

-----Original Message-----

From: SarahThemba Trust [mailto:sarah.hemstock@thembatrust.org.uk]

Sent: 17 October 2007 11:37

To: 'Michael Storey'

Subject: RE:

Dear Cllr. Storey,

Thank you for your response. I also thank you for your response to my email of 13/09/07. However, I did not have a response from you personally, or even an acknowledgment, regarding my initial correspondence of 27/08/07 in which I asked for YOUR comments on a considerable number of issues prior to the September 3rd meeting. Since Councillors are the people elected, I want the views of Councillors – not Local Government Officers!

I will publish your response on the Justice for Carers website and inform the Worksop Guardian.

In addition, your correspondence of 17th September you do not respond to any of my concerns about the absurd and ineffective “consultation” process which is documented in the Strategic Review, but merely states that you supported the Review recommendations which include asking the Cabinet to approve a period of consultation. My issues about consultation remain unanswered, and if the “consultation” you propose is as effective as that already employed to produce the Review, then it will be meaningless. My main issues surrounding “consultation” involve:

- a) Who will be consulted and how will people be recruited to and engaged in this process?
- b) How will the results of the consultation process be incorporated into future actions? Is the consultation process another means of putting ticks in the boxes so that the Council can go through the motions?
- c) Will the effect of any changes on carers and those they care for be monitored in any way?

In addition, the other points I have raised about the Review also remain unanswered.

Sarah L Hemstock
Kirkby-in-Ashfield
Notts.

-----Original Message-----

From: Michael Storey [mailto:cldr.michael.storey@nottsc.gov.uk]

Sent: 16 October 2007 17:44

To: SarahThemba Trust

Subject:

Dear Dr Hemstock

I note you have alleged in the Worksop Guardian that I did not respond to your views on the issue of consultation about residential homes. In fact I responded to you on 17 September 2007 and I would be obliged if you could acknowledge that fact. You might even care to acknowledge that publicly in view of the contents of your published letter.

Cllr. Mick Storey
Deputy Leader

E-mails and any attachments from Nottinghamshire County Council are confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately by replying to the e-mail, and then delete it without making copies or using it in any other way.

Any views or opinions presented are solely those of the sender and do not necessarily represent those of Nottinghamshire County Council unless otherwise specifically stated.

Although any attachments to the message will have been checked for viruses before transmission, you are urged to carry out your own virus check before opening attachments, since the County Council accepts no responsibility for loss or damage caused by software viruses.

Senders and recipients of email should be aware that, under the Data Protection Act 1998 and the Freedom of Information Act 2000, the contents may have to be disclosed in response to a request.

Nottinghamshire County Council Legal Disclaimer

-----Original Message-----

From: Michael Storey [mailto:cllr.michael.storey@nottscc.gov.uk]

Sent: 17 September 2007 17:29

To: SarahThemba Trust

Subject: [Norton AntiSpam] Re: FW: 3rd September Meeting - notts county council - adult social care [Virus checked]

Dear Dr Hemstock

Thank you for your reminder email and I apologise for the delay in responding to your original.

I understand you have received an officer response to some of the points you raised.

As to my own views you will have noticed that the report to the Cabinet Committee of 3 September 2007 was in my name. That being the case it will not surprise you that I moved and supported the recommendations which as you see include asking Cabinet to approve a period of consultation.

Cllr. Mick Storey
Deputy Leader

"SarahThemba Trust"
<sarah.hemstock@thembatrust.org.uk>

To <sarah.hemstock@thembatrust.org.uk>
cc

13/09/2007 21:18

Subject FW: 3rd September Meeting - notts county council - adult social care [Virus checked]

Dear Councillor,

I was disappointed that you have not replied to or acknowledged my correspondence of 27th August (bellow & attached). As we live, apparently, in a democracy, I would have thought that a response regarding your convictions on this issue would have been appropriate. I do not want a general response from an officer – I would like a response from you "The Councillor" as the person elected to your post.

I was unable to attend the meeting of September 3rd and have not been able to find the minutes of the meeting on the NCC website. However, I hope you will be courteous enough to provide at least an answer to one of my questions: did you vote in favour or against the recommendations tabled at the meeting of September 3rd (attached)?

Yours faithfully, Sarah Hemstock

Sarah L Hemstock
Kirkby-in-Ashfield
Notts. NG178HH. UK.
Tel: +44 (0) 773 983 7707
www.justiceforcarers.org.uk

-----Original Message-----

From: SarahThemba Trust [mailto:sarah.hemstock@thembatrust.org.uk]

Sent: 27 August 2007 22:28

Subject: 3rd September Meeting - notts county council - adult social care

Dear Councillor,

I understand that you will be considering the attached report on 3rd September 2007. I would like to know if you will be accepting the recommendations of the report at this meeting. In addition I would also like to draw your attention to the points below & would appreciate your comments.

Yours faithfully,

Sarah L.. Hemstock. Carer.

1. Are you aware of the fact that Adult Social Care have recently increased charges and implemented the use of unsatisfactory Private Sector care companies to provide care in people's homes recently? Are you aware that 15 NCC care homes have already been closed since 1998 and only 60 beds have been replaced?
2. What savings have been made by swapping from "Direct Services" provided by NCC Social Services to private sector care companies? Has this decision proved satisfactory?
3. What additional revenue has been raised by increasing charges to service users? Has this increase proved satisfactory? Has any study been carried out on the impact to service users? (i.e. Have you bothered to find out how the additional financial burden affects carers & those they care for – what are the health and social implications for family carers when Social Service care hours have been reduced?)
4. What impact has the closure of 15 care homes had already? Has there been any financial or other benefit of this action? Please justify the proposed closures in terms of historical changes.
5. Although "Government Targets" have been set for the number of care home places per 1000 people, have you considered that these targets may be incorrect? Do you have the backbone to vote against further changes?
6. Are you aware of the fact that Nottinghamshire's OAP's are provided with free bus passes, but those elderly & infirm people who are picked up by the NCC special need bus have to pay for the privilege?
7. If previous service changes have been successful, why hit this sector with more cuts? Please look for budget cuts elsewhere.
8. If previous service changes have not been successful, why make more cuts to cover up your mistakes? The changes made so far may be justifiable in terms of budget, but are not justifiable in terms of service provision...
9. If the changes under discussion on 3rd September 2007 take place, what will be the level of future service provision – with particular reference to Day Centres? What will happen to those currently in residential care and those currently using day centre facilities? What alternatives will be offered? For example, my Grandmother currently attends Kirkland's day Centre on Monday, Wednesday and Saturday. How will she be affected by the proposed closures? If closures are transitional – how will staff moral affect service users?
10. Have you considered emotional effects on service users?
11. Have you considered social, financial and employment impacts on those that care for service users?
12. Why has there been no **effective** service user / carer consultation during the preparation of the report? It is apparent (and backed up by studies from organisations such as MIND, MenCap & Care UK) that service users and their carers are only consulted as a means to put a tick in the box and do not actually play any part in the real decision making process. This is valid in terms of the "CABINET COMMITTEE TO REVIEW THE STRATEGIC DIRECTION FOR COUNCIL RESIDENTIAL HOMES FOR OLDER PEOPLE AND FOR EXTRA CARE SERVICES" since there are many service users and their carers, as well as local carers groups, who have received no correspondence or notification of the committee's existence prior to the handout of Wednesday 22nd August, 2007.
13. Why do you feel the need to hit the most vulnerable people in our society by increasing charges and closing facilities? It is because you feel that they are the least likely to fight back? Is it because most of them are elderly and infirm so will probably not be around to vote at the next election?
14. Social care is expensive – deal with it in a way that is most beneficial to the service user – why not make budget savings elsewhere? (Sandwiches & refreshments for council meetings at Ashfield District Council have reportedly cost an average of £40,000 per year!!! Also, Mansfield District Council holds many subsidised functions for Councillors and council employees).

Re the report:

CABINET COMMITTEE TO REVIEW THE STRATEGIC DIRECTION FOR COUNCIL RESIDENTIAL HOMES FOR OLDER PEOPLE AND FOR EXTRA CARE SERVICES

1. Under Recommendation (d) section 1.2 (page 5 of the report), how much revenue is expected to be generated from the sale of land? What guarantees are in place to ensure that revenue generated (£6.5 million from sale of land alone) is spent on day services and “extra care”? What are community-based services?
2. Under Recommendation (h) section 1.2 (page 5 of the report), it states: “The aim of this should be to develop at least an additional 150 extra care places which are alternatives to residential care”. What are these 150 “extra care places” additional to? Are they additional to places which exist in all 15 homes listed at the beginning of the report or are they “additional to” the remaining places at the 8 homes once the 7 homes have been closed? In which case they are not “additional” to anything.
3. Are care home beds and day centre places to be reduced from those currently existing? Do you genuinely think that this is the right direction to take? Government targets for bed numbers could be wrong.
4. Section 2, point 2.2 states: “Several other organisations have been invited to attend meetings and have made valuable contributions, as well as members of the public. Comments on the issues before the Committee have been widely sought including from the homes affected.” There has been no effective consultation that I am aware of. I have been informed by various care home staff that the letter from Terry Pears delivered on Wednesday 22 August, 2007 with instructions to post to service users that were not at the day centre was the first that they had heard of it. In addition, I am a member of Nottinghamshire based group “Justice for Carers” who were not asked to contribute. Please could you list the “Other organisations” and numbers of “members of the public” and also detail your methods of how you “widely sought” comments... The handout of August 22nd 2007 has been the only correspondence received by a number of Day Centre service users at Kirkland’s day centre. Notices on boards are not effective - Kirkland’s has 2 sections – residential & day care – there were no notices in the Day Centre that I am aware of.
5. Section 3, point 3.2 (page 6): How many residential beds were lost with the closure of 15 homes between 1998-2005? What impact did it have on those who lost their homes? How many people/residents died within 3 months of the move?
6. Section 6, point 6.1 “The Local Context” – did the committee consider the quality of care offered in the “independent sector”? There are many reports dealing with abuse and low standards of care in this sector. What strategies will be in place to ensure a high standard of service provision from the “independent sector providers”? Private sector care in the home is not up to standard presently – a recent report looking at Home Care in Nottinghamshire has indicated that care and time keeping is not up to standard and many appointments have been missed. If this is not working, why do you think changes to residential and day care will work? In order to follow your strategic “All Together Better” plan, you should at least get one thing correct before messing up something else! Another issue that should be considered in terms of a “Local Context” is the fact that less than a mile up the road care in the home is provided for free in Derbyshire! If residents in Ashfield pay more council tax than their counterparts in Bolsover, why do they get less from their council?
7. Please explain the term “community based services”.
8. Page 10: Why isn’t the “Stay as Now” option consistent with the Strategic Plan? Surely community based care has been “strengthened(!)” by the use of private sector care providers? Government targets for residential home places are not correct and day care seems to have been ignored by these targets, closures will affect day care very badly. In addition (page 30) there are currently only 566 vacancies in independent sector care homes & 67 in local authority homes – this is not enough to take up the slack that would arise from implementation of strategy 3 as proposed.
9. Page 10: Financial implications of the “Stay as Now” option has not been evaluated correctly and is confusing. There are some fundamental errors here. It will cost 1.4 million over the next 5 years to maintain the care homes (is this for all 9 care homes in the report (listed on page 37 of the report), or the 8 listed on the NCC website, or just the 7 that are being closed re the letter of 22nd August? This is confusing – if it is only 7 then maintenance would be further reduced by £280,000 over 5 years and the

cost of Strategy 3 further increased). However, the value of land will increase on average minimum of 10% per year (an estimated £650,000). If the land is sold off under strategies 2 & 3 the council is asset stripping itself. Additionally, the cost of “extra care” has not been calculated fully (including rent & council tax & level of care required etc) and could far exceed the cost of care currently offered by local authorities (page 41). In addition, since Ashfield District Council is reported to have spent tens of thousands per year on sandwiches, £280,000 per year is a small price to pay for the 9 care homes.

[More families will pay for home care](#)

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/main.jhtml?xml=/news/2007/01/11/naged11.xml>

[Post Code Lottery for Carers](#)

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/main.jhtml?xml=/news/2007/01/11/naged211.xml>

10. Performance Implications: current care at home private sector service providers cannot deal effectively with the current situation – check the records and reports, as a Councillor this is your responsibility. Increasing this shambolic system will be a recipe for disaster.

11. Major Risks: Options 2 & 3 both reduce numbers of beds significantly – the private sector is currently not capable of taking up the slack. Risks here should also include: inability of private sector to provide extra care (Options 2 & 3) and impact of closures on residents, carers and staff (not included in option 3).

12. Point 7.2 (page 12): The financial impact of the Stay as Now option is not significantly different from the Strategic Share option. Once transitional cost are incorporated fully into the equation (which has not been done) for the Strategic Share option it may turn out to be more expensive than Stay as Now – and in addition, land for 7 existing homes will be sold off so reducing assets held. Therefore, the financial justification for option 3 “Strategic Share” is not valid. (also refer to 2.15.10 page 56). The table 2.15.16 shows an actual difference of 0.1 million between strategy 1 – stay as now (14.3 million) and strategy 3 – strategic share (14.4 million) if the capital cost of land and buildings is included (18.8million). For this reason, justifying option 3 over option 1 on financial grounds is not correct.

13. Point 12.2 (page 13). Has there been any detailed impact assessment? You could base this assessment on comparison of number of deaths in care homes that remained open with number of deaths amongst those residents who were moved from the homes closed between 1998 & 2005 over a 3 month period from the date they were moved or knew they were moving. I think you might be shocked at the results. Obviously, this approach doesn't take into account effects on carers etc...

14. Point 12.5 – what are the indications that change is necessary? Why is reducing bed numbers an advantage? Care in the home will increase as the population continues to age, so I am sure you will be able to meet your “targets”! In addition, your own findings demonstrate that the Private Sector home care is currently failing to deliver the same standard of care as the old system. Looks like “modernisation” isn't working well, so why continue with an unworkable strategy?

15. Point 12.6 – your report recognises the fact that there will be an increasing number of older people, however, how can the reduction in the number of beds and day centre spaces be justified as a means “to ensure that services continue to develop to meet their needs”. The proposals just do not make sense – financially, socially or morally.

16. Point 12.6 – “where possible, older people should be supported at home”. This is true, however, the current private home care providers do not provide the same quality and reliability of social services (Direct Service) care. This situation should be dealt with before making additional changes to the system.

17. Point 12.6 – What exactly is meant by “Extra Care”?

18. Point 12.6 – your report states:

“The unit cost for council care home places (£558) is significantly higher than what we pay for purchased independent sector places (£315).” Are you aware of the fact that many “independent sector” homes are closing because they are in financial dire straits? They provide a poor standard of care compared with local authority homes: check out these links:

[Starving on a spoonful of mash a day](#)

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/health/main.jhtml?xml=/health/2007/01/26/nelderly23.xml>

[Care home elderly go hungry, says minister](#)

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/main.jhtml?xml=/news/2007/01/22/nelderly22.xml>

[The commission's findings](#)

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/main.jhtml?xml=/news/2007/01/11/naged111.xml>

19. Point 12.6 – you recognise that each home has an associated Day Centre. Places are difficult to get at these centres because they are full. How will reducing the number of day centre places be helpful? If the number of day a person can attend a day centre is reduced, how will this effect the carers? Some carers work when those they care for attend day centre – so reducing day centre places will have an adverse social and economic effect.
20. The report is almost totally focused on residential care and does not appear to have considered day care. Please provide information on how day care will be affected by the proposed closures. Please justify how drastic changes can be made with our considering the effects on basic services such as day care.
21. Section 2: page 23 – with 1.2 million and 200,000 annually, being paid out to independent sector care homes (over 5 years this would total 2.2 million – 0.8 million more than the stay as now strategy), the council could go a long way to paying for the improvements required in the council homes due to be closed (only £280,000 annually is required for 9 care homes – the 7 care homes listed in the August 22nd letter would be covered by the 1.2 million).
22. Section 2.6.5 & 2.6.6 – the local authority has a duty of care. What is the legal situation if this duty is neglected?
23. Point 2.9.16 page 31. The report states: “the clear message is that there has to be growth in provision of appropriate services, either non residential or residential, which reflect an increasing older population”. How will this be achieved by reducing the number of local authority beds without massive growth in the independent sector which is currently failing?
24. Page 32 – what is meant by the term “self-directed care”?
25. Page 44 – “promote greater choice and independence through community care services” – given the choice I am sure most current residents and day centre users would choose to stay as they are....
26. Point 2.14.6 – page 46. It is very unlikely that long term residents of the homes due to closure will live independently in their own homes. Closing homes and kicking residents out of local authority care homes is not a strategy for independent living. The report is fundamentally flawed in this view.
27. Page 47. What guarantees are in place to state that the money raised form sale of land/ care homes would be re-invested into caring for the elderly?

Sarah L Hemstock
Kirkby-in-Ashfield
Notts. NG178HH. UK.
Tel: +44 (0) 773 983 7707