

## CITY OF PLYMOUTH

**Subject:** Residential Care: Update on Modernisation of Older Peoples' Services 2005-2015

**Committee:** Cabinet

**Date:** 16 November 2010

**Cabinet Member:** Councillor Monahan

**CMT Member:** Director for Community Services

**Author:** Pam Marsden

**Contact:** Tel: 01752 307344  
e-mail: [pamela.marsden@plymouth.gov.uk](mailto:pamela.marsden@plymouth.gov.uk)

**Key Decision:** Yes

**Ref:**

**Part:** 1

---

### Executive Summary:

In accordance with the recommendations within the Cabinet Paper dated 13<sup>th</sup> July 2010 (Appendix 1), this report is to provide feedback to Cabinet in relation to the consultation process that has taken place about short and long stay provision in the City, and the future of Frank Cowl House.

The consultation process took place over a twelve week period. A variety of approaches were adopted to ensure that users, their carers and stakeholders were afforded opportunities to provide feedback.

This report provides a summary of the outcomes of the consultations.

All users of Frank Cowl House were invited, however, only a small number of people chose to attend the consultation events themselves. 80 questionnaires were distributed. A number of individual appointments were also offered.

The small number of service users and families who attended the events expressed a desire for Frank Cowl to remain open.

It was apparent from the feedback received that the concern about the future of Frank Cowl House was intimately connected to the welfare of the 8 long stay residents who live there and who regard Frank Cowl House as their home.

There was limited feedback from short stay residents,

As a result of the feedback key recommendations have been identified in respect of Frank Cowl House, but a new option has also been generated from the process. This will impact on Stirling House. This was not a consideration at the onset of the original consultation but has developed as the consultation has been undertaken.

We are therefore proposing that Frank Cowl House and Stirling House, which are both residential units for older people, no longer offer *new* short-stay arrangements and furthermore do not offer respite to *new* service users. These requirements can be commissioned within the independent sector.

The consultation process also provided an opportunity to ensure that service users and carers were more familiar with the choices available to them and the range of services on offer and to give further reassurance that we would continue to purchase and provide good quality short stay provision.

---

**Corporate Plan 2010-2013 as amended by the four new priorities for the City and Council:**

The four priorities are Delivering Growth, Raising Aspiration, Reducing Inequalities and Value for Communities.

This report links directly to the Council's priorities of reducing inequalities and value for communities.

---

**Implications for Medium Term Financial Plan and Resource Implications:  
Including finance, human, IT and land**

We estimate the full year financial saving from closure will be £480k. However given that closure is delayed we will identify some savings through the proposal detailed below around shared management and staffing arrangements and commissioning future short stay and respite in the independent sector. The exact savings are still to be confirmed.

---

**Other Implications: e.g. Section 17 Community Safety, Health and Safety, Risk Management, Equalities Impact Assessment, etc.**

An Equalities Impact Assessment has been completed and confirmed that a variety of approaches had been adopted to maximise the opportunities to provide feedback. Alternative services will ensure that we continue to purchase good quality short-stay provision but also promote independence and choice e.g. through flexible extra care provision.

---

**Recommendations & Reasons for recommended action:**

1. Frank Cowl House to be de-commissioned as and when all long stay residents have moved from the Unit (as per the Council's policy that no resident would be forced to move)
2. Frank Cowl House and Stirling House are no longer used for new short stay or new respite provision.

---

**Alternative options considered and reasons for recommended action:**

1. Not to de-commission Frank Cowl House.

2. To change the proposed recommendation however maintaining our residential homes without significant future investment will not meet Care Quality Commission (formerly CSCI) minimum standards. Providing alternative short stay and respite arrangements promotes choice and control for individuals.

---

**Background papers:**

Cabinet Paper 29<sup>th</sup> November 2005 (Ref: C 61 05/06) – “Residential Care: Proposals to Modernise Older Peoples’ Services 2005-2015”

Cabinet Paper 13<sup>th</sup> July 2010 – “Residential Care: Update on Modernisation of Older Peoples’ Services 2005-2015”

---

**Sign off:**

Fin	SA/C oSF/ AC10 11 004	Leg	LT 9878	HR	MGI 010/ 001	Corp Prop		IT		Strat Proc	
Originating SMT Member: Pam Marsden											

## **RESIDENTIAL CARE: UPDATE ON MODERNISATION OF OLDER PEOPLES' SERVICES (2005-2015)**

In accordance with the recommendations within the Cabinet Paper dated 13<sup>th</sup> July 2010 (Appendix 1), this report is to provide feedback to Cabinet in relation to the consultation process that has taken place about short and long-stay provision in the City (noting that a new Extra Care scheme is being developed in Devonport), and in particular the future of Frank Cowl House Residential Home.

### **1. BACKGROUND**

1.1. In November 2005 Cabinet agreed the strategic direction for Older Peoples' services which was to increase the development of Extra Care Housing as an alternative choice from traditional services such as residential care, Cabinet also agreed that no long stay resident would be forced to move.

In July 2009 Cabinet received a progress report and agreed to change the use of Frank Cowl House and Stirling House to short stay facilities. At this time, Cabinet also agreed that residents of Frank Cowl House should be offered first choice of the extra care accommodation being developed at Devonport.

On 13<sup>th</sup> July 2010 Cabinet received a further paper updating on the progress that has been made in relation to the modernisation of Older Peoples' Services. Given the development of the Devonport Extra Care facility, and the commitment to offer those residents at Frank Cowl House first choice of accommodation at the new site, Cabinet agreed to consult with users, carers and other stakeholders about the future of residential care services for older people in the city to include consideration of whether to decommission services from Frank Cowl House when it is no longer required to provide services for the current long stay residents.

This report describes the feedback from the consultation events that have taken place and provides options and recommendations taking into account the views of people involved in the consultation processes.

### **1.2. Frank Cowl House**

Frank Cowl House is one of the last three remaining local authority residential homes and currently provides a permanent home to 8 older people and has additional capacity to accommodate 12 people at any one time for short stays e.g. as "step down" from a stay in an acute hospital setting. This is usually as a one-off arrangement in order to enable a short period of recuperation and rehabilitation before returning home.

Frank Cowl House does not provide any planned or regular respite care.

Frank Cowl House itself is an outdated building and as such does not meet current day expectations including a lack of en suite facilities. The Council's strategy in modernising services for older people is to ensure better quality accommodation is offered with flexible support services to meet individual needs.

A new extra care scheme will be opened in the vicinity of Frank Cowl House in January 2011.

As detailed in the July 2010 Cabinet report, the proposals around Frank Cowl House will not directly impact on the amount of overall provision of services within the City, but instead offer a wider range of alternatives such as extra care housing.

## **2. CONSULTATION**

2.1. A 12-week consultation period was initiated following Cabinet's decision. The focus was to gather views on the future of Frank Cowl House and priorities for future service provision.

The methodology encompassed a range of initiatives to gather feedback:

- Consultation events
- Questionnaires
- Feedback through the Council's website
- 1:1 visits
- Advocacy support

### **2.2 Consultation process**

At the start of the consultation process there were 8 permanent residents at Frank Cowl House, 12 older people accessing the short stay beds and 35 staff (with a range of roles including domestic, kitchen, care and management). The age range of permanent residents is predominantly late 80s to early 90s.

The following is a synopsis of the consultation:

- The consultation process started on the 26<sup>th</sup> July and ended on the 19th October in line with best practice guidelines.
- A series of three consultation events were arranged at Welcome Hall Devonport to accommodate up to 25 people per event,
- A webpage link for comments was established and promoted.
- E-mails and letters were sent to key external stakeholders such as older peoples groups, Age Concern, NHS Plymouth and LINKs.

- Letters explaining the consultation were given to the current service users after telephone contact had been made to families to see if they wished to be present.
- In total 80 people received letters and questionnaires to include the 60 people that had used the short stay service over the last 12 months.
- A further 30 questionnaires were placed at Frank Cowl House so that visitors to the unit could respond to the consultation process if they wished to do so.
- Relatives of the permanent residents have been provided opportunities to express their views, with further letters sent during September to offer additional one-to-one meetings with the independent person together with a reminder of the forthcoming end to the consultation period.
- During the consultation an independent person arranged by the Council was present to ensure the consultation process was carried out fairly and took opinions into account and further 1:1 visits at the convenience of families have been offered.
- An advocate from Plymouth Highbury Trust has visited all the Frank Cowl House long stay and short stay residents and recorded their views.
- During September letters, consultation questionnaires, and details of the consultation events were sent to other key stakeholders including Devonport Regeneration Company in order to engage with the wider community and encourage local people to contribute to discussions if they wished.
- A consultation room was established at Frank Cowl House providing displays of the new Devonport Extra Care Scheme plans so that residents and staff could see the details about the new development scheduled to open in January 2011.
- Meetings have been held with staff at Frank Cowl House to provide updates, and arrangements made for those that wished to, to visit an established extra care scheme during September.

### **3. CONSULTATION OUTCOMES**

#### **3.1. Consultation Sessions**

The consultation events were arranged to give families and stakeholders an opportunity to discuss how the potential closure of Frank Cowl House may affect them should such a decision be taken. These events also explored how the Council intended to develop alternative provision to extend the range of options already available to carers.

We arranged 3 events at a local venue on the 10<sup>th</sup>, 13<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> August.

**Event 1:** held on 10<sup>th</sup> August at Welcome Hall Plymouth

At the first event two residents were represented by their families. There was a mixed response from this event in that one family carer felt that the service at Frank Cowl House was not of a good standard and had mixed views about the time their husband stayed at the unit.

The second resident was represented by their family who were very much wanted their relative to remain living at Frank Cowl House but acknowledged that Extra Care Housing would be a good alternative to residential care for some older people.

Council officers were present at this event and included:

- Commissioning manager
- Service Manager
- Independent person and advocate

### **Events 2 and 3**

The final two events arranged for the 13<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> August did not have any attendees.

### **3.2. Written Questionnaires**

Out of 80 questionnaires sent out to the people who had stayed at Frank Cowl House as a one off on a short term basis over the last year 8 have been returned. The returned forms indicate that people who have stayed at Frank Cowl House are generally happy with the service they received. Additional comments collated from the questionnaires include:

- 1 respondent felt that there should be an increase in short stay residential facilities where people can be supported to make a decision about their long term future when they are unable to stay in their own home.
- 1 respondent was unhappy about their stay because of the lack of privacy and outdated facilities.
- 1 respondent felt that there was not enough staff and that he felt his care was rushed.
- 1 respondent thought that there should be permanent places available for people to prevent loneliness and did not support the closure of Frank Cowl House.
- There was praise for the care provided by staff.

Other emerging themes:

- More extra care schemes should be developed to give choice.
- There should be an increase in short stay availability on discharge from hospital to aid recuperation
- There should be an increase in choice of types of care provision, on returning home after hospital.

### **3.3. Website**

The Council's website has been refreshed with a page for people to email their comments as part of the consultation process. All stakeholders were emailed and informed about the consultation and their comments have been taken into account.

### **3.4. 1:1 Visits and contact with families of long stay residents.**

A separate independent person was commissioned to ensure that the consultation was carried out in a fair and transparent way.

All families and relatives were offered a visit at their convenience, including those who were unable to attend the consultation events themselves. The independent person has also provided drop-in sessions at Frank Cowl House for whoever wanted an opportunity to discuss the issues.

The independent person has completed visits to 4 families who had requested such a visit, to gather their feedback. Indications from these families are that they did not want a change to their relative's current arrangements, although they appreciated that the modernisation plans would be a positive step for other older people.

Families and residents were also offered additional support from the manager of Frank Cowl House and from other council officers involved in the consultation processes. This resulted in a number of individual appointments to discuss with carers and service users on a personal basis and gain their views on the future of Frank Cowl House.

### **3.5. 1: 1 Advocacy**

To ensure that all the views from both the long and short stay residents were carefully captured, an advocate was commissioned from Plymouth Highbury Trust to visit and gather their wishes and views. These have been recorded on an individual basis.

Emerging themes from this include:

- Long stay residents all wish to stay at Frank Cowl House and did not want a change to their living arrangements and did not want Frank Cowl House to close
- However 2 people would consider an option of moving to extra care housing if a decision was made to close Frank Cowl House.



### 3.6. Visits to Extra Care Housing

Visits to an established extra care scheme were offered to both long and short stay residents, as well as staff based at Frank Cowl House. The visits were arranged to enable people to view a similar type of accommodation as that proposed at the Devonport site, and the services that are provided in such schemes. Residents have declined such a visit, although some staff visits took place in September.

## 4. KEY ISSUES

A summary of the key questions, themes and issues raised by long stay residents, short stay residents and relatives at the events, through 1:1 meetings and questionnaires is detailed below:

***If Frank Cowl closed the service would be effectively transferring to extra care housing and therefore managed by private organisations how would the council ensure that the quality would be the same ?***

*The council manage independent sector contracts and make sure that their policies and procedures are reviewed. We visit service users to review their care and support and make sure that services are of a good quality.*

***The top priority for older people is the provision of night time care. Would this be available in extra care housing?***

*Extra Care Housing provides people with a care and support team on site 24 hours a day whilst at the same time people have their own front door and a good standards of accommodation .*

***My mother is unable to cook for herself any more and so would she be supported to prepare a meal for herself?***

*Every person in extra care housing has an individual care plan which outlines their needs and if mealtime support is required this would be provided either by a carer to help prepare a meal or help to access the on site restaurant/ dining room if this is their choice.*

***Carers asked whether safety would be ensured in extra care housing and how access into extra care housing schemes will be managed at night time.***

*The care team is on site at night time and will manage the access to the building.*

***How could services be extended so that people could choose alternatives to going into residential care, as some older people would like to stay at home with their carers ?***

*The Council is working with health partners to improve and further develop services to help prevent hospital admission and enable people to return home with appropriate support rather than be admitted to residential care if this is their choice.*

***If a decision is made to close Frank Cowl House would there be enough provision in the independent sector to enable people to have “step down from hospital “to recuperate before going home?***

Yes

***In the residents’ rooms at Frank Cowl there are commodes and there are no en-suite facilities .What would be the refurbishment cost to raise Frank Cowl to the required standard? Is this an option?***

*Rooms at Frank Cowl are not large enough to build en-suite facilities and the building itself is outdated.*

***If Frank Cowl were to close, would there be enough capacity in the independent sector to re provide this service?***

Yes

***What alternatives would there be to Frank Cowl House for the long stay residents if the unit were to close?***

*The council is working closely with extra care housing partners to enable those who want to move into the new Devonport scheme from Frank Cowl House to do so. This will include access to support and care to meet their needs.*

## **5. EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

The Council is required to have proper regard to its obligations under the equality legislation when considering the provision of services and in particular the need to eliminate discrimination and to promote equality of opportunity in relation to the relevant equality duties.

An equality impact assessment has therefore been carried out to assess the impact of the proposals on the Councils ability to meet its duties. The assessment has provided assurance that we have addressed the impact of any changes to those that would be affected by the proposals.

## **6. STAFF CONSULTATION**

Managers have met with the staff employed at Frank Cowl House, Stirling House and Lakeside (and their representatives) and explained the decisions agreed at Cabinet in July 2010 in relation to the consultation proposals.

Staff were encouraged to feedback their views in a number of ways as described above (i.e.Questionnaire, website etc.)

The Unions have also been informed. Clearly at this stage no decision has been taken and therefore the Council is not formally consulting with them about their future employment.

## 7. SUMMARY OUTCOMES OF THE CONSULTATIONS

The small number of service users and families who attended the events expressed a desire for Frank Cowl House to remain open.

It was apparent from the feedback received that the concern about the future of Frank Cowl House was intimately connected to the welfare of the 8 long stay residents who live there who regard Frank Cowl as their home.

There was very limited feedback from short stay residents who have stayed at Frank Cowl House as a one off arrangement via a hospital discharge.

However the consultation processes have provided an opportunity to ensure that service users and carers and families were more familiar with the choices available to them and the range of services on offer.

Listening to the views of the long stay residents it is clear that at this point that they do not wish to move from Frank Cowl House. The recommendation below reflects this view.

However the Council needs to consider how to manage the service in the most cost effective way going forward.

Consultation has been ongoing on this specific issue but at all times management have been aware of the wider picture set against the strategic direction of the service and the need to balance quality care provision with even greater efficiencies rather than just considering the future of Frank Cowl House in isolation.

As a result of this key recommendations have been identified in respect of Frank Cowl House, but a new option has also been generated from the process. This will impact on Stirling House Residential home. This was not a consideration at the onset of the original consultation but has developed as the consultation has been undertaken.

We are therefore proposing that Frank Cowl House and Stirling House, which are both residential units for older people, no longer offer *new* short-stay arrangements and furthermore do not offer respite to *new* service users. These requirements can be commissioned within the independent sector.

If these recommendations are agreed, this will enable us to share management and staff costs across both units and help deliver the efficiencies required, alongside continuing to meet the needs of the current long stay residents at Frank Cowl House and Stirling House without compromising on quality.

Legal advice has confirmed that no further consultation with service users would be necessary as existing users of Stirling House would not be affected.

Staff and Trade Union consultation on any proposed changes would follow existing Plymouth City Council procedures.

## **8. HEALTH AND ADULT SOCIAL CARE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PANEL - TASK & FINISH GROUP – OCTOBER 2010**

The panel confirmed that the consultation process had been extensive and are recommending to Cabinet that the future direction for residential care for older people, are Extra Care Facilities. Furthermore that the facilities within Frank Cowl are outdated and the costs of keeping the building open are unsustainable and not value for money.

## **9. RECOMMENDATIONS**

Taking into account all the relevant factors resulting from the consultation events themselves, together with feedback from the range of consultation processes employed, the recommendations are as follows:

- 9.1 Frank Cowl House Residential Home to be de-commissioned as and when all long stay residents have moved from the Unit (as per the Council's policy that no resident would be forced to move)
- 9.2 Frank Cowl House and Stirling House are no longer used for new short stay or new respite provision.