



DERBY CITY COUNCIL

COUNCIL CABINET
17 MARCH 2009

ITEM 21

Report of the Corporate Director of Corporate and Adult Services

Consultation on the Redevelopment of Arthur Neal House Care Home for Older People

SUMMARY

- 1.1 On 8 July 2008 Council Cabinet decided to consult on a proposal to redevelop Arthur Neal House and replace it with an extra care housing scheme.
- 1.2 This report sets out the responses to the consultation process and recommends the home is closed no sooner than 1 January 2010.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 To close Arthur Neal House at a date no sooner than 1 January 2010.
- 2.2 To continue to provide day care services to those people who currently attend Arthur Neal House and identify a suitable venue in the local area if possible.
- 2.3 To work with the Sanctuary Housing Group to develop an extra care housing scheme on the site.

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.1 Demand for traditional residential care is falling as evidenced by the care homes review report. This is particularly true for in house provision as the fabric and facilities in the buildings are generally poorer than the independent sector. This will lead to over capacity and inefficiency.
- 3.2 Arthur Neal House would need considerable investment simply to ensure the building is safe and could continue to function as a care home. It would require substantially more funds to modernise it to a suitable standard for the future.
- 3.3 Consultation responses revealed much support for developing extra care housing on the site whilst raising concerns about the impact for current residents and users of day care. The site clearly has great potential to develop an extra care scheme to meet future housing and care needs.
- 3.4 It may be possible to minimise disruption to current residents by adopting a phased approach to the building of the new development. There are a number of disadvantages and risks associated with this. We asked for some additional information from Sanctuary Housing Group which is below.

- It would cost significantly more. Historically this is around 20% extra though we have not been given a precise figure at this stage. It is hoped that much of the overall cost will be met by a grant from the Homes and Communities Agency but this is not guaranteed. A more expensive bid will be viewed as less attractive than any rival bids and if the development was phased this would not attract a higher amount of grant as the level of allocation is based on the number of units rather than how they are constructed.
- There would be a cost to Derby City Council of keeping Arthur Neal house open while the new scheme is built.
- It would take longer to complete. Estimates from our development partner suggest around 18 months – 2 years longer.
- There would be considerable and prolonged noise and disruption for residents living next to a building site and this would adversely affect their quality of life. There would also be a longer period of disruption for neighbours and the local community.
- Clearly if the new development takes longer to complete then people who want to occupy these flats will need to be housed elsewhere in the meantime.

3.5 This information is based on estimates and more detailed work would be required if we were to pursue this possibility.



Consultation on the closure of Arthur Neal House Care Home for Older People

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

- 1.1 The future of all Council owned residential care homes is the subject of a wider review which will be considered by Council Cabinet. This sets out the current position and makes recommendations for the future of supported accommodation across the City. It is clear that there is less demand for traditional residential care and Council owned homes are not fully occupied.

Arthur Neal has a capacity of 25 residents and there are currently 15 permanent residents. They have lived there for varying durations with around 7 years being the longest stay and 3 people moving there in the last year. There is 1 resident who previously lived in the Lois Ellis home which occupied part of this site. There are 24 users of day care on the register in total, a proportion of whom attend in any week for varying amounts of time depending on need.

- 1.2 The reasons for consulting on a proposal to close Arthur Neal at this stage can be summarised as:

- the building is in a poor state of repair and would need considerable funds to carry out essential work and this would still leave a home which is not modernised. The most recent estimates are contained in Appendix 1.
- the home has good links with the local community and there are comparatively high numbers of older people in Mackworth which makes this a good site for a large development for older people
- the site is attractive as it includes the site where the Lois Ellis care home formerly stood. This was closed in 2002 & the building demolished.

- 1.3 In accordance with the Council Cabinet decision of 31 July 2007 to explore the possibility of extra care housing on the site, a preferred development partner was identified after a competitive process during April 2008. Sanctuary Housing who are a registered social landlord were selected and they have submitted an outline plan for around 100 flats on the site. The outline of their proposal is attached to the consultation document which is a background paper to this report.

- 1.4 A programme of consultation was carried out from 22 September to 22 December. A summary of activity and responses is attached at Appendix 2 with a more detailed analysis set out as a background paper. Views were decidedly mixed. As a broad summary the people most directly affected by the proposed closure – residents, day care users, their families, staff – were opposed to closing the home & were concerned about the impact for individuals of closure. Amongst the wider community there was considerable support for the new development and the benefits it would bring for local people. Across the board there was a clear

recognition that the current state of the home was not satisfactory, there had been uncertainty about the future and that some action was needed.

- 1.5 A petition against the closure was submitted. This contains 1147 signatures. This should be taken into account alongside other consultation responses. It is clearly a large number of people expressing a view but some caution is needed as it simply asks whether the home should be closed or not and makes no mention of the proposal to develop a new extra care facility on the site
- 1.6 An outline plan for the new development was included along with the consultation paper that was distributed. A number of respondents – including people who live near the site – raised questions about planning matters and were advised that there would need to be a formal planning application & they would have an opportunity to make representations during that process.
- 1.7 It is clear that if the home were to close this would be extremely difficult for residents and their families and they were worried about the impact this would have. Some reassurance was offered about the help & support available if people did need to move though most residents were still unhappy about the uncertainty and the prospect they would need to move. One theme which ran throughout was whether it was possible to use the other part of the site to develop extra care whilst retaining Arthur Neal or a phased approach which would allow Arthur Neal to remain open longer while building took place on the other part of the site.
- 1.8 Initial discussions with Sanctuary Housing Group indicate this may be possible but this option is not recommended. There is considerable extra cost, additional time and disruption to residents. There could be a risk to grant funding due to increased costs. This option could mean that some of the existing residents could move to the extra care development on the site. This is only likely to be appropriate for a small number of residents based on their likely needs by this time and it would need to be their choice. If this option is favoured it would require some additional work by the developer to produce more detailed plans and costings.
- 1.9 Council Cabinet decided on 30 September 2008 to agree a target of 925 units of extra care housing by 2015. The proposed development on this site will make a considerable contribution toward that target.
- 1.10 There has been considerable concern about the impact on day service users. A very small number of people use Arthur Neal for care needs but most attend for social activities. People were keen to maintain a service on Mackworth Estate if possible. The recommendation is to investigate the use of a Derby Homes building on Mackworth Estate for a day service offering social activities and provide other means of meeting the care needs of the few individuals who require this.
- 1.11 The consultation strongly affirmed the commitment and quality of the staff working at Arthur Neal care home. Post any decision being taken more detailed discussions with staff shall take place. It may be feasible for some staff to transfer to the new provider of care at the new facility to ensure some continuity of care and support for the people of Mackworth. However, this shall be dependent on several factors not least of which is staff choice.

OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 2.1 Doing nothing is not a realistic option. Considerable investment would be needed simply to ensure the home is safe and could remain open. This would inevitably involve considerable upheaval for residents.
- 2.2 The option of fully modernising Arthur Neal as a care home is not recommended. This would involve considerable cost and extensive building work which would necessitate moving the current residents anyway. Such work would not attract external grant funding. The picture across the City shows a continuing decline in the numbers of people moving into care homes in Derby. This is evidenced in the wider review of the future of Council owned care homes in a separate report. Furthermore this would not provide a use for the whole site.

For more information contact:	David Brewin, tel: 01332 255854 david.brewin@derby.gov.uk
Background papers:	Appendix 1 - Implications Appendix 2 - Consultation Summary Appendix 3 - Additional Factors to Consider Appendix 4 - Consultation Document Appendix 5 – Consultation Analysis in Detail

IMPLICATIONS

Financial

- 1.1 The funding for the scheme would be through a combination of Homes and Communities Agency grant, use of Council owned land and the revenue from selling a proportion of the flats.
- 1.2 The latest estimate for essential repairs and maintenance to the building is £651,000. The cost of fully modernising the home would be considerably higher and the care home review report suggests this would be circa £2.2m
- 1.3 The annual gross running cost of Arthur Neal is £603k. At an expected occupancy rate of 95% the weekly gross unit cost of a bed at Arthur Neal is £488. This is significantly higher than the gross weekly cost of a very dependent elderly placement in the independent sector at £353. Although not directly comparable one cost estimate of looking after an elderly person with residential care level needs in extra care would be £272 per week.

Legal

- 2.1 There are a series of legal tests that must be met before a decision to close a Residential Care Home can be made. These are set out in the 'Additional Considerations' document at Appendix 3.
- 2.2 If the decision is taken to close there is a health service circular (1998/048) which provides checklists of steps to be taken during the closure process.

Personnel

- 3.1 Council staff affected by this have been invited to participate in the consultation & each individual has had a meeting with an officer from Human Resources. Staff have access to the Council redeployment procedure but have no guarantee of another job within the Council. Given a particular set of circumstances and timing it may be possible for some staff to transfer to the new care provider in the extra care facility.

Equalities impact

- 4.1 There is no clear equalities impact.

Corporate priorities

- 5.1 Helping us all to be Healthy, Active and Independent: Raising the Quality of Social Care for Vulnerable and Older People.
- 5.2 Making us proud of our neighbourhoods: Improving the Standard and Range of Affordable Housing.
- 5.3 Giving you Excellent Services and Value for Money: Increasing Value For Money