



Leicester
City Council

Minutes of the Meeting of the
ADULT SOCIAL CARE SCRUTINY COMMISSION

Held: THURSDAY, 11 JULY 2013 at 5.30pm

P R E S E N T :

Councillor Dr. Moore – Chair
Councillor Chaplin – Vice-Chair

Councillor Alfonso
Councillor Fonseca

Councillor Joshi
Councillor Sangster (representing
Health and Wellbeing Scrutiny
Commission)

Also in Attendance

Councillor Rita Patel – Assistant City Mayor (Adult Social Care)

* * * * *

19. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillors Cleaver and Cooke (Health and Wellbeing Scrutiny Commission) and Councillor Willmott.

20. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Chaplin disclosed an Other Disclosable Interest as she had spoken with Rinku Chandarana, a family member of a resident at Herrick Lodge, one of the elderly persons homes to be discussed on the Agenda.

Councillor Joshi disclosed an Other Disclosable Interest as his wife worked within the Reablement Team within Adult Social Care at the City Council.

21. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

RESOLVED:

- i) that the minutes of the meeting of the Adult Social Care Scrutiny Commission held on 13th June 2013, as previously circulated, be agreed as a correct record.
- ii) that the minutes of the Special meeting of the Adult Social Care Scrutiny Commission held on 1st July 2013, as previously circulated, be agreed as a correct record, subject to the following additional paragraph being immediately prior to the last paragraph of the minutes: -

“That the Chair, Vice-Chair of the Adult Social Care Scrutiny Commission work with the Assistant City Mayor (Adult Social Care) and officers to develop a fully costed alternative to the current proposals based on keeping all 8 homes open and looking at options for reconfiguring them so that as well as providing residential care they can also meet the needs of residents with dementia and other health issues, intermediate care, respite care and to look at how, through joint commissioning, the Council can, with the NHS, provide healthcare in its residential homes.”

22. PETITIONS

- i) Petition against the proposed closure of Council run Care Homes in Leicester

The Scrutiny Commission noted that a petition in the following terms and signed by 596 people, had been submitted by Mr P. Bromiley to the City Council on 2nd July 2013. Mr Bromiley attended the meeting.

“This petition is being submitted by family, friends and a wider public who wish to protest against the proposed closure of Council Care Homes. The signees wish to inform the Council that they want the Homes to stay open. The request is that it be referred to the Special Scrutiny Commission Meeting on 11th July 2013.”

- ii) Save Herrick Lodge Elderly Persons' Home

The following petition, with 1470 names of people living or working in Leicester, was presented by Miss Rinku Chandarana in the following terms: -

“Herrick Lodge – a multicultural care home fit for the next UK City of Culture. The people of Leicester City need culturally appropriate services in a culturally diverse City.

Herrick Lodge is a Leicester City Council run Multicultural Elderly Persons' Home. The home is located near the Peepul Centre in Belgrave Leicester. The home provides excellent high quality long term, short term (e.g. when discharged from hospital) and respite care to the elderly people of Leicester. Most importantly the service supports people with diverse cultural needs i.e. provision of culturally appropriate food, staff that are able to communicate with service users in a language that they can understand etc.

Sadly Herrick Lodge is under threat of closure. Please sign this petition to save Herrick Lodge Elderly Persons' Home from closure and protect this excellent and linguistically appropriate service for the elderly people of Leicester. Thank you.

We the undersigned petition Leicester City Council not to close Herrick Lodge Elderly Persons' Home."

RESOLVED:

that the petition be noted and processed in accordance with City Council procedures.

23. QUESTIONS, REPRESENTATIONS, STATEMENTS OF CASE

The Scrutiny Commission received the following questions in accordance with Council procedures: -

i) Top Up fees

Mrs Bromiley asked the following question: -

"What is the current position around 'top up' fees and what was going to happen."

The Assistant City Mayor responded by stating that a decision by the Executive was not expected until mid-August and that information would be gathered and forwarded to the questioner.

ii) Closure of Care Homes

Miss Haines asked the following question: -

"Have the City Council looked at all options, other than the closure of care homes in Leicester and, if so, what are those options."

Officers responded by stating that several option had been considered, namely:-

- No change – did not address falling numbers of residents and costs
- Closing all of the homes – move people into private sector
- Sell or lease all homes as a going concern

- Close some of the homes and sell others as a going concern.

Miss Haines questioned whether consideration had been given to whether, the homes that had been identified to be closed, and were under-utilised, whether the option of say amalgamating into one home and closing the other two. Residents could now end up in homes further away from their preferred area.

Officers stated that this had been considered but stated that under the Care Directive the City Council were required to give residents a choice of where they wanted to live. Officers had mapped elderly person home provision and know that, should the Council have to move residents, they will remain close to their chosen area.

At this point of meeting the Chair outlined the procedure to be followed at the meeting and introduced the members of the Health and Wellbeing Scrutiny Commission present at the meeting, Councillors Sangster and Chaplin (also Vice-Chair of Adult Social Care Scrutiny Commission).

24. ELDERLY PERSONS HOMES PROPOSALS

The Scrutiny Commission were informed that Officers had responded to the questions asked at the Special meeting of the Scrutiny Commission held on 1st July 2013, and this report was circulated prior to the meeting.

Family members of residents of elderly persons' homes were also present at the meeting and were given an opportunity to speak at the appropriate part of the meeting.

Members were informed that, following this meeting, a report would be prepared setting out the findings of the Scrutiny Commission to be fed into the consultation process. Following further discussion it was suggested, and agreed that, due to the complex nature of the information gathered from a wide range of sources that a further meeting of the Scrutiny Commission be arranged to finalise the full findings.

At this point the Scrutiny Commission gave detailed consideration to the responses prepared by officers to the questions asked at the last meeting and further questions were asked, summarised as follows: -

1. What are we going to do to ensure long term care of the elderly?

Members were informed that the predicted rise in aging population had been factored into predictions for elderly care up until 2030

Members were informed that contact had been made with Hampshire County Council around their partnership working and the provision of nursing care within their elderly persons care homes. Further information was awaited and would be fed into the Scrutiny Commission feedback report.

2. The cost of care for Leicester City Council now?

Members noted the comparisons of costs of In House Elderly persons Homes and the Independent provision and were informed that staff within City Council homes were paid at, or above the National Minimum Wage, whereas in the Independent Sector were more likely to be paid at the National Minimum Wage.

3. If numbers are falling, why is this? We need better data on this.

Members note the various reasons for the reduction of numbers and were informed that the City Council were not able to actively market their facilities and were only able to give potential residents a choice of what facilities were available across the City and it was then a matter of choice.

4. Will members of the Executive be visiting the city care homes?

Members of the Scrutiny Commission expressed a view that it was important for members of the Executive to re-visit care homes to gain an understanding of the feelings of residents/family members /staff.

5. Instead of the cost of 1 x 60 bed purpose built facility, what would be the cost of adapting 4 homes?

Members of the Scrutiny Commission considered in detail the information set out in the response by officers and the NHS around the issues relating to the provision of intermediate care in 4 units, alongside other short term care and permanent residents.

At this point in the meeting members of the public present were invited to address the Scrutiny Commission: -

i) Philip Parkinson – Interim Chair – Healthwatch Leicester

Stated that in his opinion the Council and the Scrutiny Commission faced a dilemma. The City Council had a tradition of providing high quality care.

It was clear that existing residents/carers do not want any change at all and did not want homes to be handed over.

Residents/Relatives at Nuffield House did not want to be moved elsewhere.

Real challenge for next generations who might have much higher expectations and involve investment.

Real concerns if homes were handed over, standards would slip.

Real challenges would have to be faced with funding levels cut by the Government and one of the options on the table would have to be followed.

ii) **Member of the public**
Can't mix profit and care.

Been told that a block had been put on people coming into City Council homes and this had meant numbers had diminished.

Concerns over people choosing to go elsewhere, they did not have a choice and a lot of private sector homes were not of a good quality.

The Assistant City Mayor responded by stating that she had asked on previous occasions about whether people were being put off coming to council homes and had been told that this was not the case. An offer to fully investigate these claims had been given subject to information being forthcoming, no such information had come forward. The assistant City mayor-reiterated her promise to investigate allegations but stated that evidence was required.

iii) **Cynthia Bromiley**

Stated that relative was resident in Nuffield House and since threat of closure had been announced by the City Council her condition had deteriorated. Enquiries had been made of homes in the private sector and the outcomes had not been helpful with the potential need for top up fees should her mother move and require care above her current banded rate.

Officers responded by stating that they paid for care in private sector on banded rates, dependant on need. If level of care moved into the next band then the Council would pay but this would be assessed on an individual basis.

Assurances were given that, should residents of council elderly homes that were to close need to be moved out every effort would be made to ensure that they, and family members, were taken to look at other homes and that any move would be assisted and all possible support given.

iv) **Rinku Chandarana**

Relative of resident at Herrick Lodge.

Produced documentary evidence contrary to evidence previously referred to that council elderly persons homes were asked not to take residents.

Copies of the extracts of the report referred to were copied and made available to members and officers and the Chair stated that this information would be accepted as evidence.

In concluding it was agreed that a further Special meeting of the Scrutiny

Commission should be arranged during the week commencing 5th August, in view of the extra information still required and that a request be made to the Executive to put back the decision date to allow time for the Scrutiny Commission to formulate comprehensive recommendations and allow the Executive to fully consider all of the necessary detail available. The Chair and Vice- Chair would consult on a suitable date for the Special meeting.

The Scrutiny Commission drew together the following list of questions for officers in response to their report arising from the 1st July 2013 meeting: -

Will members of the Executive be visiting the city care homes

- Commission felt it important that Executive members should re-visit city care homes to gain an understanding of the feelings of residents/family members/staff.

Instead of cost of 1x60 bed purpose built facility etc.

Staffing

- Clarification sought as to the meaning of 'Hours Absorbed' (page 15, last para)
- Identify what tasks were not done as a result of staff 'absorbing' other tasks
- Were costs of agency staff included in the total costs for each Unit and would they have an impact on the costs of the respective Unit and therefore skew the comparison figures given.
- How much of the comparison figures quoted were the cost of agency staff and how much was paid to agency staff in the figures quoted on pages 6/7 compared to our own staff
- Outcome of Councillor Patel's investigation into reasons why people are selecting private sector homes compared to city council facilities
- Service Delivery Model (page 12) 2nd bullet point not clear and requires further explanation

Intermediate Care Building

- More information required on precise location of proposed building and indication of what the building would look like (is it wards etc.)
- Where would funding be sourced, what if funding could not be sourced
- How long would building take to construct

Service Delivery Model

- Separate Staffing Teams, is it cost effective

- Page 14, 3rd Bullet Point – question whether this was just a training issue
- Definitions required on respite/intermediate/nursing care
- We could offer similar facilities over 4 current sites, with structural changes, but at what cost
- Economies of Scale – more comprehensive figures required for accurate comparison and assess the longer term viability of facility

Other Information

- Information awaited from Hampshire CC around the nursing care provided in the Elderly Persons Homes
- Information tabled by Rinku Chandarana – source of report requested.

25. ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS

There were no items of urgent business.

26. CLOSE OF MEETING

The Chair closed the meeting at 9.17pm.