have set out.

Appendix 3 – Other Responses

During the course of the consultation the relative of one of the residents in Greenacre Older Persons Home raised a number of detailed issues. These were responded to at some length by members of the MANOP team. The following section has been agreed with the respondent to be a fair and accurate summary of the questions or issues raised and the Council's response.

Can you confirm that my relative was placed at Greenacre by the Council?

Yes, that is the case.

If Greenacre closes will its former residents who are self-funders be required to move to another home when and if their capital falls below the self-funding threshold?

In seeking to place people resident at Greenacre Older Persons Home, the guarantee is the offer of a place in a new home that meets the individual's care and support needs, meets modern expectations and where the rates are within or which match the rates that the Council pays to care home providers. A self-funding person taking up a place on this basis would not be asked to move to an alternative home as a result of their resources falling naturally below the financial thresholds.

Will Greenacre residents who are self-funders have to pay the 'private rate' in an alternative care home, either now or in the future?

No, if Greenacre Older Persons Home closes the Council intends to contract with providers to place all of its residents at rates that are within or which match the rates that the Council pays to care home providers. It is our intention that these arrangements will prevail whilst these residents require residential care.

Will the Council discriminate in any way between those people in Greenacre who fully fund their own care and those who do not?

No. We intend to treat everyone equally

Do the rates charged in Council-run homes align with those paid to independent providers under the Council's contractual arrangements with them?

Not precisely (rates in Council homes are currently in the region of £12-£30 per week less). The Council is considering increasing the rates for its own home and there are some benefits in aligning with the amounts paid to independent providers.

Could a provider unilaterally reduce the number of places it offered to the Council through the Framework Agreement and expect the residents affected to either be moved to alternative homes or for the Council to pay higher rates?

Appendix 10

Whilst this is not impossible it is considered to be highly unlikely as such a move would cause significant reputational damage to the provider. The Council would also resist such action as far as possible and would also act to safeguard the wellbeing of residents.

Has a provider ever ceased to provide places for new or existing residents and if this happened how would the Council respond?

This situation has not happened. If it did the Council would seek to avoid disruption to existing residents through negotiation with the provider but if this was unsuccessful it is most likely that we would seek to move residents to alternative homes rather than pay a higher rate.

Does the Council have a policy on placing self-funding customers with providers at framework rates during the '12-week' disregard period but then the provider charging their higher 'private rate' thereafter?

The Council follows any legal and contractual requirements but does not have a written policy on this matter. The situation described is acceptable so long as all parties are aware of it and agree at the outset.

How many private care home choices would we be presented with, should the Council decide to close Greenacre? Is there a minimum number?

We have set no minimum or maximum number. In practice we would assess the needs of each resident and find out their preferences and those of their relatives. We would then work with all concerned to find suitable options.

Will residents be asked to move out of the local area? Will this be an option if a resident wants to consider this?

We have secured sufficient places in two new homes in Dunstable to enable all of the residents at Greenacre Older Persons Home to go to them if they wish. We will work with residents and relatives to identify the most suitable home for the resident's needs and the proximity of relatives will be a consideration in the identification of suitable options. In a previous home closure two people moved to homes outside of Central Bedfordshire to be closer to relatives and friends and we will assist anyone who wants to consider this option.

Can we move our relative before a decision is made on the future of the home?

We will strongly discourage residents from moving ahead of any decision on the future of the home. If a decision is made to close the home, then at that point we will put the resources in place to assess all the residents and to work with them and their relatives to organise moves and ensure that these go smoothly. Prior to this we would not be able to deliver such a complete service.

There may be reasons why individual residents may wish to move from Greenacre Older Persons Home before a decision is made about its future. We will assist residents in this situation as we would any other Council-placed resident in any care home. However, those places the Council has earmarked at Dukeminster Court and Rosewood Court would not be available to residents seeking to move before a decision is made.

Could you provide a list of providers along with the number of places available to the Council and how many of these are occupied and how many vacant?

For operational purposes we keep a list of care home vacancies that are available through the Council's framework contract. This is updated on a weekly basis and can be supplied at any time. Although we have records of all placements made within the framework agreement this is not collated numerically as it is not data that the Council requires in this form. This information can be collated and supplied and it is suggested

Appendix 10

that this is done if a decision is made to close Greenacre Older Persons Home. The usefulness of this information is limited as the availability of places varies over time and it does not take into account the ability of these homes to meet the needs of individual residents.

Would it be possible for the Council to have a policy of not placing or contracting with a provider that had previously been closed down by CQC for poor standards?

There are a number of mechanisms in place which are operated by CQC and the Council to promote high quality care and to act if a provider does not meet minimum requirements. Whilst it may be possible for a Council to have a policy of this type it would be complex to formulate and implement and the resources required to do this may well outweigh the benefit. Even if a Council had such a policy in place and had used it to decline to contract with a particular provider, the Council would still have a duty in relation to the quality of care in the home and to safeguard the residents there.

What mechanisms does the Council have to investigate a potential new framework provider?

In addition to the checks on financial health undertaken when the Council contracts with third parties, the contract between the Council and the provider prevents them subcontracting or reassigning the contract without the Council's permission. If appropriate, as well as undertaking checks on the proposed contractor similar checks are undertaken of 'holding companies' and other companies in the same ownership.

Will you confirm that Rosewood Court has passed relevant financial checks and that this will feature in the Executive Report?

Yes, this is the case.

Would my relative be asked to move from a residential home to a nursing home if they develop nursing needs?

General practice is to try to avoid older people moving from one care home to another should their needs change. The time when this is most difficult is when a person living in a care home gets to the point where they require nursing care that cannot be provided by visits from a community nurse. In such circumstance people may need to move from a care home to a nursing home. Some homes provide both residential and nursing care. Such homes allow for the possibility that a person whose needs change from 'residential' to 'nursing' could remain there. This would not be possible in a home that was registered only to provide residential care.

Should the checks on any new care providers have been completed sooner?

Yes, on reflection there would have been some benefit in carrying out 'due diligence' checks on the new provider earlier in the process and ideally ahead of the start of the consultation

If it was not possible to secure places at Rosewood Court for any reason would this jeopardise the proposal and render the consultation invalid?

The proposal to close Greenacre Older Persons Home is predicated on the availability of places at Rosewood Court and if there was a reason why these places were not available then a review of the situation at the time would be necessary.

How would the Council proceed if Rosewood Court has not been registered with CQC before a decision is made on the closure of Greenacre?

Registration is not likely to happen before the meeting of the Executive. This should not be an issue as it is likely that the Executive decision on the future of Greenacre Older Persons Home would give the Director authority to close Greenacre Older Persons

Appendix 10

Home but would not require her to do this nor would it set a date for this to happen. This would mean that the Council can deal with any unforeseen situations such as a delay in Rosewood Court opening.