



**Consultation Report Summary: Consultation on the
Proposal to Provide Older People Residential Respite
Support Services in the Independent Sector
Hollins View Community Support Centre**

October 2014

Introduction

A consultation was held between the 28th August and 8th October, on the Proposal to Provide Older People Residential Respite Support Services in the Independent Sector. Its aim was to understand the views of customers and carers on the proposal and a number of ways other than residential care to provide respite care to give carers a break so that people have increased choice and their preferences can be met. These options included:

- Care provided in the person's own home through home care services
- The Shared Lives service.
- Receiving a Direct Payment.

Feedback Analysis

In total, 59 separate responses were received in respect of the consultation. This includes via the online comment form, telephone calls, letters received, emails received and face to face meetings. 41 of these were either from customers of Hollins View or by carers/family of users at Hollins View. Two petitions were also submitted to the Council expressing a wish to retain the respite services at Hollins View. The petitions contained 882 signatures (petition created by Councillor Laura Jeuda - Member for Macclesfield South) and 526 signatures (petition created by Eileen Talbot, Senior Voice for Macclesfield).

A) Quality of Services

i) Quality of Care

- ▶ Responses from Customers or their Carers (or those representing a customer)

17 responses were received relating that the quality of care provided at Hollins View was high. The responses included comments about the caring nature of staff, their ability to build relationships with customers and the responsiveness of the services to crisis such as the need for a carer to go into hospital.

- ▶ Other Comments (inc. those who didn't state if they were representing someone)

Members of the public were also complimentary about the care at Hollins View (3 responses). Comments were received about staff being both caring and friendly, customers being treated with respect and the lively nature of the atmosphere there.

ii) Quality of Care in the Independent Sector

- ▶ Responses from Customers or their Carers (or those representing a customer)

15 responses stated concerns about the quality of independent sector care. 4 gave concerns that independent sector homes had a focus on profit over care. 3 responses stated that customers/carers were open to the idea of receiving respite in the independent sector providing the quality of care was similar. 6 responses emphasised the importance of the respite that Hollins View provides for carers.

► Other Comments (inc. those who didn't state if they were representing someone)

3 responses from members of the public expressed unease about the quality of care in the independent sector. 1 response related that profit would be prioritised over care by these homes. Additionally, 1 consultee noted that Hollins View offered specialist respite, including a commitment to good practice and links with health, and felt that it was not possible to replicate this through spot purchasing beds.

iii) Reassurance, Continuity of Care and Social Interaction:

► Responses from Customers or their Carers (or those representing a customer)

4 responses stated that Hollins View was important due to the reassurance and peace of mind that it gave carers. 7 responses stated that the continuity of care that Hollins View provided was a critical part of the service. 5 comments suggested that the cared for person felt more comfortable with a consistent staff group.

1 respondent felt that this was particularly important for customers with dementia. 5 respondents stated that the social interaction that the service at Hollins View provides is important. 1 respondent stated that this aspect of a respite service could not be as strong as these homes already had settled populations. Another carer stated that he believed that Hollins View was primarily for people with dementia and as such was a difficult place for his wife to go as she did not have this condition. As such, he welcomed the increased choice that the proposal offered.

► Other Comments (inc. those who didn't state if they were representing someone)

In the Alzheimer's Society's response, they highlighted how respite care allowed carers to reassess the situation providing, "an opportunity to stabilise a situation by changing or adapting support to the person with dementia's needs or abilities" and also that, "it can be a tool to prevent a crisis from developing or carer breakdown". Healthwatch remarked that any transition for dementia users would have to be managed with care. They also commented that there was a lack of alternative day services locally if the service at the centre closed.

iii) The Building

► Responses from Customers or their Carers (or those representing a customer)

3 comments were received directly relating to the building. One individual asked why money had been spent on new carpets and redecoration if it was to close. Another person asked what would happen to the building if services moved from there. A

further person praised the building stating that it allowed care to be offered in a smaller setting whilst also allowing customers freedom to wander.

B) Demand for Services and Availability

► Responses from Customers or their Carers (or those representing a customer)

15 comments were made regarding the availability of respite care in the independent sector. These responses stated that there was a shortage of suitable beds within Macclesfield and that the choices that were contained in the consultation would not be available. 3 respondents stated concerns about the growing demand for respite services within the local area and the country as a whole due to the ageing population. One respondent stated that the availability of beds in the independent sector would be 'severely limited' by the amount the Council was willing to pay.

► Other Comments (inc. those who didn't state if they were representing someone)

5 comments from the public (including Healthwatch) were received regarding the availability of respite care in the independent sector. Another individual expressed concern about the rising demand for respite services due to the growing population. The response from Healthwatch also queried how the withdrawal of intermediate care would be managed, and the availability of specialist respite care for people with learning disabilities.

ii) Cost of Care:

► Responses from Customers or their Carers (or those representing a customer)

4 individuals commented that the business case for the consultation proposal had not been included in the Information Pack. It was felt that if the longer-term costs were considered the independent sector care would be more expensive. They also went on to say that not having any public provision leaves the Council in a much weaker negotiating position. One respondent felt that more efforts were needed to attract other sources of funding to keep centres like Hollins View open.

► Other Comments (inc. those who didn't state if they were representing someone)

1 individual also felt that the business case for the consultation proposal should have been included in the Consultation Information Pack.

C) Booking

► Responses from Customers or their Carers (or those representing a customer)

5 comments were received relating to the booking of respite care. These comments noted the importance of being able to book respite care in both the short term; in an emergency situation, and also in the long term, for instance, to allow the planning of holidays. As such, it was felt that any future service must be able to provide for these needs. Having a single point for booking offering reliability and flexibility was also viewed as key. Location was a further factor, with 3 comments stating the need for local services and merits of Hollins View's situation.

► Other Comments (inc. those who didn't state if they were representing someone)

2 members of the public referred to the booking of respite care. Both comments emphasised the importance of being able to obtain respite services in an emergency.

D) Alternative Services (excluding independent sector respite)

► Responses from Customers or their Carers (or those representing a customer)

A number of alternative options to receiving care at Hollins View were put forward in the Consultation. Some respondents stated that there was not enough information provided to come to a full decision on the options and that two of them were not appropriate for customers who had been assessed as needing residential respite.

Direct Payments - One carer stated that in their experience, the money that would be made available for a Direct Payment would be insufficient to cover respite care in an independent sector residential home. Another carer stated that they had already tried Direct Payments but found that it didn't work for them. They also stated that there was little aside from independent respite care that they would want to obtain as the cared for person was not keen on accessing things like day activities. Another carer felt the Council had a "duty of responsibility" with regard to respite care and that it could increase risk if people began employing their own carers.

Shared Lives - One respondent felt this service could not replace the social interaction available at Hollins View. Another respondent said that more information needed to be provided on this option. One carer stated that it sounded like a good service but would not be suitable for the person that they cared for. A further carer expressed a concern over whether there would be sufficient Shared Lives carers who would care for dementia customers, particularly overnight.

Home Care - 3 responses detailed that respite for the carer could only be gained by using respite services away from the home. One carer stated that this had been tried as an option and had not really worked for them. 1 carer stated that Home Care does not offer the social aspects of a respite stay that Hollins View provides.

► Other Comments (inc. those who didn't state if they were representing someone)

One member of the public felt that there was insufficient information to decide between options for respite type services. Another felt that home care does not

provide the social aspects of a stay at Hollins View. The Alzheimer's Society and Healthwatch's responses underlined the importance of a variety of options. They also flag that this could be an opportunity to create a broader choice for people/families at different stages of the dementia journey. Healthwatch emphasised the importance of support and training for customers using Direct Payments.

E) The Consultation

i) Opinions about the Proposal

► Responses from Customers or their Carers (or those representing a customer)

Respondents made a number of negative comments about the proposal itself. These included statements criticising the proposal as short-sighted, shameful, and unnecessary as the existing service was felt to be working well. Two individuals stated that they believed it was wrong to assert that the consultation was about choice when they felt it was actually being reduced. Some consultees were open to the alternatives put forward in the proposal.

► Other Comments (inc. those who didn't state if they were representing someone)

Members of the public also gave negative comments about the proposal. Healthwatch wanted to recognise that the service is valued by service users.

ii) Reasons for the Proposal

► Responses from Customers or their Carers (or those representing a customer)

4 responses from customers or their carers stated that they believed that the proposed transfer of services from Hollins View was really about the Council saving money rather than providing more choice. 3 respondents felt the proposal meant that vulnerable people were being affected disproportionately. One respondent felt that the proposal was about making it more difficult for people to access dementia care. 3 responses queried the idea that the proposal would bring about more choice.

► Other Comments (inc. those who didn't state if they were representing someone)

2 members of the public felt that the consultation proposal was really concerned with saving money. Another respondent stated that they felt that the proposal reflected problems with the country's approach to supporting people with dementia.

F) The Process

► Responses from Customers or their Carers (or those representing a customer)

2 customers or their carers stated that they believed that the information provided in the consultation pack was unsatisfactory as there was no information provided on where the alternative respite services would be. These respondents stated that it was therefore difficult for customers or their carers to form a judgement on the proposal. 1 response stated that the reasons given for the proposal focussed on dementia to the exclusion of others using the centre with different conditions. Responses were also received which stated that there was a lack of information relating to the business case for the proposals (see cost of care section as well).

3 customers or their carers felt that more people should have been directly involved in the consultation aside from customers/carers as it could affect other people in the future including intermediate care users. 2 of these individuals stated that for these reasons there should have been a public consultation meeting. 4 comments from customers or their carers stated that they believed that the Local Authority had already taken a decision on the proposal and that the consultation would not have any effect on decision-making. 1 respondent felt that consultation should have taken place before the Dementia Commissioning Plan went to Cabinet.

► Other Comments (inc. those who didn't state if they were representing someone)

1 response from a member of the public stated that information should have been provided on the alternative respite services. The Alzheimer's Society stated that the consultation could have been more user-friendly for people with dementia and that the Council could have taken specialist advice on this. Healthwatch felt that the information in the information pack should have been more comprehensive (incl. as to why the proposal had been put forward). They also felt (as did the Alzheimer's Society) that more people should have been involved in the consultation from the general public. 1 member of the public stated that they believed that the Local Authority had already taken a decision on the proposal.