



Children's Residential Homes: Proposed Reconfiguration of Service Provision

SUMMARY

- 1.1 The Council is committed to providing its own high quality residential children's homes for looked after children. This report outlines proposed next steps in the Council's strategy for residential provision following the five year transformation programme which was approved in 2013. The strategy sought to re-build or refurbish existing homes to reduce overall bed capacity from 44 beds to 24 mainstream beds and 5 beds for disabled children by April 2018. As a result of this extensive capital investment, we now have children's homes which are of good quality and an asset to the Council.
- 1.2 A strategic needs assessment of looked after children in 2017 concluded that 75% of children and young people currently placed in internal residential homes have complex and multiple needs. These results have been used to inform and evidence further reconfiguration proposals in respect of existing property type, size and usage.
- 1.3 Targeted consultation has been undertaken with direct stakeholders potentially affected by the proposals over a four week period between 22 August 2018 and 21 September 2018 (see Appendix 3). Those consulted were young people, staff, professionals and local community residents. For young people, specific focus groups, led by the Head of Service, have discussed the proposed changes. Feedback has been analysed and used to inform the recommendations.
- 1.4 In summary, the consultation sought views on establishing two phases for children's homes reconfiguration over the next twelve months, specifically;
 - Phase 1 seeking to develop a new model of internal delivery resulting in two distinct hubs being created that would provide up to twenty six beds collectively. Each hub to be designed to target different levels of need as per the strategic needs analysis. Hub 1, due the proximity of three homes on one site will develop a complex needs provision with accommodation of up to ten beds. Hub 2 will retain the existing mainstream and disabled needs provision with accommodation of up to sixteen beds across three homes, all at different locations across Derby.
 - Phase 2, will develop a pathway and access to a range of semi independence provision for those aged sixteen to eighteen years to

better enable the development of independence skills required for leaving care.

- 1.5 In creating Hub1, it will require approving change from the children's home strategy previously agreed at Cabinet in 2013 to:

- a) cease the scheduled refurbishment of the final home;
- b) approve formal closure of this home; and
- c) agree transfer the capital budget to invest in the refurbishment of a smaller building already within the site of Hub 1 into a two bedded home.

It is acknowledged that the overall bed capacity in the original strategy was to achieve 24 mainstream beds and 5 beds for disabled children by 2018. This proposal seeks to reduce that number to 26 beds but extend the range of support to include developing skills ability to meet complex, mainstream and those children and young people with a disability.

- 1.6 The strategic direction outlined in 2013 and agreed by Cabinet was to reduce the number of internal residential beds in a planned and gradual way. This included the eventual closure of one home at the end of the programme in 2018 because it was not deemed value for money to upgrade the home because of the extent of the repair and maintenance costs. The operational plan was always to move young people from this home (referred to as home 5 in the table at 4.5) towards the end of the refurbishment programme and this was done in a planned and considered way in April 2018. The current position is that the home is empty and this report recommends that Cabinet make the decision to formally close the home. Residents consulted on the issue provided strong support for this course of action.
- 1.7 Phase 2 seeks to address the reduction of beds by seeking approval to increase the baseline bed availability within Derby for those young people aged 16 to 18 years. It is proposed to secure a number of small homes through working in partnership with Derby Homes. The range of properties will be targeted to those young people within existing children's homes to enable swifter move on from Hub 1 or 2 into semi-independence living. By doing this it is anticipated that capacity will be released sooner than is the current practice which is to retain till 18 years. Feedback from Care Leavers over the past 12 months has supported the view that more needs to be done and earlier in preparing looked after children to live independently. Given the number of 14 and 15 year olds currently in situ (nine), the release of bed space will enable a return of those placed out of area.
- 1.8 The recommendations are based on all available information from analysis and consultation to date. The aim is to develop resilient, responsive and flexible accommodation that will provide a continuum from entry into care, to preparing for independence and finally exiting care, depending on need.

- 1.9 This report has removed all identifying aspects in relation to the names of individual Derby City Council children homes on the basis that this information would identify their locations and therefore present a safeguarding risk to the children and young people.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 To agree the two phased approach to reconfiguration of children's in-house residential services, those phases being the establishment of a two hub approach and creation of a semi-independent living pathway.
- 2.2 To agree as part of Hub 1 establishment to;
- a) cease the scheduled refurbishment of the final home
 - b) approve formal closure of this home and;
 - c) agree transfer the capital budget to invest in the refurbishment of a smaller building already within the site of Hub 1 into a two bedded home.
- 2.3 To agree closure of the home that has been empty since April 2018
- 2.4 To agree a future review of properties within the councils portfolio to determine, subject to an updated strategic needs assessment, if any properties might be suitable for children's residential provision.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.1 The current and increasing level of complex and challenging need will continue to place pressure on Derby's ability to source suitable placements and meet outcomes for young people. The reduced sufficiency and external market provision means that Derby will need to create its own solutions to meeting future need. The current configuration is not sustainable and has resulted in 'bed blocking' across some of the homes. The homes as they are currently configured are not consistently achieving best outcomes for young people and are not being fully utilised.

There are approximately twenty young people placed out of area due to complex needs and behaviours. This on average costs circa £5,500k per week resulting in significant expenditure to the Council. By reconfiguring our existing provision and introducing phase two, some of those young people placed out of area can be transitioned back into Derby which will meet both our strategic objective and be more cost effective.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

4.1 The original programme of re-build and refurbishment was part of a five year, £5m capital funding project commencing in 2013 and due to finish in 2018. The strategy was designed on a gradual bed reduction over the five years to both meet £350,000 efficiency savings required of residential services in 2014/15 and also meet desired outcomes for homes for looked after children being- *“smaller establishments providing a more personalised, less institutionalised service, improving the living environment and working to ensure the best outcomes are achieved for young people”* (Cabinet report March 2013). The strategy has gone a long way to meet that, however the landscape has changed since approval in 2013.

4.2 In 2013 the strategy agreed was for internal provision to meet mainstream or enhanced needs only. Complex needs were to be met through purchase of external provision. In 2012, an average of 10 external placements were needed and purchased. However in 2018 this has increased to an average of 20 placements now being purchased externally.

4.3 **Bed Capacity and Usage 2012 – 2018**

The strategic direction outlined in the 2013 Cabinet report was to reduce the number of internal residential beds (excluding the five beds for disabled children) in a planned and gradual way as follows:

- To reduce from 39 to 34 beds in 2013
- To reduce to 27 beds by January 2015
- To reduce to 24 beds by April 2018

4.4 The table in 4.5 summarises the planned bed capacity at the conclusion of the five year transformation strategy (excluding the five beds for disabled children). It can be seen in the table the strategic intention was to close and in some cases re-build children's homes. The rationale for home 5 closing was alluded to in the March 2013 Cabinet report in that it was assessed not value for money in terms of repair and maintenance costs to upgrade the home. The cost of £725,000 over the next 10 years was estimated which was over £500,000 more than any of the other homes to maintain. This was the equivalent to £12,000 per bed, per year which was not considered value for money in comparison to the other homes.

4.5 **Planned bed capacity post five year transformation strategy excluding the five beds for disabled children (by April 2018)**

Provision	No of registered beds in 2013	Registered bed forecasted by 2018	Difference
Home 1a and 1b	10 (over 2 new build homes)	9	-1
Home 2	6 (new build)	6	0
Home 3	6 (refurb)	5	-1
Home 4	6 (refurb)	4	-2
Home 5 (planned closure)	6	0	-6
Total	34	24	-10

4.6 The plan was always to move young people from home 5 (see table 4.5 above) towards the end of the refurbishment programme and this was done in a planned and considered way in April 2018. The current position is that the home is empty and this report recommends that Cabinet make the decision to formally close the home. Residents consulted on the issue provided strong support for this course of action.

4.7 2018: Current Usage – the table below **includes** the five beds for disability

Provision	No of registered beds	Average occupancy over past 12 months
Home 1a (new build) *	5	2
Home 1b (new build) **	5	3
Home 2 (new build)	6	6
Home 3 (due to open with 5 beds) ***	0	0 (12 month refurb)
Home 4(planned for refurb to a 4 bedded home)	6	4
Home 5 (empty from April 2018)	0	5
Home 6 (disability)	5	4
Total	27	24

*/**Homes 1a and 1b have had up to 8 young people in them and despite registered for 10 young people, 2 beds, one per home, have been used for additional staff sleep-in rooms due to the complexity of need, or if required, for emergency placement. This is entirely in line with Ofsted's minimal national standards for children's homes.

*** Home 3 was due for opening in April 2018 but has been delayed due to contractor slippage.

The current occupancy on 16 September 2018 was 23 with 18 in mainstream

4.8 Strategic Needs Assessment 2017

The strategic needs assessment is summarised in Appendix 2. The analysis showed that some areas of need had reduced slightly but issues around child sexual exploitation and substance misuse and alcohol remains areas of concern.

The strategic residential needs assessment concluded that 75% of current placements have complex needs (with a range of 16.7% for one home, typically identified as settled care to 100% in two of the homes) The original target group for Derby's residential homes prior to the investment programme was aimed at core and enhanced need. The analysis confirmed that there had been a large increase in children with specific complex needs across the city between 2011 and 2017.

4.9 **A new vision**

The Council currently has five operating residential children's homes providing up to 27 beds, though only 24 are used for mainstream and disabled children and young people. As cited above, the presenting needs of young people requiring accommodation has changed significantly since 2013, therefore if Derby is to realise its strategic objective of maintaining Derby children and young people in Derby, the current homes configuration and staffing provision requires change to ensure those with complex needs and challenging behaviours can be safely accommodated within its current provision.

- 4.10 Most homes have sustained a "good" rating by Ofsted over the past two years for the quality of care provided and outcomes achieved. However the intended use and purpose was not for providing specialist support to those with complex needs. Demand over the past 12 months has forced the service into attempting to meet those needs as the external market has become saturated. This in turn has meant creatively using internal accommodation and staff to deliver services it was not designed nor intended for. Evidence from neighbouring authorities and from observing the evolvement of the external market over the past few years suggests that needs for those with complex and challenging behaviours are better met within smaller two to three bedded home environments.
- 4.11 There is opportunity for the Council to maintain pace with external development and changing needs of young people. However, this would require approval to divert from the final phase of the 2013 children's home strategy. This final phase will require approval to cease existing plans of refurbishing the last home, which is scheduled to reduce a six bedded home to a four bedded home. The proposal would be for that home to close and transfer the capital budget of £500,000 to a smaller home project that would be designed to meet complex need costing £175,000. The rationale being that sufficiency is limited and decreasing for this cohort of children and young people both regionally and nationally. Derby is already facing significant challenge to source and secure the right type of placement for children and young people therefore it would be prudent for Derby to be able to provide its own solution, not just in relation to improving its ability to meet need but also in its public duty to provide cost effective public services.

4.12 Phase One – A Two Hub Model for Children’s Residential Homes

The proposed development of Hub 1 would be targeted at meeting complex and multiple needs. It would involve investment in the training of staff and additional multi agency support to promote greater stability of placements. An increased staffing ratio and flexible working structure across Hub 1 will promote improved support, outcomes, and resilience for the most vulnerable young people in the in-house provision. This in turn will improve stability of placements across Hub 2, who would care for young people with core and enhanced needs. The service will work with human resources and the Council’s Organisational Development Team to ensure that the restructure is undertaken and developed with a well-designed programme and overseen by a designated project team. Consultation feedback was mainly positive from all stakeholders about this direction of travel.

4.13 Hub 1 - Complex Needs. These homes will accommodate up to ten young people with complex needs and be supported by a virtual multi-disciplinary team to include the following services:

- Connexions
- KEEP
- CAHMS
- Leaving Care Team
- Derby Homes
- Shared Lives
- Local Area Co-ordination Team
- Social Worker
- Restorative Parenting
- Live Well – Public Health
- Youth Offending Service
- Key Worker
- Hope Centre

4.14 Hub 2 – Settled Care. These homes will accommodate up to 16 young people across three homes with lower levels of need which require support due to not being able to live within a family setting. The homes will work alongside appropriate services to ensure that all young people entering the care system within Derby will be supported to exit care at the right time. This will include working with them and their social worker to fully prepare them for adult life at the point of entry.

4.15 Phase Two

Within Phase two, there is a proposal to transition young people aged 16 years into semi-independent living. As a Corporate Parent, Derby City Council has a responsibility to ensure that young people are fully supported transitioning into adulthood. There is also a responsibility to ensure that each young person transitioning has the skills to successfully achieve their outcomes in life.

- 4.16 Currently there are nine young people who will be reaching their 16th birthday in 2019 that live within residential care provision. If the current proposals are agreed, this will result in those young people being transitioned into a semi-independent home within the next year with outreach support from the service.
- 4.17 The proposal is to work with Derby Homes, who are also Corporate Parents and partners, to review their housing stock with a view to securing a cluster of homes/flats in the future to support young people to transition into semi independence and eventually leave care. Young people will be supported by a Residential Care worker to remain independent, safe and well, as well as their social worker and personal advisor from the care leavers' service.
- 4.18 Evidence shows that smaller group living is a preferred option to large group living such as Residential Children Homes. Feedback so far has indicated that a number of young people nearing their 16th birthday would prefer the option of living with a friend or on their own, rather than the current living environment that they are in. Consultation with young people is already informing of this and demand will increase for this type of provision going forward.
- 4.19 Other models across other authorities show that those who are less vulnerable can be placed in a separate flat or two-person home with outreach support. This helps them to maintain their tenancy, which at present is a challenge where support is limited.
- 4.20 Costs to support young people who live out of the area of Derby and with external placements are significantly high. Consideration needs to be given to ensuring that where possible, appropriate and in line with their care plan, all young people aged 15 years of age are reviewed where out of the area or with external providers with the aim to be transitioned to semi-independent living within Derby.
- 4.21 Consideration also needs to be given to young people needs when supporting post 16 to 18 year olds. Further work will need to commence with Derby Homes on this proposal including the use of assistive technology within the remit of semi-independence.

4.22 **Consultation**

Consultation has taken place with key stakeholders, children and young people. This has taken place over a three week period. Overall consultation has been generally positive on the two phases for the children's home reconfiguration. Full details of the consultation responses can be found in Appendix 3.

4.23 **Equalities impact assessment**

An Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) has been undertaken and this is at Appendix 4.

OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 5.1 To do nothing is not an option, due to the budget constraints and market sufficiency. The cost of placing young people and children out of the area of Derby is significant. Also, the needs of young people have changed, with demand necessitating specialist support to be considered.

To refurbish one of the Homes at a cost of circa £500,000. However, given that this Home has recently been subject to complaints from the local residents, as it is located in a residential area, this option would need to be carefully considered.

This report has been approved by the following officers:

Legal officer Financial officer Human Resources officer Estates/Property officer Service Director(s) Other(s)	Olu Idowu Alison Parkin Liz Moore Jane Sowerby Suanne Lim, Service Director, Children's Integrated Services, People DMT
For more information contact: Background papers: List of appendices:	Sharon Green 01332 642740 sharon.green@derby.gov.uk None Appendix 1: Implications Appendix 2: Strategic Needs Assessment 2017 Appendix 3: Summary of consultation responses Appendix 4: Equality Impact Assessment

IMPLICATIONS

Financial and Value for Money

- 1.1 The reconfiguration programme will result in a cost reduction of £200,000 from the staffing budgets of the current homes, primarily due to one home closure.

Costs of circa £700,000 will also be avoided due to essential maintenance and upgrades requirement for the building planned over the next ten years.

Legal

- 2.1 Each home is regulated and inspected by Ofsted, as required by the Care Standards Act 2000. Inspections are based on the Children's Homes (England) Regulations 2015 and National Minimum Standards. All local authorities have a duty of care as a Corporate Parent and a responsibility to provide the best possible services and support to Looked After Children in their care. Consultation with children and young people will be undertaken to inform the outcome.

Personnel

- 3.1 Staff working in children's homes are subject to Disclosure and Barring Service checks and expected to conform to high standards of conduct and performance.
- There will be changes to the role and function of staffing across Hub 1 therefore an achieving change and consultation with staff will need to occur

Equalities Impact

- 4.1 An Equalities Impact Assessment will need to be carried out before any changes are made.

Health and Safety

- 5.1 Children's homes are fully compliant with Health and Safety legislation and policies. General Risk Assessments and Stress Risk Assessments are regularly updated and managers have received appropriate training.

Environmental Sustainability

- 6.1 Environmental sustainability is promoted, for instance by recycling, heating efficiency and insulation in so far as the design of the building allows. Roofing and cavity wall insulation has been installed in some buildings.

Property and Asset Management

- 7.1 A five year programme of replacement and refurbishment has been underway, and has been the subject of separate reports to the Corporate Parenting Board.

Risk Management

- 8.1 The Business Continuity Plan contains an assessment of risks and control measures in place.

Corporate objectives and priorities for change

- 9.1 The report contributes to the following Council objectives:
Good quality services that meet local needs.

Strategic Needs Assessment 2017

A needs assessment was undertaken in October 2017 and analysed 470 looked after children and young people across internal children homes, agency residential, and agency fostering. Of the 470 individuals, 15 were in agency residential placements, 28 were in internal residential homes, and 231 in agency fostering. Over the past 6 years there have been significant changes in complex and multiple need presented by our children and young people;

- Special Educational Needs / Learning Difficulties : 45% increase
62.5% in 2017 compared to 17.5% in 2011
- ADHD and Autism : 37% increase
40.6% in 2017 compared to 3.5% in 2011
- Self-Harm: 35% increase
43.8% in 2017 compared to 8.8% in 2011
- Mental Health: 27% increase
50.0% in 2017 compared to 22.8% in 2011
- Substance misuse and alcohol– remained static
43% in 2017 compared to 44% in 2011
- Child Sexual Exploitation – reduced by 8% but still prevalent in all internal residential children's homes
47% in 2017 compared to 55% in 2011
- Offending Behaviour - reduced by 22% but still prevalent in all internal residential children's homes – see below
44% in 2017 compared to 66% in 2011

Within the internal children's homes there has been significant rises in comparison to the 2011 need analysis.

- Self-Harm from 18.5% to 42.9%
- ADHD/Autism from 7.4% to 52.4%
- Challenging/Risky behaviour from 77.8% to 95.2%
- Offending Behaviour from 44.4% to 66.7%
- SEN/Learning Difficulties 3.7% to 66.7%
- Mental health 40.7% to 42.9%

Summary of consultation responses

The objective of the consultation was to gather views and opinions from key stakeholders in order to support the decision making process. The consultation methodology as follows:

- A series of group and 1:1 meetings. All staff were invited to attend
- 1:1 and group meetings were held with the young people and children
- Questionnaires sent to staff and key stakeholders to complete
- Questionnaires given to young people and children to complete

Residents were individually visited, rather than posting the questionnaires through their letterboxes and requesting them to be posted back. The residents felt that this was more personal and were able to give their views on the proposals directly.

Their responses were as follows:

Been lots of disturbances at night. Has had a massive impact and affected my health. Definitely do not want another Children's Home. Would like to see something there for the elderly people to visit like a community hub/coffee/tea shop. You cannot get into the other community hub, as busy.

Not offended me. Kids have been ok. It has had its ups and downs, but lived with it. No impact and not been disturbed by them (Kids). Had a bad name and lots of damage to the Home. Don't want it to reopen as a Children's Home. Would like to see an older people's residential home in its place.

Not bothered us. No impact, if reopened, not bothered. Should treat with respect and not capable of looking after. Some hitting carers. Nothing done to challenge the young people and sort when issues. Treat with respect, give respect. Would like to see an older peoples home in its place.

Do not want it to be a place for drugs, rehab or others. No objections being a Children's Home, but think the building is institutionalised.

Lack of sleep due to behaviours at night. Keep me awake. Some disturbances during the day. Better continuity of staff. If refurbished, would not bother me but would need to look at the age group of the kids. Most of the time not bad children, some are. Would like to see a community hub. Parking space an issue, needs to be something but not sure what. Heard that there will be younger age going in.

Been awful, been here for five years. Nights where they are out at 4 am in the morning. Partner goes to work, but is disturbed. When we first moved in, it was fine...impact is a 10! Lots of shouting. Not positive, wouldn't want another Children's Home. Guarantee that it would not start again. Would want something for older people due to the area. Knew it was a Children's Home when we bought the property, and was a lovely area. Started a year to a year and a half ago, kids jumping up and down on Police cars and the minibus. Been throwing stones onto

cars, challenging residents...hopefully not another Children's Home. Not in the right area.

Knew it was a Children's Home, bought home knowing not the best. Been over once or twice, they are kids. Some staff don't do anything, some brilliant. Don't care what it is, got to go somewhere. Need a park or college near, ideal for kids as not a lot to do. Got right people guiding, would be ok. Staff member X constantly took young people out. Interacted at least.

I worked in Special Education. Have more of an outlook. These are special kids. They do a lot of shouting and swearing, and nocturnal let out at night. Kids moved in, feel sorry for them. Not had a lot of grief, but can hear them when they come over. They are not perfect and sooner the Home was not a Children's Home. Don't want it to be a rehab unit. Older folks or something. This is a nice caring residential area, when I first came here, it was not built up and lots of space and things to do.

Trouble for the last 8 years. Will be back to square one if another Children's Home. Why so naughty? Stones, bricks and melons thrown. They apologised and I gave them a few quid. They are always on the front causing riots. Was going to sell up, but would lose value as would have to tell them it's a kids Home.

Horrendous. My child has not been able to go out into the garden as kids swearing. Night time bad, fluctuates. Not a good experience. Been here for four years. Would like to see the Home be used for older people.

Noise a nuisance. I go to work and up at 6 am. Lack of sleep once every two weeks. Been here for four years and would not recommend to anyone to live here. Area wonderful, but with the Children's Home being here, not pleasant. Community is quite old and teenagers swearing.

Depending on severity of why they are there, children a bad bunch. Must be better places than here with more to do. They seem restless trying to entertain themselves, area not for kids. Not a Children's Home, would like to see a shop, café or community hub. There is community spirit and some like chalk and cheese. If they had more to do, would be ok.

Young people:

The young people and children who are currently residing within the Children Homes were spoken to on an individual basis and within a group setting, with staff present. The majority of the young people spoken to understood what the proposals were. Some of the young people declined to comment on the proposals, and did not exhibit an interest. There were four young people who were unable to make comments due to their presenting needs. In total 19 young people's views were sought.

The key messages from the young people in relation to the proposed changes were:

- Don't want too many young people and children in the Homes
- Does that mean that all young people will be moving around?
- It will be good If I can live in the ECP if I can't then it won't be good
- I don't like Hub 1 & Hub 2, it doesn't sound right. How will it support 16 young people?
- Why do we need a new Home?
- Has to be clean bedding
- Yeah would be good
- Yes, will be good. I will believe it when I see it
- Not if there are too many people
- Not if there are too many people in there, you will have to get more night worker in there for Hub 1
- Sounds good if it actually works out like it
- They'll be too many kids on one site
- Staff won't have that much control over that many naughty kids
- I really don't agree and don't want staff moving from Home 2
- I don't want any of my staff moving at all
- More unsettled here
- The Homes shouldn't close as other people may not have anywhere to live
- If I move they will have a big impact

Staff

In total there were ninety staff consulted with regards to the proposals. In August and September, staff consultation meetings held across all five Children Residential Homes. These sessions were attended by Trade Union representatives and HR to enable them to fully hear staff views and comments. Most staff attended the sessions, and where they did not, 'mop up' sessions were put on to enable those staff that could not attend, to have a voice. However, there were, for various reasons including annual leave, some staff that did not attend.

Initially it was decided to hold discussions with staff prior to sending out the Stakeholder Questionnaire. The reason for this was to ensure that staff had the opportunity to fully engage and hear what was being proposed, with a view to allowing staff the opportunity to digest what was being proposed, and then to complete the questionnaire.

Due to the nature of their roles and summer holiday period, this did prove challenging to engage with all staff, and therefore individual and small group discussions took place.

Staff were again reminded direct through email during September, that they still had an opportunity to contribute to the consultation.

In relation to the impact these proposals would have on the staff,

Comments from staff who did engage during the consultation sessions included:

- What is new from what we had previously?
- Don't reopen the two Homes that are due to close due to the locations and the problems encountered with residents
- Additional staff will be required
- What additional training will be provided to ensure staff to be able to support fully within Hub 1 as more complex?
- Will Hub 1 have Managers in place in the Homes?
- How will the Placement Matching take place, currently does not work right?
- If something works in one Home, will it be changed?
- Biggest problem is the young people not engaging
- We want the best for our kids
- Want to get involved with the project if it gets the go ahead
- Transition into independent living is an area which we need to improve, as addressed in the Narey report (Staying Put/Staying Close)
- A model of semi-independent Homes supported by Residential staff and the existing flats will allow this to happen
- Hub 1 will be able to more adequately and flexibly meet the needs of young people with complex needs, utilising in-house professionals to create an individual package of care around each young person
- Hub 2 will give the young people who are more settled in placement the opportunity to develop with the disruption of others
- Further consideration will need to be given to the distribution of staff across the service, and the leadership and management structure on the site to ensure success
- Staffing could be an issue even with the best intentions
- Planning to put 8 young people with very challenging behaviours in one place will not have a positive outcome for the young people
- More young people leading each other on in a negative way
- I don't think people understand what we are already doing – we already use keep and wrap around services – the keep always say it works better when the young person is already settled
- We do need to change and to modernise and to move with the times
- I come from the private sector – there are some things that we do in the Council that could change
- Not going to have enough beds – some might not want to come back
- Other local authorities are moving towards a home environment of 2 people – clearly struggling here with staff, people going off sick – staff are so tired – It's not settled enough here not like other homes
- That's because we have had them so long. Have started life skills package the last few years – all kids ring for a lift all the time – not got independent skills
- One concern is their behaviour when they leave – this is what lets them down and they lose their tenancy – they would not work with key workers one key worker did quite a lot of intensive work – we worked really hard – you can lead the horse to water but you can't make it drink

- Time management is also key when yp are asleep you can do certain tasks – 3 yp just left school entry level once holidays have finished we need to support them looking for a job
- Placements not matched correctly
- Smaller Homes would be better for the young people
- Reducing the number of young people living at Home 2 in the main building from 5 to 4 this would allow for better outcomes for young people and less peer group pressure which is a huge thing when you have 5 or 6 young people living together in one home.
- I agree with some of the proposals in particular supporting young people's transition from living in a Children's Home into the community and residential staff working in partnership with housing associations / Aspire-Leaving care to support young person achieve stability in there new placement in the community.
I agree that Home 5 and Home 4 have been closed down both building are poor and the environment for young people to live in.
- I believe the money would be better spent on ECP House refurbishing it and supporting the 2 buildings to achieve better outcomes for the young people. Will Multi agency be on site at ECP building doing direct work with young people at Homes 1a and 1b?
- I can only see positive outcomes for young people from the changes•
Not going to have enough beds – some might not want to come back
- I agree with the proposals with the correct staff in place that have a good understanding of working with young people who needs may be complex and believe in working alongside the wider systems to enable young people to get expertise support incorporated into their care plan.
- Staff working at the complex needs site should be highly motivated and have a clear focus of meeting their needs
I do think that residential workers should undertake more of an outreach role to support those young people who have moved on to live independently
Part of their transition programme should be to support then on an outreach basis with an agreed timescale
I also think that the independence tool kit that the homes use could/should be more focused on more realistic issues for young people like dealing with loneliness and isolation

Feedback from Key Stakeholders

I agree that it would be good for our young people to have access to supported living at an earlier stage, to start the process of independent living. I also agree with small residential units which resemble family homes.

However, I am concerned about having the most vulnerable and challenging young people on one site. Something additional would need to change before this could happen – you have mentioned “There will also be a virtual specialist team of professionals available to provide ‘wrap around’ services to the young people to who require an enhanced level of support. They will have office accommodation within the refurbished building. If a young person needs additional support, they may move to this new Residential Home on the site for a period dependant on their prevailing needs” - What additional skills, would this team have, from that of our existing residential team? From where the site is based, it is very easy for young people to

'disappear' and go missing. Young people on the site already go into each of the homes together/entice each other to go missing/trash the property, if all the young people on the site are the most vulnerable and challenging, surely this will become more widespread and difficult to control.

Derby City Council's offer to Children in Care for placements needs to be able to meet the changing landscape in needs and complexities of the CYP's coming into care. Our offer needs to be able to meet the complex needs with sites and staffing that are focused on delivery of placements internally.

The proposal has considered the current needs of the young people coming into care and who require higher level of support.

This is a far more young person focused approach and also ensures that young people are living closer to the communities they know and should be integrated into for adult life, thereby giving them greater life opportunities.

This also works hand in glove with other projects across the city to promote better outcomes for looked after children such as CONCORDAT and missing children.

The proposal also provides opportunities for greater development of life-skills by children and young people in care in a safe environment.

Therefore reducing risks themselves and others.

I do think assessment re mental health and other issues and a clear behaviour should be completed upon admission.

Placement matching is vital if positive outcomes are to be achieved. The county appear to be successful with this.

There is not enough information provided about phase one and phase two that I feel able to agree/ disagree with the question about whether I agree with the two phase approach and this is not a service area I am familiar with.

I am not clear from the information provided whether the proposed creation of hub one and hub two is going ahead (with 24 places in total – 8 for complex needs). If it is going ahead then I would agree it doesn't make sense to refurbish a home that is no longer going to be used. If it doesn't go ahead then there is a danger that the unused/ closed children's home will quickly deteriorate and then need a lot of investment to bring it back into use. In the meantime how many residential places are we currently able to provide for Derby City children and for how long whilst we wait for a decision to be made and work to be done.

I do think it is worth sacrificing Home 4 to invest more heavily in complex care. However, I do think it is possible to run a home in a residential area – Home 2 appears successful- if you have longer term placements and stable and experienced staffing.

I like the idea of using the old building at the Hub 1 site as an assessment /reception home . With experienced and stable staffing you should be able to settle more challenging behaviour before putting them in a group environment. Therefore reducing risks themselves and others.

I do think assessment re mental health and other issues and a clear behaviour should be completed upon admission.

Placement matching is vital if positive outcomes are to be achieved. The county appear to be successful with this.

I am concerned that if the staff are not experienced and constantly change then the new place would become just another home rather than a specialist service.

I agree that it would be good for our young people to have access to supported living at an earlier stage, to start the process of independent living. I also agree with small residential units which resemble family homes.

However, I am concerned about having the most vulnerable and challenging young people on one site. Something additional would need to change before this could happen – you have mentioned “There will also be a virtual specialist team of professionals available to provide ‘wrap around’ services to the young people to who require an enhanced level of support. They will have office accommodation within the refurbished building. If a young person needs additional support, they may move to this new Residential Home on the site for a period dependant on their prevailing needs” - What additional skills, would this team have, from that of our existing residential team? From where the site is based, it is very easy for young people to 'disappear' and go missing. Young people on the site already go into each of the homes together/entice each other to go missing/trash the property, if all the young people on the site are the most vulnerable and challenging, surely this will become more widespread and difficult to control.

Children with complex needs and challenging behaviours need therapeutic placements and need to be educated in appropriate schools, if our children are brought 'home' their education needs to be thought about prior to moving them, especially, where their education is already successful.

It is duly noted that the Council is facing significant pressures in respect to the financial position and value for money. This response however does raise a number of concerns in respect to this proposal that we feel need to be raised.

With respect this proposal is not written in a way that clearly sets out the options available nor does it offer an alternative. It is appreciated that significant work has gone into this proposal, but in its current format it has raised a number of significant questions that impact on the effectiveness of this consultation.

The proposal to 'do things differently' seems somewhat one dimensional in this proposal, therefore It is difficult to comment and offer any true analysis of the proposal and the risks associated without a fuller understanding of the whole suite of proposed change. There is very little description in this proposal that focusses on the impact and outcomes this reconfiguration will have on the children, it seems with all honesty to be a resource led proposal.

There is consideration given to matching, however anecdotally we know that there is a resource vs need bias that we need to consider.

It should be noted that not all stakeholders have responded to the questionnaire. A number of key stakeholders were sent the questionnaire to complete:

- Ofsted
- Social Work and Children in Care Teams – Social Workers/ Managers
- IRO's
- Virtual Head
- Local Area Co-Ordinators
- Commissioning
- Trade Unions
- Training & Development Team
- Derbyshire Police
- Youth Offending Service
- The Keep

The responses received indicated that:

- Most are in favour of the proposal to cease progression of the scheduled refurbishment of one of the Homes and to reinvest in the smaller Home as set out in the questionnaire
- Most agree with the two phased approach
- In relation to the impact of the proposed changes, there were very mixed comments, with some declining to comment:
- The impact will be limited with the correct teams in place and we are working with the wider service to get the expertise support for young people. It will also be limited if the young people are consulted and aware of the plans
- I am disappointed with the proposed plan to not refurbish Home and re-open this building to accommodate four children with an independence flat like has happened with the other homes at Home 2 and Home 3. With the reduction in capacity, my concern would be that more young people with mainstream residential needs will end up being placed in residential units outside of Derby which seems to be the opposite of what is intended with a plan to bring children with complex needs back to Derby
- The main area would be that it allows young people to reach their full potential
- No concerns
- Vulnerable young people living together having a negative impact
- Initially there would be some transition issues along with possibly being placed with peers that they might not be happy with living in a different area
- The impact on the service delivery is varied, with some respondents stating no impact to big impact