Residents have shared their views on proposals to change West Sussex County Council’s Adults’ in-house social care services. The county council launched its Choices for the Future survey at the beginning of May to offer residents, staff, people who use the services and their families and carer’s the opportunity to have their say on the future model of services.

More than 450 people have completed the survey with 92% of those who took part supporting the principles of the service proposals. 46% of respondents agreed with the detailed proposals themselves, whilst 37% disagreed, and the remaining 17% were unsure.

In addition to the survey, 190 people attended 14 sessions to hear what families and carers thought. A further 210 people who currently use the services, also attended 20 sessions to give their views.

This report details the findings from the engagement on the service proposals described in the Choices for the Future booklet. There are also two appendices that accompany this report:

- Appendix A – detailed analysis of the public survey
- Appendix B – set of frequently asked questions (FAQ’s)

1. Background information:

West Sussex County Council provides a wide range of social care services across West Sussex. Some are provided directly by the county council which are referred to as in-house services and others are provided in partnership with other organisations. The in-house services include day centres, residential homes and a Shared Lives scheme.

Adults’ Services in-house social care services are currently made up of twenty one building based services, with 900 people using services, 500+ staff, a county wide Shared Lives service with 90 paid carer’s and a budget of £11m.

The service supports people ranging from 18 to 104 years old with a wide spectrum of different needs and diagnosed conditions. Whilst our services are currently separated as ‘older people’ and ‘learning disability’ services the reality is that these services span the
range of ages and diagnoses (including an increasing number of older people with a learning disability and a diagnosis of dementia).

There is not a “one size fits all” approach to supporting people to live the life they want and we have to use our resources effectively to provide a sustainable service that meet people’s needs both now and in the future. The buildings we use and how resources are currently organised no longer fit the changing needs of the people who use the service. If we do nothing our current building stock will need an estimated £15m spend in the next 10 years just to maintain them as they are – this would not make them any more accessible or change the way they can be used.

Prior to this recent engagement and survey, people have fed back that they want different things and require different types of support at different points in their life. The service needs to be flexible, responsive and above all see people for who they are and what they can do. People’s needs are changing and the skills, specialisms and resources needed to do this overlap with what we currently designate as ‘older people’ and ‘learning disability’ services.

By changing the way we organise our service and how we use our resources (staff, buildings and transport) the service will have increased ability to support people to build on their strengths, meet people’s needs irrespective of the persons ‘label’ and maintain what people can already do. This would also include connecting people into work, volunteering, education or using community based services and groups.

People should also be supported to be part of where they live, in their own community and to ensure they can be as independent in their daily lives as possible. For people who have to travel to their services the majority of people will either experience a reduction in travel time (40%) or have no difference in current travel time (51%).

We fully recognise the concerns raised by people (detailed in this report) and emphasise that these proposals are not about closing or reducing services but ensuring that they can better meet the changing needs of people in West Sussex in the future.

2. Engagement completed during 2016/17:
Extensive engagement with all key stakeholders has been a key focus throughout this project.

During 2016 and 2017 officers have spoken to approximately 800 people as part of the initial scoping of project. This engagement focused on what was and what was not working within current services and what people thought “good” looked like for them in terms of future provision.

This included;
- **Satisfaction survey across all services** – (Jan to March 16) - response from 300 customers and 195 families/carer’s.
- **Staff sessions** - total of 13 sessions with 250 staff (March to May 16) and ongoing engagement during 2017.
Results from the engagement and survey

- **Sessions with users of services** – involvement of 349 people across all services (June 16)
- **Family and carer sessions** – total of 9 sessions with 110 families/carer’s (June 16)
- **Sessions with other Adults’ Services staff** – (July 16) met with 52 Social Workers, and Occupational Therapist’s.
- **Members** – email updates, Member days, and Cabinet Member round-up.
- **UNISON** – attendance at workshops, ongoing updates and briefings.

In summary, people using services fed back that they would like to do more and be as independent as possible, do “everyday activities” and be supported to achieve this in the way that is right for them. This included doing more in their local community and supporting them to live the life they want.

All users of services, families/carer’s and staff felt that more should be made of the resources available and that there should be more choice and the services should be open to a wider group of people. In addition the need for services to be flexible, responsive and easily accessible to avoid people needing more expensive services or getting to a point of “crisis” was a strong and reoccurring theme.

**Burnside**

It is also worth mentioning that this engagement was built on extensive work done with users of the service, staff and families at the Burnside Learning Disability Day Centre in Burgess Hill during 2014 and 2015. Following a Cabinet Member decision in September 2014 to engage with key stakeholders on the future of the service a new approach to service delivery was developed. The decision to focus on Burnside was largely due to the immediate concerns about the condition of the building, it not being fit for purpose, its location and access and the high cost of it being re-developed.

This led to the development of a new service model that has embraced the service principles below and has seen the growth of a service that now provides most of its activities outside of its building - over 70% of the 30 people that attend each day participate in opportunities and activities within the local community.

**3. Service Principles:**

There were a set of themes that came from the engagement throughout 2016/17 which showed that people wanted a service that:

- allows easy and quick access to help and support;
- is local and easy to find (part of the community);
- is flexible and responds to what customers and families/carer’s need;
- provides services to the community - not just one group of people (mixed use of buildings);
can support the prevention and independence agenda - some of whom may only require a short term service;
integrates and works with the wider community and helps people to access what is available where people live;
keeps specialist environments where needed;
makes the best use of the resources we have;
gets appropriate information and advice quickly and easily to users of services and their families carer’s

These were the most common and repeated themes that came from all of the sessions held and responses from surveys carried out. All staff, families/carer’s and people that use services were informed of the outcomes from the engagement in 2016/17 and were updated on the development of the service proposals.

All of the outputs from this initial engagement directly informed and shaped the service proposals developed during 2017 and 2018.

4. Engagement completed during April and May 2018:
This section details the engagement carried out on the service proposals and the responses from this.

The engagement in April 2018 focused on the county council’s Adults’ Services in-house staff teams in order to give them an opportunity to hear and comment on the proposals prior to the engagement with families/carer’s, users of services and the wider public. Nine sessions with the in-house staff were carried out in April 2018 with 280 staff. Those that did not attend were engaged on the proposals at team meetings.

The engagement during May 2018 included:

- 14 sessions with families and carer’s – around 190 people attended these. All families and carer’s of people using the in-house services were informed of the proposals;
- 456 responses to the ‘Choices for the Future survey’ – which includes 154 from people who use the services;
- results from the Adults’ Services in-house services annual customer satisfaction survey;
- 20 group sessions with 210 people who currently use Adults’ in-house services and a number of 1 to 1 supported sessions where needed;
- engagement with affected local county council Members and other Members across April and May 2018;
- ongoing engagement with and presentation about the proposals to the Adults’ Services customers and carer group;
• report from Health watch West Sussex detailing feedback from stakeholders
• 26 email responses.

5. Survey findings:
A total of 456 responses to the ‘Choices for the future’ survey were received. Of those 154 (34%) identified themselves as a user of services.

It is important to note that over a quarter of the total responses (26%) were in relation to Glen Vue day centre and the majority of these respondents identified as either a member of the public or a representative of a voluntary, health or independent organisation. These responses focused on the concern of losing the functionality of the building in relation to the various community groups currently using the space. This would not be the case and the County Council fully recognises the need to work very closely with Mid Sussex District Council who owns the building and all groups currently sharing the space at Glen Vue to identify the best option going forward so these groups may continue to provide their valuable service.

The analysis shows that there is strong support for the service principles with around 92% of people supporting the principles that informed the development of the service proposals – each of the principles scored over 85% on the ‘agree strongly’ choice.

There was a more mixed response on the individual service proposals. Overall, 46% of respondents agreed with the proposals, whilst 37% disagreed, the remaining 17% were unsure. Looking at the response from people who use the services separately, 51% agreed with the proposals, 25% disagreed and 24% were unsure.

People who use the service were in general, more positive about the aspects or characteristics of each proposal than other respondents, for example that it treats people as individuals and increases opportunities to connect people to where they live.

The most common areas of concern raised around the proposals are as follows:

**Overall**
- Impact changes will have on people using services
- Impact changes may have on staff
- Involving affected people in the planning of changes

**People who use services**
- Impact changes will have on people using services
- Involving affected people in the planning of change
- Impact of bringing together people with different needs

These along with a range of other issues are addressed in section 10 of this report.

Overall all respondents wanted to be kept informed, with letters providing updates being the most popular method with 42% of people who use services wanting to be involved
in the planning of changes. People also wanted face to face communication and a greater variety of engagement materials to be available to people who use the services.

A more detailed analysis is attached as Appendix A.

6. Users of services - satisfaction survey 2018

The annual satisfaction survey was carried out during the early part of 2018 to get an overview of what people thought of the service they receive and what needs to be developed. Whilst not directly connected to the engagement on the service proposals it is important to include this so a full picture of what is being said is captured.

The satisfaction survey is comprised of responses from 362 people across the service with 76% of responses coming from people who use day services (there was roughly an equal response from older people and people with a learning disability. Overall 96% of people who responded felt they were happy with the support they receive. People felt that the services were very good at;

- keeping people safe;
- the ways in which staff communicated with them;
- the way staff supported them and keeping personal information confidential.

The key areas of improvement identified include:
- supporting people to live the live they want – to get better at asking what people want and how they want be supported through person centred reviews and agreed outcomes that the person wants;
- supporting people to make and maintain friendships and connections – looking at creative ways of helping people to maintain relationships and make new ones;
- offering choice of which staff support people where possible, with increased opportunities for people to be involved in the recruitment of new staff;
- to increase opportunities for people to stay active and healthy;
- ensuring people know how to raise concerns and/or make a complaint

7. Engagement sessions

There were 14 sessions with families and carer’s and 20 group sessions with people who currently use the services, with some 1 to 1 supported sessions. Nine sessions with the in-house staff were carried out in April 2018 with 280 staff.
**Feedback from people who use services**

The sessions done with people currently using our service on the individual proposals were supported by the staff familiar to people at each service. Judgements were made at each service as to how best to engage with people given the varying needs they had and the complexity of breaking down and describing some of the proposals.

Approximately 210 people participated in the face to face sessions during May 2018 through a variety of different formats. The majority of responses were from the learning disability services (day and residential care). In addition sessions were held with people who use the services at Maidenbower day centre in Crawley. The most regular and common themes which emerged from this engagement is shown below;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>What’s good about the services?</strong></th>
<th><strong>What could we do better?</strong></th>
<th><strong>What do you want in the future?</strong></th>
<th><strong>General comments</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Various arts and crafts activities</td>
<td>• More activities and opportunities in the community</td>
<td>• Accessing things in the community</td>
<td>• Worried about the change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Getting out and about - being supported to go out into and access the community</td>
<td>• More computers and accessing social media</td>
<td>• Visit other day centres – they have different things on offer</td>
<td>• Don’t want to lose my service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Making friends</td>
<td>• Support Independence</td>
<td>• More space and quiet spaces when you want to be on your own</td>
<td>• Would like to try other things</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Exercise</td>
<td>• Bigger bedrooms</td>
<td>• Need better buildings</td>
<td>• Happy to go to other day services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Being supported to do activities in the community for example gym, football tournaments, using the library, and going to the cafe</td>
<td>• Changes to the buildings, for example lifts, better kitchens and toilets</td>
<td>• Learn skills that will help me get a job</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Accessing Aspire college courses</td>
<td>• Improve and repair buildings</td>
<td>• Meet more people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cooking, gardening and music</td>
<td>• New and better equipment</td>
<td>• Remain safe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Feedback from family and carers:
The majority of the family and carer sessions were positive with people understanding the rationale behind the proposals. In general the proposals around the residential services were accepted and families recognised and acknowledged the existing challenges and need for 21st century environments over the next 5 years.

An increase in respite and short breaks was warmly welcomed and a priority for many. Families using older people day services in the Western and Southern area were relieved with the proposals as they had expected the under usage would lead to closures. They felt the proposed model was exciting and positive for the future.

The proposals for Maidenbower and Glen Vue day services (Crawley and East Grinstead respectively) were challenged by a number of family members due to the potential disruption, uncertainty about the alternatives offered and potential of increased travel time for the seven people using Glen Vue.

The response from families of people using day centres for adults with a learning disability was mixed, largely due to concerns around potential disruption caused by changes, and how people would be supported in the community. However a large proportion of families attended were positive about the changes and felt a more localised offer was a good thing.

A summary of the key priorities for families/carer’s is shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Southern</th>
<th>Northern</th>
<th>Western</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Supporting people and families through the change process and transition and involving them in reviews&lt;br&gt;2. Ensuring staff at the services are fully involved in the reviews and be the main contact for families during transition periods&lt;br&gt;3. Preservation of services (not closing them)&lt;br&gt;4. Involving people in the development of the service offer - 'co-production'&lt;br&gt;5. Promotion and development of more Shared Lives provision (for older people and people with learning disabilities).&lt;br&gt;6. More respite (short break) services</td>
<td>1. Supporting people and families through the change process and transition and involving them in reviews&lt;br&gt;2. Ensuring no loss of service to people and their families/carer’s that day service attendance provides&lt;br&gt;3. Ensuring sufficient capacity in the system for day service provision&lt;br&gt;4. Preservation of services (not closing them)&lt;br&gt;5. Involving people in the development of the service offer - 'co-production'&lt;br&gt;6. More respite (short break) services</td>
<td>1. Supporting people and families through the change process and transition and involving them in reviews&lt;br&gt;2. Ensuring no loss of service to people and their families/carer’s that day service attendance provides&lt;br&gt;3. Maintaining friendship groups&lt;br&gt;4. Involving people in the development of the service offer - 'co-production'&lt;br&gt;5. More respite (short break) services&lt;br&gt;6. Wrenford - maintaining the service as it is</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Feedback from Adults’ in-house staff
Overall, the in-house staff was positive about the proposals and felt they provide ‘a clear and consistent vision’ that ensures the ‘future viability of the services’. In addition the majority of staff felt they ‘had been listened to’ and that the proposals ‘feels like an inclusive model that is focusing on getting people to work together to achieve better outcomes for people’.

Staff expressed concerns about impact on job roles, the importance of co-production on the service model and the need to ensure enough time is given to deliver positive transitions for people using the services and their families. A summary of the main issues and what staff felt should be the main focus is shown below:

- effective and ongoing communication and engagement in various formats;
- co-production of service model, planning and decision making;
- sustainable, trained and supported workforce;
- culture change and embedding the agreed principles;
- supporting customers through the change;
- community engagement and development

All of these issues will be given priority consideration in any future implementation plans.

Wrenford day centre
A group of families representing 21 of the 71 people using the Wrenford day centre for adults with learning disabilities requested a separate meeting as they strongly opposed the principles behind the proposals and felt that the current building should remain and be invested in. This meeting was held on 29 May 2018. The main issues and concerns raised were:

- maintaining the Wrenford day service as it is;
- maintaining a separate service for people with a learning disability;
- ensuring no loss of service to people and their families/carer’s that day service attendance provides;
- maintaining friendship groups;
- supporting people and families through the change process and transition and involving them in reviews;
- involving people in the development of the service offer - 'co-production'

The proposal to move the Wrenford day service into both Judith Adams day service in Chichester and the Chestnuts day service in Bognor Regis was the only significant challenge with the proposals for the day centres for adults with learning disabilities.

Whilst the Wrenford service is extremely well used it is currently situated within an industrial estate on the outskirts of Chichester city centre making it difficult for people to get to community based activities as they are unlikely to be within a short walking
distance. The county council want to develop more opportunities for people to utilise what’s available in their community whilst having a suitable and local building-base for those that need it.

Chestnuts day service in Bognor Regis only uses a small percentage of their space and it is within the town centre making it an ideal place for people who live locally. The majority of people who attend Wrenford live in Bognor Regis (58%) so it makes sense for those people to start using a more local service so they can build up confidence and independence near their home. In addition the proposal would reduce travel time for the people living in Bognor and would position the service to attract new people who want to build on their confidence and independence in the area they live.

Judith Adams is also well situated within Chichester city centre and is only using 30% of the space available in the building.

The proposals for the day services at the Chestnuts and Judith Adams are that they will transition into a multi-use service for people with mixed levels of needs and will focus on creating opportunities for people within the community. Older people and people with a learning disability will no longer be segregated and will come together at the same site.

The majority of concerns from people using the service were around the change process, loss of friendships, what will be offered at the new sites and what resources will be transferred into the new buildings – for example the spa bath and sensory room at Wrenford etc.

The county council has given a commitment to work closely with people who use the service, families and carer’s to carefully consider friendship groups, suitability of environments, parking and resources that would be transferred to the Chestnuts and Judith Adams centres.

Initial visits to Judith Adams and Chestnuts by families/carer’s and some people who use the service have been taking place so they can see the proposed environments first hand.

We have included a minimum of nine months, following any decision made to implement the proposals, to complete the change process and co-produce what is needed with all people who use the services, families/carer’s, and staff. This time would be spent ensuring we work with people to be clear about who will go where, what support they need, what people want in the buildings and getting the work done. It is during this period that we will also engage with the necessary professionals to help make the changes, for example architects, surveyors, and moving and handling specialists.

8. Maidenbower and Glen Vue day services:

One of the service principles developed which informed the proposals is to make best use of our resources and ensure we don’t unnecessarily duplicate services. In the Crawley area our partner (Shaw health care) already provide day services and the county council will work with them to offer places to people currently using Glen Vue and Maidenbower, at their Burleys Wood and Deerswood lodge services.
The county council understands that not everyone will want to go to Burleys Wood and Deerswood Lodge or that it will suit everyone and where this is the case other options would be explored. In line with our responsibilities under the Care Act (2014) there will be a review to assess everyone’s needs and these will be done with the person and their families/carers to find the best solution.

In general the concerns around these proposals echo what has already been documented (change process, loss of friendships etc.).

However there have also been specific concerns about the withdrawal of services from East Grinstead. The county council day service that is provided from the Glen Vue site in East Grinstead is in a Mid Sussex District Council owned building and is currently leased from them. This service currently serves seven people in total and provides a daily service to approximately two people a day. The demand for this service has been decreasing over the last two years, despite continued efforts to promote the service. Over the last two years (2016-17 and 2017-2018) Glen Vue had four new people starting in those two years with eight people leaving in that period. These figures do not include dementia crisis referrals (which are short term placements).

Following any decision to implement the proposals, the people using this service would be fully supported to ensure appropriate alternative provision is in place prior to ceasing the day service element at Glen Vue.

Of the 26 emailed responses received the majority related to issues around the proposals for Glen Vue (18), with the exception of one relating to Coastal enterprise, two to Maidenbower and five relating to Wrenford. Of the 18 relating to Glen Vue 16 were concerns that focused on the future of external groups currently using space at Glen Vue.

The county council recognise that Glen Vue is more than just the small day service that is currently provided. There are a number of external groups, who currently use the space at Glen Vue for free and the county council recognises the need to work very closely with Mid Sussex District Council and all groups currently sharing the space at Glen Vue. The county council commits to identify the best option going forward so these groups may continue to provide their valuable service in this area.

The Maidenbower day service in Crawley currently supports a total of 41 people with an average attendance of 15 people each day - this is a service that was set up for 45 people a day with the building space being able to take up to 92 people a day. There is a mix of ages and support needs at Maidenbower but the majority are over 65 (77%) and have a physical and/or sensory impairment (70%).

As with Glen Vue, the demand for the service at Maidenbower has been decreasing over the last two years, despite continued efforts to promote the service. Over the last two years (2016-17 and 2017-2018) Maidenbower had 11 new people starting with 12
people leaving in the same time. These figures do not include dementia crisis referrals (which are short term placements only).

We currently lease space at Maidenbower from Crawley Borough Council. The proposal around the day service element does not undermine the county council’s responsibilities in the current lease arrangements. The county council recognises the need to work very closely with Crawley Borough Council around the future use of this space and commit to identify the best option going forward.

Whilst the population is aging we know that this will hit at different times in different areas. We know that Crawley Borough has one the lowest levels of current demand as well as the lowest increases in long term support over the next five and 20 years. This is a factor of the much younger demographic of Crawley influenced by its proximity to London and Gatwick.

9. Feedback from others
Officers have worked closely with UNISON at each stage of the project and UNISON has been actively engaged in the workshops and staff engagement sessions. A report from Health-watch West Sussex was received during the engagement period requesting more information around the previous engagement and methodology around the proposals. A full response was sent to Health-watch.

10. Response to key themes from the engagement process
This section details the key issues and concerns raised during the engagement period and a response to each issue is given. The Frequently Asked Questions information is attached as Appendix B and shows the questions asked during the face to face sessions and are answered individually.

The impact the changes will have on people using the services:
We recognise that the proposed changes will impact on people using the services. The county council is committed to co-producing the delivery of the proposed service model with people who use the services, their families and carer’s, staff and other key stakeholders throughout the five year plan.

We have allowed for a minimum of nine months lead-in time for each day service merger to ensure people are supported appropriately and agree the appropriate outcomes that will best meet people’s needs. In addition this time allows the service to design and reconfigure the environment in the proposed buildings with everyone.

For the residential homes the county council will work closely with people who use the service, their families and carer’s, staff and the necessary professionals to identify the best way to deliver the services needed in line with county council’s commissioning priorities. Co-production discussions for this part of the service are likely to start during the beginning of the 2019-2020 financial year.
Transition teams will be in place for the day services element which will comprise of key stakeholders and led by the Adults’ in-house staff. Representation from people who use the service and families/carer’s will be discussed and agreed with those stakeholders.

In line with the county council’s responsibilities under the Care Act (2014) there will be a review to assess everyone’s needs and these will be done with each person receiving a service and their families/carer’s to find the best solution and ensure a smooth transition. The county council will ensure ongoing involvement, engagement and review of the progress of the Adults’ in-house day service changes and consultation on any closure and subsequent rebuild of Adults in-house residential sites.

**Impact of bringing together people with different needs:**

We know that people’s needs are changing and people are living longer and later in life. This is a good thing but it is impacting on the current structure for the Adults’ in-house services which was set up to deliver services for older people and working age people with learning disabilities, often in buildings that are now no longer accessible for people with mobility issues.

For example in the Adults’ in-house learning disability residential homes more than 40% of people are over 65, with a range of age related conditions (including dementia). This has meant that staff development and partnership working with other professionals has needed to support people who are both older and have learning disabilities. Whilst there are differences between these two groups there is also an increasing amount of similarities.

The Adults’ in-house learning disability day services have 56 people (15%) over 65 of which over 40% of those have a diagnosis of dementia. In the next few years (if all remains the same) the number of people over 65 in learning disability day services would increase to 109 equating to almost a third of the total number of people receiving a service. Based on population projections that trend will continue and increase exponentially.

As with the learning disability residential services, the day services has had to adapt and develop to meet people’s needs. This has led to some of the older people using the learning disability day services receiving their service at our Specialist Day Services (Laurels and Judith Adams). In addition a number of younger people using the learning disability day services are now volunteering in our Specialist Day Services.

We also accept referrals for adults with a learning disability to our short stay reablement a service based at Marjorie Cobby House in Selsey. Whilst predominately for ‘older people’ the placements for ‘adults with a learning disability’ have been successful.

This approach is not new and previously the county council did run day service environments for both older people and adults with a learning disability. Whilst the service model is different, the principles of integration and supporting people based on their needs remain the same.
Careful consideration will be given to how best we use space to meet the different needs of people. This will be similar to what we already do in our learning disability buildings where there is often three to four separate areas to ensure individual needs can be met.

A good example of where this approach has been implemented and is working well is in Dorset. Tricuro is a provider of health and social care services across Dorset who are jointly owned and run by Dorset, Bournemouth and Poole Councils. Their mission statement is to “be the sought after service provider to vulnerable adults in Bournemouth, Poole and Dorset” through “working together to create a friendly, happy and positive environment for everyone”.

To this end they come from the perspective that service should be needs led and not based on labels. Following a visit to their services, their model of integrating ‘older people’ and ‘adults with a learning disability’ has worked well and has seen an increase in people using their services. Co-production of the environments and what is offered underpins their success along with development which is informed by ongoing discussion with the people that use their services, families/carer’s and staff. More information on Tricuro can be found at [http://www.tricuro.co.uk/](http://www.tricuro.co.uk/)

**How the principles support the proposals;**

Following the engagement with customers, families/carer’s and staff in 2016/17, officers worked with budget holders to develop the proposals.

The engagement work done during 2016 and 2017 resulted in a set of ‘success factors’ for the project that contributed to the key priorities in the West Sussex Plan 2017-2022.

These then formed the basis for a set of service principles that informed the development of the ‘Choices for the Future’ proposals developed for the Adults’ in-house services and are summarised as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Putting the person first</th>
<th>Reaching people earlier and being more accessible in local communities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independent for later life</td>
<td>Helping people access community solutions and improve their connections with others to reduce isolation and loneliness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A prosperous place</td>
<td>To focus on need rather than customer groups and help people maximise their strengths to develop and maintain skills that will support independence and control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best use of resources</td>
<td>Emphasizing the importance of being highly responsive when people are in crisis and developing a plan that helps them to regain as much independence as possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A strong and sustainable</td>
<td>Contribute to sustainability in the social care market place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actively seek to build partnerships in the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Options were considered against each of the agreed ‘success factors’ and a range of evidence were collated across the life of the project. This included population data, service usage information, unit costs, comparable provision in each and detailed condition and architect reports for each building.

An evidence matrix was the developed for each service. The evidence matrix considered the following for each service:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is the current service model effective and efficient?</th>
<th>Is the current building suitable?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Unique service offer (it has a strong market position)</td>
<td>☐ Level of investment in building is reasonable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The service occupancy is good</td>
<td>☐ The building meet changing customer needs/required delivery model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The service is full to capacity</td>
<td>☐ The building space is well used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Predicted increase in demand is immediate</td>
<td>☐ The building location is good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The unit cost is competitive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The evidence base collated confirmed what had been suspected for some time:

- demand is predicted to increase across all geographic areas in the next 20 years although this happens earlier than others in some areas for example Crawley has one of the lowest levels of current demand, as well as the lowest increase in long term support over the five to 20 years. This is a factor of the much younger demographic of Crawley;
- there is better external provision in some areas than others;
- there is some over provision in some service types, for example older people day services, and some under provision in others such as short stay - particularly in the north of the county;
- adults in-house services were generally cost competitive around short stay, complex care and shared lives but more expensive for long stay beds and day services;
- learning disability residential services and Marjorie Cobby are currently fulfilling a rising need for much more crisis and short stay requests;
- buildings are generally under invested in and are not able to meet people’s needs in some places;
- 55% of the available space in the day service buildings is not being used and is not easily accessible – five out the seven learning disability day service buildings are placed on industrial sites;
• six of the seven Adults’ in-house residential homes will not be able to meet the needs of people using the service over the next five years and four of those require a full rebuild.

Each service was considered individually across four main options. These options reflected the most common areas explored during local authority reviews of Adults’ in-house provision reviews across the south east of England:

1. Do nothing
2. Programme of outsourcing to external market across all Adults’ in-house services
3. Close non-statutory services (day services)
4. A programme of rationalisation across day services and solutions to ensure the sustainability of residential services are achieved across the Adults’ in-house service

An analysis of the benefits and risks were then undertaken in relation to each of four identified options.

Doing nothing (Option 1) is not an option given the projected demand upon services and state of our building stock. The areas of improvement needed will become worse and delivery will be untenable in around 50% of our buildings within five years.

Whilst there are a number of positives around Option 2, the current backdrop of market supply, fragility in some areas and lack of interest in short term complex services means that this is not viable at present. However, continued exploration of opportunities to develop innovative partnerships with a range of providers and partners is part of the preferred approach.

Option 3 creates the biggest risk around political and public opposition and costs would potentially increase. As sufficient supply in the market does not currently exist there would be no guarantee of finding solutions for people. It would reduce capacity as a whole within the social care market. In addition given that a large number of people using the services have complex needs there is risk of increased family/shared lives breakdown due to the respite that day service services provide to families/carer’s not being available

Option 4 represents the proposals that have been put forward. It is considered that this is the only credible option that has the ability to fully deliver on both the success factors and ensure full alignment with commissioning priorities across Adults’ Services.

**Loss of friendship groups**

It is recognised that this is of high importance to many people and at the planning stage the county council will work very closely with people to sustain existing friendships where people want to do so. It will also work with people to form new friendships and connections in their local community.
Loss of respite provision for families and carer’s:
The county council recognise the importance of respite care and are committed to ensure that these proposals do not have any significant impact on the current levels that families/carer’s currently receive. It is also intended to increase the amount of ‘on the day’ bookable day time breaks that are available in the Adults’ in-house day services and increase the number of short stay beds in our residential/24hr services.

Increase in travel time to access the service

People should be supported to be part of where they live, in their own community and to ensure they can be as independent in their daily lives as possible. For people who have to travel to their services the majority of people will either experience a reduction in travel time or have no difference in current travel time.

Travel time does not affect people using long term residential services and for those using respite the majority will be unaffected or have a reduced distance to travel, for example the majority of all referrals to Marjorie Cobby in Selsey come equally from people who live in Chichester and Bognor.

With the exception of the people using Glen Vue and Maidenbower people using our Specialist Day services will be unaffected.

Whilst it is possible that there may be an increase in travel time for the seven people using the day service at Glen Vue there is no significant increase in travel time expected for the 41 people who are currently using Maidenbower as a result of the proposals.

We have mapped the 391 people currently using our Learning Disability day services using their current geographical address with the proposed alternative service. For the 122 people using services at Burnside day service (Burgess Hill) and Strawford day service (Horsham) we will not know travel time impacts until the new location for these services are identified and agreed. However the county council will ensure that the principles of ‘is local and easy to find (part of the community)’ and ‘integrates and works with the wider community and helps people to access what is available where people live’ are central in any decision making for an alternative site.

Of the 269 people that currently use the Wrenford day service and the Coastal strip (Pines, Oaks, Coastal enterprise, Coastal Workshop Rustington) 125 (46%) of people will have reduced travel time as the proposed alternative sites are closer to where they live, 124 (46%) will not be affected and an estimated 20 (8%) people may expect a slightly longer travel time.

Changes are being led by savings and are a ‘done deal’
Whilst there is efficiencies from these proposals this was not the primary driver. The main objective of this work is to:

- meet the outcomes wanted by people who use them and their families/carer’s;
ensure compliance with legislation, such as the Care Act 2014 and maximise opportunities available;
reflect national and local best practice;
agree best use of existing resources moving forward;
define the purpose and function of an Adults’ in-house service;
meet future need so that Adults’ in-house services compliments but does not unnecessarily duplicate what the market can provide;
use resources more effectively through the rationalisation of building usage and have a focus on population and need through joint service planning across customer groups. This includes building replacement, disposal and capital investment at some sites;
increase reablement and prevention and independence focused services including a greater emphasis on short term community based day opportunities;
contribute to the priorities detailed in the West Sussex Plan 2017-2022

The proposals are not a ‘done deal’ but do represent a detailed and wide ranging piece of work that has produced evidence based solutions to ensure a sustainable approach to providing services.

All of the comments, concerns and ideas that have been collated through this engagement period will be carefully considered prior to any decision being made.

**Limited time to engage sufficiently**

The public survey was live from 4 to 31 May 2018. Whilst we recognise that the engagement period may appear short, our proposals for each area were developed around a set of Service Principles which came out of our engagement with staff, people who use our services, families and carer’s, county council Members and others over the past two years. We also engaged directly with the families, carer’s and people who use the service on the proposals during May 2018.

However we recognise that these proposals may have benefited from a longer engagement period and we will ensure that this learning is applied to any future engagement activity.

9. Next steps

We would like to thank everyone who has taken part in the engagement activities and for giving their time to feedback on the service proposals.

The main themes in the feedback were that people wanted a flexible, responsive service; a recognition of individual needs; and the importance of allowing enough time to plan any changes with the people who use the services so that any impact they may experience would be managed effectively.
All of the responses are being considered prior to a decision being taken.

Letters have gone out to people who use the services, their families and carers to inform them of the timing for the decision. Once published the decision report will be made available on the county council’s website and communicated widely to everyone.

If you would like more copies of this booklet or need this information in another format such as easy read, in large print, on audio or in another language please contact Hu Evans on 03302 2 23739 or e-mail hu.evans@westsussex.gov.uk.

This booklet and appendices are also available via our Have Your Say website: https://haveyoursay.westsussex.gov.uk/legal-democratic-services/choices-for-the-future