

APPENDIX 1

People's Directorate – PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT OFFICE

OUTLINE BUSINESS CASE

Maximising Independence of Adults': Internal Care Review – Learning Disability Short Breaks

Purpose

The purpose of this document is to gain approval to proceed to consultation on the proposed options in relation to the Learning Disability Short Break service.

The Business Case focuses on the current practice and situation, market and future of the service. This document describes the proposals for the service, together with an outline of the key issues and challenges faced.

Project Mandate

Background

Background and business context

The service provides planned and unplanned short breaks for people with learning disabilities and respite services for carers. Unplanned short breaks enable the Council to respond to situations such as long term hospitalisation of carers, break down in a placement and in the worse scenario, where there has been a sudden death of a carer/parent.

Due to the scale of funding reductions but also the changing times in which we operate, the City Council has recognised that there is a need for radical change in how our organisation works – its role and functions and the culture that determines how we work together with the people of the city. To address these challenges, the City Council set up the Future Council programme during 2015 to deliver an integrated and strategic approach to managing the necessary changes. This has taken on board all the recommendations of the Kerslake review of corporate governance, published in December 2014 and the ongoing advice and support from the Improvement Panel set up at the beginning of 2015.

A small part of the Future Council programme has focussed on developing proposals for the Council's internal Specialist Care Service (SCS). In November 2015 the Council released its 2016+ Budget proposals for consultation, one of which concerned the Internal Care Review – Learning Disability Short Breaks service.

Further details about the Council's wider approach can be found in the Council Business Plan and Budget 2016+ Consultation document. The Budget 2016-2019 consultation set out a range of proposals to deliver the savings required to balance future budgets. The Budget was approved in March 2016.

Vision Statement

Birmingham City Council intends to reorganise its internally provided services, so that people may choose to buy these or different community based services which meet their assessed eligible needs for care and support. Currently the law prevents the use of a Direct Payment to purchase services run by their Council. Birmingham City Council is committed to developing

	<p>services for people that help them to live as independently as possible, exercising choice and control over the planning and delivery of the support they need.</p> <p>The Council gives people a personal budget, of which all or some can be taken as a Direct Payment, to spend on their care and support services. The Council has significant funds tied up in block contracts; it seeks to move away from this position and give people choice and control over which service they can purchase. We will encourage eligible service users to take this budget as a Direct Payment, from which they can buy a range of services including traditional residential short breaks, support from a personal assistant, or other types of community based support. The Council’s approach will be to encourage people to manage their own resources and care wherever they can to maximise their independence.</p> <p>Outcomes The Vision is intended to deliver the following outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An increase in the range of services people can buy with a personal budget • An improvement in the overall quality of services available for people to buy should they choose to do so • Contribute to increase in the numbers of people directing and coordinating their own care and support. • Contribution to the reduction in the Council’s overall workforce • A shift away from the internal provision of these services • To deliver the savings identified in the Council Business Plan and Budget 2016+.
<p>Service Objectives</p>	<p>The purpose of the service is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council’s internal Specialist Care Services (SCS) division provides residential short breaks and respite care for approximately 130 people with learning disabilities in two units. • The Care Act 2014 places a duty on Local Authorities to meet the assessed eligible care and support needs of individuals and their carers when assessed against the National Eligibility Framework. While the Local Authority is not duty bound as an organisation to deliver or provide the care and support itself, it must ensure sufficiency of provision – in terms of both capacity and capability – to meet anticipated needs for all people in their area who have eligible need for care and support. • Birmingham City Council has long recognised the need to offer family carers a range of options to provide them with a break or respite from their caring responsibilities and is part of a suite of services designed to maintain people in their home and prevent people requiring more intensive and costly long term care services. • The service is regulated by the Care Quality Commission.
<p>Service Demographics</p>	<p>Service locations</p> <p>The service currently operates from two locations which are owned and managed by Birmingham City Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Laurels – Stechford • Brook House - Lozells <p>Service users</p> <p>The service provides residential short breaks and respite care for approximately 130 people with learning disabilities and their carers/families.</p>

	<p>Employees The service currently employs the following numbers and grades of staff: Grade 5 – 3 Grade 4 – 4 Grade 3 – 15 Grade 2 – 18 Grade 1 - 6</p>
<p>Current Position</p>	<p>Current service operation The current service is provided internally by Birmingham City Council and its employees at a cost of £1.444m per annum. People using the service are allocated a number of ‘bed nights’ per year on an individual basis dependent on their assessed eligible need for care and support.</p> <p>Performance Performance of the service is judged on three criteria – service quality, service occupancy and service unit cost as follows:</p> <p>Service quality – Both services were inspected in May and June 2015 by the Regulator. The Care Quality Commission’s (CQC) view is that both The Laurels and Brook House ‘require improvement’. Whilst the Council continues to make improvement, the benchmark for such services is a ‘good’ rating by CQC. Both services have action plans in place to ensure the required improvements are made. The Laurels received an unannounced CQC inspection on 4.5.2016 – the initial feedback has been positive. The CQC’s full report is expected in early July 2016.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service occupancy – Analysis of data between April and August 2015 (which includes the busy summer months) showed that use of the service for short breaks, averaged approximately 35%. A similar percentage of the service was occupied by extended guests who ought to be in more appropriate long term services. The benchmark is 90% occupancy, a figure achieved by private operators and the services own identified target. • Unit cost –The average cost of a week’s stay in 2015 at The Laurels was £1,508 and at Brook House £1,900. The benchmark weekly cost ranges from £349 with a Shared Lives provider to up to £1,480 with a similar residential care provider in the private market. <p>Need for change / drivers The following drivers for change have been identified:</p> <p>Policy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The emerging Adults Transformation programme – Maximising the Independence of Adults sets out a series of plans, proposals and activity to deliver benefits and savings to reduce the predicted gap between increasing demand for service and reducing budgets . • Between November 2015 and January 2016, the Council consulted upon its Budget proposal for 2016+ in order to deliver in excess of £250m of savings (equating to 25% of its total budget). • Birmingham City Council is committed to developing services for people that help them to live as independently as possible, exercising choice and control over the planning and delivery of the support they need. • The Council intends to move away from a system of block contracted provision. <p>Financial</p>

- The Council is required to make significant savings as detailed in the Council Business Plan and Budget 2016+. The internal Specialist Care Services – Short Breaks service has been identified as a contributor to these wider savings plans. The savings target requirement is as follows:

2016/17 (£000)	2017/18 (£000)	2018/19 (£000)	2019/20 (£000)	2020/21 (£000)
(192)	(364)	(364)	(364)	(364)

- The Laurels requires significant capital investment if it is to remain viable in the medium to long term.

Buildings

- It is recognised that the service has reduced in size in recent years as a result of unused capacity and poor quality building stock. However continuation of the service would require significant capital investment, which is estimated at £1.5m.
- The Laurels is not fit for purpose in the long term. It is well located, but the building is old and the size and quality of the rooms and facilities are not of the size, type and quality that people expect and wish to use. There is very limited access for people who use wheelchairs or require the use of a hoist. The site needs a major refurbishment to make it fit for purpose in the future.
- Brook House is in better physical condition than the Laurels and has had some refurbishment and investment in the last few years.

Occupancy

- Analysis of occupancy data showed that use of the service for short breaks, averaged approximately 35% against a benchmark of 90% occupancy, a figure achieved by private operators and the services own identified target.
- There would appear to be scope to consolidate supply in order to meet demand as long as the 'extended guests' can be accommodated in long term provision.

Future Demand Projections

- It is difficult to translate general projections of population increases into future demand for specific services like short breaks or respite care, as so many different factors determine which services people will want to use or purchase.
- A flexible system is therefore required, which offers people a range of choices, but that is able to expand and contract capacity when demand for services requires this.

Market capacity - Current

A range of alternative provision is available in the market already including:

- Three independent residential respite care homes – Silverbirch Road and Greswolde Park Road (provided by Birmingham Multicare) and Emscote House (provided by Norman Laud Association). Silverbirch Road have reported that they have on average between 1 and 2 beds vacant during the week and between 0 and 1 bed vacant at weekends. The other 2 homes report they are near full capacity.
- Shared Lives – 8 carers seeking to deliver respite care have been recruited by the internal service and through the Person Shaped Support (PSS) shared lives contract let by Birmingham City Council. The intention is to develop this market further.
- There is a well-developed market in Birmingham for home support services, which

	<p>could provide care in the citizen’s home and can include help with; personal care including washing and dressing; housekeeping or cleaning; cooking and preparing meals; taking medications or health care needs; and companionship or activity based support. These services could be used to provide respite.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Personal assistant – as above, but with employment responsibilities attached. • . <p>Market capacity – Developing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Upward Housing is developing plans to build a 10 bed ‘Care Hotel’ as part of its development in east Birmingham – ‘The Bromford’. The plans involve 10 serviced apartments with integrated care and support. If the organisation proceeds with its plans they have indicated the provision could be open in Spring 2017. • It is the Council’s intention to increase the number and availability of Shared Lives carers and it has invested resources to achieve this. • There is a small but developing range of holiday accommodation in different parts of the country with integrated care on site. • It is recognised that market capacity may need to be developed to respond to the demand for access to emergency placements.
Scope	The internal Specialist Care Service (SCS) Short Breaks service currently delivered from The Laurels – Stechford and Brook House – Lozells.

PROJECT DEFINITION	
Way Forward	To consult upon a range of proposals, including the potential closure of the remaining internal Specialist Care Service (SCS) Short Breaks service.
Dependencies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Personal Budgets – the development of the tool which the Council will use to calculate an indicative budget. • The readiness of high quality supply of alternative services to take up demand created by the recommended option. • The capacity of an implementation team of Social Workers to carry out the required assessment and support planning work with existing service users and implement the recommended option. • The need to have robust alternative services available for use in emergency situations. • The ability to accommodate the current extended guests into alternative and appropriate long term provision.

Options Appraisal

Option 1	No change										
Information Considered	<p>Analysis of the following was carried out: market-wide costs, market wide quality, market-wide capacity, service occupancy, peak activity, service users, and other uses of the service.</p> <p>Finance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The net operational saving to the Council of the implementation of this proposal is detailed in the table below: <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>2016/17 £000</th> <th>2017/18 £000</th> <th>2018/19 £000</th> <th>2019/20 £000</th> <th>2020/21 £000</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	2016/17 £000	2017/18 £000	2018/19 £000	2019/20 £000	2020/21 £000	0	0	0	0	0
2016/17 £000	2017/18 £000	2018/19 £000	2019/20 £000	2020/21 £000							
0	0	0	0	0							
Pros and Cons of Option	<p>Delivery of identified outcomes</p> <p>Pros</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The option could deliver an improvement in the overall quality of services, if the current action plan is implemented. <p>Cons</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The option does not deliver an increase in the range of services people can buy with a personal budget The option will not contribute to an increase in the number of people directing and coordinating their own care The option will not contribute to a reduction in the Council’s overall workforce The option does not represent a shift away from the internal provision of these services The option will not deliver any of the savings included in the Council Business Plan and Budget 2016+. <p>Additional considerations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Laurels is not fit for purpose in the long term and needs major refurbishment to bring it up to modern standards. Property Services estimate this will cost approximately £1.5m to carry out. 										
Stakeholders engaged.	A range of internal stakeholders have been consulted. Permission is sought to consult, to enable a wider range of external stakeholders to be consulted, including service users, staff and the provider market.										
Recommendation	Following initial analysis by the Council this Option is <u>not</u> preferred for implementation but is subject to consultation.										
Principal Reason for Decision	The option does not deliver significantly against the identified outcomes.										

Option 2	Close The Laurels and move the service to alternative Council owned accommodation and retain Brook House.										
Information Considered	<p>Analysis of the following was carried out: market-wide costs, market wide quality, market-wide capacity, service occupancy, peak activity, service users, and other uses of the service.</p> <p>Finance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sale of the Laurels will generate a one-off capital receipt – estimated to be in the region of £0.5m. To be recycled in addition to capital investment to bring any future building up to standard. • Capital investment will be required to bring any future building up to an acceptable standard and would likely negate any financial benefit derived from the sale of The Laurels. Estimated additional investment - £1m • The net operational cost to the Council of the implementation of this proposal is detailed in the table below: <table border="1" data-bbox="451 707 1482 819"> <thead> <tr> <th>2016/17 £000</th> <th>2017/18 £000</th> <th>2018/19 £000</th> <th>2019/20 £000</th> <th>2020/21 £000</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>52</td> <td>55</td> <td>282</td> <td>247</td> <td>247</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	2016/17 £000	2017/18 £000	2018/19 £000	2019/20 £000	2020/21 £000	52	55	282	247	247
2016/17 £000	2017/18 £000	2018/19 £000	2019/20 £000	2020/21 £000							
52	55	282	247	247							
Pros and Cons of Option	<p>Delivery of identified outcomes</p> <p>Pros</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The option could deliver an improvement in the overall quality of services, if the current action plan is implemented. <p>Cons</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The option does not deliver an increase in the range of services people can buy with a personal budget • The option will not contribute to an increase in the number of people directing and coordinating their own care • The option will not contribute to a reduction in the Council’s overall workforce • The option does not represent a shift away from the internal provision of these services • The option will not deliver any of the savings included in the Council Business Plan and Budget 2016+ and will incur the Council additional costs. <p>Additional considerations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Laurels building is not fit for purpose. New accommodation would address this issue. • Analysis of the use of Brook House and The Laurels demonstrates that there is significant under use of current capacity. • Analysis of the use of alternative provision in the market demonstrates that there is some existing spare capacity and some potentially emerging new capacity (due to come online in Spring 2017). There is a risk of oversupply being created in the market. • The costs associated with expanding or moving of the existing service into alternative buildings has been assessed and is unlikely to deliver the required savings for the service. 										
Stakeholders engaged	A range of internal stakeholders have been consulted. Permission is sought to consult, to enable a wider range of external stakeholders to be consulted, including										

	service users, staff and the provider market.
Recommendation	Following initial analysis by the Council this Option is <u>not</u> preferred for implementation but is subject to consultation.
Principal Reason for Decision	The option does not deliver significantly against the identified outcomes.

Option 3	Close The Laurels and continue to provide a service at Brook House in the medium to long term										
Information Considered	<p>Analysis of the following was carried out: market-wide costs, market wide quality, market-wide capacity, service occupancy, peak activity, service users, and other uses of the service.</p> <p>Finance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sale of The Laurels will generate a one-off capital receipt – estimated to be in the region of £0.5m, which would provide the service with ongoing annual revenue benefit of £37.5k. • Assumption is made that 50% of the staff team will transfer from The Laurels to Brook House to provide care and support to a potential increase in service users transferring from The Laurels. • In addition the net operational saving to the Council of the implementation of this proposal is detailed in the table below. Savings are contained within brackets, costs are not: <table border="1" data-bbox="451 707 1474 819"> <thead> <tr> <th>2016/17 £000</th> <th>2017/18 £000</th> <th>2018/19 £000</th> <th>2019/20 £000</th> <th>2020/21 £000</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>110</td> <td>(47)</td> <td>(97)</td> <td>(115)</td> <td>(115)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	2016/17 £000	2017/18 £000	2018/19 £000	2019/20 £000	2020/21 £000	110	(47)	(97)	(115)	(115)
2016/17 £000	2017/18 £000	2018/19 £000	2019/20 £000	2020/21 £000							
110	(47)	(97)	(115)	(115)							
Pros and Cons of Option	<p>Delivery of identified outcomes</p> <p>Pros</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The option could deliver an improvement in the overall quality of services, if the current action plan is implemented. • The option may deliver an increase in the range of services people can buy with a personal budget, if the market continues to develop new services • The option may contribute to an increase in the number of people directing and coordinating their own care • The option will make a contribution to a reduction in the Council’s overall workforce, but not as significant as Options 5 and 6 • <p>Cons</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The option will deliver some of the savings included in the Council Business Plan and Budget 2016+, but does deliver savings of the level required. • The option represents a partial shift away from the internal provision of these services but is not fully consistent with the vision. <p>Additional considerations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis of the use of Brook House and The Laurels demonstrates that there is significant under use of current capacity. • Analysis of the use of alternative provision in the market demonstrates that there is some existing spare capacity and some potentially emerging new capacity (due to come online in Spring 2017). There is a risk of oversupply being created in the market. • Whilst Brook House would require less capital investment than The Laurels, the other indicators of service quality, service occupancy and unit cost do not support the need to maintain Brook House in the long term as part of an overall service offer. 										

Stakeholders engaged	A range of internal stakeholders have been consulted. Permission is sought to consult, to enable a wider range of external stakeholders to be consulted, including service users, staff and the provider market.
Recommendation	Following initial analysis by the Council this Option is <u>not</u> preferred for implementation but is subject to consultation.
Principal Reason for Decision	The option does not deliver significantly enough against the identified outcomes

Option 4	Close the Laurels and transfer Brook House as a short breaks service to an alternative provider										
Information Considered	<p>Analysis of the following was carried out: market-wide costs, market wide quality, market-wide capacity, service occupancy, peak activity, service users, and other uses of the service.</p> <p>As part of the consultation the Council may consider ring-fencing the outsourcing to organisations in accordance with EU Regulation 77 for Reserved Contracts. Under this regulation competition can be limited to organisations whose objectives are the pursuit of a public service mission linked to the delivery of services; whose profits are reinvested with a view to achieving the organisation’s objective; whose structures of management or ownership of the organisation are based on employee ownership or participatory principles, or require the active participation of employees, users or stakeholders.</p> <p>Supply / capacity in market</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The occupancy data from Brook House indicates maximum peak activity spare capacity of 8 beds. • Birmingham Multicare’s Silverbirch Road has indicated a small number of vacancies on weekdays. • There are approximately eight Shared Lives carers able to offer respite care. • Further supply of 10 apartments at The Bromford is scheduled to become available in Spring 2017. • There is a risk of oversupply being created in the market. <p>Finance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sale of the Laurels and Brook House will generate a one-off capital receipt – estimated to be in the region of £1.1m, which would provide the service with ongoing annual revenue benefit of £82.5k. • The assumption has been made that TUPE would apply to the sale of the Brook House service and that all staff and associated costs would transfer to the new provider. • In addition to this there are additional costs associated with the transfer of a service to an alternative provider, including procurement, human resources and legal costs. These have not been quantified, but should be considered fully if this option is to be taken forward. • In addition the net operational saving to the Council of the implementation of this proposal is detailed in the table below. Savings are contained in brackets, costs are not: <table border="1" data-bbox="451 1664 1489 1776"> <thead> <tr> <th>2016/17 £000</th> <th>2017/18 £000</th> <th>2018/19 £000</th> <th>2019/20 £000</th> <th>2020/21 £000</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>52</td> <td>(54)</td> <td>(94)</td> <td>(129)</td> <td>(129)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	2016/17 £000	2017/18 £000	2018/19 £000	2019/20 £000	2020/21 £000	52	(54)	(94)	(129)	(129)
2016/17 £000	2017/18 £000	2018/19 £000	2019/20 £000	2020/21 £000							
52	(54)	(94)	(129)	(129)							
Pros and Cons of Option	<p>Delivery of identified outcomes</p> <p>Pros</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The option could deliver an improvement in the overall quality of services. • The option may deliver an increase in the range of services people can buy with a personal budget, if the market continues to develop new services • The option may contribute to an increase in the number of people directing and coordinating their own care 										

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The option will make a contribution to a reduction in the Council’s overall workforce, but not as significant as Options 5 and 6 <p>Cons</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The option will deliver some of the savings included in the Council Business Plan and Budget 2016+, but does deliver savings of the level required. • The option represents a partial shift away from the internal provision of these services but is not fully consistent with the vision. <p>Additional considerations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TUPE transfer of staff and their associated costs may impact on any future provider’s ability to make savings.
Stakeholders engaged	A range of internal stakeholders have been consulted. Permission is sought to consult, to enable a wider range of external stakeholders to be consulted, including service users, staff and the provider market.
Recommendation	Following initial analysis by the Council this Option is <u>not</u> preferred for implementation but is subject to consultation.
Principal Reason for Decision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The option does not deliver significantly enough against the identified outcomes

Option 5	Close the Laurels and Brook House on a phased basis and offer service users alternative provision in the market through a Personal Budget										
Information Considered	<p>Analysis of the following was carried out: market-wide costs, market wide quality, market-wide capacity, service occupancy, peak activity, service users, and other uses of the service.</p> <p>Supply / capacity in market</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Birmingham Multicare’s Silverbirch Road has indicated a small number of vacancies on weekdays. • There are approximately eight Shared Lives carers able to offer respite care. • Further supply of 10 apartments at The Bromford is scheduled to become available in Spring 2017. <p>Finance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sale of the Laurels and Brook House will generate a one-off capital receipt – estimated to be in the region of £1.1m, which would provide the service with an ongoing annual revenue benefit of £82.5k. • In addition the net operational saving to the Council of the implementation of this proposal is detailed in the table below. Savings are contained in brackets, costs are not: <table border="1" data-bbox="451 835 1485 947"> <thead> <tr> <th>2016/17 £000</th> <th>2017/18 £000</th> <th>2018/19 £000</th> <th>2019/20 £000</th> <th>2020/21 £000</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>49</td> <td>(296)</td> <td>(346)</td> <td>(377)</td> <td>(411)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	2016/17 £000	2017/18 £000	2018/19 £000	2019/20 £000	2020/21 £000	49	(296)	(346)	(377)	(411)
2016/17 £000	2017/18 £000	2018/19 £000	2019/20 £000	2020/21 £000							
49	(296)	(346)	(377)	(411)							
Pros and Cons of Option	<p>Delivery of identified outcomes</p> <p>Pros</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The option could deliver an improvement in the overall quality of services. • The option will deliver an increase in the range of services people can buy with a personal budget, if the market continues to develop new services • The option may contribute to an increase in the number of people directing and coordinating their own care • The option will make a significant contribution to a reduction in the Council’s overall workforce • The option will deliver the savings included in the Council Business Plan and Budget 2016+, but not as quickly as Option 6 • The option represents a shift away from the internal provision of these services. <p>Cons</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on workforce • Impact on service users and carers associated with seeking alternative services and managing change. <p>Additional considerations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While it is the Council’s intention to increase the numbers of people self-directing their own care and support by taking a Direct Payment, where they are unable to do so people can opt to have their Personal Budget managed by the Council. In such cases the Council will arrange their care and support by contracting on behalf of the individual with the selected provider or 										

	<p>providers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A stepped closure approach will enable the Council to manage risks around the timing of availability of new or developing provision in the market. • An alternative emergency placement arrangement may need to be commissioned.
Stakeholders engaged	A range of internal stakeholders have been consulted. Permission is sought to consult, to enable a wider range of external stakeholders to be consulted, including service users, staff and the provider market.
Recommendation	Following initial analysis by The Council this option is <u>preferred</u> as part of a stepped programme of change resulting in the eventual exit from all of the Council's short breaks services and is subject to consultation. It will allow time for the market to be shaped and for the Council to further manage any risks associated with an exit from service provision.
Principal Reason for Decision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The option delivers against all of the identified outcomes

Option 6	Close the Laurels and Brook House together and offer service users alternative provision in the market through the provision of a Personal Budget										
Information Considered	<p>Analysis of the following was carried out: market-wide costs, market wide quality, market-wide capacity, service occupancy, peak activity, service users, and other uses of the service.</p> <p>Supply / capacity in market</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Birmingham Multicare’s Silverbirch Road has indicated a small number of vacancies on weekdays. • There are approximately eight Shared Lives carers able to offer respite care. • Further supply of 10 apartments at The Bromford is scheduled to become available in Spring 2017. <p>Finance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sale of the Laurels and Brook House will generate a one-off capital receipt – estimated to be in the region of £1.1m, which would provide the service with ongoing annual revenue benefit of £82.5k. • In addition the net operational saving to the Council of the implementation of this proposal is detailed in the table below. Savings are contained in brackets, costs are not: <table border="1" data-bbox="451 902 1474 1010"> <thead> <tr> <th>2016/17 £000</th> <th>2017/18 £000</th> <th>2018/19 £000</th> <th>2019/20 £000</th> <th>2020/21 £000</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>13</td> <td>(296)</td> <td>(346)</td> <td>(411)</td> <td>(411)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	2016/17 £000	2017/18 £000	2018/19 £000	2019/20 £000	2020/21 £000	13	(296)	(346)	(411)	(411)
2016/17 £000	2017/18 £000	2018/19 £000	2019/20 £000	2020/21 £000							
13	(296)	(346)	(411)	(411)							
Pros and Cons of Option	<p>Delivery of identified outcomes</p> <p>Pros</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The option could deliver an improvement in the overall quality of services. • The option will deliver an increase in the range of services people can buy with a personal budget, if the market continues to develop new services • The option may contribute to an increase in the number of people directing and coordinating their own care • The option will make a contribution to a reduction in the Council’s overall workforce • The option will deliver the savings included in the Council Business Plan and Budget 2016+, earlier than option 5 • The option represents a shift away from the internal provision of these services. <p>Cons</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on workforce • Impact on service users and carers associated with seeking alternative services and managing change. <p>Additional considerations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While it is the Council’s intention to increase the numbers of people self-directing their own care and support by taking a Direct Payment, where they are unable to do so people can opt to have their Personal Budget managed by the Council. In such cases the Council will arrange their care and support by contracting on behalf of the individual with the selected provider or 										

	<p>providers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If all of the Council's services are closed at the same time it will place additional pressure on new or emerging services. • An alternative emergency placement arrangement may need to be commissioned.
Stakeholders engaged	A range of internal stakeholders have been consulted. Permission is sought to consult, to enable a wider range of external stakeholders to be consulted, including service users, staff and the provider market.
Recommendation	Following initial analysis by the Council this option is <u>preferred</u> as the quickest means of achieving the Council's service delivery and savings goals and is subject to consultation. It does however carry some additional risk as highlighted in the section above.
Principal Reason for Decision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The option delivers against all of the identified outcomes

4. Budget and management information

Please see above Options for summarised financial information.

5. Project Development Requirements/Information

Products required to produce Full Business Case	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Consultation Plan and associated consultation materials• Consultation Outputs• Updated Equality Assessment• Reassessment of service user/carers needs
Estimated time to complete project development	4 Months
Estimated cost to complete project development	No direct costs have been identified at present to enable the project to develop to the Full Business Case stage.
Funding of development costs	N/A
EIA: the main risks so far identified a strategy for managing them and need for any contingency arrangements.	<p>An initial Equality Assessment has been completed and will be revised and updated as the project develops towards a Full Business Case.</p> <p>The Equality Assessment has considered the options contained in the Outline Business Case and currently identifies that the proposals would have the most significant impact on those with the following protected characteristics; age; disability; and gender. These will be the focus of the Equality Analysis as it develops throughout the consultation period and in developing the Full Business Case</p>