

Summary Sheet

Council Meeting:

Cabinet and Commissioners' Decision Meeting – 10 July 2017

Title: Outcome of the Consultation and Recommendations on the Learning Disability Offer and the future of In-house Services for Adults with a Learning Disability and/or Autism

Is this a Key Decision and has it been included on the Forward Plan?

Yes

Strategic Director Approving Submission of the Report

Anne Marie Lubanski, Strategic Director of Adult Care and Housing

Report Author(s)

Janine Moorcroft, Head of Service, Adult Care Services

Ward(s) Affected

All

Summary

The review of the Learning Disability Offer and future of In-House Services for Adults with a Learning Disability and/or Autism is integral to the Council's overall vision for transforming adult social care. This entails developing a service that enables people with a learning disability to:

- Have the opportunity to get a job and contribute to their community
- Have the opportunity to choose where they live and
- Have access to a good quality health service
- Be kept safe and protected from all forms of exploitation
- Access services of the highest quality which make a difference in assisting people to be as independent as possible
- Offer services that are affordable, are personalised and are what people would want to choose

Reforming the service will also contribute to the Council's strategic vision as set out in the Corporate Plan 2016/2017:

"Rotherham is our home, where we come together as a community, where we seek to draw on our proud history to build a future we can all share.

We value decency and dignity and seek to build a town where opportunity is extended to everyone, where people can grow, flourish and prosper, and where no one is left behind.

To achieve this as a council we must work in a modern, efficient way, to deliver sustainable services in partnership with our local neighbourhoods, looking outwards, yet focused relentlessly on the needs of our residents."

In order to deliver this vision for the borough the Council has adopted the following priorities:

- Every child making the best start in life
- Every adult secure, responsible and empowered
- A strong community in a clean, safe environment
- Extending opportunity, prosperity and planning for the future
- A modern, efficient council – customer focused, responsive, accountable, outward looking and providing value for money

Through the Together for Change programme of work the need for change was demonstrated through the following quotes:

“People need choice and control of their lives”

“It’s not about the buildings but activities and routine”

“A real choice for everyone”

“Hope for better services”

The national context in relation to Adult Social Care and the future of service provision for adults with a learning disability is reflected in:

- Care Act 2014
- Transforming Care for People with Learning Disabilities 2015

The legislation affirms the commitment to personalisation and shaping responses to individual circumstances, enabling people to exercise choice and maintain control over their own lives, whilst promoting efficiency and value for money in the use of shrinking resources. The challenge at both national and local levels is to develop robust, sustainable opportunities and support that promotes prevention and early intervention.

Further to the approval of the report “Consultation on the Modernisation of the Learning Disability Offer and the future of In-House Services for Adults with a Learning Disability and/or Autism” on 14 November 2016, this report further builds on the outlined direction of travel and sets out the subsequent next steps and recommendations for consideration.

The previous reports have acknowledged that this approach will be a 3 year improvement journey to ensure the success of the future model and to build on the offer for Rotherham, based on what people have told us through the consultation period. The Council therefore envisage changes to continue until 2020.

The steps that have been taken over the last 2 years have built on the principles of the Care Act 2014 and the need to enhance our offer to move away from an offer of traditional based support to a model which promotes independence for young people and adults. However, it is recognised that some customers with significant and complex needs will require support in a safe and secure environment but optimising their independence wherever possible. In order to achieve this, the Council will work more closely with users, family carers, and key partners from the Rotherham Clinical Commissioning Group (RCCG), Rotherham, Doncaster and South Humberside Trust (RDaSH) and Health Stakeholders.

There will be a focus on timely advice and information, technology and the delivery of improved outcomes for people in more cost effective ways, with an emphasis on what people can do rather than what they are unable to do. This is described as a strength based approach.

In real terms, this will mean that people will have access to enablement services to ensure people's independence will be optimised as much as possible and this will be to ensure their best outcomes. This will include employment opportunities, leisure opportunities and a real choice as to where and how they live.

The current building based offer of day care, respite and residential care can restrict the independence, choice and control of current customers and is not cost effective, although it is still considered that such care remains appropriate in the short to medium term for a small cohort of people with complex needs. In addition, it is recognised that the service spends £21.5 million (2016/17) on Learning Disability Services for approximately 725 people.

The proposed new service 'offer' has to be supported by proactive and innovative commissioning. The approach was outlined in the Cabinet Report of 26 May 2016, which will shape future services, ensuring there is a choice for people to access their support in a different way, such as being based in supported living or using shared lives rather than defaulting to residential care. The agreed commissioning approach ensures that the market responds to the needs of individuals now and in the future. This will continue to be co-produced with people with a learning disability to facilitate the shaping of the market and in so doing inform the quality of support and the management of risk. In order to support this process the Council has commissioned Community Catalysts to develop small local and community based options that will offer individuals a range of activities to meet their support needs.

This will also increase the preventative offer so those people who need short term assistance can build confidence or make contacts with relevant support groups. There will also be a focus upon providing an enablement service which is not currently provided when the Council review the enablement offer, and there is evidence and good practice which shows the positive impact on people's outcomes when enablement is used effectively.

Recommendations:

1. Cabinet is asked to:

- a) Approve the key principles for the adult social care pathway as outlined in section 5 which clearly defines the aspirations and the overall offer to the residents of Rotherham and underpins the Adult Social Care Vision and Strategy (March 2016).
- b) Approve that a Prevention and Technology Strategy is developed in line with the Care Act 2014 by August 2017 for all user groups.
- c) Approve a 12 week period of consultation with customers, staff and stakeholders on the options for Oaks Day Centre (Wath), and following the completion and analysis of the consultation agree to receive a further report outlining future recommendations.
- d) Approve a 12 week period of consultation with customers, staff and stakeholders on the options for Addison (Maltby) and following the completion of the consultation and analysis agree to receive a further report outlining future recommendations.

- e) Approve a 12 week period of consultation with customers, staff and stakeholders on the options regarding the re-provision of respite care to enable a closure of Treefields and Quarryhill respite and following the completion and analysis of the consultation agree receive a further report outlining future recommendations.
- f) Approve the retention of the REACH Day service with the option of reviewing the current accommodation.
- g) Note that all current customers will be individually re-assessed to ensure they receive the appropriate package of care.
- h) Approval to receive final proposals following analysis of the consultation responses.

List of Appendices Included:

Appendix A – Timeline of process and further consultation, including specific service consultation.

Appendix B – Learning Disabilities Equalities Analysis

Appendix C – Summary presentation from online consultation

Background Papers:

- Vision and Strategy for Adult Social Care – March 2016
- Implementing a Strategic approach to the commissioning and delivery of learning disability services- 26 May 2016
- Consultation on the modernisation of the Learning Disability Offer and the future of In-House Services for Adults with a Learning Disability and/or Autism” on 14 November 2016
- Transforming Care for people with Learning Disabilities, 2015
- Care Act 2014/15
- Mental Capacity Act 2005
- Making it Real 2012
- Think Local, Act Personal 2010
- Rotherham Housing Strategy 2016 – 2019
- Together for Change Document (Learning Disabilities)
- Full consultation document from online consultation
- Summary data from engagement opportunities

Consideration by any other Council Committee, Scrutiny or Advisory Panel:

Overview and Scrutiny Management Board

Council Approval Required:

No.

Exempt from the Press and Public:

No.

Title: Outcome of the Consultation and Recommendations on the Learning Disability Offer and the future of In-house Services for Adults with a Learning Disability and/or Autism

1. Recommendations:

- 1.1 Approve the key principles for the adult social care pathway as outlined in section 5 which clearly defines the aspirations and the overall offer to the residents of Rotherham and underpins the Adult Social Care Vision and Strategy (March 2016).
- 1.2 Approve that a Prevention and Technology Strategy is developed in line with the Care Act 2014 by August 2017 for all user groups.
- 1.3 Approve a 12 week period of consultation with customers, staff and stakeholders on the options for Oaks Day Centre (Wath), and following the completion and analysis of the consultation agree to receive a further report outlining future recommendations.
- 1.4 Approve a 12 week period of consultation with customers, staff and stakeholders on the options for Addison (Maltby) and following the completion of the consultation and analysis agree to receive a further report outlining future recommendations.
- 1.5 Approve a 12 week period of consultation with customers, staff and stakeholders on the options regarding the re-provision of respite care to enable a closure of Treefields and Quarryhill respite and following the completion and analysis of the consultation agree receive a further report outlining future recommendations.
- 1.6 Approve the retention of the REACH Day service with the option of reviewing the current accommodation.
- 1.7 Note that all current customers will be individually re-assessed to ensure they receive the appropriate package of care.
- 1.8 Approval to receive final proposals following analysis of the consultation responses.

2. Background

- 2.1 A key driver of the localised strategic approach to the provision of support for adults with a learning disability is the national context which has a focus on transforming care and support based on personalised support, early intervention and enabling people to access a range of services and support at the point in which they need to do so. The key principles of this national context are reflected in the Care Act 2014 and Transforming Care (National document led by NHS England). In addition to the driver for transformational change, there is the financial context of reducing resources and increasing demand, which is both a national and local challenge.
- 2.2 The Care Act 2014 requires people to be assessed as individuals and for their needs to be determined in terms of their personal 'wellbeing'. The Act focuses on looking at people's strengths, what they can do and what outcomes they want to achieve, which is described as strength based approach. It anticipates that most individuals can lead full lives focussing on prevention and timely advice and information. This will require a significant practice and cultural shift locally to which the Council has to respond.

2.3 In Rotherham, there is a higher rate of people with a learning disability per 100,000 population at 371.77 compared to a regional rate of 346.06 and our neighbouring Authorities of Barnsley with 313.76 and Doncaster at 348.53. Rotherham also has significant cohorts, for example, 204 people aged 18-30 years and 164 people aged 51-64 years. It should also be noted that there are 347 carers aged between 55 and 69 who support a service user with a learning disability.

Historically adult social care in Rotherham has been based upon a traditional “assess for service” model which has resulted in a higher proportion of adults with a learning disability in receipt of services when compared to regional neighbours. Care and support has been provided by services rather than prevention and promotion of an individual’s strengths. Services also tend to be traditional due to lack of alternatives available.

Many Local Authorities have moved away from providing any in-house, building based offers and now offer a tailored, individualised and personalised service. Others have targeted a reduced resource to people with significant complex needs including behaviour that challenges. A personalised approach will look at the individual’s outcomes as described in the Care Act 2014 and therefore individuals will use their personal budget with support to identify the best way to meet their own needs. This may be by accessing universal services at no or low cost, purchasing community services or commissioning a provider to provide domiciliary care or other types of support. This means that a range of different options will be developed and offered and this will incrementally increase through the transformation of adult care.

It can be suggested that the 18-30 cohort has largely been impacted upon by transitions from Children’s Services, due to alternative provision not being available. The 51-64 cohort (regardless of primary support reason/disability type) is reflective of Rotherham’s service demographics. The numbers of people accessing a traditional service within this group are further evidence of a model of “service provision”.

Higher numbers of learning disability service users are reflected in the proportion of 2016/17 budget spend with 30% of all Adult Social Care budget being spent on learning disability services/service users.

Consideration is therefore required on how to transform our services to meet the aspirations of individuals and their families, but also acknowledge the need for time to build confidence, trust and the wider market of services within local communities over the next 3 year period for wide ranging need and expectation.

2.4 The journey to look at alternative options for traditional based services began in April 2015, and more significant work was undertaken following the report to Cabinet in May 2016, which included alternatives to traditional care and developing community assets. The work to date has achieved the following:

- Transformation of Copeland Day Care Centre from a traditional building based service to one focussed on a personalised approach.
- Development of Community Link Workers to assist with market shaping. This has included developing new opportunities in the community where people can access or use their personal budget to purchase either individually or in “friendship groups”.

- Care Act compliant assessments which has started to embed a strength based model, ensuring that an individual's outcomes are at the centre of the assessment.
- A variety of commissioned resources to support the development of community assets, such as community connectors and Disabled Go.
- The Council has contracted with Community Catalysts to provide a specific focus on Learning Disabilities and to build on the number of social enterprises available in Rotherham.

2.5 At Cabinet meeting held on 26 May 2016, the paper on “Implementing the Strategic Approach to the Commissioning and Delivery of Learning Disability Services” was agreed to start the discussion about how and why the service offer for people with a learning disability and/or autism will change in the future.

In addition to this there has been a series of engagement events with customers, carers and families on the modernisation of the Learning Disability Offer called Together for Change.

In November 2016, Cabinet approved that the Council should begin a consultation with customers, stakeholders, carers and the general public about what they thought could meet the needs of those people who may need services in the future. The progress to shape the offer has continued through the consultation process on the wider Learning Disability and Autism Offer for Rotherham and there have been many opportunities for customers, carers and staff to engage in these conversations. It is clear through the consultation that there has started to be a shift in the thinking of how the offer could look in the next 3–5 years and that people aspire for the wider offer of choice and personalised services.

The review of the Learning Disability Offer and future of In-House Services for Adults with a Learning Disability and/or Autism is integral to the Council's overall vision for transforming adult social care.

2.6 The approach will enable people to transform their lives from one where they either live in and use specialist services or live in the community in a range of accommodation provision but are not part of it, into living as part of the community, mainly using services open to everyone with access to specialist services when needed. The individual needs of people will be met in the least restrictive settings as possible, formulated on robust positive risk assessments based on the recognition that people live in their communities safely and often have better outcomes for their health and wellbeing. This will be underpinned by the principles of the Mental Capacity Act 2005 where best interests need to be considered.

2.7 **Learning Disability In-house Day Services**

There are currently 3 building based in-house day services – Oaks Day Centre at Wath, Addison Day Centre at Maltby and Reach Day Centre at the Elliott Centre, Badsley Moor Lane. In addition, there are 2 outreach services for Addison and REACH within Maltby and Kiveton Park.

In addition to this there are also 10 customers in commissioned day services.

- 2.8 Oaks Day Centre is a learning disability day service based within Wath which operates Monday to Friday between the hours of 8.30 am – 4.30 pm. On average there are approximately 80 customers in attendance per day from a total of 120. The majority of these customers access adult services in-house transport as they do not live locally. 50% of customers also reside in a residential or supported living setting where the Council pays for 24/7 support. The service provides primarily building based activities with some outreach work into the community. Most customers have been accessing this service for in excess of 20 years and there is little evidence of any customers moving on to independent opportunities.
- 2.9 Addison is a learning disability day service based within Maltby which operates Monday to Friday between the hours of 8.30 am – 4.30 pm. On average there are approximately 90 customers attending per day from a total of 130. There is little evidence to show that customers from this service move on to alternative provision. The service provides building based activities and planned activities within the community.

The site also includes ADPRO which is the Learning Disability supported employment base. There are some good outcomes that have been demonstrated within the employment service, however, there is a question around the current base and if this would be more effective operating from the town centre. Most customers who attend Addison use in-house transport to access their day provision, however, all customers who access ADPRO self-travel.

The service has connections with 26 local employers that offer 32 of the trainees at ADPRO placements. During 2016/17 16 people have been in paid work between 1 – 15 hours per week. (5.6%)

Through undertaking a focussed piece of work around ADPRO and our employment offer the Council would foresee this figure increasing to the national average of 5.8 % which would result in positive outcomes for customers and reduce personal budgets.

- 2.10 Reach Day Centre based within the leased-in Elliott Centre is situated in Herringthorpe on Badsley Moor Lane and provides support for 30 customers per day. Maple Avenue is in Maltby and this is the outreach service which supports a further 25 customers. There are currently 55 people receiving a service across the week. Reach Day Centre is open Monday to Friday 8.00 am – 4.00 pm. 90% of the customers live with their parents and 80% use social care transport and 20% are transported by family members. The customers attending Reach Day Centre have complex needs and in the majority of cases need a higher level of support than customers at Oaks and/or Addison.

2.11 **Transport Arrangements**

Approximately £0.81 million per year is spent on travel arrangements for people with Learning Disabilities to day care, with an additional £320,000 per year spent on the provision of private hire taxis. Any changes will need to ensure that people will have travel training, where appropriate, in order to be independent. This will be risk assessed and based on good practice.

It should be acknowledged that many customers have not had a holistic assessment to determine any transport needs or changes to current transport arrangements. This has created an unnecessary dependency on Adult Care transport and an increased cost.

It should also be noted that the corporate transport review will look at solutions to integrate transport and provide a more streamlined and cost effective model. This new delivery model can then be embedded into individual assessments where appropriate.

2.12 Learning Disability Respite

The Council has 2 in-house traditional respite services - Treefields in Wingfield and Quarry Hill in the Wath area. Both services offer respite care to people with a learning disability.

Treefields has a 95% occupancy rate and Quarry Hill has a 91% occupancy rate - these figures include provision made for emergency respite. There are 6 bedrooms in each establishment. It should be noted that neither service can accommodate people who use a wheelchair as the buildings are not accessible. This support is provided for 101 customers. Treefields and Quarry Hill provide emergency respite on a rota system with Ladycroft an independent residential/respite unit.

All individuals accessing the services would need a strength based reassessment to look at any ongoing needs, including the need for respite for carers / family members.

2.13 Learning Disability Residential

Parkhill Lodge in Maltby is a 22 bed learning disability residential unit. The rationale to include this building in the review is because it will support the programme to deliver personalised outcomes for customers. A detailed analysis would need to be undertaken once all the strength based assessments have taken place to look at the overall financial impact of individual assessments. This would also be predicated on market availability at reasonable cost. This area is interdependent with the commissioning strategy for people with a learning disability.

In addition to this there are 172 customers living in 24 hour accommodation, 29 of which are out of area placements. This is due to the need for specialist provision that has not been readily available in Rotherham.

3. Key Issues

3.1 In order to continue to deliver the vision agreed in March 2016 for the Learning Disability Service and to progress on the key themes that have developed through conversations from the Consultation, the following issues need to be considered:

- The reliance on traditional models of care, with a large number of people living in care homes and sometimes having to live away from Rotherham to receive services. There are currently 29 people in receipt of 24 hour care living out of the Borough. All customers need to have an assessment to determine if their current placement is in their best interests and meeting their needs within an independence model. There will also be a requirement to ensure that the costs applied are reasonable to meet the individual's needs. Support plans should be clear on the expected outcomes for individuals and an approach that enables independence and reduced levels of support (step down approach) to alternative accommodation, where appropriate, put in place.
- The high use of traditional day centres and poor or limited access to mainstream social activities with few work opportunities. It should be noted that it is unusual

for a Local Authority to provide 5 days a week day care for people with high complex needs and in addition for people who reside in residential and/or supported living to access day care as an addition. This will be addressed through individual assessments with customers who reside in these settings and in addition through engagement with providers. However no changes would take place before assessments have been undertaken and stakeholders have been engaged.

- An initiative which was called Community Opportunities Programme, consisted of a Team Manager and 2 Social Workers, was launched in September 2016 and had a focus with 10 volunteered customers and their families to work closely with them to take a detailed look at the customer journey for assessment and support planning which aimed to look at alternatives. Feedback from carers and customers linked to traditional services has in some cases demonstrated a change in their thinking to move away from the current model.
- Currently there is only one type of respite offer which is a building based traditional 6 bedroom property, which is not accessible for customers with more complex needs and does not offer choice. It should be noted that the Council also commissions 10 private respite beds for Rotherham residents.
- The current in-house transport offer which comprises of a fleet of leased vehicles restricts the ability for customers to self-travel. In addition there is also an overuse of private hire taxis for customers. Wherever possible, the Council will support those customers to enable them to enhance their skills and travel safely within their community. This piece of work has progressed and has seen several reductions in the use of transport and changes to the provision of transport, which has resulted in better outcomes for customers and some financial savings.
- The Shared Lives Scheme currently offers placements for 48 people, of which 40 are learning disability customers, and has shown good outcomes. A piece of work was commissioned to analyse quality and customer outcomes. There is an expansion plan which will allow the scheme to offer day support and short breaks on a larger scale to a wider group of people based on the carers' needs. Shared Lives offers a good alternative to residential care which is personalised and more cost effective. This is a key work stream within the Learning Disability Programme and a recruitment process for a new Shared Lives Manager will be the catalyst required to move this project on in terms of pace, scale and innovation.
- The connection between services for children and adults with learning disabilities needs to be strengthened to ensure continuity in meeting needs. A transitions team has now been established and joint work is taking place with Children and Young Peoples Services (CYPS) / Education and Health to implement a new approach including a better understanding of the cohorts and their future needs.
- Ensuring a joint approach to commissioning services across health and social care has been introduced to reduce duplication, confusion and cross-agency issues for both adults and children.

3.2 Property Maintenance

The Adult Care & Housing Directorate has been liaising with colleagues from Asset Management to determine the predicted repairs and maintenance costs for the current in-house Learning Disability establishments. There is a summary of the predicted repairs and maintenance costs over the next 25 years.

It is clear, however, that there are some repairs that are recommended to be undertaken within the next 12 months if the buildings are to be retained in the longer term. These are outlined below:-

| Property | Total Cost | Repairs / Maintenance | |
|--------------------|------------|--------------------------|-----------|
| Parkhill Lodge | £20,000 | Timber Cladding | £5,000 |
| | | Boiler Pumps | £5,000 |
| | | Asbestos AIB Corridors | £10,000 |
| Quarry Hill | - | No major condition costs | |
| Treefields | £2,000 | Damp in wet room | |
| Oaks Day Centre | £900,000+ | Refurbishment | £900,000+ |
| Maple Avenue | - | No major condition costs | |
| Addison Day Centre | £45,000 | Roof | £30,000 |
| | | Windows | £15,000 |

4. Options Considered and Recommended Proposals

4.1 The formal 60 day consultation on the Learning Disability and Autism Offer for Rotherham commenced 05 December 2016 and ran until 02 February 2017; this comprised of a series of engagement events across the Borough and online questionnaires. The main purpose was to outline the Council's vision and to receive feedback from a wide range of stakeholders about what they want the future offer to look like. This then informs the recommendations for in house services covered in this paper.

There were 627 people from across Rotherham who engaged in the completion of questionnaires or attended one of the 23 engagement opportunities (one to ones, focus / discussion groups). This consisted of customers, carers, staff, members of the public, stakeholders and young people who may access services in the future.

The data analysis for the online questionnaires has been completed by an external body, with the data from the engagement events being compiled by the Quality and Performance team.

Following the 60 day consultation, it is clear there were some key themes coming out that have informed the recommendations going forward. Within the consultation through engagement within Focus Groups, Drop-in sessions and one to ones the following themes were discussed:

- Choice and control
- Living in your own community
- Having your own front door
- What the services for Learning Disabilities and Autism should look like in 5 years?
- Anything else you would like to tell us?

The two background papers for the consultation sets out the summary of the information on the data analysed from the questionnaire and the full detail of the consultation questionnaires. The data from the engagement opportunities (one to ones, focus / discussion groups) is also included in the background papers.

4.2 Summary of Consultation

This section outlines the information from the online questionnaires and the information analysed from the twenty three engagement opportunities. (Please refer to background paper)

- **Summary of Online Questionnaires**

A total of 487 questionnaires were completed either online or via requesting a hard copy. The breakdown of the 487 was as follows:

| | |
|----------------|-----|
| Customers | 227 |
| Carers | 92 |
| Staff | 141 |
| General Public | 27 |

70% of the customers who completed the questionnaire had a Learning Disability and 5% had autism. The majority were young with 70% being under the age of 45.

- **Services Used**

In respect to current services used 62% of customers accessed day care provision, with 23% accessing respite services, 22% in supporting living and 18% in residential.

42% include access to other services such as the in-house employment provision, school, college and Speakup.

- **Skills and Activities**

There was a specific question within the questionnaire which determined what people are good at. Within this data 48% of people listed hobbies and interests in which they enjoyed. The most popular being baking/cooking, computers and gardening.

- **Support Needed**

There were 207 customers' responses to this question with variable answers that all identified some level of support. Some identified a low level of support whilst some demonstrated a higher need.

The carers and families returned 90 responses with 58% reporting a high level of need, some carers clarified by saying *"cannot speak, stand, walk, brush hair or teeth"* or support needed *"everything involved in daily living, and all aspects of life"*.

Other levels of support were also mentioned around night support *"sleeping issues, keeping safe inside and outside the house"*.

- **Support to improve Choice and Control**

This question was specifically what the Council can do to help people have more control over own choices? Of the 155 respondents who answered this question, 15% said that they already have support and identified who they would go to if they needed support. A further 15% wanted more support and for those who came up with suggestions some wanted more choice and said that this may come from having a job and gaining more independence.

There was one example in particular that suggested his carer stopped a customer from doing things and others suggested the person is too severely disabled.

- **Opportunity to Work**

51% of customers said that they would want to work or volunteer (if not already). Additional comments to this question were made suggesting working in a bar, bakers shop, café and library and 11% wanted to work outside. Some customers were more creative with their ideas with answers such as *“work at New York Stadium”*, *“volunteer at Disneyland Paris”*.

- **Travel**

This response was overwhelming, with 67% of people suggesting support for travel training and bus buddies, with an escort and community transport for those who are more vulnerable.

- **Safety**

26% of carers suggested that they didn't feel safe in the community and 12% of customers said that they did not; with 54% of customers responding saying they felt safe.

People said that feeling unsafe is linked to the person's level of severity of disability. It was reported *“I worry in unfamiliar surroundings and then might suffer from sensory overload and have a meltdown publicly”*.

- **Future Planning**

From the 92 carer respondents who were asked if the person they cared for had a plan in place for the future, 85% said no. There were worries about the future and a time when carers are no longer around. There were also anxieties around services closing.

- **Availability and Access to Services**

There is a concern from people that there are insufficient services for people with a learning disability in Rotherham. There is also a perception of a lack of services/groups available and lack of local groups to access.

Carers outlined their own perspective on the quality of what a service should be like in the future, *“he needs stimulating learning and socialising mixing with young people like himself with trained staff”*.

Carers described the outcomes of a quality service which is based on their experience, *“He has grown in confidence learning new skills. He goes to college 3 days and does 2 hours at Barnados Charity Shop through Ad-Pro”*, *“He has just started travel training and will learn some travel safety from this”*.

Following the consultation it is clear that there a number of future recommendations in respect to the Learning Disability and Autism Offer for Rotherham, that are being considered separately. This includes personal budgets, opportunities to self-travel and future planning for individuals. This activity is underway through routine activity with Adult Social Care.

4.3 **Summary of Engagement Opportunities**

Twenty three opportunities were available for people to engage (see Figure 1.1 in background paper for consultation). In total, 140 people participated in this part of the consultation. The majority of participants were family carers and people with

learning disabilities and/or autism. Some providers including Healthwatch, the Rotherham Parent Partnership and YAWR (You Ask We Respond) were represented at the hard to reach group engagement session.

From the twenty three engagement opportunities the top six themes focussed on:

- Health and Wellbeing
- Day Centres
- Accessibility and Community Involvement
- Choice and Control
- Communication, information and advice
- Assessment and Reviews

The analysis below provides a summary about what exactly was discussed within each of these main themes.

- **Health and Wellbeing**

Out of the twenty three engagement opportunities, health and wellbeing was raised at twenty six times. Within the health and wellbeing theme, friendships were of key importance. Participants placed significance on the importance of maintaining friendship groups, making new friends and socialising outside of day centres:

“I would like to see my friends more outside of the day centre” -session 12.

During session 15 participants stated:

“Friendships are more important than where he is based”.

- **Day centres**

Across the twenty three engagement opportunities Day Centres were mentioned at twenty two events.

During a discussion between 19 family members / carers of people with a learning disability and/or autism, it was mentioned that some service users have been attending day care for many years and this is the only support they receive:

“[He] Loves the centre – it’s his life” -session 13.

During another engagement opportunity the following was stated:

“People currently think that Day Centres are the only option as this is what they are used to” -session 1.

Some family members/carers commented that their son/daughter attends a day centre but they do not have the choice they once did.

“Day centres can’t provide the choice of activities they once did due to staff and budget cuts” – session 1.

“If centres are unable to provide the activities they shouldn’t be put onto clients’ timetables”– session 1.

In contrast other participants had more negative opinions of the day care offer. Some argued that:

- Day centres do not meet need
- No 1:1 in place at day centre so [my son/daughter] is bored
- People are pigeon holed and aren't given opportunity to try things at day centres
- Day centres should not be the only option available
- Day centres are unable to provide activities

Day centres were also discussed in relation to choice and control with some commenting that service users are able to make choices at day centres and others disagreeing, stating that day centres cannot provide choice.

“Day Centres can't provide the choice of activities they did due to staff and budget cuts” – session 1.

- **Choice and Control**

Across the twenty three engagement opportunities choice and control was mentioned at fourteen events. When discussing choice and control participants tended to discuss this in two categories:

1. How individuals experienced limited choice and control
2. How individuals were able to make their own choices

It was evident amongst people with a learning disability and/or autism that there are mixed feelings regarding choice and control. Some individuals feel they have choice and control but with limitations stating:

“I have a lot of choice and control but sometimes people try to put their opinions on me” – session 12.

“Yes [I am able to do activities and hobbies that I'd like to do] but money is sometimes an issue” – session 12.

Carers felt strongly about the impact of having a learning disability and/or autism and individuals being able to make choices at short notice stating:

“Can't just go to the pictures, life is day by day, can't look in to the future. It's a life sentence” – session 13.

Others reported that choice and control is difficult due to dependency on others or to having to follow someone else's schedule:

“Control is hard because I can't go to the cinema on my own, I have to rely on someone who will go out with me” – session 12.

With some people with learning disabilities commenting they had to rely on others to get out and about and that money impacted on their ability to take part in activities they would like.

Participants also discussed the fact that carers and supporters tried to put their opinions on to them, and that their parent/carer tells them what to do, with some

carers seemingly agreeing stating:

“[My son/daughter] is not able to make choices and control”, “[he/she] is better being told what to do rather than being given a choice” – session 5.

Others commenting that lack of other services impacted on their ability to have choice and control:

“Goes to Oaks as there is nothing else” – session 13, *“Day Centres can’t provide choice”* and *“Day services unable to provide activities”* – session 2.

Options for individuals with complex needs were also highlighted as an issue which affects choice and control:

“No care available for complex needs in Rotherham - need to access out of borough services” – session 21.

- **Communication, Information Communication, Information and Advice**

Out of the twenty three engagement opportunities, communication, information and advice was mentioned at fourteen events.

Participants stressed the importance of transparent communication:

“Be open and honest – don’t waffle, tell us how it is” – session 1.

This was extended to information and advice:

“You need to be open with information and advice sharing” – session 1.

Attention was brought to the methods of communicating and that there are different ways to communicate other than written. Some service users have specific communication needs, such as Makaton. It was felt that information and advice should be available to the general public in a timely manner. This should include communication about what is available/what the options are. Participants feel that the communication of information and advice is an issue. Reference was made to the current experience of accessing information and advice stating that the process of who to speak to and how is unclear. Specific mention was given to the Single Point of Access, citing unacceptable waiting times and also ineffective signposting by Switchboard.

“It should be a stepping stone to finding out what’s available and how we can action it” – session 21.

Following the consultation it is clear that there are a number of future recommendations in respect to Learning Disability and Autism Offer for Rotherham.

Due to the number of themes and extent of the information gathered it is recommended that specific consultation takes place on the separate areas as outlined below.

- **Assessments and Reviews**

Out of twenty three engagement events, the theme ‘assessments and reviews’

was mentioned at fourteen events.

Carer's assessments were raised as an issue with participants concerned about the lack of information and awareness. Others voiced that more robust carer's assessments were needed, whilst others complained that they had not been offered a carer's assessment.

Contingency planning was discussed and participants raised concerns about there being a lack of contingency or 'emergency' planning in place.

There was concern about the timeliness of assessments and reviews being overdue and/or not being followed through. Some spoke about not being able to 'get a social worker' (session 21). Individuals that had received an assessment or review raised the following issues:

- Inconsistencies with assessments
- Negotiating over support and services – 'bartering' to keep one, lose another
- Independent living was not considered
- Going round in circles and no outcome
- Quality of assessments is a worry
- No financial assessment for years

4.4 Accessibility and Community Involvement

A theme emerged around accessibility and community involvement. This was discussed at sixteen of twenty three engagement opportunities.

Participants raised the need for community resources for all.

"We need to move away from a one size fits all thought to look at individuals to get the right placement for them, with people of same interests, age groups etc" and that there should be "community resources for all, not just people with learning disabilities" – session 2.

Some individuals indicated that they feel involved in the community and are able to access community based services and events i.e. via 'Thurcroft Big Local', 'Get Sorted Music Academy', 'Burlington Bash' and 'Elephants in Step'.

Others shared that they need support to be involved and without this would be isolated from community activities. Participants also felt that having skilled and experienced staff was crucial to supporting community activities and it was referenced that some service users can only access the community with support from carers.

"It's easy to go out because you have carers" – session 12.

Some raised concerns about the accessibility of services;

"I am worried about loneliness and the accessibility of services and available services" – session 2.

"There is a lack of opportunities in the south which means we have to travel" – session 2.

Access to buildings was discussed as an issue as it can prevent people participating in activities and receiving community based support. Some mentioned having to travel across the borough to access day care.

There were a number of concerns raised about accessing the community;

"I can't read the signs" – session 12.

"Not all buildings are accessible to everyone because of wheelchair access" – session 12.

In addition to this public transport can impede people from accessing the community;

Participants felt small community bases or 'hubs' with 'chill-out' rooms would be a good idea for people to access. It was stressed that these would need to be;

- Local, to reduce the need for transport
- Safe places

“Bringing in more local services to areas so that travelling would be minimised to shorter journeys that would be easier and more manageable for people. This would also provide easier access for more people” – session 1.

“We would have no objection to smaller focussed groups that support friendship and difference and it being person centred; but there would still need to be some smaller buildings for people to meet and for winter days or wet spring and summer days and for resources” – session 14.

4.5 Hard to Reach Groups - Feedback from Engagement Events

Hard to Reach communities are under-represented across Rotherham Learning Disability Services with only 4.05% known to services.

The 18-64 LD population currently has 667 customers with an open service (27) of which 4.05% are from a Hard to Reach Community

Speakup worked with a representative from the Unity Centre to organise a specific focus/discussion group which targeted hard to reach communities to ensure their voice was heard. 22 people attended the session which involved family members, people with learning disabilities and/or autism, supporters, advocates and representatives from the Parent Partnership and Rotherham Healthwatch.

5 Key principles of the new social care offer

Approve to the key principles for the adult social care pathway which clearly defines the aspirations and the overall offer to the residents of Rotherham and underpins the Adult Social Care Vision and Strategy (March 2016).

This entails developing a service that enables people with a learning disability to:

- Have the opportunity to get a job and contribute to their community
- Have the opportunity to choose where they live and,
- Have access to a good quality health service
- Be kept safe and protected from all forms of exploitation
- Access services of the highest quality which make a difference in assisting people to be as independent as possible
- Offer services that are affordable, are personalised and are what people would want to choose

5.1 Prevention and Technology

The Care Act requires Local Authorities to ensure the provision or arrangement of services, facilities or resources to help prevent, delay or reduce the development of needs for care and support. The prevention duty extends to all people in a Local Authority's area, including carers, regardless of whether they have needs for care and support, or whether someone has had a needs or carers' assessment.

In Rotherham our current offer of assistive technology and how the Council prevents customers from coming through our front door is a challenge.

There is a cultural change shift in Rotherham and a move away from the over-reliance on traditional models of care and support to a strength based approach. A significant amount of work has been undertaken to start this process including “Me Learning” Care Act for all staff, 2 days face to face training on strength based practice and implementation of a practice challenge group meeting that is held twice per week to review the quality of assessments across Adult Social Care.

In addition to this the position of a temporary Change Leader has been recruited into for an 18 month period with a specific focus on Prevention and Early Intervention. The work that will be undertaken through the Change Leader will give a strong focus to start to change the strong perception of the need for services and 24 hour support. Within the consultation, 39% of carers felt that with 24 hour support a person could live independently. Built on to this needs to be an emphasis around the offer of assistive technology and how this can support living independently to mitigate or minimise the need to 24 hour care.

During the consultation there was a question around the awareness of what is happening in the community with 40% of customers saying that they did not know or have an awareness of what is happening in the community, whilst 60% reported that they did have some awareness. 79% of staff reported that they did not have any awareness.

In addition 28% of customers told us that they feel part of their community through services like ADPRO, and by getting involved in local events. One customer quoted *“I would like people to be more tolerant of my learning disability and autism”*.

It is recommended that this work continues and that Adult Social Care builds on the improvement of the information and advice offer which demonstrate a model that “prevents, reduces and delays”

This includes the approval and introduction of a Prevention and Technology Strategy developed in line with the Care Act 2014 by August 2017, and the continuation of the work that has commenced with Community Link Workers, Information and Advice Officers and the project for Community Catalysts.

5.2 Day Opportunities

In order to give people more choice and control, the Council need to maximise opportunities for all people within their own communities.

During the consultation 18% of customers advised that their lack of confidence or competence stopped them from undertaking activities and 20% suggested that there was a lack of support to do the things they wanted to do.

Customers suggested that they would like more places to go that are more accessible with wheelchair access.

When carers were asked about constraints within the consultation, they responded that whilst the learning disability of the person they cared for was high for a majority of carers, it was recognised that having support for carers could help maintain a consistent quality of service for a person.

It was clear that there are some worries about the lack of services available and the fact that carers need to work. Carers reported that *“I worry about the extra stress of arranging his care eg: direct payments, employing carers etc”*.

This was also reiterated within the engagement opportunities events where individuals raised concerns about managing a budget and the need for information and advice.

In addition to this, hard to reach communities raised concerns about the lack of Personal Assistants who understand cultural needs.

It is clear that through our contact with customers and carers that the Council need to undertake a further piece of work to promote the use of personalised budgets and how this can provide positives outcomes for customers.

When people were asked about their travel arrangements the response was overwhelming, with 67% of customers suggesting support for travel training and bus buddies, with an escort and community transport for those who are more vulnerable. It is recommended that in order to allow customers to gain skills and independence in self-travel, which will give people the opportunity to access places that they do not currently, that the Council look at support through additional travel training.

5.3 Housing and Accommodation

Through the consultation discussions took place around future housing and accommodation requirements and wishes. It was clear that 52% of customers did not know if they had a support plan for the future and 84% of carers confirmed that they did not.

It was also stated that staff felt that customers and carers were not receiving the necessary support to plan for the future. For most carers and families this subject remains a matter of serious concern.

Through the people who responded within the questionnaires it was determined that 56% of customers lived within the family home. Whilst 17% reside in residential and 16% in supported living, with only 2% in shared lives placements and 9% independently.

When asked specifically about the thought of living independently or if customers thought they should or could, 32% answered "yes" and 68% answered "no". Carers' results on this particular question were 41% "yes" and 59% believing their son/daughter "was not able to" or "would not want to".

The main theme throughout this subject was that services needed to have an individualistic approach for complexity and severity of disability.

Neither customers nor their families have any faith that the Learning Disability population can live on their own without any support. The public believe that living independently can be done provided they are supported appropriately.

This subject is inter-related with the fact that future planning has not been at the heart of discussions held with customers and their families. It is clear that a wider piece of work needs to be undertaken to start to build on the strength based assessments. There is also a need to promote the positives of independent living through visits to schemes such as supported living.

Rotherham has seen some positive outcomes of customers who have resided within a residential setting and have moved on to supported living where they have thrived and gained independent living skills.

This piece of work will be undertaken in partnership with Housing building on the priorities within the Housing Strategy. This work will need to be undertaken to establish the demand and gaps in any specialist provision. There is also some work to be undertaken with providers to be clear on the offer and an approach that promotes and enables independence.

5.4 **Employment Opportunities**

The consultation gave a real insight into the aspirations and expectations of customer's opportunities to gain paid employment or access voluntary work. When asked the question staff responded positively with 80% of staff stating that yes, providing a job is right and there is adequate support. Only 3 people felt this was inappropriate and replied negatively.

The values communicated from staff members were based on the values of equality of opportunity *"people should be given the opportunity to access employment, quite rightly so as they do have a valuable contribution to make to society"*.

Customers responded positively to this question and 92% of customers said that they should have the opportunity to work, whilst 54% of carers and families said that they should not have the opportunity.

Interestingly out of the customers who responded positively to this question only 25% of the cohort said they had the aspiration to work. This is potentially due to the fact that the customers who responded are accessing traditional service models that do not offer the opportunity to access work or gain skills and confidence to access voluntary work or paid employment.

It is clear that the Council need to raise customer's aspirations for employment and voluntary work. It is recommended that a focussed piece of work is undertaken with the relevant partners to enhance our pathway to employment for customers with Learning Disabilities and explore the existing model in-house (ADPRO) to build on any existing opportunities and areas for development. This would tie into the wider consideration for Addison and the offer as outlined in this report.

5.5 **Future of Learning Disability (LD) In-house Services.**

Learning Disability Residential (Parkhill Lodge) and Respite (Quarryhill and Treefields)

It has been determined from engagement with some of the customers within the in-house learning disability residential home that they could be suitable to be supported within an independent living environment. The 22 bedded unit also hosts 2 separate internal flats on the ground and first floors which could be appropriate for development to meet the new requirements of the service. There are also surplus bedrooms across from the internal flats which are currently not used.

During the consultation, hard to reach communities discussed issues around accessing direct payments and personal budgets, and finding personal assistants who understood cultural needs. In addition people stated that *"residential and respite - don't meet people's needs culturally"*.

To enable a better offer for respite, it is recommended that the use of Parkhill Lodge and other Council assets is investigated to include the provision of respite. It was clear from the consultation that carers rely on the use of respite services to enable them to continue in their caring role however the current offer within Treefields and Quarryhill do not accommodate for complex needs. This is an issue that would be overcome through re-providing the service within Parkhill Lodge.

By undertaking this change, it would allow the decommissioning of one or both in-house respite units (Treefields and Quarryhill) over a 12 - 18 month period, both of which offer 6 bedrooms.

The reduction in the use of permanent beds would therefore be utilised for customers currently accessing the in-house respite services.

Treefields and Quarryhill are both semi-detached properties that offer respite to families for either planned or emergency purposes. Whilst the services receive positive feedback from customers and carers, they do not lend themselves to customers who have more complex needs and disabilities.

It is therefore recommended that the below options are considered for consultation to allow for an alternative offer. Quarryhill and Treefields respite buildings could be converted back into a residential property or may be favourable for development.

To provide an in-house learning disability residential unit is rare, however, it is clear that customers who reside here are safe, happy and well with a good Care Quality Commission rating. One option is to retain Parkhill Lodge for the medium term until 2019/20 and possibly re-provide respite within Parkhill Lodge. The customers who are able to be supported in a different environment i.e. Supported Living should be assessed with a plan to move on from a residential setting.

It is recommended that a specific consultation takes place with customers, carers and stakeholders for a period of 12 weeks (see Appendix A). During this time The Council will talk to individuals and their families about the impact and to hear views and concerns about the proposals.

There is a need to consult for the 12 week period due to the complexities of the customer group and to give everyone the opportunity to be involved.

| Option 1: Retain Parkhill as a LD Residential Home and retain 2 current Respite Homes (Treefields and Quarryhill) | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Strengths | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Retains future provision |
| Weakness | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Does not tackle the need to change and transform service in line with vision and aspirations outlined within the report. ▪ Would not offer any choice and control to customers to move on to live independently or to promote independence. ▪ Would not support customers with complex needs. ▪ Would not release any financial savings. ▪ Would not give flexibility to create a different offer that is sustainable. |

| Option 2a: Re-configure Parkhill Lodge to combine the usage of 1 respite unit (Treefields or Quarryhill) over a period of 12 months | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Strengths | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provides sustainable offer for Parkhill Lodge residents for the medium term ▪ Creates a different offer for Parkhill and a more sustainable respite offer which would accommodate for customers with complex needs. ▪ Releases some financial savings through the closure of 1 respite unit and generates opportunities for the usage of the residential building |
| Weakness | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Changes to current environment for customers. |
| Key Assumptions | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Customers within Parkhill Lodge would require an assessment of need to determine the potential of moving on to independent living. ▪ Capital money should be available to support the reconfiguration work needed within Parkhill Lodge. |

| Option 2b: Utilise Cherry Tree House, Masbrough as an Adult with Learning Disabilities Respite Centre to combine the usage of 2 respite units (Treefields and Quarryhill) | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Strengths | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The property is a vacated children's respite facility which is fully accessible. ▪ The premises are adjacent to Liberty House which provides Learning Disability Respite Services up to the age of 18, thereby providing continuity to users as they leave children's provision and move to adults. ▪ The building is in good condition having had a substantial amount of investment over the last few years. ▪ The building is accessible and would meet the needs of people more complex needs. ▪ The premises are vacant and require minimal works to re-commission. |
| Weakness | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Changes to current environment for customers. |
| Key Assumptions | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Capital money should be available to support the reconfiguration work needed within Parkhill Lodge. |

| Option 3: Re-configure Parkhill Lodge to combine the usage of 2 respite units (Treefields and Quarryhill) over a period of 18 months | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Strengths | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provides sustainable offer for Parkhill Lodge residents for the medium term ▪ Creates a different offer for Parkhill and a more sustainable respite offer which would accommodate for customers with complex needs. ▪ Releases some financial savings through the closure of 2 respite units and generates opportunities for the usage of both buildings in a residential area. ▪ Manages the transformation of the services simultaneously. |
| Weakness | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Changes to current environment for customers. |
| Key Assumptions | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Customers within Parkhill Lodge and both respite units will require an assessment to need to determine the potential of moving on to independent living. ▪ Capital money should be available to support the reconfiguration work needed within Parkhill Lodge. |

Out of the above options it should be noted that **option 3** is the preferred recommendation based on the strengths outlined above. This would also allow for a wider transformation of services simultaneously and would maximise the use of Parkhill Lodge over the medium term until 2019/20 whilst the market develops.

5.6 Learning Disability Day Centres

Oaks Day Centre – Wath

The outcome of the consultation whilst some people said they felt they had choice and control, it was clear that customers gave an overwhelming response of their wish to gain employment or voluntary work. This was demonstrated through people expressing their wish to engage in different work settings. 83% of the customers who responded are currently accessing our in-house services (day services and respite).

Some individuals with a learning disability and/or autism not only aspired to live independently but also expressed an interest in seeking employment. Work, education and volunteering were mentioned seven times across the twenty three engagement opportunities.

People with learning disabilities and/or autism stated:

“I would like a job” – session 12.

Others mentioned experiencing learning, work or volunteering opportunities already
“I feel safe to go to college two times a week” – session 12.

When customers were asked about what they were good at, they responded with a variety of activities with the most popular being cooking/baking, computers and gardening. Whilst some of these activities are offered within a day centre environment it can be demonstrated that this is not personalised to the individual and that skills are not utilised to maximise peoples opportunity to work or volunteer.

It was clear that some customers and carers are happy with their current offer and day centre placement as they feel that this meets all their needs in a positive way. There was a strong sense of willingness from carers to support the change and in some cases carers recognised that the choice of a traditional day centre perhaps was not the best option for their loved one.

It is evident that people's friendship circles are really important due to the relationships that have been built over a number of years and that a safe building base of some kind would be favourable. Although there is an understanding and acceptance that this does not have to be the same building for all activities or a large purpose built environment, it is also clear that specialist support services are crucial for customers and carers, and they would like to see more choice for complex and specialist support.

Oaks Day Centre currently offers support to approximately forty people with complex needs. Individual assessments would be required to take place with customers to determine their support needs and to seek potential alternative provision.

There is a piece of work being undertaken from May 2017 through Community Catalysts who will be working with customers and their families to start "taster sessions". This will enable customers with their friendship groups to try other community activities and events in their local area.

Many participants who engaged in the consultation felt that the Council should utilise their existing buildings better, while others acknowledged that some existing buildings were run down and required investment. However, participants felt that should services change they would like the option of having a smaller building base, particularly for the winter months.

'Buildings' became a theme, being discussed six times out of the twenty three engagement sessions.

As outlined above there are some repairs and maintenance costs that will need to be undertaken on the building within the next 12 months. These are approximated to cost in the region of £900,000. The cost of this work is not one that is sustainable in the current climate and this needs to be considered as part of the overall recommendation.

It is recommended that a further period of consultation be held on Oaks Day Centre (Wath) including the option of closure. The consultation should run for 12 weeks to enable all users and families to be engaged within the process. The consultation would need to consider the impact on specific customer groups, the need to source suitable alternative provision and engagement with wider groups and organisations to explore alternatives for individuals. This would also include communications with Community Catalysts and commissioning to enable discussions around the needs and demand for provision in Rotherham.

A specific timescale will be required around any future changes to the provision including closure. The timescale would need to take account for all customers to have a reassessment of need and to allow for any transition processes for customers who will move to alternative provision. Within this timescale the market will continue to be developed to meet the needs of all customers groups.

Whilst recommendations within the report highlight the retaining of REACH customers would still be required to be assessed. These assessments may result in other alternative community based options for customers, which would free up provision for people with a learning disability and autism and or complex needs.

It should be noted that the customers who attend Oaks in many cases have been in attending Oaks for decades from when the former day centre was a school.

Therefore there is highly likely to be sensitivities that will need to be carefully managed with customers, carers and families through consultation and any reassessment.

Around 50% (of the 111 customers) who attend Oaks day centre up to five days a week reside in Supported Living or Residential accommodation. A discussion will need to be held with the relevant providers to discuss their commitment to support customers with day activities within their current living establishment. This would be with a view that this would cease any attendance to in house day centre provision.

| Option 1: Retain Oaks Day Centre | |
|-----------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Strengths | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Retains future provision |
| Weakness | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Does not tackle the need to change and transform service in line with vision and aspirations outlined within the report. ▪ Would not offer any choice and control to customers to move on to live independently or to promote independence. ▪ Does not promote intergenerational approach ▪ Would not support customers to access other community options or employment options ▪ Would not release any financial savings. ▪ Would not give flexibility to create a different offer that is sustainable. ▪ Would create additional financial pressures to modernise building in excess of £900K |

| Option 2: Reduce the offer of Oaks Day Centre to customers who reside within residential and supported living. | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Strengths | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reduce the current offer by 50% of the current customer base and allows further time to source other alternatives for customers in particular with complex needs. ▪ Reduces any duplicate funding arrangements in respect to dual funding for residential and day care provision. |
| Weakness | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Changes to current environment for customers. ▪ Challenge from current providers of residential and supported living. ▪ Would create additional financial pressures to modernise building in excess of £900K |
| Key Assumptions | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Customers within Oaks would require an assessment of need before any changes to the provision of service is made. ▪ Re-assurances would be given to customers regarding re-provision before any changes are made. These commitments would also need to be regularly monitored to ensure compliance. |

| Option 3: Consult on Planned closure of Oaks Day Centre and re-provide by personal budgets and or commissioned day care by an external provider | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Strengths | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Enables the process to create a fit for purpose offer for Rotherham and the opportunity to work with customers and families to achieve their aspirations. ▪ Meets our vision and aspirations to offer more choice and control though exploring alternative solutions for customers and allowing the growth of innovative community options. ▪ Manages the transformation of the services simultaneously. ▪ Releases some financial savings through the closure of the centre and generates opportunities for the usage of the land within a residential area. |
| Weakness | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Changes to current environment for customers. ▪ Potential Transition issues for customers with differing timescales. ▪ Challenge from existing users and families ▪ Potential redeployment issues for staff |
| Key Assumptions | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ All customers will all require an individual assessment of need. |

From the options outlined above it should be noted that **option 3** is the preferred recommendation. This is due to the reasons outlined within the strengths. This is predicated by the facts outlined within the report around the need to transform services and create an offer that has more choice for people within Rotherham, and enables independence. It should be recognised however that all 111 customers within Oaks should be individually re-assessed. A recent exercise on the current customer cohort identifies that around 33 customers at Oaks are supported within the complex needs section of the building. It is recognised that this is an area that is underdeveloped within Rotherham and a suitable alternatives would therefore need to be identified for all customer groups. There are options within another in house service (REACH) where it may be suitable for some customers to transition due to the specialist provision that the service delivers.

Addison (Maltby)

Addison is a day centre for people with a learning disability and over the years the manager and staff have created opportunities for the community to be integrated. This has worked well in some aspects including the kitchen and café arrangements that are open for all to attend.

The centre also houses the in-house learning disability employment service (ADPRO). ADPRO currently have 20 customers that are accessing the service at the present time and have shown some aspects of success in providing an opportunity for customers to gain the necessary skills and confidences to secure paid employment and also have a number of successful voluntary placements. It is, however, recognised that the service could thrive in a different environment outside Addison and maximise employment options through a town centre base. Maximising opportunities for employment is a priority area. This option could be a catalyst to enhance and drive skills and employment for people of Rotherham.

Recent discussions have taken place to look at the potential of the site at Addison being used differently. This could for a different offer to allow for young adults leaving school to access locally provided services where employment skills would

be undertaken with a view to customers moving on to paid employment and to promote the confidence and skills to enable customers to live independently.

The land that Addison occupies is of a significant size and at present hosts 2 large separate buildings with numerous activities and craft rooms and a complex needs section. In the outdoor space it presents a large log cabin which has full electrics, several outdoor poly tunnels and a large grassed area which is utilised by the local schools for football training.

The main building itself has had essential repairs and maintenance, however over the coming years it would require significant investment to retain the standards that would be required if the building was to remain of full use.

Around 109 customers attend Addison and their outreach centre at Kiveton with the majority of customers attending 3 or 4 days per week. Out of the cohort of customers that attend Addison around 13 are supported within complex needs, whilst around 33 can display behaviours which challenge and the remaining customers have health and or mobility issues. It is envisaged through a holistic assessment that some customers could be supported to access community activities whilst other individuals would take more time to transition to new alternatives due to the complexities of their needs.

| Option 1: Retain Addison | |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Strengths | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Retains future provision |
| Weakness | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Does not tackle the need to change and transform service in line with vision and aspirations outlined within the report. ▪ Would not offer any choice and control to customers to move on to live independently or to promote independence. ▪ Does not promote intergenerational approach ▪ Would not support customers to access other community options or employment options ▪ Would not release any financial savings. ▪ Would not give flexibility to create a different offer that is sustainable. ▪ Would create additional financial pressures to modernise building. |

Options 2 and 3 would need to be undertaken concurrently as they involve further exploratory activity and additional options appraisals to be carried out:

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Option 2: Explore potential interest from not for profit providers and consider viable business cases for additional use of the current building for a range of community activities | |
| Strengths | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Retains Addison Day Centre “as is” whilst reducing RMBC provider portfolio. ▪ Aligns children’s and adults’ provision for further refinement and development in the long term. ▪ Provides community options for the community of Maltby |
| Weakness | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Does not easily facilitate short term change. |
| Key Assumptions | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ RMBC continue to fund Addison provision. ▪ All customers will need to have an individual assessment of need. ▪ This will necessitate further options appraisals to be conducted on any submitted business cases and this is anticipated to take up to three months to conclude. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Option 3: To explore the financial viability of sourcing alternative day care accommodation providing support to people with high and complex needs only. | |
| Strengths | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provides accommodation that supports the service and meets the needs of customers. ▪ Would create sustainable solutions for customers with complex needs and future needs for growing demand. ▪ Creates new alternatives that are fit for purpose ▪ Opportunities to build on innovation and creativity of a new build maximising expertise from partners. ▪ Provides suitable alternative for specific customer cohort and reassures families and carers. |
| Weakness | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Does not easily facilitate short term change and the timescales are fluid at present time. |
| Key Assumptions | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ All customers will need to have an individual assessment of need. ▪ Engagement from commissioning and housing colleagues to support the initiative. |

| Option 4: Consult on planned closure of Addison and re-provide by personal budgets and or commissioned day care by an external provider | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Strengths | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Enables the process to create a fit for purpose offer for Rotherham and the opportunity to work with customers and families to achieve their aspirations. ▪ Meets our vision and aspirations to offer more choice and control though exploring alternative solutions for customers and allowing the growth of innovative community options. ▪ Manages the transformation of the services simultaneously. ▪ Releases some financial savings through the closure of the centre and generates opportunities for the usage of the land within a residential area. |
| Weakness | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Changes to current environment for customers. ▪ Potential Transition issues for customers with differing timescales. ▪ Challenge from existing users and families ▪ Potential redeployment issues for staff ▪ Potential breakdown of community engagement that has been built up over the years through Addison. |
| Key Assumptions | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ All customers will need to have an individual assessment of need. |

There is not a definitive recommendation for Addison at this juncture due to the need to consider further options in more detail once business cases have been received. The recommended option for Addison will therefore be covered in a subsequent Cabinet report.

REACH Day Centre and Outreach Service (Maple Avenue and Elliott Centre)

The REACH service is provided from two sites – the Elliott Centre at Badsley Moor Lane, which is the larger of the two sites, with a smaller site at Maple Avenue, Maltby.

The outreach centre Maple Avenue venue has demonstrated some really positive outcomes for customers with autism and learning disabilities, including engagement with the wider community and developing skills and confidence to access local transport.

The service at Maple Avenue can demonstrate good value for money and has a cohort of extremely committed staff who know and understand the complexities of the customer group of 55 customers who attend up to 5 days per week with autism and or a learning disability and behaviours that can challenge. The Council know similar services within Rotherham which are commissioned and are delivered at a higher cost which strengthens the need to retain this service.

It should be noted that around 10 customers at REACH at Maple Avenue are supported with an assessed one to one worker due to the complexities of their health needs and or behaviours that can challenge at times. Whilst REACH supports customers with more complex needs it is known that some customers may

benefit and thrive from a different setting that may better meet their needs. These customers would require a re-assessment to determine this.

It is clear from consultation that there is a need for specialist services that demonstrate positive, proactive and safe outcomes for customers who have more complex needs. There is the potential for the service to grow and there would be a need to review the accommodation that is occupied by the REACH service at both sites. It is recommended that this is explored. This would then enable the service to take on new referrals and consider working in a more flexible, individual and sessional way.

Through the consultation there was a clear emphasis on the need for routine and structure particularly around autism.

Social isolation was highlighted as a concern impacting on health and wellbeing with anxiety regarding communication and frustration being experienced by people not understanding individuals with learning disabilities and/or autism.

Change was referenced several times in the context of health and wellbeing with participants concerned that individuals may not like change and it may have a negative impact on their health and wellbeing.

“B likes routine and any change to this can cause a behaviour problem” – session 4

“Changes affect families, jobs and mental health” – session 11

Some carers commented that day centres are the “best option” (session 3); stating that current services meet needs which was highlighted as particularly important for service users with specialist and complex needs. Carers also voiced that day centres like Reach, which is a specialist service for individuals with autism, provides routine and structure that is important for individuals who have autism.

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Recommendation : Retain REACH Day Centre provision and continue to support current customer group - with a view to exploring more suitable premises. | |
| Strengths | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Retains future provision and provides continued stability for customers with autism and or learning disability and behaviours which can challenge. |
| Weakness | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Does not tackle the need to change and transform service in line with vision and aspirations outlined within the report. ▪ Would not offer any choice and control to customers to move on to live independently or to promote independence. ▪ Does not promote intergenerational approach ▪ Would not support customers to access other community options or employment options ▪ Would not release any financial savings. ▪ Would not give flexibility to create a different offer that is sustainable. ▪ Would create additional financial pressures to modernise building. |

It is recommended that REACH Day Service is retained with a view to considering the use of premises..

Other Recommendations

- 5.7 Within Adult Social Care there are some customers who reside within a residential or supported living setting and in addition access other services such as Day Care and transport services. Around 50% of customers who live in residential and or supported living access the in-house day services.

In some cases this provision results in a duplicate cost to the authority and results in the customer attending day care provision up to 5 days per week. The existing providers of the residential and supported living accommodation would therefore need to provide activities within the current offer.

To change the existing practice there will need to be a period of consultation with existing providers, customers and families to introduce a mandate to change this provision.

- 5.8 To deliver on the above recommendations for in-house services, the majority of the customer base affected by such changes would need a review. In order for this to happen, there will need to be commitment for a team of social workers who could undertake holistic Care Act assessments with customers and their families.

The extent of this work would also require a dedicated project team to drive the delivery of this forward. Agreement has been sought to advertise for a Band L post which will allow for the current Learning Disability Operational Manager to support the Head of Service with the developments. In addition to this there will need to be some additional capacity to support the full delivery of the consultation and any agreed implementation.

6 Consultation

- 6.1 The Council has been engaging with customers, carers, staff, voluntary sector and local communities for more than 18 months. The conversations on the change agenda have continued and as part of this there were specific events such as "Together for Change" which engaged customers and carers from the learning disability day centres. This process was used to discuss people's aspirations and how the Council can shape services for the future together.

The consultation process for the LD and Autism Offer took place from 05 December 2016 to 02 February 2017 for a period of 60 days. Within this time a range of senior officers supported the process to meet as many people as possible. This was undertaken through the process of focus groups, drop-in sessions, one to ones and completion of questionnaires.

Speakup self-advocacy were involved within the consultation and have supported customers and carers where needed.

As a matter of public law, any proposal to close a facility or significantly change a service will require a reasonable period of engagement and consultation with those affected by such a proposal. The amount of time required for a consultation exercise should be decided on a case by case basis. The latest Government guidance on consultation principles confirms that the length of a consultation exercise should be judged on the basis of legal advice and taking into account the nature and impact of the proposal. In addition, the capacity of the groups to be consulted needs to be considered to achieve real engagement, rather than merely following a bureaucratic process. The guidance indicates that the period of

consultation will usually last for between 2 and 12 weeks. Based on a discussion with the Assistant Director of Legal Services it is recommended that the consultation outlined within this report lasts for the maximum period of 12 weeks. This is based on the need for a reasonable period of time to consult with customers and families who would be affected by such proposals. In addition, this will build in time for the complexities of the customer groups. Given those complexities, it is not anticipated that this could be completed in less than 12 weeks.

The purpose of the consultation is to gather the views and preferences of those consulted on the proposal and its implementation, and to understand whether there are any possible unintended consequences of the proposal. The product of the consultation will then help to inform final proposals.

Appendix A outlines the consultation timeline and the specific consultation for each recommendation.

7 Timetable and Accountability for Implementing this Decision

- 7.1 It is proposed that a further period of consultation take place based on the recommendations. The consultation will be with a specific focus on the future of in-house services. Following approval of this report the consultation would commence in September 2017 (Appendix A). In addition to this there is an indicative timeline for the preferred option for Oaks Day Centre and the re-configuration of Parkhill Lodge.
- 7.2 Because of the need for a further period of consultation and the above timescales, there will be a delay in achieving the savings for Learning Disability and the savings for 2017/18 of £457,000 would not be realised. If the decision is taken to close Oaks Day Centre, this will result in all customers being re-assessed. Sourcing alternatives would need to be worked through on an individual basis. The timescales to assess and find suitable alternatives is difficult to gauge but could be deliverable to release the savings within 2018/19. The current work that is underway with the Community Catalysts contract will give an opportunity to see some creative alternatives developed for customers within these timescales.
- 7.3 The consultation process for Treefields and Quarryhill would run alongside this and would be delivered within the same timescales as above and therefore would impact on delivering the additional £245,000 savings in 2017/18.

8. Financial and Procurement Implications

- 8.1 These proposals in respect of the re-provision of residential, day care and respite care are included in the Adult Services Development Programme. The proposals also form part of the Medium Term Financial Strategy which includes total savings of £4.2 million over 3 years based on the reconfiguration of learning disability services, moving away from traditional building based in-house provision to more personalised and independent services. In order to work towards meeting these approved budget savings approval is required to enable extensive consultation to commence as soon as possible.
- 8.2 As part of the Development Programme there has been implementation of a financial tracker which shows the savings for each particular area with the year it should be achieved. The full savings for learning disabilities can be seen in the table below:

| Work Stream | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | 2018/19 | Total |
|---------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|------------------|
| | £ | £ | £ | £ |
| Modernisation of LD Offer | 254,000 | 457,000 | 682,000 | 1,393,000 |
| In-House Respite | | 245,000 | | 245,000 |
| High Cost Placements | 540,000 | 880,000 | 160,000 | 1,580,000 |
| Supported Living/CHC | | 1,000,000 | | 1,000,000 |
| Total Savings | 794,000 | 2,582,000 | 842,000 | 4,218,000 |

It should be noted that the £245,000 saving for in-house respite (Quarryhill and Treefields) was approved as a budget saving for 2016/17 and therefore is currently resulting in a budget pressure. The consultation process was required to enable this to take place with due consideration and suitable alternatives identified. However the savings within this report may not deliver the full amount of budget savings after taking account of alternative service provision. This position will be kept under review as the service changes are progressed and the Directorate will identify mitigating savings to cover any shortfall.

In addition to the proposals being considered in the report there is a further £2.5 million identified for learning disabilities earmarked against savings on high cost placements within residential and nursing care and supported living. This is to be delivered through re-tendering of external contractors and via re-negotiation with existing providers and reviewing care packages including ensuring contributions from health.

8.3 Financial Implications against the current Assets

Engagement with Asset Management who undertake a corporate landlord responsibility have provided a list of the planned maintenance costs that are required on the properties outlined within this report over the next 5 years.

In particular there are significant costs against Oaks Day Centre for repairs and maintenance which are over £900, 000. This is an estimated figure based on industry standards (for example for a heating system) and actual repairs and refurbishment costs would be subject to tendering and procurement.

The net expenditure budgets for 2017/18 for the services under review (excluding property costs) are as follows:-

| Establishment | 2017/18 Net Budget |
|----------------------|---------------------------|
| | £000 |
| Oaks Day Centre | 917 |
| Addison Day Centre | 1,006 |
| Treefield Respite | 294 |
| Quarryhill Respite | 278 |
| Elliott Centre | 666 |
| Total | 3,161 |

These figures include premises running costs and budget savings approved as part of the budget setting process for 2016/17 and 2017/18.

9. Legal Implications

9.1 Under the Care Act 2014, local authorities have statutory duties towards individuals who are ordinarily resident in their area to ensure they:

- receive services that prevent their care needs from becoming more serious, or delay the impact of their needs;
- can get the information and advice they need to make good decisions about care and support; and
- have a range of provision of high quality, appropriate services to choose from.

The purpose of the Care Act is to improve people's independence and wellbeing. The legislation sets out specific duties of local authorities to provide or arrange services that help prevent people developing needs for care and support or delay people deteriorating such that they would need ongoing care and support.

Local authorities are required to consider the following:

- what services, facilities and resources are already available in the area (for example local voluntary and community groups), and how these might help local people
- identifying people in the local area who might have care and support needs that are not being met
- identifying carers in the area who might have support needs that are not being met

In discharging this duty, local authorities are required to work with their communities and provide or arrange services that help to keep people well and independent. This should include identifying the local support and resources already available and helping people to access them.

9.2 The Council currently discharges its duties to adults with learning difficulties through a combination of in-house services and externally provided services. This report contains recommendations on the potential options for significantly remodelling how services are delivered to those individuals in the future. Given those potential changes and the fact that many individuals have been service users over a long period of time, it is likely that they would have a legitimate expectation to be consulted on any potential significant changes to the current services. In the circumstances, the Council should also consult service users to comply with its common law duty to act fairly. The proposed consultation exercise is set out in paragraph 6 above.

9.3 In addition to the legal requirements for robust consultation, the Council has to ensure it complies with its duties under the Equality Act 2010. Under Section 1 of that Act the Council must, when making decisions of a strategic nature about how to exercise its functions, have due regard to the desirability of exercising them in a way that is designed to reduce the inequalities of outcome which result from socio-economic disadvantage. In addition under Section 149 of the Equality Act, the Council must comply with the public sector equality duty which requires it to have due regard to the need to:

- Eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the Act.
- Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.
- Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

In dealing with this duty, the Council must have due regard in particular, to the need to:

- Remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant characteristic that are connected to that characteristic.
- Take steps to meet the needs of people who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different to the needs of persons who do not share it.
- Encourage persons who share a relevant characteristic to participate in public life or any other activities where their participation is disproportionately low.

Protected characteristics include disability, age, race, sex, religion or belief, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy/maternity and sexual orientation.

- 9.4 It is proposed that full assessments of customer and carers will be undertaken to ensure all care and support packages are appropriate.

10. Human Resources Implications

- 10.1 Each proposal will need more detailed work to assess the impact on staff and appropriate consultation with staff and trade unions will need to be undertaken. A corporate notification has been made to the government indicating potential job losses across the council from 1 June 2017 to 31 March 2018 and therefore this proposal will fall within this.

In terms of each establishment the following shows the number of workers who may potentially be affected by the proposals:

Oaks Day Centre– 37 workers
 Quarryhill – 19 workers
 Treefields – 17 workers
 Addison – 43 workers
 Elliott Centre – 18 workers
 Maple Avenue – 7 workers

Should the proposals go ahead the Council will ensure that its policies and procedures are used to support staff, wherever possible, to find suitable alternative employment. However, for the range of proposals indicated above, if all were to proceed, then there is likelihood for some compulsory redundancies, as it is unlikely that redeployment opportunities would be available to accommodate all of the staff. The potential costs of redundancy and pension need to be considered.

Due to the number of staff potentially affected there would be a need for a statutory 90 day consultation.

11. Implications for Children and Young People and Vulnerable Adults

- 11.1 The development of a range of high quality sustainable opportunities for future customers who may transition from children's services will help these young people to maintain their skills and have choice and control over where they live and how they spend their time. Work is underway which will offer more choice that will meet a variety of needs which can be bought by the customer directly. Young people will choose to have a personal budget in the form of a direct payment and be able to decide how to spend this flexibly. Services will be local to where people live and customers will become fully integrated within their local communities. Through the transition board progress has been made to gain an understanding of whom the younger people are and identify any needs at an earlier stage and the impact on Adult Services. This will form a key work-stream to be taken forward.
- 11.2 As part of the consultation process the Council have engaged with young people and attended events such as the "parent's partnership group". There has also been communication with the Strategic Commissioner in CYPS to promote the completion of questionnaires. There has been development with the special educational needs schools in Rotherham and the Chief Executive to build better working relationships and solutions for younger people.

12 Equalities and Human Rights Implications

- 12.1 The attached is the Learning Disability Equality Analysis (Appendix B) for the Adult Social Care Development Programme as a whole, however, following the decision and within the consultation period there will be a need to work on individual analyses that relate directly to each area. There will be work with customers to co-produce an equality analysis for each decision made.

It is recognised within the equality analysis that the recommendations regarding re-provision of services may result in a disproportionate representation of learning disability services being provided in the Maltby area. This would be rectified within the medium term whilst alternative provision is being grown throughout the whole borough.

13. Implications for Partners and Other Directorates

- 13.1 Key partners and stakeholders will be engaged with as part of the consultation process and will continue to form part of our wider discussions through the Development Programme.
- 13.2 There is a need for a clear engagement and communication/media plan. There will need to be a working group that would drive this project and include dedicated officers from a variety of teams including the communications team.

14. Risks and Mitigation

- 14.1 Risk of not agreeing to the recommendations will mean that the aspirations and outcomes for customers will not be achieved and the budget savings will not be met, and alternative options will need to be identified in order to achieve a balanced budget.
- 14.2 Due to the timescales outlined within the report (Appendix A) there is a risk that the savings identified for 2017/18 will be delayed and that this will leave a pressure within existing budgets.

- 14.3 Young people coming through transition will have limited choice if alternative service models are not developed in a timely way.
- 14.4 Despite the amount of on-going engagement with parents and carers, it is acknowledged that the decisions to be taken will not be favourable. Some customers could be affected by one or more of the recommendations.
- 14.5 There is a strong possibility of legal challenge and negative media attention. Therefore consultation and following due processes in a transparent manner and engaging with customers will be fundamental and underpin all activity. All individuals will have an individual reassessment of need in a strength based way as outlined in the Care Act 2014.
- 14.6 There is an increased risk of formal complaints.
- 14.7 Market development as part of Shaping the Future Strategy, and more specifically highlighted in the Market Position Statement will be required to deliver the alternative solutions with the proposed decommissioning as outlined within the report.

15. Accountable Officer(s)

Anne Marie Lubanski, Strategic Director of Adult Care and Housing

Janine Moorcroft, Head of Service, Adult Care Services (Provider)

Approvals Obtained from:

Strategic Director of Finance and Corporate Services:- Judith Badger

Director of Legal Services:- Dermot Pearson

Head of Procurement (if appropriate):-

This report is published on the Council's website or can be found at:-

<http://modern.gov.rotherham.gov.uk/ieDocHome.aspx?Categories>