

Public Document Pack

Gareth Owens LL.B Barrister/Bargyfreithiwr
Chief Officer (Governance)
Prif Swyddog (Llywodraethu)



To: Cllr Aaron Shotton (Leader)

CS/NG

Councillors: Bernie Attridge, Chris Bithell,
Helen Brown, Derek Butler, Christine Jones,
Kevin Jones and Billy Mullin

18 May 2015

Nicola Gittins 01352 702345
nicola.gittins@flintshire.gov.uk

Dear Sir / Madam

Cabinet – Tuesday 19 May 2015

I refer to the agenda for Cabinet on Tuesday 19 May 2015 and enclose the following reports which the Chair has agreed to consider as urgent items:

Yours faithfully

Democracy & Governance Manager

7a **MELROSE CONSULTATION** (Pages 3 - 12)

7b **RESPONSE FROM ENVIRONMENT OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY
COMMITTEE TO A CALL IN** (Pages 13 - 16)

This page is intentionally left blank

FLINTSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

REPORT TO: **CABINET**

DATE: **TUESDAY, 19 MAY 2015**

REPORT BY: **CHIEF OFFICER (SOCIAL SERVICES)**

SUBJECT: **MELROSE CONSULTATION**

1.00 PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.01 To provide an overview of the outcome of the consultation in order for Cabinet to make the final decision regarding the future provision of day care services, previously provided at the Melrose Centre.

2.00 BACKGROUND

2.01 The agreed budget for the Council for 2015/16 included the need to rationalise day care for older people reducing to a smaller number of sites, and to target specialist provision, e.g. supporting people living with dementia. This informed the recent budget report and confirmed the proposal to consult on the possible re-provision of the services provided at the Melrose day centre in Shotton.

2.02 Day services for older people are provided 5 days per week in four main centres, The Melrose Centre, Marleyfield House Day Centre, Croes Atti Day Centre and The Old Brewery. Services run in the main Monday -Friday from 9am – 5pm.

2.03 The service provides both dementia and generic day care across all of the centres on discreet/dedicated day. Day services are very much a part of the strategy to keep people at home for as long as possible. It meets the needs for respite care provided to support carers as well as the cared for. The average age of people attending day services is 85.

2.04 Over the past 12 months occupancy levels for in house day care have dropped. This could be for a number of reasons, including change in transport arrangements, increase of direct payments, the establishments of community based activities/support and more use of alternative provision such as The Windmill an independent sector day centre in Buckley. The trend indicates a reduction in the number of people requiring generic support with consistency in the number of people with dementia.

2.05 Given that the Melrose Centre supports mostly generic day care and the building is in need of significant capital funding, it is timely to review service provision and the location of such provision and

reconsider the needs of those currently attending the Melrose centre and where appropriate offer alternative support. This could be in another placement, a direct payment or support to access community based services.

- 2.06 The attached consultation document details the four consultation options and options summaries.

3.00 CONSIDERATIONS

CONSULTATION - KEY POINTS

- 3.01 The formal consultation began with two consultation events held on 3rd and 4th February 2015. Attendance at both events was good with over 70% of service users and their families attending the consultation events.

- 3.02 In addition to the group consultations, face to face consultations also took place, we have also received a number of letters and emails from service users and families.

- 3.03 The 4 options considered are set out below. Although there are very strong reasons for wanting to review the future of the Melrose Centre it is nevertheless good practice to consult on retaining the status quo as one option.

- Invest in the refurbishment of the Melrose Centre and continue as is.
- Transfer the day services to a new organisation that is which is independent from the Council.
- Transfer current day service users to other day services in Flintshire.
- Actively support individuals to arrange their own day services through the use of Direct Payments and Managed Accounts.

- 3.04 More detailed information about the 4 options can be found in Appendix 1

There was opportunity for individuals and their families to hear from the voluntary sector. The information provided by Flintshire Local Voluntary Council (FLVC) and the North East Wales Carer information Service (NEWCIS) about other groups and opportunities within Flintshire was considered helpful to individuals and their families.

Consultation outcomes in summary

- 3.05 Over 75% of Melrose service users and their families took part of the consultation process.

- 3.06 Option one was the most popular option with 100% of those consulted, maintaining that the Melrose Centre should be kept open as a day centre and that the Council should invest in the building making it fit for purpose, that services should remain as they are, and the Council should find other efficiencies to meet the funding gap.
- 3.07 Option two was strongly the second favoured option. A requirement for the service users and their families, was that this option would need to accommodate all service users within any new premises.
- 3.08 Option three was supported by some people.
- 3.09 Option four is not an option that individuals want to pursue however, some families took information away with them to consider for the future.
- 3.10 Alternative sustainable models the future will be explored with service users with the support of the voluntary sector.
- 3.11 Option 2 was strongly the second favoured option. A requirement for the service users and their families, was that this option would need to accommodate all service users within any new premises.
- 3.12 The strong conclusion from this consultation is that Option 2 is the only feasible option to take forward. Although Option 1 was clearly popular from the consultation support that it received, it is not possible to take forward this option due to capital and revenue funding constrains. Therefore this report is strongly recommending that Option 2 is the most favoured option that is also financial sustainable. There will also be some people that prefer to utilise Option 3 in accessing local authority day-care in one of our remaining day centres. The clear conclusion of this consultation is that the taking forward of Option 2 with some elements of Option 3 provides a very good service which compares very well with the current service and is financially sustainable

4.00 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 4.01 Cabinet is asked to approve the recommended Option 2, the transfer of the service to a new organisation, for the future provision of day care services, previously provided by the Melrose Centre.
- 4.02 Cabinet approve that where it is people's choice that Option 3, the transfer of day care to another Local Authority day centre, is made available to day care service users.

5.00 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 5.01 The proposed change to day care services will achieve £130k efficiency already planned in the council's annual budget.

6.00 ANTI POVERTY IMPACT

6.01 There is no significant input.

7.00 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

7.01 A report has been presented to the Asset Management Group regarding the Melrose Centre being surplus to Social Service requirements.

8.00 EQUALITIES IMPACT

8.01 An initial scoping exercise has been undertaken, and the assessment confirmed that there would be minimal impact to service users, this is because a service will be maintained, operating from a building which is fit for purpose.

8.02 The consultation has offered choices for individuals and this meets with the requirements of the Social Services and Well-being Act.

9.00 PERSONNEL IMPLICATIONS

9.01 There are 5 staff, on variety of contract hours, to consider as part of the proposed closure. Meetings have been held and formal Individual Consultation meetings are being progressed.

9.02 T.U.P.E forms part of the negotiations for any service transfer. However, it is envisaged that these staff will choose to be redeployed into vacant posts within other service areas.

10.00 CONSULTATION REQUIRED

10.01 To consult with key stakeholders, staff, service users, and with Social and Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

11.00 CONSULTATION UNDERTAKEN

11.01 Full consultation with key stakeholders, staff, and service users has been undertaken.

11.02 This report was considered by Social and Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee on the 14th May. The outcome of the meeting was fully supportive of the recommended option, the recommendation being "having due regard to the outcome of the consultation, the committee endorses the intention to proceed with option 2 "(the recommended option)

12.00 APPENDICES

12.01 Melrose consultation – summary of actions

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION ACT) 1985
BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS**

None.

**Contact Officer: Neil Ayling, Chief Officer, Social Services,
Telephone 01352 702500
Email: neil.j.ayling@flintshire.gov.uk**

This page is intentionally left blank

Melrose Consultation - Summary of options

Appendix 1

Option	Option Summary	Key Points for Consideration	Impact / risks
<p data-bbox="91 215 481 311">Option one - Invest in the refurbishment of the Melrose Centre and continue as is.</p>	<p data-bbox="495 215 1294 582">Concern was raised regarding the condition of the building and why the Council has not maintained the building to an acceptable standard. Individuals felt that the condition of the building was being used as an excuse to close the centre and that the condition of the Melrose was not really as bad as the council were making out. A comment was made that the condition survey related to 2011 if this deemed the Melrose building as poor and in need of capital investment why had it taken a number of years to get to this position, the service has been running in the building as it is when allegedly unfit for purpose all this time.</p> <p data-bbox="495 622 1288 750">Questions were asked with regard to the asset, and what will happen to the asset if it is no longer a day centre. There was concern regarding Council's responsibility to ensure it doesn't become an eyesore within the community.</p> <p data-bbox="495 790 1294 917">Questions were asked about the centre and how much will it cost the Council to moth ball and manage the asset once closed in terms of local vandalism in the area and general upkeep.</p> <p data-bbox="495 957 1281 1260">The overwhelming issue raised was in relation to the staff and the care and support provided by the Melrose staff team, service users and families were 100% in favour of keeping the staff team. Individuals and their families told us that they would "put up with" closing the Melrose and moving to a new building, as long as the staff team would continue to support and deliver the service. All individual and their families raised major concerns regarding the suggestion of independent sector provision.</p> <p data-bbox="495 1300 1232 1396">100% of those consulted with considered the most favourable option was to reinvest and keep the Melrose Centre open and continue as is.</p>	<p data-bbox="1308 215 1713 486">Supporting this option will incur costs of approximately £90k capital investment to bring the building to an acceptable standard that will meet future needs. In addition the service will not achieve the £130k efficiency savings.</p>	<p data-bbox="1765 215 2116 383">The risk to keeping the Melrose Centre open and investing in refurbishment would not achieve the efficiency saving.</p> <p data-bbox="1765 422 2128 486">The risk to choosing this option is Moderate</p>

Option	Option Summary	Key points for consideration	Impact / risks
<p>Option two - Transfer the day service to a new organisation which is independent from the Council.</p>	<p>100% of those consulted felt that this option could be considered if and only if the staff team would continue to provide support.</p> <p>100% of those consulted maintained that the care and support provided by the staff group was essential to their well-being. Having a staff team they had confidence in was the most important part of the day service.</p> <p>100% of those consulted maintained that independent sector providers would not be able to provide the same or similar trained staff. Individuals felt that the terms and conditions of independent sector providers did not encourage quality of provision.</p> <p>The overall majority of individuals felt that option two would be acceptable, if any new provider could accommodate all the day care centre users. The community spirit, and camaraderie was vital to the success of the day service. The relationships and networks with one another and with the staff was of critical importance to all.</p> <p>Individuals, their families and carers told us that they would have peace of mind if the in house staff team could continue to provide the service.</p> <p>The overwhelming majority would support a transfer to a new provider (building only) but would not support this option if the staff do not move with them.</p>	<p>Supporting this option could achieve the desired outcome, it would meet the needs of most people.</p> <p>Should Members agree to maintain this as an in house service at the request of 100 % the £130k saving will not be achieved, in addition the council may incur a cost of renting space for day centre usage from a provider. .</p>	<p>The transfer of day services to a new centre will provide an improved enhanced environment for day service users.</p> <p>Closing the Melrose centre would have a low impact on people. A day service will still be provided and assessed needs will still be met, by an independent care provider.</p> <p>Service users could be involved in the recruitment of any new staff employed by the Independent sector providers.</p> <p>Risk – Minor</p>
<p>Option</p>	<p>Option Summary</p>	<p>Key Points for Consideration</p>	<p>Impact / risks</p>
<p>Option three - Transfer the</p>	<p>This option was discussed in some detail, it was explained</p>		<p>The transfer to alternative</p>

Melrose Consultation - Summary of options

Appendix 1

<p>current day service users to other day services in Flintshire.</p> <p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">Page 11</p>	<p>that whilst this was an option for some people, the service could not accommodate all individuals, it was confirmed that there are day care spaces at Croes Atti in Flint, and some day care spaces at Marleyfield House in Buckley.</p> <p>It was confirmed that these centres are currently Council run</p> <p>Some families were seeking assurances that Croes Atti and Marleyfield House would be a long term option given the recent press coverage on care home closures. The majority of people were concerned that if they chose this as an option, they may be in a similar position in 12 months time.</p> <p>Some individuals felt that this might be an option they would want to consider, given that these centres are Council run, and recognised that their own circumstances might change over time.</p> <p>This option will be considered by some as a suitable option for them.</p>		<p>in house day services provided at Croes Atti and Marleyfield House, can be accommodated and arranged on an individual bases .</p> <p>This option can be achieved with the time scales this would be a personal choice option.</p> <p>This option can run in parallel with option 2</p> <p>Risk – Insignificant</p>
<p>Option four - Actively support individuals to arrange their own day services through the use of Direct Payments and Managed Accounts.</p>	<p>The direct payment option was explained in detail, however this option was not seen as a solution for the client group. The overwhelming majority of the client group are over the age of 87 years and individuals felt the knowledge, effort and change would be too great a burden for them and their families / cares to manage.</p>	<p>Individual would find this option difficult to understand, the times and opportunities for individuals may be limited, however this option can be discussed with individuals and their families.</p>	<p>This option forms part of the range of options for individuals to choose from, and should not be seen in isolation.</p> <p>Risk – Moderate if this was the only option supported by members</p>

This page is intentionally left blank

FLINTSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

REPORT TO: **CABINET**

DATE: **19TH MAY 2015**

REPORT BY: **MEMBER ENGAGEMENT MANAGER**

SUBJECT: **FLINTSHIRE PARKING STRATEGIES**

1.00 PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.01 To formally report to the Cabinet the result of the call in of decision 3157 – Flintshire Parking Strategies.

2.00 BACKGROUND

2.01 At its meeting on 21st April 2015, the Cabinet approved the Flintshire Parking Strategy report of the Chief Officer (Streetscene & Transportation).

2.02 The decision was subsequently called in by Councillors Mike Peers, Neville Phillips, Arnold Woolley, Carol Ellis and Dennis Hutchinson. The reasons given for the call in were as follows:

(1) The Flintshire Parking strategy does not take into account the impact of parking charges on the vitality and viability of each town and community.

(2) The impact of out of town shopping centres with free parking has not been considered on existing town centres.

3.00 CONSIDERATIONS

3.01 The call in was heard by the Environment Overview & Scrutiny Committee at a meeting on 14th May.

3.02 At the meeting, the initiators of the call in were represented by the signatories, together with Councillor Richard Jones. The decision makers were represented by the Deputy Leader/Cabinet Member for the Environment, Councillor Bernie Attridge, together with the Chief Officer (Streetscene & Transportation)

3.03 Both the call in initiators and the decision makers put their cases to the committee, and responded to Members' questions.

3.04 At the end of that process and summing up, the committee was reminded of the four options which are available to it in response to a call in. The Cabinet Member indicated that if the Flintshire Parking strategy was found to be in need of revision before the anticipated twelve months review, he would not hesitate so to do. In such circumstances, an appropriate report would then be submitted to the Cabinet.

3.05 The decision which the committee made was option 1 that the Overview & Scrutiny committee is satisfied with the explanation which it has received. The decision makers were therefore informed that the decision may now be implemented.

4.00 RECOMMENDATIONS

4.01 That the Cabinet welcomes the decision of the Environment Overview & Scrutiny Committee and the Flintshire Parking Strategy be now implemented.

5.00 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

5.01 The implications of this decision are identified and listed in the report to Cabinet on 21st April 2015.

6.00 ANTI POVERTY IMPACT

6.01 The implications of this decision are identified and listed in the report to Cabinet on 21st April 2015.

7.00 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

7.01 The implications of this decision are identified and listed in the report to Cabinet on 21st April 2015.

8.00 EQUALITIES IMPACT

8.01 The implications of this decision are identified and listed in the report to Cabinet on 21st April 2015.

9.00 PERSONNEL IMPLICATIONS

9.01 The implications of this decision are identified and listed in the report to Cabinet on 21st April 2015.

10.00 CONSULTATION REQUIRED

10.01 Not applicable.

11.00 CONSULTATION UNDERTAKEN

11.01 Not applicable.

12.00 APPENDICES

12.01 None.

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION ACT) 1985
BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS**

Agenda for the environment Overview & Scrutiny Committee at its meeting on Thursday 14th May 2015.

Contact Officer: Robert Robins .
Telephone: 01352 702320 .
Email: Robert.robins@flintshire.gov.uk .

This page is intentionally left blank