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DRAFT Survey Findings Analysis

There were 456 responses to the survey, comprising 415 hard copy and online returns and 41 hard copy easy-read responses. An overview of people responding to the survey is given in Table 1. For the purposes of this analysis, two groups have been created:

Overall respondents (456 people) – comprising all respondent categories

Users of services (154 people – comprising the first four categories in Table 1 (marked with a grey background)

Table 1: Which of the following best describes you? (Select all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>No. of people</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I use day services</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use 24 hour care - this includes long stay residential and short stay services e.g. respite</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use Shared Lives services</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use other Adults Social Care services e.g. support at home</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I work for Adults In House Social Care (Provider Services) in West Sussex County Council</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I represent a voluntary, health or independent organisation</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I care for someone who uses day services</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I care for someone who uses 24 hour care - this includes long stay residential and short stay services e.g. respite</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The main roles described in ‘other’ included family member (38), friend (16) local community resident (9), voluntary and community sector representative (7), neighbour (6) and carer (6). As people were able to select more than one option the figures shown in table 1 would not tally with the total amount of individual respondents.

Service Principles

**Fig 1. What is important to you? Agreement with service principles, overall (%)**

- Services should include people whatever their disability
- Services should be local and support people when they need help
- Services should focus on what people can do, not what they can’t
- Provide more short-term services that help people maintain their independence
- Support people to build their confidence by accessing their local community for activities
- Support people to meet others to reduce isolation and loneliness
- Specialist environments for people with more complex needs should be available when people need them
- Work with other voluntary and independent organisations to produce better results for people

Agree Strongly | Agree | Disagree | Disagree Strongly | Not Sure
As Fig 1 illustrates, overall there was strong agreement with the principles behind the proposals. All were supported (agree strongly/agree) by over 85% of respondents, with over 50% strongly agreeing for all but one principle (provide more short-term services that help people maintain their independence, 46% agree strongly).

Users of services also supported the proposals, although as Fig 2 illustrates they were less likely to agree strongly, with only two proposals scoring over 50% (services should be local and reducing isolation/loneliness, both 53%).

On average, 86% of users of services agreed (agree strongly/agree) with a principle, which was similar to the 92% average for overall respondents. Users of services were however considerably less likely on average to agree strongly with a proposal (44%) than the overall (59%).

Fig 2. What is important to you? Agreement with service principles, users of services (%)

Comments about principles

Whilst people strongly supported the principles, some expressed concern at their application to the service proposals included in this review.
Some felt that including people whatever their disability could mean a ‘one size fits all’ approach, which was felt to be inappropriate in some situations. This included bringing together people with learning disabilities and people with dementia on the same site, as it was felt that their needs were often different. Some also feared that people with lower levels of need could lose out in shared environments, as resources would be focused on those with a higher need.

Some people felt that whilst a focus on ‘what people can do, not what they can’t’ was appropriate for some service users, it was less clear that it was a helpful approach for others:

"If this is about adults with learning difficulties, then absolutely, I’m all for that idea. However, in the case of older people, what they are unable to do, or maybe no longer be able to do should be taken into consideration as it may be as important as what they can (still) do when considering the most appropriate care”

Concern was also voiced over any potential shift of services from in house to other providers, including the voluntary sector and independent organisations, as the costs for participation could be less stable and subject to increases. Given the very limited budgets available to many service users and their families this could reduce their capacity to participate and potentially lead to increased isolation.

Whilst some people strongly supported the principles, they emphasised that a focus on independence and community-focused activities required investment in a number of areas, including local transport, and could not provide a cover for a reduction in funding:

*I agree strongly with all the above, but in order for them to happen support and transport need to be available. Currently from my experience this does not appear to be available and restricts the lives of people with a learning disability living in the community.*

*There needs to be enough funded, flexible support to remove all the barriers that people face to being a part of their community. Independence is not synonymous with savings for the council - lots of people need more hours of flexible, great quality 1:1 support in order to be more independent, i.e. to be able to go out and do new things when they want to.*

**Service Proposals**

For users of services and people overall there was considerably less general agreement with the proposals than the principles behind them. Whilst on average 92% of people overall agreed with the principles, this fell by half, to only 46% agreement with the general proposals. Users of services were also less supportive of the proposals, with agreement declining from an average of 86% for the principles to only 51% agreement with the overall proposals.
Alongside their slightly higher level of general agreement with the proposals, as Fig 4 shows, users of services were also more positive than people overall about each of the individual aspects of the proposals.

**Fig 4: % of respondents who liked an aspect of the proposals, overall and users of services.**
Users of services were also slightly less likely than people overall to highlight areas that required additional focus to ensure than any change was successful, as shown in Fig 5.

On average, people overall were more likely to cite an area that required additional focus than an individual aspect they liked about the proposals (57%/39%). In contrast, users of services were, on average, slightly more likely to cite to cite an individual aspect of the proposals that they liked (54%) rather than an area requiring additional focus (52%).

**Fig 5: What are the things to focus on to make change successful? Overall and users of services (%)**
Comments about proposals

As Fig 5 shows, there was close alignment between responders overall and users of services when thinking about areas of focus to ensure that change was successful. The three most frequently cited issues were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Users of Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impacts change will have on people using services</td>
<td>Impacts change will have on people using services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts change may have on staff</td>
<td>Involving affected people in the planning of change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involving affected people in the planning of change</td>
<td>Impact of bringing together people with different needs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Impacts change will have on people using services
Impacts change may have on staff
Involving affected people in the planning of change
Managing uncertainty over the length of five year plan
Managing loss of current friendship groups
Impact of bringing together people with different needs
Ongoing updates to all those affected by change

Overall
Service Users
People were also asked to comment on the proposals and a wide range of responses were received. These included the following frequently mentioned issues, which were cited across most of the specific service proposals:

- For proposals that involved local closures and the relocation/merger of services respondents commonly felt that this undermined the principle that ‘services should be local and support people when they need help’.
- Concern regarding the potential impact of changes on the care and support that users of services currently received. Any disruption to existing routines was generally viewed as a challenge that would require careful, well planned management.
- Fears over the loss of access to friendship networks, some of which had been built up over many years, if users of services would need to go to a different location.
- That the relocation of services could lead to some users of services being unable to continue to access them and that this would mean the loss of essential respite time for carer’s.
- Concern over potential increases in travel time and distance. This was particularly an issue regarding proposals affecting elderly people, including those with dementia, who may find it difficult to cope with increased and more complex journeys.
- A feeling that, often, changes were being led by the need to make savings, rather than the care and support needs of individual users of services. This was also a regular comment in staff responses to the survey.
- A lack of clarity about how proposals would be delivered, what their long-term impacts would be and any measures about how to manage the change for users of services and their carer’s.
- Some people expressed a degree of cynicism about the engagement activity, viewing the proposals as a ‘done deal’ and that their comments would have little impact on the outcome.

Whilst the majority of comments about the proposals focused on issues, areas of disagreement and concerns it is important to note that some people also recognised the potential benefits of some proposals and welcomed the changes.

"I totally agree with the proposal to find a site suitable for Strawford and Hobbs Field Residential home to be on the same site and in a more accessible location. Strawford is on an industrial estate and not easy for users of services to walk there themselves or get there by public transport”

Service Proposals

Table 2: Which Services are you referring to? (Please tick all that apply) %
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service and Location</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Service and Location</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>commenting on all services</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Wrenford, Chichester</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commenting on residential care only</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>New Tyne, Worthing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commenting on day services only</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Pines, Durrington</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chestnuts, Bognor Regis</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Coastal Enterprise, Worthing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammonds, Bognor Regis</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Oaks, Rustington</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tozer House, Chichester</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rowans, Worthing</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marjorie Cobby House, Selsey</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Glebelands, Shoreham</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanhope Lodge, Durrington</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Strawford, Horsham</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ball Tree Croft, Sompting</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Maidenbower, Crawley</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurels, Rustington</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Hobbs Field, Horsham</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Workshop, Rustington</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Glen Vue, East Grinstead</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith Adams, Chichester</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Burnside, Burgess Hill</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As per Table 2 many of the service proposals received only a small percentage of total responses and therefore it’s not possible to provide a representative overview of comments received. As people were able to select all that applied to their response, often the comments for specific proposals actually related to different services, most notably Glen Vue. The frequently cited proposal comments in the section above are broadly representative of the range of comments received across all proposals and illustrate the range of opinions regarding the potential changes.
A number of proposals received high levels of responses, including a wider range of comments and these are considered in turn.

Glen Vue Day Centre, East Grinstead

Glen Vue represented over a quarter of total responses (26%) and therefore it has considerably impacted the overall findings. It is important to note that of the 117 responses only 6 were users of services (5%). In contrast, 75% of Burnside respondents were users of services.

In general, responses regarding the Glen Vue proposals were considerably more negative than overall. This reflected concern as to the meaning and implications of the proposals for the community in a number of key areas:

- That Crawley was not local to East Grinstead and that the relocation of services therefore ran counter to the principles supposedly guiding the proposals.

- A highly negative impact of increased travel for people with dementia to access services which would be located further away in the Crawley area.

  "In the Consultation document you say that provision should be as local as possible and not involve people in long journeys elsewhere. This totally contradicts the withdrawal of services in East Grinstead and is very regrettable. Carer’s have enough to contend with caring for relatives with dementia without adding to their stress and worry of having to travel outside the town."

- The potential loss of essential respite for carer’s that locally available services provided. This could lead to some people becoming unable to cope with their caring responsibilities.

- The loss of local facilities to the East Grinstead community. This particularly concerning to a number of people given the projected increase in the local elderly population.

- A feeling that the north of the county and East Grinstead in particular, had seen its services and facilities continually reduced.

- A number of people, including voluntary and community sector representatives, argued that the Centre should be transferred to a voluntary provider, such as Age UK, in order to ensure that it continued to provide a facility for the community.

- East Grinstead Town Council stated that they would be unable to support any proposal that did not involve the re-provision of services at the Centre. It also stated that the county council should acknowledge its responsibility to ensure continued service provision in the town, should the new provider withdraw.
Maidenbower Day Centre, Crawley

Of the 38 responses covering Maidenbower, 5 (13%) were from users of services. 17 responses (45%) were from people also responding on the Glen Vue proposals and a number of comments were therefore duplicated. Comments specifically related to Maidenbower included the following:

- The Centre was a positive, welcoming environment, particularly for people with dementia. Centre users felt comfortable and relaxed when they attended and they welcomed the familiarity of the building, the friendship groups they had established and the staff, who were highly regarded. Losing this facility was a cause for anxiety.

"Maidenbower has great facilities for my needs. Why think about money impact, you talk about supporting people - this does not sound like it”

- 'Deerswood and Burley were not regarded by some as comparable environments, and were perceived as having a lower user/staff ratio and had poorer transport provision.

- Concern amongst carer’s that if the service was closed they would lose their respite time, which was essential for them to be able to carry on providing care. This was a cause of stress for both the carer and the person they cared for.

"My husband is attending Day Services at the moment at Maidenbower Centre. I have grave concerns that his placement is at risk! As I am his full time un-paid carer this is the time that allows me to have a 'normal existence' seeing my grandson, errands, shopping, if this changes I will not cope with looking after my husband”

Wrenford Day Centre, Chichester

Of the 36 responses to the Wrenford proposals, 6 (17%) were users of services, 4 of whom used day services.

- Parents of centre users expressed strong concern as to the suitability of moving their children to a site which would be shared with elderly people, including those with dementia.

"Our son has complex needs and there's only ONE place he can go and your going to close it? Putting him and others like him in a dementia day centre with old people is just wrong. The 2 proposed alternatives Judith Adams and chestnut are not capable to handle these complex needs he and other like him have. Saying there'll be no reduction in services is a joke”
- It was stated that people with learning disabilities and dementia could exhibit challenging behaviour, which could be distressing for other people. As a result, the appropriateness of bringing together these two groups in a shared environment was challenged.

- The loss of friendship groups was cited as a particular concern given that current Wrenford users could be split between two other centres.

- Staff and parents both felt that if a site had to close, it should be Judith Adams, rather than Wrenford. Wrenford was preferred as it was purpose-built with good facilities, was on one level and had capacity to house specialist equipment. Judith Adams was located on a busy road, had limited available space, lacked specialist equipment and facilities such as changing rooms. It also had limited space for minibus parking.

- Concern was expressed over the potential loss of the Starburst Arts Group, located at Wrenford, as this provided people with learning disabilities a very important opportunity for creativity.

- Some noted the importance of the experience of travelling for users of services and welcomed opportunities for people to travel more. It was also noted that providing services over a wider area could provide a more diverse social experience for some users of services.

**Burnside Day Centre, Burgess Hill**

75% of responses to the Burnside proposal were from users of services. All of the completed easy-read surveys related to Burnside, illustrating the high level of engagement with users of services. As Fig 6 indicates, respondents were more positive about all aspects of the proposals than respondents overall.

**Fig 6: % of respondents who liked an aspect of the proposals, overall and Burnside.**
In contrast to other proposals, respondents provided very few comments on the proposals. One respondent expressed concern regarding a perceived reduction in services in the fast-growing town and questioned the long-term plan for the service (the proposal includes a commitment that an alternative building in the town would be sought). One day service user emphasised that they were happy at Burnside and another stated that they wanted to stick with the Burnside site.

**Keeping People Informed**

**Fig 7: How can we keep you informed? Overall and users of services (%)**
Both people overall and users of services wanted to be kept informed through a range of channels. As per Fig 7, for both groups, letters providing updates was the most popular method. 42% of users of services wanted to be involved in the planning of changes at the service they attended. Whilst 36% of people overall wanted updates provided on the county council’s website, only 18% of users of services selected this option.

In contrast to web-based information, additional comments from users of services emphasised the role of face-face communication with staff, who could provide updated information which they would then be able to discuss.

People overall gave a range of additional comments, which included:

- Regular email communications and updates.
- The need for longer consultation periods, with surveys that provided an opportunity to challenge, rather than validate proposals.
- Information and engagement materials should provide greater clarity about the proposals and their potential impacts.
- More effective links with advocacy services should be established as these could enable more people to participate and make more effective use of already planned activities with advocacy service customers.
- Working with more closely with voluntary, community and independent providers to provide them with more information and to promote updates and further engagement activity with their customers.
- Engage more closely with local councils in the areas included in the proposals.
- Phone help-point for users of services, their families and carer’s.

Profile of respondents

Age

33 people did not respond to this question. **Fig 8** provides a breakdown of those who did and shows the higher age profile of users of services, compared to the overall population. 18% of users of services were aged 85+, compared to only 6% overall.

**Fig 8: Age profile of respondents (exc. ‘not answered’), overall and users of services (%)**

![Graph showing age profile of respondents](image)

Gender

As **Fig 9** shows there was a clear division between the gender of users of services who answered this question and the overall population. Whilst 60% overall were female, 52% of users of services were male. One person preferred to self-describe their gender. 19 people did not answer the question.
Sexuality

Of those answering the question, 77% of people overall defined as heterosexual, as did 63% of users of services. Two people, including one service user defined as a gay man and three people, including one service user defined as a gay woman/lesbian. Two people defined as bisexual and 13 people, including 9 users of services preferred to self-describe. 7% of people overall and 10% of users of services preferred not to disclose their sexuality. 57 people did not answer the question.

Ethnicity

Of those who answered the question, the overwhelming majority of respondents were White, 86% of users of services and 87% overall identified as White British. A further 3% of users of services and 2% overall defined themselves as White other. Two service users self-defined as mixed, whilst two further overall respondents were Asian. Three people, including two service users, defined as Other. Nine per cent of both users of services and people overall who answered the question selected ‘prefer not to say’. 40 people overall, including 13 service users, did not answer the question.

Religion

Of those answering the question, 58% of people overall and 60% of service users defined as Christian. One person overall defined as a Buddhist, whilst 10 people overall, including 5 service users, selected ‘Other Religion’. 24% overall and 19% of users of services had no religion, whilst 15% overall and 17% of service users answering the question preferred not to disclose their religion. 44 people did not answer the question.

Disability

As Fig 10 shows, of those who answered the question, 70% of users of services self-described as having a disability, compared with 34% of people overall. 23 people did not answer the question.
Table 3 provides a breakdown of the type of disability of users of services and people overall. Of those selecting ‘Other’ 7 users of services had an acquired brain injury, two people had dementia and one was partially sighted. A further person had a brain aneurism, one was epileptic and another had spinal damage. One person had difficulty with walking and a heart condition.

**Table 3: Nature of disability, overall and user of services (tick all that apply, %)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability</th>
<th>overall</th>
<th>user of services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical Impairment</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensory impairment</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental health issue</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning disability</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term Illness</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**UK Armed Forces**

No people who answered the question were currently serving in the UK armed forces. 8% of people overall and 18% of service users had previously served, whilst 85% overall and 71% of users of services had not. 7% of people overall and 10% of users of services preferred not to say. 57 people, including 39 users of services did not answer the question.