

Report title: School Road
Wards affected: Brislington East
Strategic Director: John Readman
Report Author: Sheena Huggins

RECOMMENDATION

That following the outcome of the Full Council Budget Setting meeting on the 18th February 2014, and having considered the individual assessments of the service users and alternative provision proposed, Cabinet agrees that respite services currently delivered at School Road Respite Unit (School Road) should end on the 1st April 2015.

Key background / detail:

Purpose of Report

1. The purpose of this report is to update Cabinet on actions taken following consultation regarding the potential closure of School Road. This report also outlines information to enable Cabinet to make a decision whether to cease provision of respite services at School Road Respite Unit.
2. School Road is a 7 bedded respite unit situated in Brislington, South Bristol. It is owned and operated by Bristol City Council. School Road opened in 2003 to provide respite and short breaks for Adults with learning disabilities that did not require nursing care.
3. The standard charge per bed per week for School Road is £1,731.09 which amounts to £630k per annum to run the service.
4. The number of referrals and service users utilising the service has decreased. Younger people moving from Children's and Transition Services are seeking more alternative, personalised and flexible ways to ensure that they and their families enjoy a respite or short break. These include holidays, Shared Lives and Direct Payments, which offer maximum choice and control to individuals.
5. As part of the 2014/2015 Council budget process a proposal was made to close the provision at School Road and to re-provide the services offered in different ways. This would deliver savings of £290k.
6. The primary reason for delaying the reallocation of School Road funding was to enable Social Workers to work with Service Users and their families to undertake assessments of need prior to co-producing new support plans and considering alternate respite care arrangements. It is recognised and appreciated that many families have used School Road for respite for some years. They are confident in the staff and the environment and consider that things should remain unchanged for the people that they care for.

7. For some families and service users, change is welcomed as an opportunity, but for some change of this nature can be difficult. Some service users and their families are very concerned about suitability, quality and amount of alternative services and transport to alternative services and the impact of change on their loved ones and their families.. Officers have provided significant support, via a dedicated team of Social Workers, working directly with the service users and families.
8. There has been comprehensive engagement with service users and families and the basis for the recommendation to close School Road has been widely shared.
9. An Equality Impact Assessment has been completed, which sets out how we will mitigate any impact resulting from a change in respite provision.
10. At the Full Council on 18th February 2014, the Mayor said of the proposal in the 2014/15 budget consultation to close School Road, that he had "delayed the savings so that there is time for officers to work closely with everyone to understand their individual situations and possible solutions" The Major went on to add that he will want reassurance that "real workable alternatives are in place before any savings are made" This report sets out the work undertaken by officers as instructed by the Mayor and notes that individual service users of School Road have been offered personalised and comprehensive assessments of need. Following these assessments, officers are now in a position to report that real workable alternatives are in place.

**BRISTOL CITY COUNCIL
CABINET
3 February 2015**

REPORT TITLE: SCHOOL ROAD

Ward(s) - Brislington East

Strategic Director: John Readman – Strategic Director

Report author: Sheena Huggins – Service Manager

**Contact telephone no. 0117 9021568/07585307357
& e-mail address: sheena.huggins@bristol.gov.uk**

RECOMMENDATION for the Cabinet approval:

RECOMMENDATION:

That following the outcome of the Full Council Budget Setting meeting on the 18th February 2014, and having considered the individual assessments of the service users and alternative provision proposed, Cabinet agrees that respite services currently delivered at School Road Respite Unit (School Road) should end on the 1st April 2015.

Purpose of Report

1. The purpose of this report is to update Cabinet on actions taken following consultation regarding the potential closure of School Road. This report also outlines information to enable Cabinet to make a decision whether to cease provision of respite services at School Road Respite Unit.
2. Respite, (which can also sometimes be referred to as short breaks) are preventative in nature and provide support services that enable service users to have a break from their parent or carer. They also may provide the opportunity for a carer to have an often much needed break from their caring responsibilities. Respite can range in length from as short as a day, to overnight, to even a two week holiday break, depending on the needs of the service user. Respite care can be, and is, delivered in many different ways; sometimes in the home, in shared lives schemes, in building based services or via a Direct Payment. In order to access council funded respite care a social work assessment is required. A respite break can be planned or unplanned in the event of an unexpected event or emergency.
3. School Road is a 7 bedded respite unit situated in Brislington, South Bristol. It is owned and operated by Bristol City Council. School Road opened in 2003 to provide respite and short breaks for Adults with learning disabilities that did not require

nursing care.

4. The standard charge per bed per week for School Road is £1,731.09 which amounts to £630k per annum to run the service.
5. The services delivered at School Road are usually planned. The building has one bedroom accessible to people with physical disabilities. Any extension, lift installation or adaptation is simply not viable in this building.
6. The number of referrals and service users utilising the service has decreased over the last 10 years since opening, from over 100 service users to 52 regular service users currently. The current average age of Service Users accessing this service is 45 years old. Younger people moving from Children's and Transition Services are seeking more alternative, personalised and flexible ways to ensure that they and their families enjoy a respite or short break. These include holidays, Shared Lives and Direct Payments, which offer maximum choice and control to individuals. A number of service users have also chosen to have their needs met by independent sector providers. It is also important to note that only 7 new service users have accessed this service since 2009, meaning that the referral rate to the service is significantly low and reducing.
7. As part of the 2014/2015 Council budget process a proposal was made to close the provision at School Road and to re-provide the services offered in different ways. This would deliver savings of £290k. Following consultation and having listened to the concerns of carers, a decision was made at the Full Council Budget setting meeting on the 18th February 2014 to review the proposal once all service user assessments had been completed and suitable alternative provision could be identified.
8. The primary reason for delaying the reallocation of School Road funding was to enable Social Workers to work with Service Users and their families to undertake assessments of need prior to co-producing new support plans and considering alternate respite care arrangements. It is recognised and appreciated that many families have used School Road for respite for some years. They are confident in the staff and the environment and consider that things should remain unchanged for the people that they care for.
9. Officers have provided significant support, via a dedicated team of Social Workers, working directly with the service users and families to discuss alternative options if School Road closes. This has been via a programme of meetings, newsletters, and offers to families and service users to visit alternative services across the City. Officers have responded to a significant number of letters and enquiries about the proposal to close School Road and also have independently funded a worker within the Carer's Centre, who has provided support to carers both individually and as a group.
10. At the Full Council on 18th February 2014, the Mayor said of the proposal in the 2014/15 budget consultation to close School Road, that he had "delayed the savings so that there is time for officers to work closely with everyone to understand their individual situations and possible solutions" The Major went on to add that he will want reassurance that "real workable alternatives are in place before any savings are made" This report sets out the work undertaken by officers as instructed by the

Mayor and notes that individual service users of School Road have been offered personalised and comprehensive assessments of need. Following these assessments, officers are now in a position to report that real workable alternatives are in place.

11. 63 service users have been assessed, 49 carers have been offered a carer's assessment. There are 10 providers based in the Bristol area with sufficient capacity to meet the needs of service users and families who are eligible for a respite service. Appendix 1 shows a high level breakdown of the service users and alternative provision. Each of the alternative providers are registered with the Care Quality Commission, are subject to accreditation by the Council and must comply with the joint Bristol Quality Assurance Framework as a condition of providing services to disabled people.
12. There has been comprehensive engagement with service users and families and the basis for the recommendation to close School Road has been widely shared.
13. Other key messages are:
 - The building at School Road is not fit for purpose; it is not fully accessible to disabled people and does not lend itself to adaptation.
 - The vast majority of respite breaks are provided outside of School Road via other providers or in other ways.
 - The recommended closure reflects the national agenda of Towards Excellence in Adult Social Care, improving service users and carer's flexibility, choice and control over their respite breaks. (http://www.local.gov.uk/media-centre/-/journal_content/56/10180/3374265/NEWS)
 - Demand for this service has reduced over the past 5 years with only 7 new service users accessing and utilising this service since 2009.
 - Children and young adults moving through the transitions team are choosing alternate forms of respite/short break options, including the use of direct payments.
 - Comparable and other forms of respite / short breaks are less expensive
 - Re-providing services elsewhere for the existing service users and their families would deliver better value for money and save £290k per annum.

Consultation and Scrutiny Input:

These proposals were presented to People Scrutiny Commission on 19 January 2015. The Commission made the following comments:

The Commission Members were sympathetic to concerns highlighted by service users and families regarding the close of School Road.

The Commission received information regarding the range of options available to provide respite care, which includes Shared Lives. Members are satisfied that appropriate consultation has taken place and were re-assured that Social Workers

have been working with Service Users and their families to undertake assessments of need prior to co-ordinating new support plans and considering alternative respite care arrangements.

a. Internal consultation:

14. There has been full and transparent consultation with staff and their union representatives throughout the period. School Road has been a standing item at Sub Joint Consultative Committees which meet twice monthly to allow consultation and to raise any issues as they arise.
15. In addition to general briefings regarding arrangements for the staff at School Road, we have provided bi-monthly updates to staff that require re-deployment and ensure that union representatives are informed of the role of School Road staff within the assessment process, support to carers and transitional arrangements.
16. At the time of writing, only one member of staff would require redeployment within the council should the decision be taken to close the unit. Some staff have chosen to move on to employment within other departments within the council prior to the decision being made. As part of the wider restructure within the council, staff at School Road were offered the opportunity to take voluntary severance, this ensured equity with all staff in grades BG 1 - 9 across the council who were able to submit a request. Should the unit remain open beyond March 2015, staff would be backfilled by redeployed staff with the appropriate skills from other areas of the council.
17. In addition to the above briefings to union representatives, a number of staff meetings (in addition to routine staff meetings) have been held. The aim of these meetings has been to:
 - Seek the views of staff to feed into the process
 - Keep staff up to date
 - Provide an update on the progress of the service user assessments
 - Update on the process towards a final decision
 - Provide an opportunity for staff to ask questions and to gain advice from BCC Human Resources department.
18. Minutes of staff meetings were taken, minutes have been displayed and are made available to staff. All staff have attended 1:1 meetings with a Manager and a member of our human resources department to discuss individual circumstances.

b. External Consultation

19. The consultation to close School Road was undertaken as part of the budget setting process for the 2014/2015 budget setting process. Since that time, we have held 4 dedicated consultation meetings for service users and Carers. Attendance of service users and carers at these meetings has not been consistent and has varied from between 7 to 18 carers and family members across the 4 events.
20. The aim of the meetings has been to:
 - Seek the views of service users and carers to feed into the process
 - Keep carers up to date
 - Provide an update on the assessment process/assessments
 - Update on the process towards a final decision

- Provide an opportunity for service users/carers to ask questions
 - Meet alternative providers.
21. Throughout the consultation meetings officers have outlined the rationale for the proposal, including the national drivers to improve service user's choice and control over services they receive. A number of independent providers have attended the consultation meetings and have been able to clarify aspects of their services, including emergency arrangements, transport and activities that take place within their service provision.
 22. Officers have encouraged service users and carers to look at alternate respite provision, and this is why providers have been invited to consultation events and a specific 'Provider event' was held, which was tailored for families to meet providers of alternate respite provision. However, a relatively small number of families have deferred making a decision about booking respite in the future, hopeful that services at School Road will continue. Officers have encouraged families to book breaks as usual with new providers.
 23. In addition to the above events, newsletters have been sent out to all service users to ensure they receive up to date and accurate information.
 24. Concerns raised by carers have included the following:
 - Safeguarding,
 - Isolation from their friends who currently attend the unit with them,
 - The quality of independent provision
 - Emergency provision.
 25. In response to concerns and queries raised by service users and carers the following responses and alternative options have been outlined:
 26. **Investment** - During each consultation meeting with service users and carers, officers have explained the financial impact of fewer referrals to the service, which has resulted in a drop in occupancy at the unit. There has also been discussion as to why amendments (such as a lift and an extension) would not be financially viable.
 27. **Shared Lives** - Officers have clarified that all service users will receive an assessment of their needs, which will set out how their individual needs can be met. In respect of Shared Lives, officers have also explained that this service is not for everyone and that the assessment will inform the type of respite that is required, there has not an expectation that a large number of service users will move to this service.
 28. **Safeguarding/Quality of provision** – All independent providers are required to meet the same standard of Care Quality Commission (CQC) regulations as Bristol City Council provision delivered at School Road. All reports relating to inspections are public and can be located via CQC web pages. Additionally, all providers with whom the Council contract are subject to Council Quality Assurance and a accreditation processes.
 29. **Isolation** – There has been discussion with service users and carers regarding how we aim to minimise isolation and to accommodate emergency provision. This is further explored in the Equality Impact Assessment. This assessment also notes the

requirement to review the market provision for service users who will move into adult provision in the future.

30. The ability of carers to book School Road beyond December 2014 for respite has obviously caused some considerable anxieties. The Council has clarified that we will look at each individual case and bookings will be honoured where no alternative provision has been identified if the decision to close School Road is made.
31. Feedback has been consistent, with service users and carers advising that they do not wish the unit to close and would like the service to continue in its present form.
32. An online petition was submitted to keep open School Road and currently has 551 signatures.

Other options considered:

33. The building at School Road is not fit for purpose; it is not fully accessible to disabled people and does not lend itself to adaptation.
34. Some independent providers have viewed the property, but did not wish to purchase the building from the council due to its restrictions as outlined in the point above.

Risk management / assessment

Public Sector Equalities Duties

35. Summary of EqIA for School Road - The Equality Impact Assessment identifies that the assessment of need might reduce the allocation of some service users and carers. However, through the assessment process it is also possible that allocation may increase. Should an individual's allocation change they will be entitled to a review.

For service users that coordinate stays at School Road when specific friends are there, we will request new providers facilitate this wherever possible as well as promoting safe social networking and venues for meeting within the community.

Some service users can find change difficult. To support them Care Management staff will work closely with the staff at School Road. Taster sessions and overnight stays will be supported by School Road staff wherever possible.

For carers the potential changes may result in anxiety/distress or impact on employment if changes to patterns of respite occur. We will work with School Road and the Carer's Support Centre to provide information, advice and support to minimise any anxiety. Carer's assessments will take into account the health and wellbeing, finance, employment and the needs of the carer required to continue in their supporting role.

If there are changes in travel arrangements, Care Management will discuss with the provider to ensure service users can access respite in an appropriate way.

The full Equalities Impact Assessment can be found at Appendix 2

Eco impact assessment

36. The significant impacts of this proposal are that there would be a reduction in energy usage for heating and lighting. Also a reduction in travel in the city and it's associated impacts of air pollution, co2 emissions and noise.
37. The proposals include the following measures to mitigate the impacts: Guardians to be briefed to use only required reduced heating and lighting.
38. The net effects of the proposals are that if the unit closes there would be a small environmental benefit through reduced energy usage and travel. See Appendix 2.1 – ECO Impact Assessment

Date: 18th November 2014

Name: Claire Craner-Buckley
Energy Service Place Directorate
Verified: Steve Ransom

Resources and legal implications

Finance

Financial (revenue) implications

39. Should School Road close, there is a potential saving of £290k, subject to the completion of reassessments of the needs of existing service users and the provision of appropriate alternative services being in place.

Peter Gillett, Service Director Finance Date: 4th November 2014

B Finance (capital Implications)

40. There are no capital costs related to the proposed closure of School Road. However, the closure of the building will release an asset that will be available for sale or re-use.

Janet Ditte - Service Manager (Finance) Date: 6th January 2015

C Legal implications

41. The local authority may lawfully take a decision which results in the closure of a respite care facility and the re provision of respite services provided that the decision maker has before him all relevant information and takes into consideration and pays due regard to, the outcomes of the consultation, the equalities implications of the decision, the updated assessments in relation to each service user and carer and the relevant human rights issues that are engaged.
42. In order to be lawful consultation must have been carried out a formative stage i.e. when the mind of the decision maker is still open to change and can be influenced by the responses to the consultation which are included in the report. The information provided to the consultees must enable them to give informed consideration to the proposal and they should have an adequate response time. The School Road service

users and carers must have been consulted with in a way that was fair, effective and appropriate taking into account their particular characteristics. The decision maker must conscientiously consider the outcomes of the consultation in making the decision.

43. The public sector equality duty (Equality Act 2010 section 149) is set out in the report and an Equalities Impact Assessment has been completed. The information provided, including the assessment, the consultation responses and summary of the service user and carer assessments must be detailed enough to enable the decision maker to comply with the duty to have due regard to the need to achieve the identified goals. If a risk of an adverse impact is identified consideration should be given to measures to avoid or mitigate the impact before a decision is made. The duty must be exercised in substance, with rigour and an open mind.
44. The School Road service users have assessed needs for the provision of respite care. The local authority has a duty to meet the assessed eligible needs of the service users. It is however entitled to change how it meets those needs as long as they continue to be met. How it is proposed the needs will be met if School Road was to close is set out in Appendix 3. The local authority has a duty to carry out assessments of carers needs. After 1st April 2015, it will also have a duty to meet carers assessed eligible needs. How it is proposed these needs will be met if School Road was to close has been considered carefully and is being monitored.
45. Article 8 of the European Convention of Human Rights convention provides that everyone has the right to respect of their family and private life. However Article 8 rights are not absolute an interference in private life can be justified by public interest considerations including economic and resource factors. The decision maker needs to carry out a balancing exercise with the service users/carers rights on one side and the factors relevant to the wider public interest on the other. The greater the degree of disruption to the service users/carers private life and social contacts the stronger the countervailing public interest considerations need to be before the balance falls in favour of re provision of the service.

Sarah Sharland Senior Solicitor Date: 9th December 2014

D Land / property implications

The land and buildings at School Road are held freehold by the City Council. Sale or reallocation for alternative service provision will be determined in accordance with the operation of the Council's Corporate Land Policy. There is a presumption that all surplus public assets will be sold for the best price reasonably obtainable.

Advice given by Steve Matthews, Service Manager (Property Strategy)

Date 18 January 2015

E Human Resources implications

46. There are 19 staff employed at School Road. In the event of closure, a variety of

arrangements are in place for these staff including Voluntary Severance (VS) as part of the organisational restructure, redeployment etc.

47. If School Road remains open then we will look to redeploy other care staff from services into the vacancies left behind by those going on VS.
48. There has been full and transparent consultation with staff and their union representatives, throughout this period as well as the consultation meetings held at appendix 4, we have had it as a standing item at our Sub JCCs, which meets twice monthly, to allow open consultation and raise any issues as they arise.

Lorna Laing, People Business Partner Date: 11 December 2014

Risk management / assessment:

FIGURE 1

The risks associated with the implementation of the (subject) decision :

No.	RISK Threat to achievement of the key objectives of the report	INHERENT RISK		RISK CONTROL MEASURES Mitigation (i.e. controls) and Evaluation (i.e. effectiveness of	CURRENT RISK (After controls)		RISK OWNER
		(Before controls)			Impact	Probability	
		Impact	Probability				
1	Risk of insufficient capacity in the market to meet the needs of service users at School Road.	High	Medium	Market intelligence has shown at the time of report, 614 nights per annum available in the market.	Medium	Low	People Directorate DLT
2.	Risk of insufficient beds in the case of a respite bed being required in an emergency	High	Medium	We will continue to work with new providers to include additional emergency beds. Existing provider does provide an emergency bed.	Medium	Medium	People Directorate DLT

FIGURE 2

The risks associated with not implementing the (subject) decision:

No.	RISK Threat to achievement of the key objectives of the report	INHERENT RISK		RISK CONTROL MEASURES Mitigation (i.e. controls) and Evaluation (i.e. effectiveness of	CURRENT RISK (After controls)		RISK OWNER
		(Before controls)			Impact	Probability	
		Impact	Probability				
1	Risk of delay in decision, resulting in £290K savings not being met	High	Medium	Assessments have been undertaken with all service users, alternate provision has been offered, including Direct Payments and Shared Lives	High	Medium	People Directorate DLT
2	Staff would need to be redeployed from other services to maintain the service and meet CQC standards/regulations	High	Medium	Staff would be redeployed from other areas of the service. Agency staff could be utilised while further recruitment is undertaken	Medium	Low	People Directorate DLT

Public sector equality duties:

Before making a decision, section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 requires that each decision-maker considers the need to promote equality for persons with the following “protected characteristics”: age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex, sexual orientation. Each decision-maker must, therefore, have due regard to the need to:

i) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct prohibited under the Equality Act 2010.

ii) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and those do not share it. This involves having due regard, in particular, to the need to:

- remove or minimise disadvantage suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic.

- take steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of people who do not share it (in relation to disabled people, this includes, in particular, steps to take account of disabled persons' disabilities);

- encourage persons who share a protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low.

iii) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected

characteristic and those who do not share it. This involves having due regard, in particular, to the need to tackle prejudice and promote understanding.

Appendices:

Appendix 1: Current activity

Appendix 2: Equalities Impact Assessment

Appendix 2.1: ECO Impact Assessment

Appendix 3: Information concerning outcomes of Assessments

Appendix 4: Service user and carer communication events

Appendix 5: Case Studies

Appendix 1

Current Activity

At the start of this proposal there were 63 service users at School Road, 52 of whom use the service on a regular basis. The average age of service users is 45 years old and the person who has used the service longest has been attending since it opened in 2003. The average length of attendance is six years. The average usage is 39 nights per year. In terms of support needs, 20% service users have high dependency, 30% medium and 50% low dependency.

Respite Provision in the Market

At the time of writing this report, all of the service users have been assessed and the outcomes of those assessments are known. 12 service users have yet to decide on their preferred option, with 444 nights to be allocated. We are confident that there is sufficient capacity within the independent sector to accommodate in excess of the nights required by service users.

On the 16th December 2014, capacity within the market stood at 614 nights per annum. It should be noted, that whilst all of the service users have been assessed, 12 service users have not yet chosen their preferred option. We believe that there is capacity within the market to meet the needs of people within School Road elsewhere.

Alternative service providers, in the same way as School Road, will endeavour to offer a regular pattern of respite breaks if that is what suits the service users and their carer. Where possible this will be consistent with the existing pattern, but again, as with School Road it cannot be guaranteed or that an existing pattern of bookings could be entirely replicated.

Assessments to date appear to reflect that the majority of service users appear to prefer buildings based respite. However an additional option for service users is the choice to be supported on a holiday via an independent provider, in addition to the options of Shared Lives and Direct Payments.

Placement Costs:

The standard charge per bed per week for School Road is £1,731.09 which amounts to £630k per annum.

Demand:

The demand for this service has diminished over the past 5 years with only 7 new service users accessing this service since 2009. The majority of service users going through transitions are choosing other forms of respite, including, Direct Payments.

Appendix 2 – EQIA

Bristol City Council Equality Impact Assessment Form

(Please refer to the Equality Impact Assessment guidance when completing this form)

Name of proposal	School Road
Directorate and Service Area	H&SC – Care Services
Name of Lead Officer	Sheena Huggins

1.1 What is the proposal?

Review the use of School Road, a respite facility for 7 people with learning difficulties with a view to commissioning more flexible respite in other places, including alternate provision such as Shared Lives and Direct Payments which offer the Service user greater choice and control.

2.1 What data or evidence is there which tells us who is, or could be affected?

Service Users

- School Road presently provides 7 beds offering respite/short breaks to 62 people with a learning difficulty (one service user has passed away), total service users assessed 63).
- Individuals' pattern of usage varies from a 1 night stay, a weekend to a week or 2 week stay with the average annual usage being 39 nights per year.
- The average length of time individuals have used this service is 6 years with the longest usage by one person being 11 years.
- The oldest service user is 66 years old and the average age of individuals is 45 years old.
- Support needs – of the 52 individuals who utilise the service on a **regular** basis, the support needs are as follows
20% Service users have a high dependency
30% Medium dependency
50% Low dependency

Protected Characteristics for Service users attending School Road

School Rd – **62 Service users** :

Gender	Female	Male
	27	35

Age	18 – 25	26-35	36-45	46-55	56-65	66 -75	76-85	86 over
	9	8	13	18	13	1		

Disability	Learning Disability	Physical Disability	Visual impairment	Hearing		
	62	4	2	1		

*service users may have more than one disability, additional disabilities captured above.(Eg Service user may have a learning disability and visual impairment).

Ethnicity	White/British	Dual Heritage White/African Caribbean	Black African Caribbean	Asian/British/Pakistani	Vietnamese
	58	1	1	1	1

Religion	C of E	Catholic	Roman Catholic	Muslim	Jehovah's Witness	Baptist	Pentecostal	None stated
	14	4	1	1	1	1	1	39

Sexual preference	Don't know/Not sure	Would prefer not to say	Heterosexual	
	23	14	25	

Families and Informal Carers

- Families and Informal Carers rely on respite in order to maintain caring role.
- The age of Carers varies between 26 and 85.
- The average respite allocation is 39 nights per year

2.2 Protected Characteristics of Carers

Gender	Female	Male
	15	3

Age	18 - 25	26-35	36-45	46-55	56-65	66 -75	76-85	86 over
	0	1	3	1	1	5	3	0

Ethnicity	White/British	Dual Heritage White/African Caribbean	Black African Caribbean/British	Asian/British/Pakistani
	16	0	1	1

Religion	C of E	Catholic	Muslim	None stated
	8	1	1	8

2.3 How have we involved, or will we involve, communities and groups that could be affected?

- There has been comprehensive engagement with service users and families with key messages given in communications. These include the fact that the decision will be made at Cabinet on the 3rd February 2015 and the basis for

the recommendation to close School Road has not changed. This is person led and changes will only happen following a detailed and personalised assessment.

- Carers have been offered an assessment to inform their individual support needs to allow them to continue in their caring role.

3.1 Does the proposal have any potentially adverse impacts on people with protected characteristics?

Potential significant negative impact on service users:

- If the individual enjoys the level/amount of respite they presently receive, they may be disappointed if a reassessment reduces their individual budget entitlement and therefore, for example, gives them less funding and a lower number of days/nights respite. A reduction in service could result where a service user's previous respite allocation has not been taken. In 5 cases respite has not been required.
- A number of service users have their booking coordinated by their carers so that they stay at School Road when specific friends are there. Future alternative respite may restrict the opportunity for this to take place. It should be noted that School Road staff try to accommodate this; it is not always possible .e.g. Following the admission of an emergency and the cancellation of an 'Emergency Quota Bed'.
- Some service users may find the transition to a new/different form of respite provision/service difficult; this may also be more difficult for some individuals who have used School Road for many years.
- Some service users will be adversely impacted on following the proposed change and the timeline which may or may not impact on their behaviour.
- Travel – Some service users may be nervous/anxious utilising new transport or accessing different travel arrangements compared to existing arrangements.

Potential significant negative impact on Carers:

- Following reassessment of their son/daughter, relative and a carers assessment, Fair access to care (FACS) eligibility for some service users and carers may be reduced.
- Carers have said that the transition to a new service is unsettling, as they are familiar with staff and the existing routine at School Road. For some individuals who have been utilising the service for a number of years, this may result in anxiety/distress, which then may impact on the carer in the form of behaviour's that require additional support .
- This group of people have experienced a number of changes to services over recent years.
- Some carers may become anxious when being required to consider alternative respite provision for their son/daughter/relative, when they have been satisfied with this service at School Road.
- There could be an impact on the emotional/physical wellbeing of the carer due to the uncertainty of a new service being offered and/or making the transition to a new service.
- There could be an impact for the carer regarding employment should the respite arrangements change and not meet previous patterns of

respite/breaks.

- It is essential for the carer to maintain a positive relationship with the person/relative that they are caring for, during the change process.
- To maintain material circumstances (income/housing) following the change of respite.
- Travel – There may be a change in travel arrangements for Fair Access to Care eligible service users attending respite, which may cause Carers some anxiety.

3.2 Can these impacts be mitigated or justified? If so, how?

Service Users: Mitigation and Support

- Service users will receive a holistic assessment that will review all of a person's need for services.
- It is possible that some service users may have a reduction, or an increase in respite should their Fair Access to Care eligible needs have changed.
- It is also possible that following assessment, a service user's allocation may also increase should the carer/service be reviewed as requiring additional, eligible respite. Should an individual's needs change, service users would be entitled to an assessment or review. Where a service user has reduced Fair Access to Care eligible needs, we will work with that family to ensure that appropriate and eligible support is in place. e.g. low level community services.
- Following any change in respite provider new providers will be encouraged to maintain friendship groups, by coordinating bookings. This arrangement could not be guaranteed for every respite stay which is consistent with the service at School Road. We will request new providers to facilitate this wherever possible. In addition we would encourage service users to sign up to Bristol and Me (safe social networking site) to maintain contact and to network social activities with peers. We would also encourage service users to utilise the new Bristol Community Links centre Cafés and drop in's, in addition to Community bases, such as libraries or Community/sport centres.
- Some service users who find transition or change difficult, this will be highlighted at the point of assessment. Care Management staff will work closely with staff from School Road (and in some cases health colleagues) to manage the transition process. In addition prior to any permanent transition, taster sessions and overnight stays will be offered to mitigate anxiety. Taster sessions will be supported by School Road staff where they can.
- Where it is anticipated that some service users struggle with timelines and need absolute clarity, Care Management will work with School Road Staff, to plan what information and actions are required at the relevant time. This is to minimise distress and the resulting impact for the service user. Where a specialised overview is required, assistance from the Community Learning Difficulties team will be engaged.
- Following re-assessment of their son/daughter, relative and a carers assessment, entitlement for some service users and carers may be reduced. It is possible that following an assessment an individual's respite allocation may increase, this recognises the needs of the individual and the carer. Where there is a reduction, this will be open to review should needs change.

Carers: Mitigation and support

- Carers are entitled to a re assessment or review of their caring needs at any time.
- Where a carer is advising that they are very anxious regarding proposed change in their respite arrangements or regarding the assessment process staff from the Care management team, will work with School Road staff, together with the Carer's Support Centre, in order to provide, information, advice and support to minimise any potential anxiety.
- The Care Management team, working with service users and carers, are very experienced; positive comments have been received by families who have recently worked with members of the Care Management team, following a change in the services they receive.
- This will include support around both the assessment process and any support required around transitional arrangements. The care management process will identify early in the assessment should a carer require additional specialised assistance from the Community Learning Difficulties Team.
- The care management team and staff from School Road will support carers to visit and transition to any new respite provision. This may include introductory visits or overnight stays for the service user. The carer and service user will be supported during these transitional arrangements.
- All carers have been offered a carer's assessment. This will be a holistic assessment, taking into account the health and wellbeing, finance, employment and the needs of the carer required to continue in their supporting role. The aim of the assessment will be to consider the individual impact on the carer and family and to consider suitable respite provision that matches their needs in terms of breaks from their caring responsibilities. This assessment will also seek to maintain the positive relationship with the individual that they are caring for and to maintain their material circumstances such as income/housing (as appropriate).
- Travel – There may be a change in travel arrangements for Fair Access to Care eligible service users attending respite, which may cause carers some anxiety regarding access to the new service. To mitigate this, Care Management will discuss travel arrangements with the provider, to ensure that the service user can access respite in an appropriate way. It should be recognised that some Carers may have access to Mobility Vehicles, in such cases carer's may be asked to drive the individual to the new respite facility.

3.3 Does the proposal create any benefits for people with protected characteristics?

General opportunities and positive impacts:

- Services for respite care/short term breaks, are becoming more personalised, deliver improved choice, control, privacy and dignity.
- Improved flexibility and range of commissioned respite resources/services will enable service providers to better meet the specific needs of all equalities groups. The Council expects providers to be able the cultural and social needs of service users and with for example our Shared Lives Services we currently have 6 carers from BME background. New Respite provision will provide the opportunity for service users to meet new friends, in addition to existing friendship groups. This will increase service user's network of friends.

Potential opportunities and positive impacts for service users:

- The opportunity to have respite which is ‘bespoke’ to their needs and ‘likes’ e.g. within a shared lives setting where consideration is given to individual requirements e.g. hobbies, lifestyle, religious and cultural. Individuals have the opportunity to directly access a personal budget and can choose/arrange, with possible support, their preferred respite support/services.
- The opportunity to have 1:1 care, support and activities in a shared lives placement as opposed to communal/shared living in a residential setting.

Potential opportunities and positive impacts for Carers:

- In addition to the reassessment of their son/daughter/relative, carers will be offered a carer’s assessment. The primary purpose of the assessment is to support carers to continue to care for their relative at home, with the appropriate level of breaks from their caring responsibilities
- Opportunity to consider more appropriate/individualised respite settings that better suit the needs of their son/daughter/relative and to think about longer term planning options for the future.
- For carers there is an opportunity to have their requirements met by alternate respite provision that suits their needs/requirements. E.g.: via Direct Payments and Shared Lives.

3.4 Can they be maximised? If so, how?

- Service users and Carers - Through the care management process.
- We will continue to work with families and the 0- 25 service, to continually develop a range of provision and choices for individual respite breaks.

Step 4: So what?

4.1 How has the equality impact assessment informed or changed the proposal?


- Reinforced the need to ensure that due process is followed in terms of formal consultation with all stakeholders and robust comprehensive care management assessments are carried out with service users and informal carers are offered formal carers assessments.
- We will continue to work to ensure the right/adequate level of alternative respite provision is in place to meet service user’s need.
- The Council, as part of the re-assessment and support planning process offer a full range of respite options to meet fair access to care eligible needs.
- Identified the need for a ‘newsletter/paper – Keeping in touch.’ This will allow service users to keep up to date with their friends who may have taken a Direct Payment, moved to Shared Lives Service or within independent sector provision.

4.2 What actions have been identified going forward?

- Project planning and resources in place to move this work/change forward.
- Dedicated care management resources have completed the assessment of 63 service users and their respective carers where appropriate.
- Consultation has continued throughout the period following the decision on the 5th January 2014, with service users and carers.
- Due process undertaken with regard to assessments for service users and informal carers.

4.3 How will the impact of your proposal and actions be measured moving forward?

- Service Users – Evidence collated through the care management process that service users have been re-provided with suitable alternative respite provision.
- Carers - Alternative respite provision is in place/ in the process of being arranged for service users, which meets their needs as outlined in their formal carers assessment.
- Detail on the range and number of alternative options for respite care provision that are available for service users and relatives to choose from
- It is recognised and appreciated that many families have used School Road for respite for many years. They have required a great deal of support to consider alternative respite options, and transitional arrangements for their sons or daughters to commence a different comparable service. This support has been maintained by School Road Staff, the care management reviewing team and by the Carer's support centre representative.

Service Director Sign-Off: 	Equalities Officer Sign Off: Simon Nelson
Date: 21 January 2014	Date: 20 January 2014

Appendix 2.1: ECO Impact Assessment

Impact Checklist

Title of report: School Road Respite Unit–potential closure				
Report author: Sheena Huggins				
Anticipated date of key decision 3rd February 2015				
<p>Summary of proposals: The closure of School Road Social Care Respite unit in Brislington is proposed. The service offers 1-14 night breaks for up to 6 weeks to adults with learning difficulties. There are nearly 200 potential service users for this service however about 15 people use the service regularly.</p> <p>If a decision is made to close the unit then BCC are likely to sell the building. There are no plans to demolish it.</p> <p>They are significant negative social impacts if this service is withdrawn however the scope of this assessment is of the environmental impacts.</p>				
Will the proposal impact on...	Yes/No	+ive or -ive	If Yes...	
			Briefly describe impact	Briefly describe Mitigation measures
Emission of Climate Changing Gases?	No			
Bristol's resilience to the effects of climate change?	No			
Consumption of non-renewable resources?	Yes	+ive	Energy usage will be reduced due to reduced usage of building. Guardians will use some energy whilst building is awaiting sale.	Ensure Guardians are briefed to conserve energy & only use it in rooms they occupy.
Production, recycling or disposal of waste	No			
The appearance of the city?	No			
Pollution to land, water, or air?	Yes	+ive	Air pollution will reduce due to less vehicle journeys transporting service users to/from unit	
Wildlife and habitats?	No			
Consulted with: Claire Craner-Buckley				
Summary of impacts and Mitigation - <u>to go into the main Cabinet/ Council Report</u>				
The significant impacts of this proposal are that there would be a reduction in energy usage for heating & lighting. Also a reduction in travel in the city & it's associated impacts of air pollution, co2 emissions & noise.				

The proposals include the following measures to mitigate the impacts: Guardians to be briefed to use only required reduced heating & lighting.

The net effects of the proposals are that if the unit closes there would be a small environmental benefit through reduced energy usage & travel.

Checklist completed by:

Name: Claire Craner-Buckley	
Dept.: Energy Service Place Directorate	
Extension:9224459	
Date: 18.12.14	
Verified by Energy Service	Steve Ransom

Appendix 3

Outcome of Assessments

As part of the proposals outlined in this report, Social Workers have undertaken service user and carer assessments of individual needs. These tables detail the outcome of the assessments undertaken (as at 15/01/15).

1. Service User Assessments:

Table 1

Service Users	Total
No. of service users in scope for an assessment	63
No. of service users who received an assessment	63
No. of service users who were found ineligible following assessment	2

2. Breakdown of Service User decision – retention of respite

Table 2

Service Users	Total
No. of service users wishing to retain respite (see below for further breakdown)	53
Families who have chosen to make alternative arrangements	8
No. of service users who were found ineligible following assessment	2
Total	63

3. Breakdown of Service User preference for those retaining respite – by model of respite

Table 3

Service users preference, post assessment	
Residential respite services	35
Shared Lives	11
Supported Living	1
Direct payment	1
Other authority	1
Moved to full time residential care	1
To be confirm preference	12
Passed away	1
Total	63

4. Breakdown of service user allocation of night's post and pre assessment.

Table 4

Number of Nights	1-10	10-30	31-50	51-100
Service users allocation pre assessment	6	31	21	4
Service users allocation post - assessment	0	25	15	5

*16 people have chosen alternative short break solutions (following assessment)

* 1 service user – returned to neighbouring authority services

It is important to note that the figures in table 4 reflect the actual numbers of nights on a service users support plan. In some cases, service users took the opportunity to have additional nights, when the unit had available vacancies.

Additional nights to the support plan may have also been allocated in the event of an emergency, e.g. in the event that a carer fell unwell or was admitted to hospital.

Where there has been a decrease in nights, this may reflect a myriad of reasons, for example a service user/carers may now have chosen not to take respite or may prefer to utilise alternatives to respite, such as moving to supported living accommodation.

5. Carer Assessments

Table 5

Number of Carer Assessments Completed	28
Number of Carer's Assessments declined	7
Number of Carer Assessments outstanding	14
Number of Carers considering an assessment	2
Number of Carer's Assessments – Not eligible (e.g. not living with their carer	12
Total	63

*Some Carers have been poorly or in hospital, hence contributed to the delay in Carer assessment.

It is important to note, at the point of assessment some carers had arrangements in place following a previous assessment.

Following an assessment, a Carer may receive additional funding; this funding can be either a one off payment or an on-going weekly payment. For Carer's receiving on going payments, they are entitled to an annual review.

Appendix 4: Service user and carer communication events:

Date	Type of consultation	Attendees
18/11/13	Meeting with staff (at School Road) Letter to accompany the meeting	Staff team and Senior Management
19/11/13	Letter from Director to all carers	
Dec 13	Mayor consultation dates/public meetings	Public/carers/staff
9/12/13	Letter to carers with update and invite to 18 December 2013	
18/12/13	Consultation with carers from School Road	Carers and senior management
19/12/13	City Hall meeting with Mayor	Public/carers/staff
15/1/14	Letter from School Rd to Carers with proposed budget details	
30/1/14	Consultation with carers from School Road	Carers and senior management
18/2/14	Council meeting to finalise budget	Mayor and Councillors
19/2/14	Staff meeting at School Road	MW (Service Manager) and staff
Feb 14	Letter to carers to confirm outcome of Full Council	
5/3/14	Staff and HR meeting at School Road	Staff team and HR representatives
12/5/14	Staff HR and management meeting at School Rd	Senior management, staff team and HR representatives
21/5/14	Staff meeting with management at School Rd	Senior management and staff team
3/6/14	Carers invited to meet potential providers.	Carers, management and providers
17/6/14	Senior management and staff meeting at School Rd	Staff, AF (Care Manager) and senior management
18/6/14	HR and Staff meeting at School Road	HR and staff 1 to 1s
18 – 19/6/14	One to one meetings between Carers and assessing team	Social workers and carers
16/7/14	HR representatives at School Rd	Staff and HR 1 to 1s
18/7/14	Letter to carers with update on closure	
30/7/14	Newsletter	
Oct 14	Newsletter	
17/10/14	Letter to carers with newsletter	
29/10/14	Meeting with carers and providers	Senior Management, Carers, Social Workers, provider
18/12/14	Meeting for service users and carers	Senior Management, Carers, Social Workers and Providers

Appendix 5: Case Studies

Case Study one

Jamie (not real name) is 42. Jamie has severe learning difficulties, communication difficulties and mobility problems as a result of cerebral palsy. Jamie lives with an elderly parent who provides care. Jamie has 48 days per year respite which is as regular weekends and a 5 day a week day service with an independent day service provider.

Jamie's parent has some health problems and has needed to go into hospital several times recently and needs regular hospital appointments. The day service provider offer a day service that is very flexible and support can extend into the evening when groups might go to see a film or go to the pub. When needed, and at short notice the provider can extend Jamie's day so that his parent does not worry about rushing to get back from an appointment. The provider can and does swap hours for those planned for later in the week in consultation with Jamie and parent to provide the flexibility that Jamie and his parent need.

The day service provider that Jamie uses also provides respite breaks. Jamie knows a lot of the staff and other service users, and transport goes daily from the day service to the respite houses.

Jamie has visited the respite houses with his parent. It was agreed that Jamie would go for tea initially and now Jamie has had a first stay. Jamie's parent would have preferred respite in South Bristol as he does not drive but he has been very happy with the choice, flexibility, disabled access and standard of communication with the provider. One thing that was a concern was how and whether Jamie would be able to access a social life and contacts like at School Road. Our initial review shows that Jamie has been able to access more community facilities and been able to maintain friendships and reconnect with old acquaintances and friends and Jamie and his parent are very happy with progress.

Case Study two

Leslie (not real name) is 60 years old and lives alone. Leslie is supported by family members and has a Direct Payment from the Council to pay for eligible social care services. Leslie chooses to buy support during the day from an independent day service provider. Leslie had an allocation of 28 nights respite per year at School Road.

During the assessment, which involved Leslie's family, it was discussed that it would be beneficial for Leslie to access a service run by people who Leslie knows. Because Leslie was not using all 28 nights each year, needs were reassessed as needing 20 nights respite per year. This can be reviewed in future if eligible needs change.

Leslie is now uses an alternative provider of respite. It is a 7 bed unit residential environment. Leslie said the first stay was enjoyable and included going out on trips, evenings out and being offered a menu which included Leslie's favourite dishes.