

DERBYSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

CABINET

22 February 2018

Report of the Strategic Director for Adult Care

**RESPONSES TO THE CONSULTATION ON THE PROPOSED CLOSURE
OF HAZELWOOD HOME FOR OLDER PEOPLE
ADULT CARE**

1. Purpose of the Report

To inform Cabinet of the outcome of the consultation and Equality Impact Analysis on the proposed closure of Hazelwood Home for Older People in Cotmanhay, Ilkeston, and to recommend that Cabinet approves that:

- Hazelwood home for Older People remains open until a new Derbyshire County Council home is opened in the Cotmanhay area
- Essential remedial works are undertaken at Hazelwood to ensure the home is safe during the intervening period
- Appropriate consultations are carried out once a site has been secured.

2. Information and Analysis

On 14 September 2017 Cabinet approved a proposal to consult on the proposed closure of Hazelwood Home for Older People. Hazelwood is a 30 bed care home in Skeavingtons Lane, Cotmanhay. It was constructed in 1972 having four wings with 10 bedrooms on each of three of the wings. The fourth wing, which previously also had 10 bedrooms, was converted into a rehabilitation day unit in 2005 for use by Derbyshire Community Health Services Foundation Trust (DCHSFT). This has since been vacated by DCHSFT and has remained empty ever since.

The consultation has come about as a result of the programme to refurbish and undertake essential maintenance at the Council's Homes for Older People. This programme was approved by Cabinet on 16 June 2015 when £4.2m was set aside, following the closure of four homes plus a respite care facility, for the refurbishment of the remaining Council run homes.

A comprehensive programme of work including essential maintenance and refurbishment was devised. The work at Hazelwood was scheduled to begin initially in autumn 2016 but was delayed at that time because of the closure of a number of other care home beds and the need to retain capacity for winter pressures. Whilst undertaking this work the plan was to convert the currently unused day unit (Gold Wing) to en-suite bedrooms, to provide an additional five beds giving a total of 35 within the home altogether. The prospective work programme involved one wing at a time being vacated with residents being moved to another part of the building in order that work could be undertaken safely.

Property Services provided the following estimated costings for the work to be undertaken:

Planned maintenance works	Estimated cost £m	Funding source
Kitchen Ventilation	0.050	PMP 15/16
Pitched roof recover	0.480	PMP 16/17
Rewire associated with reroof	0.220	PMP 17/18
Renew heating pipes	0.150	PMP 17/18
SUB-TOTAL	0.900	
Improvement works		
Bathroom Improvements	0.074	Adult Care Capital
Toilet Refurbishment	0.074	Adult Care Capital
Sluice / Store Room Improvements	0.029	Adult Care Capital
Kitchen Refurbishment	0.120	Adult Care Capital
Gold Wing conversion	0.400	Adult Care Capital
Client contingency	0.028	Adult Care Capital
Fees	0.070	Adult Care Capital
SUB-TOTAL	0.795	
TOTAL	1.695	

The funding for the works to be undertaken was to be £0.9m from the Planned Maintenance Programme (PMP) and £0.795m from the £4.2m set aside in the 16 June 2015 Cabinet report. The estimated timescale for the work to be undertaken was two years. This would have meant that at least 10 of the beds at the home would need to remain vacant during this time period which would lead to an additional cost. This was estimated to be £0.489m in lost income (10 beds at average weekly cost at the time of the 14 September Cabinet report of £469.98 for 104 weeks).

The total estimated cost of undertaking the work including lost income was therefore in excess of £2.0m. Given this, and the disruption which the work would cause to residents, Cabinet approved that a period of consultation should be undertaken on the potential closure of Hazelwood taking account of the overall estimated cost of the essential work and concerns as to whether this represented a good use of public money.

Consultation

There are currently 21 residents living at Hazelwood. The breakdown of the resident group as at 23 January 2018 is as follows:

By age: 2 residents are aged under 80, 10 are aged between 80 and 90 and 9 are aged over 90 years old.

By length of stay: None of the residents have lived at Hazelwood for less than 6 months, 8 have lived at Hazelwood for between 6 months and 2 years and 13 have lived at Hazelwood for more than 2 years.

In addition one regular respite care client was also involved in the consultation.

Consultation commenced on 21 September 2017 and was due to end on 14 December 2017. This was extended to 2 January 2018 in order to give people more time to consider some additional information concerning the cost of the proposed work which had been requested by relatives. Consultation was publicised by a letter to all residents, their families and carers, and staff; a letter to local statutory agencies and GP practices; a media release; a leaflet for general distribution; and a webpage on the council website.

Appendix 1 is a key document to be read in considering this report as it provides a full summary of the responses, queries and comments raised during the consultation. This document includes views expressed by residents, their friends and family which officers believe fairly reflect the opinions expressed during the consultation, all the correspondence and feedback can be made available if requested by elected members. The quotes were recorded by officers in the meetings with residents and their families, in total 52 relatives 14 residents, 10 staff and one ward Councillor attended the meetings held at the home. It should be noted however that residents and relatives expressed the view that anything other than the opportunity to address Cabinet directly would not adequately convey their strength of feeling that the closure should not proceed.

The format of the two meetings held at Hazelwood was that a senior officer set out the reason why Hazelwood was being proposed for closure. This was followed by all those attending being able to express their views on the proposed closure. Local managers were also in attendance to deal with any specific questions arising from the consultation.

In general residents and relatives were very unhappy at the prospect of Hazelwood closing. It is considered by most respondents to be a good care home providing good quality care, with concern also raised that it is the last remaining Council run care home in Ilkeston. Significant concern was also expressed about the potential negative impact on residents of any move as a result of closure.

Some respondents questioned the validity of the estimated cost of the work which was planned to be undertaken, and if all of this work was essential. In response to these questions the Council has obtained independent verification of the estimated costs and a review of the works planned to replace the roof trusses.

The independent cost consultant (Gleeds) reviewed the estimated costs of the work utilising the same information which the Council's Property team had used as the basis for the original estimates. Gleeds estimated the cost of the works required as being £3.3m, significantly their estimate includes additional costs of 30% for time and materials as a result of the need to phase the work with the building still being occupied. In addition Gleeds undertook a Capital Cost Benchmarking exercise which demonstrated that the average cost of planned works at Hazelwood (£2,648 per square metre) was higher than 9 other similar refurbishment schemes on care homes in other local authority areas.

The independent Structural Engineer undertook a review of the condition of the roof and made the following recommendations. His view was that the longer term solution was the same as the previous evaluation; that due to the movement noted in the roof trusses the only viable option in the long term was to replace the roof completely. The Structural Engineer did however confirm that remedial work, including the installation of bracing, could be carried out to ensure the continued safety of the structure by reducing the risk of further movement in the roof trusses.

Another key issue which was raised during the consultation was why did the evaluation of Hazelwood which was undertaken for the revised strategy approved by Cabinet in June 2015 recommend that the home should remain open, whilst the Council were now consulting on possible closure; what has changed?

The property evaluation which was undertaken in the 16 June 2015 Cabinet report considered 4 criteria:

- The quality of the physical environment
- Financial sustainability of the home
- The fitness for purpose of the building
- Strategic benefits of the home for the local area

Hazelwood has been re-evaluated against these criteria and each remains largely consistent with the original scoring except for the financial sustainability of the home which has changed because of the significantly increased cost associated with maintenance and refurbishment than was envisaged at the time of the 2015

strategy. The Property Performance Survey which was undertaken at the time of the 16 June 2015 report identified potential maintenance and refurbishment costs of approximately £0.729m. Some of the work identified as required at that time has since been undertaken (notably the replacement of 5 heating boilers at a cost of £55,000). By comparison, if the works required to Gold Wing are excluded from the current planned refurbishment and maintenance programme, the approximate cost is £1.295m which is in excess of £0.5m more than the original figure. It was for this reason that the Council proposed the potential closure of the Home.

Outcome of the consultation

It remains the Council's view that undertaking all of the planned work at Hazelwood is essential in the longer term but that this approach does not, in the light of the new information, represent a good use of public money. The cost of refurbishment and maintenance has escalated significantly since the 16 June 2015 Cabinet report to the extent that it is no longer viable to undertake the required work. Even if all of the work were to be undertaken Hazelwood would remain in many respects well short of the design standard for modern care homes; this can have a direct detrimental impact upon the day to day care of residents living at Hazelwood. For example the bedrooms are much smaller than the current design standard which means that some items of moving and handling equipment do not fit in the bedroom unless all of the furniture is first removed.

However, the Council has listened to the views expressed by residents and relatives during the period of consultation, and has considered the expert advice received, and it is therefore recommended that the closure does not go ahead at this time but the future of Hazelwood is reconsidered at a future date when, as is proposed, a site and potential design for a new care home in the Cotmanhay area have been identified. This approach will potentially give the residents and relatives the opportunity to input into the design of a new care home if appropriate. The implications for the current (2015) strategy will also need to be further considered at that time.

The Council is committed to maintaining a Council run care home for older people in the Cotmanhay area and work will begin immediately to identify a suitable site for a new care home in the local area. Any new development would be subject to further engagement with residents and their relatives at Hazelwood, relevant planning approval and securing the capital investment required to construct it. It is anticipated that once a new care home has been constructed all of the residents and staff from Hazelwood will have the opportunity to transfer to the new facility if they so wish.

During the consultation the question was raised about undertaking a limited amount of work on the home in order to address immediate concerns about safety whilst seeking an alternative site for a new care home in the local area. On the basis of the new advice from the independent Structural Engineer it is now believed that

some limited remedial work can be undertaken which will ensure the safety of the building in the medium term. To ensure there is no deterioration in the state of the roof this will be monitored on an ongoing basis. The work to replace the ventilation system in the kitchen is also an immediate health and safety concern which needs to be addressed. Other maintenance work which is essential in the short term will be undertaken as and when required.

3. Financial Considerations

The cost of the revised short term remedial work will be taken from the Planned Maintenance Programme budget allocation set aside for this purpose. The proposal to secure a new site and construct a new care home in the Cotmanhay area will be subject to a further Cabinet report in due course.

4. Human Resources Considerations

If a suitable provision is identified appropriate consultation with staff may be required. It is envisaged however that if practical, staff would transfer from Hazelwood to any new facility if opened.

5. Legal Considerations

Proposals to make significant changes in service provision require consultation with those affected, including service users, staff and carers. Members must take careful account of the views expressed in arriving at their decision. In addition any final decisions must also take into account the rights of service users as set out in the Human Rights Act 1998, specifically Article 8, "Right to respect for private and family life". In assessing these proposals, the Council should also have regard to its statutory duties under the Care Act 2014 and equalities legislation. In particular Cabinet members are reminded of the need to have careful regard to the conclusions of the equality impact analysis.

6. Social Value Considerations

The Social Value Act 2012 places a requirement on the Council to consider the economic, environmental and social benefits of its approach to the procurement of public services. In this instance the social benefit of retaining a care home in the Cotmanhay area supports the decision to keep Hazelwood open in the short term but not to spend the full amount on planned maintenance and refurbishment in the longer term.

7. Other Considerations

In preparing this report the relevance of the following factors has been considered: equality of opportunity, health, environmental, transport, property and crime and disorder considerations.

8. Background Papers

Major Change and Closure Guidance

9. Key Decision

Yes

10. Is it required that the Call-in period be waived in respect of the Decisions being proposed within this report?

No

11. Officer's Recommendation

Cabinet approves that:

- 11.1 Hazelwood home for Older People remains open until a new Derbyshire County Council home is opened in the Cotmanhay area
- 11.2 Essential remedial works are undertaken at Hazelwood to ensure the home is safe during the intervening period
- 11.3 Appropriate consultations are carried out once a site has been secured.

Joy Hollister
Strategic Director – Adult Care
County Hall
MATLOCK

Appendix 1

CONSULTATION REPORT ON THE PROPOSED CLOSURE OF HAZELWOOD CARE HOME

1. Purpose of the Report

On 14 September 2017 a report was presented to Cabinet which sought approval to consult on the proposed closure of Hazelwood Care Home. This was approved and Cabinet noted the programme of consultation. The consultation was launched on the 21 August and closed on the 2 January 2018. This report will summarise views and opinions submitted during this period.

2. Methodology and Approaches

The consultation used a qualitative approach to gather people's views about the proposed changes. Officers enabled as many people as possible to take part by offering a range of ways in which people could share their views:

1. All current residents identified together with their next of kin received an information pack detailing the proposed closure of the Home.
2. All Statutory Agencies (including GP surgeries), the voluntary sector and private residential homes within the geographical area of Hazelwood were sent a letter informing them of the proposals together with the information leaflet.
3. A leaflet was produced and gave information about the proposal for Hazelwood. This detailed how people could have their say and signposted them to further information either via the Derbyshire County Council website (www.derbyshire.gov.uk/Hazelwood), the Service Manager's telephone number for Stakeholder Engagement and Consultation Team (SECT) or via an email address: telladultcare@derbyshire.gov.uk
4. The Derbyshire County Council website gave an outline of the proposal, and provided the Cabinet Member report of 14 September 2017 as well as a copy of the leaflet.
5. Participants were also encouraged to write in to the Council via a letter or email, dependent on their preferred method of communication.
6. The Stakeholder Engagement and Consultation Team and a senior officer also attended two meetings at the home potentially affected by the proposal. Residents, staff and next of kin were given the option to comment about the proposals at these meetings.
7. Press releases were sent to the media during the period of consultation. These press releases were also published on the Derbyshire County Council website.
8. A drop in session was held in Ilkeston library where members of the public were invited to give their views on the proposals.

Qualitative Approach

The written submissions received via the feedback online form, letters and emails were all analysed using Microsoft Excel alongside the comments given at meetings. This allowed the information to be condensed into manageable summary categories or themes for analysis. Comments and quotes were coded by officers in SECT which allowed themes to emerge directly from reading people's views. The team coded the information using classification, sorting and arranging of the information. This gave the team an opportunity to widen their understanding of the views about the proposals and indicate some of the reasons behind people's opinions. It also allowed people to expand and give examples as to the potential impact of the proposed changes.

Who was encouraged to participate?

All residents, their families and friends, statutory agencies, voluntary organisations and private residential homes in the geographical area of Hazelwood Care Home, Cotmanhay were sent a letter and a leaflet immediately following the Cabinet Meeting noting the commencement of consultation. Staff were also able to have their say via their unit manager.

Information was available within the residential homes including a copy of the Cabinet paper and the leaflet for anyone who wished to see a further hard copy together with a copy of the structural report.

Staff from SECT attended two specifically arranged meetings at the home in which participants were given the opportunity to comment.

The format of the meetings held at Hazelwood was that a Group Manager from Adult Care set out the contents of the proposals from the 14 September 2017 Cabinet report, and the reasons why the particular home in question was being proposed for closure. This was followed by all those attending being able to express their views on the proposed closure. Local managers were also in attendance to deal with any specific questions arising from the consultation.

A further meeting was subsequently held with the Assistant Director of Adult Care, Simon Stevens, Maggie Throup MP and 6 relatives at Hazelwood Care Home.

Consultation views on proposal to close Hazelwood.

Letters, Emails and Telephone Calls

Forty emails, eleven letters and four phone calls were received during the consultation period. Respondents were mainly the relatives of the people currently residing in the residential home, but also included Erewash Clinical Commissioning Group, two local MP's (Maggie Throup and Pauline Latham) together with the local

medical centre (Littlewick Medical Centre, Ilkeston). The main themes emerging from these methods of consultation were:

1. the passion to keep the home open because of its location and high standard of care
2. the availability of alternative residential care in the local area
3. the questioning of the accuracy of the costings quoted in the Cabinet paper of the 14 September 2017.

Meetings held at the Home

Two meetings were held at Hazelwood at which residents and next of kin were invited to share their views and opinions on the proposals and to ask any questions. In total 52 relatives 14 residents, 10 staff and one ward Councillor attended the meetings held at the home,

In total 221 comments were captured at both meetings. The typed comments were then made available at the home for those attending to read and comment on further. The following are the top five main themes which emerged from both meetings:

1. **Council Finance** (74 comments) – questioning the estimates and overall strategic financial planning
2. **Distress caused to residents and relatives** (34 comments)
3. **Alternative accommodation concerns** (21 comments)
4. **Standard/Quality of Care** (18 comments)
5. **Validity of consultation** (9 Comments)

Under the theme **Council Finance** the following are a representative sample of the quotes captured during the meeting at Hazelwood Care Home which questioned the estimates:

- “Who did the valuations/estimates as these appear to be an over inflated quote”
- “It is glaringly obvious that we are living in a time when there is more elderly and will need more facilities like this one – not less. The proposed scheme should be costed correctly and then it would save the disruption to the residents and the stress this is causing and save them having to move”
- “Everyone present at this meeting would like to see alternative estimates being drawn up – and only then should a decision be made – you can’t make a decision on the estimates that have been put in this cabinet paper – they just don’t stack up”

Under the theme **Distress caused to residents and relatives** the following are a representative sample of the comments captured during the meetings at Hazelwood Care Home:

- “Hard to put a relation in a home in the first place, then you struggle to get them settled – to move them to another home could kill them”
- “We don’t want them to have the stress of this and don’t want them to have to move – they are happy and settled here”
- “I hope that you are seeing our passion to keep Hazelwood open and how strong we feel that it should be kept open – please make sure that the Elected Members realise just how strongly we feel about this”

Under the theme of **Alternative accommodation concerns** the following are a representative sample of the comments captured during the meetings:

- “Hazelwood is the last Derbyshire County Council run home in Ilkeston – Cotmanhay is the most deprived area in Derbyshire – an area of older people who need affordable older peoples residential services”
- “Going through the list of care homes in the area – if the home closes what will happen to the residents if it does? There are just not residential homes in Cotmanhay”
- “What about the long term future of elderly people in the area? Where are the people going to go in five to ten years’ time? It’s not much foresight on behalf of the Council with an ageing population to even think about closing the only residential care home it has in this area”

Under the theme of **standard/quality of care** the following are a representative sample of the comments which were captured:

- “The difference this home made to our loved one is fabulous – it’s such a great feeling when you know that your loved one is somewhere that they like and you can see them blossoming – the care and attention given by staff here is amazing”
- “Nobody has mentioned how good the quality of care in this home is – the staff are great – they keep the residents motivated and looking forward to the next day – this is really important”
- “In Hazelwood you get the finest care – and care should be the number one priority for the council.”

Under the theme of **Validity of the consultation** the following are a representative sample of the comments which were captured:

- Will the Cabinet members see the notes taken today?
- We think this is a done deal and the consultation is just a tick box exercise
- Relatives would like to record that the first meeting notes did not truly capture the passion of all involved to keep Hazelwood open and requested that this be recorded

A subsequent meeting was held at Hazelwood which was attended by Simon

Stevens the Service Director for Direct Care, Maggie Throup MP and six relatives of the residents residing in Hazelwood Care Home. This allowed the themes outlined above to be addressed further.

Meeting Held at Ilkeston Library

A drop-in session was held at Ilkeston library where two members of the SECT gathered the views of the local population on the proposals. The purpose of the drop-in session was to elicit the views of members of the public who may have a legitimate interest in the proposed closure, possibly because they may consider it as a future option for their own care or for the care of a relative. This was publicised via a poster displayed both in the library and at Hazelwood Care Home. It was also announced via an article on the front page of the local newspaper, Ilkeston Life. In total 35 members of the public, together with one resident from Hazelwood and several relatives chose to come along to the drop in meeting to have their comments noted for the consultation. Councilor Robert Flatley representing Ilkeston East Ward, was also in attendance. The SECT also handed out over twenty five leaflets to the public which explained the proposal and how they could register their feedback.

In total 151 comments were captured during the meeting and the top themes emerging were:

- **Distress caused to residents/relatives** (46 comments)
- **Local area amenities and economy** (26 comments)
- **Alternative accommodation concerns** (18 comments)
- **Standard/quality of care** (12 comments)
- **Council Finance** (11 comments)

Under the principle theme from the Library meeting of **Distress caused to residents/relatives**, the following are a representative sample of the comments which were captured:

- “I am concerned about the residents having to move out of the area in which they are familiar”
- “Putting loved ones in a home is extremely stressful once they are settled the last thing you want is the thought of them having to move”

Under the theme **Local area amenities and economy** the following are a representative sample of the comments which were captured:

- “We are losing so many community facilities – which is making a big negativity in the area”
- “Concerned about local jobs and the impact of the closure would have on the local economy”

Under the theme of **Alternative Accommodation concerns** the following are representative examples of the comments which were captured:

- “Only a few care homes in the area in a community like Cotmanhay you need somewhere near by – need to be able to walk to it to visit your loved ones”
- “It’s terrible – there is not going to be any local authority run homes that are local to Erewash people – there will only be private homes available and the cost and quality of care are just not comparable”

Under the theme of **Standard/quality of care** the following are representative examples of the comments which were captured:

- “Care and the staff at Hazelwood are fantastic”
- “Visited lots of residential homes and Hazelwood is the best I have been in”

Under the theme **Council finance** the following representative comments were captured:

- “The council have the money to keep it open and should spend it on local people. Why not build new ones before shutting existing ones?”
- “Don’t understand if the money is available why don’t you spend it on repairing the home”

During the consultation period considerable focus was placed by residents and carers on the accuracy of the estimated costs included in the Cabinet report for the work to be carried out on Hazelwood; the necessity for some of the work; and whether the level of disruption would be as severe as described by officers. This resulted in a Freedom of Information request and an independent cost consultant being appointed. The original proposed consultation period was then extended from December 14th 2017 to January 2nd 2018 to allow greater time for the information provided by the Council to be digested and responded to.

Petitions and Facebook

An on-line petition was received opposing the closure of Hazelwood. This petition contained 2593 signatures on closure of the consultation period. The comments made within the petition can be viewed online with the following link:
<https://www.change.org/p/derbyshire-county-council-save-hazelwood-care-home-cotmanhay-ilkeston>

A paper petition was formally handed in to Derbyshire County Council opposing the closure of Hazelwood Care Home containing 1356 signatures in total. A further electronic list of names and addresses of people who are opposed to the closure of Hazelwood care home was forwarded via email from Maggie Throup MP containing 122 names.

A Facebook page called “Save Hazelwood” was set up by relatives to keep residents, families and the local people updated on the steps they can take to voice their opinion on the proposed closure of the home. This Facebook page had 240 likes and 247 followers at the time of the closure of the consultation on 2 January 2018.

Summary of Consultation

The principle common themes which ran through the feedback from the consultation processes concern the costings of the proposed work and the impact on relatives and residents if the home were to close.

A full set of comments from the meetings at Hazelwood and Ilkeston Library is included in Appendix 5.

Very strong views were expressed about the Council’s belief that that the work is necessary and the estimated costs of that work. Carers and residents believe that the extent of the work had been exaggerated by the Council and that the costs associated with the work had been inflated. The outcome of the Freedom of Information request was a full disclosure of the work undertaken by Property Services on developing their estimated costs and the production of a report by an independent cost consultant.

Based on past experience within the Council of other similar proposals for home closures, a set of Pledges were distributed to residents and relatives at the outset of consultation to set out how Adult Care would assist in planning to meet the needs of individual residents if Cabinet were to decide that a particular home should close. This is attached as Appendix 4. The Pledges relate to the detailed assessment that would be carried out on each individual resident. This would be coordinated by a case worker but with input from the resident, family carer and staff at each home. This would form the basis of making informed choices about where residents’ needs can be best met and to make the process of moving homes as smooth as possible. The pledges would mitigate many of the concerns particularly expressed by residents and family carers about the potential impact of a move on vulnerable older people.

These Pledges offer specific assurances on the assistance that will be provided to address a) – c). Further detail specifically on assisting the residents in making the transition can be found in the Major Change and Closure Guidance. The Equality Impact Assessment (Appendix 2) refers to the available evidence on the impact on resident’s health and wellbeing in instances of planned moves.

Conclusions/ Lessons Learnt.

The proposals were understood by the residents of Hazelwood and their carers who participated fully in the consultation both through the formal meetings at the

outset of consultation and through subsequent follow-up. Residents who lacked the capacity to make their views known were appropriately represented.

The consultation process has seen a great deal of interest in the proposed closure from the wider community in Ilkeston. Social media as well as more traditional means of eliciting support have been used by campaigners. This has resulted in a clear message not just from residents and their carers that Hazelwood should remain open and that the local community greatly value the presence of a Council-run care home in the area.

Appendix 2

Derbyshire County Council

Equality Impact Analysis Record Form 2014



Department	Adult Care
Service Area	Direct Care
Changes or Proposals	Proposed closure of Hazelwood Care Home
Chair of Analysis Team	Helen Greateorex
Date of Analysis	JANUARY 2018
Version	1

1. Prioritising what is being analysed

a. Description of current service arrangements

The Council has proposed the closure of Hazelwood Care Home

b. Details of proposals or changes

The Council's proposal is to close the following residential care home:
Hazelwood Care Home, Skeavingtons Lane, Cotmanhay
These proposals were set out in a report 'Consultation on the Closure of Hazelwood Care Home, Cotmanhay' considered by Cabinet on 14 September 2017

C. Rationale for proposed changes

This Equality Impact Analysis (EIA) seeks to identify the potential impact on residents, their families and carers, older people generally and the wider community with a legitimate interest of proposals to close Hazelwood Care Home. In the Cabinet paper on the 14 September 2017 permission was sought to consult for twelve weeks on the proposal to close Hazelwood Care Home. The care provided by staff at Hazelwood is of the highest quality, but the building itself does not meet the standards we provide in many of our other, more modern residential homes.

The costs involved in repairing the home, combined with refurbishment costs and loss of income while the work is being carried out may not represent the best value for the Council.

2. The team carrying out the analysis

Name	Area of expertise/ role
Helen Greateorex	Service Manager, Stakeholder Engagement and Consultation Team
David Gurney	Group Manager, Performance, Adult Care
Rob Moore	Group Manager, Adult Care, Accommodation and Support
Wendy Rhodes	Unit Manager (Hazelwood Care Home)

3. Existing information and consultation based feedback

a. Sources of data and consultation used

Source	Reason for using
Cabinet report of 16 June 2015	Provides information on potential demand/ users of home and future services
Market Position Statement	Provides information on the social care and health needs of older and disabled people in Derbyshire
Resident data	Makeup of the residents of the home, their family and carers, including levels of need, age, disability, ethnic origin, gender, whether they have family

Source	Reason for using
	support, whether they have dementia and care cost information
Consultation feedback	Views and concerns of residents and their families/ family carers, partner organisations, and other stakeholders, including people in the local community
Other consultation	Feedback from local people (those not directly connected to the home) and potential users of future services, including the third sector
Employee consultation	To obtain the views of those employees working at the home who may be affected if the Council proceeds with its proposals

4. Known impact on different protected characteristic groups

- a. From existing data and information – who is likely to be adversely affected, how, and to what degree? Will anyone gain or benefit from the proposals?

This section reflects the numbers of residents using the service on 23 January 2018.

Protected Group	Findings
Age including children and families, older people	Currently 21 people are permanent residents of Hazelwood Care Home. 10 of the residents are aged between 80 - 90, 9 are aged over 90 years old, 2 are aged under 80.
Disabled people including mobility, sensory, learning, mental health, HIV, and also include carers and relatives	All residents at the care home could be described as 'frail elderly' of whom 13 have some form of dementia either formally diagnosed or based on the experience of staff. Dementia will impact on residents' capacity to make informed decisions about a move. Under these circumstances a best interest decision will be made on their behalf by a relative or friend. If this is not possible to arrange then an independent advocate from outside agencies will be sought to assist with arrangements. It should be noted however that during the consultation 2 residents did not have representation, relatives of these residents were contacted by the Stakeholder Engagement and Consultation Team (SECT) by telephone. The received comments were recorded as part of the feedback.

	<p>8 of the residents are deaf, a primary condition which provides them with protection under the Equality Act as a disabled person.</p> <p>10 residents require the use of a wheelchair for all or some of the time to assist with their mobility.</p> <p>There are no identifiable benefits to residents of a move to a different care home.</p>
Gender (sex) including men and women, boys and girls	The facilities cater equally for both male and female residents.
Gender reassignment – including impact if any on transgender people	None of the residents or respite users informed that they had gender reassignment or were transgender.
Marriage and civil partnership – also include impacts on lone parents and unmarried couples	All of the residents report as being single or widowed and there are no unmarried couples or couples with civil partnership.
Pregnancy and maternity – including new mothers/ parents	Not relevant to the demographic element served by these facilities.
Race – including all racial groups, including impact if any on Gypsies and Travelers	All 21 residents (100%) define themselves as being of White British ethnic origin. To place this within context the population of Derbyshire is 92.5% white (derived from Office for National Statistics 2009 data).
Religion and belief including non-belief, including religious minority communities, Humanists	All 21 of the residents reported Church of England as their religion.
Sexual orientation – including the impact if any on LGBT people	All 21 residents reported as heterosexual.

Non-statutory

<p>Poorer and disadvantaged communities and groups, including people who experience financial exclusion</p>	<p>9 of the residents fund their own care costs and all residents have some form of support from within their family or circle of friends.</p> <p>The Council has included within its Pledges (which set out the help it will give to residents and their families and carers) an undertaking to consider providing additional financial assistance, within reason, to residents for the costs of new accommodation, care and support.</p> <p>The Council will need to make clear to residents, their families and carers, exactly what this assistance could include and whether there are any limitations such as cost and time. The availability of alternative appropriate accommodation and care and support could be, in part, determined by the willingness of the Council to provide top ups to help cover the additional costs of care.</p> <p>It is possible that some of the relatives and friends of residents will find it hard to meet the increased cost of transport, depending on their own personal financial circumstances and the degree to which the care home to which the resident moves is further away from their own home. Maintaining friendships and links with relatives may in some instances be dependent on the ability of the Council to assist friends and relatives to be able to continue to visit.</p> <p>Hazelwood caters for residents drawn from a relatively local catchment area. All but one of the residents is local to Ilkeston. Accessibility to Hazelwood via public transport is relatively easy and affordable to relatives, carers and other potential visitors. It should be noted that a high proportion of relatives and carers do not have access to their own transport.</p> <p>Ensuring that the wishes and needs of residents, their families and carers are taken into account if the proposals go ahead is important. The Council will need to be aware of the links that residents have with the local community or any other communities, where family and other carers reside and their ability to travel to other locations, and how these links can be supported for each residents at a new location.</p> <p>Many of the residents' friends and relatives are local to Hazelwood. Ensuring that current visiting patterns are maintained will be an important factor in successfully re-settling current residents by offering them continued contact with people who are important to them and will</p>
---	--

	offer comfort and support at a time of major change. This may also include contact between residents and the current staff group at the facility if they were to wish to remain in contact with some residents they have known for some time.
--	---

Impact on employees of Derbyshire County Council or prospective employees

<p>The proposed closure Hazelwood will affect the 30 staff who work there, 8 of whom live in Cotmanhay. This may result in staff being redeployed to other workplaces or redundancies. Most of the staff are care staff and domestics on low incomes who are likely to live in close proximity to the home and who may find it hard to consider redeployment if it involves considerable travel. 29 of the staff employed at Hazelwood are female.</p> <p>The particular circumstances of the staff group will only become clearer if the proposal to close is agreed by Cabinet at which point consultation would start with the staff groups affected</p> <p>Cotmanhay is recognised as a ward with a high level of deprivation. The closure of the home would remove from the area a service which offers employment opportunities to local people</p>

- b. From existing customer and other feedback – who is likely to be adversely affected, how and to what degree? Will anyone gain or benefit?

<i>Protected Group</i>	<i>Findings</i>
Age	<p>The proposal will impact on older people as the care home provides primarily long term accommodation for older people, including a number of people who have dementia.</p> <p>Residents, their families and others consulted have all raised concerns over the impact of moving to alternative accommodation will have on the current residents. In particular people are concerned that moving will cause stress and illness amongst residents, break the ties people have within the home and local community, and make it difficult for families and friends to continue to provide the support and care they do currently</p> <p>As part of an Equality Impact Analysis completed in 2015 at the time when other home closures were planned, Public Health selected 38 individual academic papers written from the 1970s up to the present day. All examined some aspect of the impact on health and wellbeing of elderly residents experiencing enforced</p>

	<p>relocation from institutionalised care home settings. The findings varied significantly between the studies, from increased mortality right through to relocation having beneficial effects. As a result no single study could be relied upon for conclusions but there were broad overall findings which were significant to those 2015 home closures. The findings from that review of academic papers led to changes in the Major Change and Closure Guidance, which sets out for staff how best to address the needs of residents and their families affected by closure</p> <p>The research carried out by Public Health drew the following broad overall findings of significance in terms of potential impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased falls • Increased depression and stress • Increased cognitive impairment • Reduced ability to manage activities of daily living • Increased mortality • Moves can be beneficial (particularly if moving to a better quality or more appropriate setting) <p>The impacts tend to be worse for elderly and frail residents. One study, however, did show the impact on residents with significant cognitive impairments was less than for those without.</p> <p>Whilst impacts may vary, they tended to be small and relatively short-lived, generally around 4 weeks although one study demonstrated effects at 3 months. Public Health carried out a further survey to reflect additional research published since 2015. This showed that two further studies had been published which were of direct relevance to the proposed closure of Hazelwood. This document is included as Appendix 3. This updated survey of published papers highlights from one study the potential stresses arising from friendship groups being broken up during or after a change of care setting. Both the Pledges and the Major Change and Closure Guidance address this.</p>
Disability	<p>The frail nature of many of the residents and the fact that a number also have dementia means that in terms of disability, the proposals could result in a worse impact for people affected who might be deemed to be disabled as well as elderly.</p> <p>The authority will need to take the individual health and</p>

	<p>wellbeing of each resident, as well as the needs of families and carers, into account as part of its arrangements for supporting residents to move, should the proposals go ahead.</p> <p>The Major Change Guidance will assist in ensuring that the risks which can be associated with a move are kept to a minimum. This is based on thorough assessments, including risk to health and wellbeing, and ensuring that all factors are fully taken into account in the process of identifying where a resident moves to and ensuring the move itself is properly handled.</p>
Gender (sex)	<p>No specific issues have been raised or highlighted which link directly to the gender of the residents that would be affected if the proposals go ahead.</p> <p>As most of the existing residents and employees of each facility are female, there is a gender impact, but as the proposals would not affect male and female residents or employees particularly differently, providing that consideration was taken of the needs of all individuals, then this would not amount to unlawful discrimination or another form of prohibited conduct under the Equality Act 2010.</p>
Gender reassignment	<p>No specific issues have been highlighted during the consultation in relation to gender re-assignment/ gender identity. There is no evidence to suggest that the proposal will result in unlawful discrimination or adverse impact on grounds of gender re-assignment/ gender identity.</p>
Marriage and civil partnership	<p>No specific issues have been highlighted in relation to marriage and civil partnership. There is no evidence to suggest that the proposals will result in unlawful discrimination or adverse impact on grounds of marriage and civil partnership.</p>
Pregnancy and maternity	<p>No issues have been highlighted during the consultation in relation to pregnancy and maternity issues, including by residents' families or carers. There is no evidence to suggest that unlawful discrimination or adverse impact will result on grounds of pregnancy and maternity.</p>
Race	<p>No specific issues have been raised in relation to ethnic or racial origin, or race equality. There is no evidence to suggest that the proposals will result in unlawful</p>

	discrimination or adverse impact on grounds of race or ethnicity.
Religion and belief including non-belief	The consultation and data has highlighted that a number of residents have existing ties to local churches. The Council will need to take account of individual faith commitments and links when seeking to identify suitable alternative supported housing should the proposals go ahead, as part of its pledges of support.
Sexual orientation	No specific issues have been raised in relation to sexual orientation. There is no evidence that the proposals will result in unlawful discrimination or adverse impact because of sexual orientation.

Non-statutory

Poorer and disadvantaged communities	<p>The feedback from residents and their families/ carers has highlighted concerns over the affordability of alternative supported accommodation in care homes, and a number of concerns were expressed about the perceived quality of care in the care home sector and the attendant costs of care.</p> <p>The Council's Pledges state: 'We will ensure that within reason you do not incur additional costs through moving to a new provider'. The authority will need to provide more clarity on an individual basis about exactly what costs would be covered, for how long and on what basis, should the proposals go ahead, so that residents, their families, carers or any advocate on their behalf have clear information about the costs of moving and how the costs of alternative accommodation would be met.</p>
--------------------------------------	---

Employees or prospective employees

<p>Consultation with employees can only formally take place once a decision has been made by Cabinet on the future of the Hazelwood. If the home were to close then Human Resources will begin work with the staff affected to consider the options open to them. Wherever possible Adult Care would wish to retain the skills and experience these staff have gained in this field of work but this is subject to individual discussions with staff and is dependent on their circumstances and the range of options which may then be available to them.</p>
--

- c. Are there any **other** groups of people who may experience an adverse impact because of the proposals?

The proposed closure of this home will have an impact on other carers in the Ilkeston area as local people will have less choice on homes they can potentially move into. In turn this may also impact on ease of access to see a relative or friend once they have moved into a care home.

In the consultation concerns were expressed that local people would no longer have a choice of a Council care home in Ilkeston itself. The Council has no strategy which determines where its care homes should be located. It does, however, have an obligation to ensure that there is sufficient capacity in the care home market to meet need and allow choice. That need could be met through its own provision and that of the independent care home sector.

- d. Gaps in data

What are your main gaps in information and understanding of the impact of your policy and services? Please indicate whether you have identified ways of filling these gaps.

<i>Gaps in data</i>	<i>Action to deal with this</i>
The early stage of these proposals means that some information, particularly in relation to how individual residents would be affected, remains presently unknown	If the Council decides to proceed with the proposed closure, it will need to ensure that an up-to-date needs assessment takes place for each resident. These assessments will be carried out with family carers, staff and the residents themselves on an individual basis. This will include being able to clarify the detailed questions and concerns that residents, their families and carers will have. This may be a protracted process depending on individual circumstances and should not be rushed. The Council acknowledges that this process may establish circumstances whereby the risk of moving a resident is so great that it cannot take place at that time, if at all.

5. From the consultation carried out specifically in relation to proposed changes, what views or issues have been raised by those who have responded? (Include both the views and any issues which have been raised and alludes to the likely impact)

a) Please summarise the consultation which has been carried out

A wide range of consultation methods have been used by the authority to record the views and opinions of people who could be affected by the proposal including:

- Current residents
- Users of the service, their families and carers
- Potential users of the service and future services provided by the authority
- Other stakeholders including the wider local community
- Statutory and voluntary sector organisations in the local community which work with older people and carers

This included:

- Meetings with relatives and friends of residents. 2 were held at Hazelwood Care Home
- A briefing to employees working at Hazelwood Care Home to outline the proposals and enable them to ask questions about how it would affect residents and employees and offer their comments
- The sending of formal correspondence and a copy of the Cabinet report and Pledges to the current residents, their families and carers, to explain the proposals, outline the consultation process and to invite them to provide their views in a number of ways
- Online consultation via the 'Have Your Say' webpages of the Council's website. This invited people to contact a named officer by telephone, email or letter to provide their views or make enquiries about the proposals etc.
- Advice to partner organisations such as the borough council, town council, GPs and other NHS organisations, and local district and County Councilors
- An open session was held at Ilkeston Library for local people to express their views. Many of the people who chose to comment did not have a current connection to Hazelwood

b) Please summarise the feedback received. This should make clear where those who have responded have highlighted any potential adverse impact as well as their opinions on the proposals.

The full report setting out in detail what consultees had to say about the proposal can be found as an Appendix to the Cabinet report.

6. Are there any ways of avoiding or reducing possible adverse impact on any groups of people, what are those actions, and how will Derbyshire County Council assist?

The research carried out by Public Health drew the following broad overall findings of significance which need to be addressed to mitigate the impact of any move:

Factors identified relating to successful adjustment to relocation fall into 4 categories:

1. People characteristics
2. The level of planning and preparation
3. Whether the move is voluntary or involuntary
4. The quality/similarity of the new setting

The Pledges being made by the Council to residents provide the basis for the detailed support that residents will need in relation to moving, should the proposals be agreed and go ahead. These Pledges are as follows:

1. We will treat you with dignity and respect and consult you and keep you informed throughout the process
2. We will ensure relatives and friends chosen by you are informed of the home closure and are able to remain involved in the process too
3. We will name a member of staff from your present care home who knows you well to listen to you, to support you and stay in contact with you
4. We will provide an advocate to assist anyone who does not have mental capacity to make decisions about their future arrangements and has no family or friend to do this
5. We will discuss with you your preferences, care and support needs and address your concerns about moving. We will update your assessment if necessary and check you agree with what has been written
6. We will ensure you have as much choice as possible about the type of care service you choose. We will arrange for you to visit ones you consider may be suitable or for your family to do so if you are unable to do so
7. We will complete a new 'support plan' and 'life book' with you to make clear your likes; things you want to do or be assisted with; your interests and priorities now and in earlier life. Once you are in agreement with what is in the plan/ book this can be used to brief your new service providers and help them prepare for your arrival
8. We will ensure that within reason you do not incur any additional costs through moving to a new provider
9. We will carefully plan the day of the move with you – who you want to travel with you; how you travel; a written list of personal items – everything will be done to reduce stress or worries
10. We will visit you and find how you are doing after the move and check

if there is anything else you wish to be done

11. Finally we pledge to try our best to meet your own personal priority – for example you may have friends you particularly wish to stay together with after a move

Additional depth is provided to the Pledges within the Major Change and Closure Guidance. This guidance sets out all the points that need to be covered by social workers and staff in the care home to ensure that assessments are carried out fully; that appropriate choices are made by residents and relatives; that the move itself is handled sensitively to mitigate the impact on the resident; and the circumstances in which it is not appropriate to proceed with a move. This is a key document for Adult Care staff in undertaking the assessment and the moves of residents to new settings

Proposed Mitigation

1. The Council has a set of Pledges and comprehensive guidance in place to assist in ensuring any moves of residents as a result of a home closure are handled sensitively and thoroughly. This also provides a point of reference for residents and their relatives to ensure that staff work to these high standards. In line with the guidance itself these documents should be made available to staff, residents and relatives should the closure be agreed by Cabinet
2. During the process of identifying possible alternatives for residents who would be affected by the closure of the home, the Council should hold as many vacancies as it can in its own homes close to Hazelwood to maximise the choices available to residents who may wish to relocate to a Council care home
3. Adult Care, through its Adult Care Brokerage Service and Direct Care Management Team, should seek to maximise the range of choices available to those residents and respite care users affected by home closures

Those directly affected if the closure goes ahead are understandably concerned over what the future could hold for them. The residents are old and frail and a number have dementia and other disabilities, which means that moving for any reason could be disruptive, stressful and affect health and wellbeing in an adverse way. People affected by the proposals clearly think very highly of the care and support they receive. There is no evidence which suggests that this would amount to unlawful discrimination or any other form of prohibited conduct as defined under the Equality Act 2010

The findings of this analysis should be utilised by Cabinet along with the more detailed record of consultation required to make the decision over whether to proceed with the proposed closure of Hazelwood Care Home. In doing so it will assist the Council to demonstrate that it is meeting its public sector equality duty to have due regard for the need to advance equality of opportunity, eradicate unlawful prohibited conduct and promote good relations

7. Main conclusions and recommendations

Conclusions

The two analyses of a total of 40 academic studies undertaken by Public Health showed that there are broad significant findings on the potential impact on the health and welfare of older people who may be affected by a move should Hazelwood close.

The research did not demonstrate however that the relocation of residents brought about by a home closure will necessarily have a detrimental impact on residents provided that care and attention is paid to the planning at each step along the way.

The Council has an important part to play through its Direct Care Service, which is responsible for the management of its in-house care homes, and Brokerage Team in ensuring that the choices for alternative placements are maximized.

Recommendations (if any)

It is recommended that:

Adult Care, through its Adult Care Brokerage Service and Direct Care Management Team, seeks to maximise the range of choices available to those residents and respite care users affected by home closure

8. Action planning in response to the completed analysis

<i>Objective</i>	<i>Planned action</i>	<i>Who</i>	<i>When</i>	<i>How will this be monitored?</i>
Maximize choice for residents affected by the closure	Direct Care to maximise the numbers of vacancies held for potential use by those residents requiring relocation	Group Managers for Direct Care	Ongoing	Through monitoring how many beds are/ are not made available to those affected by a closure
Maximize choice for residents affected by the closure	Brokerage service to circulate information on the wishes of those residents affected by a closure	Service Manager (Brokerage)	Ongoing	Through email communication with providers

9. Monitoring and review arrangements

Please outline what steps will be taken to monitor and review the implementation of proposals if they are agreed here:

Responsibility for the monitoring of the implementation rests with the Adult Care Senior Management Team. Responsibility for identifying shortfalls in alternative service provision rests with the Group Managers for Prevention and Personalisation in Erewash and for Direct Care in the South of the County

10. Conformation that equality impact analysis (EIA) completed and read

Name of officer signing off EIA as completed: David Gurney

Date: 23.01.18

This Equality Impact Analysis has been read by:

Name	Date	Position
Cllr Barry Lewis		Leader of the Council
Cllr Jean Wharmby		Cabinet Member for Adult Care
Cllr Wayne Major		Cabinet Support Member for Adult Care

Where and when published e.g. Cabinet Report, on Derbyshire County Council website

Alongside the Cabinet report on the Derbyshire County Council website

Appendix 3



Evidence Summary: Health Impacts of Care Home Closure and Subsequent Relocation of Residents (Update from 2015)

Confidentiality

PUBLIC

Version	Publishing Date	Comments	Author
1.0	09/01/2017	Final version	Richard Flint Public Health Manager (Epidemiology) Public Health Derbyshire County Council County Hall Matlock Derbyshire DE4 3AG

Evidence Summary: Health Impacts of Care Home Closure and Subsequent Relocation of Residents (Update from 2015)

Background

In 2015, an Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) was conducted in relation to a proposed closure of care homes across Derbyshire. As part of the EIA a literature search and evidence summary were produced by public health. The search looked at the impact a care home closure and the subsequent relocation has on its residents, and mitigating factors that could be put in place to reduce potential negative impacts on residents.

The 2015 evidence summary (Appendix A) included 38 academic studies based on the search strategy in Appendix B. This search has been repeated in December 2017 to ascertain if any new literature has been published since the 2015 search and, if so, whether there are any changes to the information previously provided.

Methodology

A systematic search of the databases available via HDAS, NHS Evidence, Trip database, Cochrane library using the previous search strategy (Appendix B) was conducted. The search identified 2 studies eligible for inclusion in the updated review. An evidence based practice guideline was also found.

Results

The two recent included studies each varied in type; one being a retrospective quantitative study exploring morbidity and mortality in the relocation of highly dependent long care residents¹. The other is a qualitative study exploring the perspectives on the way in which a protocol for the relocation of older adults was used. It explores the perspectives of residents, family members and care home staff².

The population used by the quantitative study may not be generalisable to the whole care home population, due to using a sample of the most high dependent care residents, with high fragility and significant cognitive impairment¹. The study found significantly higher levels of antibiotics and antidepressants prior to relocation in the group to be relocated compared to a control group, which may infer stress related disease. There were no significant variations in mortality rates between the two groups. The quality of this quantitative study is not the highest; it does not provide any information on the analytical process, statistical methodology used to derive the results, or mention whether it controlled for confounding factors (gender, length of stay). It also does not say whether a protocol was put in place as part of the relocation.

The second identified study² explored the perspectives of how the use of a protocol influences a resident's experience of a relocation. The findings are consistent with previous studies: Planning and preparation, ensuring the involvement of residents, relatives and staff, and a person centred approach are important for improving resident's experiences through of being relocated.

Not mentioned in the 2015 summary, this study highlights the negative social impacts that could occur during relocation. Residents may lose friendships through relocation or be relocated at different times to friends, which could result in stress. This can be mitigated via quality planning and involvement of all residents, family and staff.

The search also found an evidence based practice guideline³, which provides information and guidance for the relocation of cognitively intact older adults. The guidance is for any relocation, whether between care homes or from a family home to a care home for the first time. It provides suggested pre-relocation interventions such as ensuring an individualised plan to assess an individual's current needs, relocation needs, and preferences, ensuring early planning of the move and facilitating continuity of care.

It also recommends incorporating ongoing post relocation interventions that are tailored to the individual. Including assessing and meeting physical and psychosocial needs, providing support, promoting past, present and future relationships, continuity of daily patterns of living and personalising the new environment.

Conclusion

An updated search of the evidence on the impact of a care home closure and the subsequent relocation has on its residents, and mitigating factors that could be put in place to reduce potential negative impacts on residents found only a small number of studies (2) since the original 2015 search.

These studies support the findings of the 2015 summary; that the use of a protocol/guideline improves resident's experiences when part of a relocation and reduces the risks of negative impacts.

Based on the previous evidence summary below is an overview of the factors, potential impacts and methods that could be implemented to mitigate negative impacts:

Factors related to successful adjustment to relocation fall into four categories:

- People characteristics (current health status, demographics)
- Planning and preparation
- Voluntary/ involuntary move

- Quality/ similarity of new setting

Potential impacts can be:

- Beneficial (particularly if moving to a better quality or more appropriate setting)
- Increased falls
- Increased depression and stress
- Increased cognitive impairment
- Negative social impacts (loss of friendships)
- Reduced ability to manage activities of daily living
- Increased mortality

These impacts tend to be worse for more elderly and frail residents (however, one study showed the impact on residents with significant cognitive impairment was less than for those without). Those that were relocated at short notice due to environmental emergencies are also likely to be at more risk to negative impacts.

However, whilst variable, impacts tended to be small and relatively short-lived (generally around 4 weeks although one study demonstrated effects at 3 months).

- Negative impacts could be mitigated against by:
 - Good planning and preparation (a person centred approach, involvement of family and staff)
 - Maximising sense of control in residents
 - Post relocation review and support
 - Falls prevention measures
 - Maximising the quality of the new residence

References

- 1 Mello, S. and O'Connor, K.A., 2016. Morbidity and Mortality Following Relocation of Highly Dependent Long-Term Care Residents: A Retrospective Analytical Study. *Journal of gerontological nursing*, 42(11), pp.34-38.
- 2 Leyland, A.F., Scott, J. and Dawson, P., 2016. Involuntary relocation and safe transfer of care home residents: a model of risks and opportunities in residents' experiences. *Ageing & Society*, 36(2), pp.376-399.
- 3 Hertz, J.E., Koren, M.E., Rossetti, J. and Tibbits, K., 2016. Management of Relocation in Cognitively Intact Older Adults. *Journal of gerontological nursing*, 42(11), pp.14-23.

Appendix A - Original Evidence Summary- 2015

- 38 individual academic papers have been selected for review. All examining some aspect of the impact on the health and wellbeing of elderly residents experiencing enforced relocation from institutionalised home care settings.
- Papers from the 1970s up to the present day were included. Sample sizes varied from 12 to 439 (larger sample sizes are more likely to reflect actual impact, as opposed to changes which have happened by chance). The studies

were both quantitative (examining the size of any effect) and qualitative (trying to understand important effects that cannot be measured i.e. what factors may have made residents feel more in control etc.). The quality of the studies varied, particularly with regard to control groups of residents; without adequate controls it is very hard to draw conclusions from any observed changes as they may have been due to chance alone.

- Findings varied significantly between the studies, from increased mortality right through to relocation having beneficial effects.
- I would strongly advise against reporting the outcome of any single study, as nothing shows a fully complete or reliable picture. That said, the broad, overall findings of significance to this EIA are:
 - Factors related to successful adjustment to relocation fall into four categories:
 - People characteristics
 - Planning and preparation
 - Voluntary/ involuntary move
 - Quality/ similarity of new setting
 - Potential impacts can be :
 - Beneficial (particularly if moving to a better quality or more appropriate setting)
 - Increased falls
 - Increased depression and stress
 - Increased cognitive impairment
 - Reduced ability to manage activities of daily living
 - Increased mortality
 - The impacts tend to be worse for more elderly and frail residents (however, one study showed the impact on residents with significant cognitive impairment was less than for those without).
 - However:
 - Whilst variable, impacts tended to be small and relatively short-lived (generally around 4 weeks although one study demonstrated effects at 3 months).
 - Negative impacts could be mitigated against by:
 - Good planning and preparation (including visits to new residence)
 - Maximising sense of control in residents.
 - Post relocation review and support
 - Falls prevention measures
 - Maximising the quality of the new residence

Appendix B - Search Strategy

Sources searched: Cochrane Library, TRIP, NICE evidence, Medline, Embase, Cinahl, PsycInfo and BNI

Search strategy: (medline example, modified for different databases):

- 1 Medline NURSING HOMES/
 - 2 Medline "residential care home*".ti,ab
 - 3 Medline "residential home*".ti,ab
 - 4 Medline "care home*".ti,ab
 - 5 Medline "nursing home*".ti,ab
 - 6 Medline "nursing care home*".ti,ab
 - 7 Medline HOMES FOR THE AGED/
 - 8 Medline 1 OR 2 OR 3 OR 4 OR 5 OR 6 OR 7
 - 9 Medline closure.ti,ab
 - 10 Medline HEALTH FACILITY CLOSURE/
 - 11 Medline PATIENT TRANSFER/
 - 12 Medline 9 OR 10 OR 11
 - 13 Medline relocat*.ti,ab
 - 14 Medline removal.ti,ab
 - 15 Medline moving.ti,ab
 - 16 Medline 11 OR 13 OR 14 OR 15
 - 17 Medline exp AGED/
 - 18 Medline 8 AND 12
 - 19 Medline 17 AND 18
 - 20 Medline 8 AND 10 AND 16 AND 17
 - 21 Medline MORTALITY/
 - 22 Medline QUALITY OF LIFE/
 - 23 Medline wellbeing.af
 - 24 Medline exp "OUTCOME ASSESSMENT (HEALTH CARE)"/
 - 25 Medline distress.ti,ab
 - 26 Medline 21 OR 22 OR 23 OR 24 OR 25
 - 27 Medline 19 AND 26
- Filtered for studies 2015 onwards.

Appendix 4

OUR PLEDGES TO RESIDENTS

1. We will treat you with dignity and respect and consult you and keep you informed throughout the process
2. We will ensure relatives and friends chosen by you are informed of the home closure and are able to remain involved in the process too
3. We will name a member of staff from your present care home who knows you well to listen to you, to support you and stay in contact with you
4. We will provide an advocate to assist anyone who does not have mental capacity to make decisions about their future arrangements and has no family or friend to do this
5. We will discuss your preferences, care and support needs with you and addressing your concerns about moving. We will update your assessment if necessary and check you agree with what has been written
6. We will ensure you have as much choice as possible about the type of care service you choose. We will arrange for you to visit ones you consider may be suitable or for your family to do so if you are unable to do so
7. We will complete a new 'support plan' and 'life book' with you to make clear your likes; things you want to do or be assisted with; your interests and priorities now and in earlier life. Once you are in agreement with what is in the plan/book this can be used to brief your new service providers and help them prepare for your arrival
8. We will ensure that within reason you do not incur any additional costs through moving to a new provider
9. We will carefully plan the day of the move with you – who you want to travel with you; how you travel; a written list of personal items – everything will be done to reduce stress or worries
10. We will visit you and find how you are doing after the move and check if there is anything else you wish to be done
11. Finally we pledge to try our best to meet your own personal priority – for example you may have friends you particularly wish to stay together with after a move

Appendix 5

Comments and feedback from meeting held at Ilkeston Library

- I would be worried about other homes in the area and the cost of private care
- The Cabinet paper wording has been weighted in a particular way and not been put in a favourable way
- The home is only small – but this is in its favour as this makes it more homely
- There is a need for more beds rather than less
- Would question the timescale for the proposed work – and would like to see a plan of how this would breakdown
- (Resident) the proposals are terrible, and it's breaking my heart. It should never happen. They have got the money to do the repairs so they should do them instead of closing it. They will have to build a new one if they close it – how much is that going to cost? Why should they close it, it wants quite a bit doing to it but it will be sad to see it go. I think I know what's happening already, they shut Hillcrest and there was nothing up with it. They aren't using the Hillcrest building, I moved from Hillcrest to Hazelwood 2 years ago. I don't want to move again, once is enough. It's terrible isn't it (the gentleman got teary at this point and said 'it's hurting me, it's a sad state of affairs') what about the staff if they close it.
- 25 beds in this area are better than none
- Against the closure
- All the residents are happy – it is not a good idea to move the vulnerable people.
- Anybody visiting – its easily accessible – the bus services to and from are easy
- At a community day at Cotmanhay we gauged opinions and all of the local residents felt that it was an amenity that was need locally
- Care and the staff at Hazelwood are fantastic
- Community needs this facility
- Concerned about how it will devastate people in Cotmanhay and the surrounding area – due to the lack of other Council run care home
- Concerned about local jobs and the impact of the closure would have on the local economy
- Concerned about staff and impact on the local economy
- Concerned about the availability of the Care Home in the area
- Concerned about the overall facilities in Cotmanhay
- Cotmanhay had had a negative feedback on things closing locally
- Don't like the way the local authority are pulling out of care – funding being cut and private care homes are finding it more and more difficult to provide the same level of care

- Don't understand if the money is available why don't you spend it on repairing the home
- Don't want you to close the home
- Engage local people and embed the home into the local community – make it more of a community hub
- Even the pets make it feel like home
- Feel the decision has been made
- Friendship groups are really important and I would be worried about the impact of this. I am also worried about the age of the residents – the impact of moving them on could kill them
- Hazelwood is a lovely home – I was a home help and went into the home to visit my ladies – its lovely and friendly and the food is gorgeous
- Hazelwood is a purpose built home – the homes in the area are multi stories and not conducive for people with dementia
- How about reduce salaries to Councillors where they are over £100,000 so they can make a contribution!!!
- I am concerned about the residents – they have made strong friendship groups within the home and I would be worried if these would be lost if they had to move
- I am concerned about the residents having to move out of the area in which they are familiar
- I bet the decision has already been made – last year they were going to do the repairs but nothing has been done. My Grandma is in there, she is 98 years old. It took a lot to get her settled, she gets confused and to put her somewhere else she is going to be even worse. She hasn't got long, and to be moved at this late stage will be detrimental to her health – when you move them they don't last long, why not stay open until the residents have passed?
- I can understand that the repairs are a big cost – the people who did the roof should be held accountable.
- I don't drive and being able to get to visit Mum and Aunty is a worry
- I don't understand the logic of the cost? The Council wastes millions of pounds – but when it comes to people you should invest in looking after them better
- I have read about the number of other homes in the area but not about how the number of beds will be replaced.
- If Hazelwood were to close it would mean that we are losing yet another local amenity in Cotmanhay and Ilkeston
- I think it's a good use of the public purse to spend money on this home
- I would be also worried about what they would put on the site to replace it

- I would be worried about other home in the area and the cost of private care
- If mum moves we are really concerned about how this will affect her
- If they close it – there are 22 beds, where would they be distributed?
- If they knew about the repairs why haven't they been done before? It's just cost cutting.
- If this is closed it will be big loss to the residents
- Is small and friendly and everyone knows one-another
- It shouldn't be about politics – it should just be about THIS PLACE and it be kept open.
- It shouldn't shut but it will.
- It would be cruel to move them – Mum has dementia and my aunty has Alzheimer's and both reside in Hazelwood. Mum has some awareness – she has been distressed since the proposal has been put. They need routine and things to be constant and familiar. Mum is constantly crying and really upset about the proposal
- It would have a knock on effect on the local economy and jobs if Hazelwood were to close
- It's a major upheaval for all the people and it should have been addresses before now, not left to get in this state that it has to close. I am quite shocked at the amount it's going to cost to refurbish. They have left it until it's reached a large amount – where was future planning?
- It's about having real choices of where you can live as you reach old age
- It's disgusting – we have nothing in Cotmanhay
- It's terrible but they will close it no matter what we say – my wife was in Hillcrest.
- Its cruel and it could kill our relatives if you move them
- It's not good to have people miles away from where they are familiar
- It's terrible – there is not going to be any local authority run home that are local to Erewash people – there will only be private homes available and the cost and quality of care are just not comparable
- Keep Hazelwood open
- Kirk Hallam is the nearest residential home if Hazelwood were to close – this is just not acceptable as a viable alternative
- Local people should have these decisions for local amenities
- Love to see Hazelwood expanded and see it as a nursing home and it has real potential

- My father-in-law is in there, I would rather they did the renovations and keep them all in the home. I know they are suggesting 2 years to do the work, I am sure it could be made shorter than that. They are talking about moving residents around to do the work – the sooner the work is done they can get back to full capacity. My father-in-law has already moved from Hillcrest and the property is still empty – could money be raised from that?
- My mother is in there. In my opinion the home has been left and rundown for the last year. It's been understaffed with no entertainment, the residents are bored and fed up. Improvements are needed but only one estimate has been received to have the improvements to be done and there should be more than one. In this day in age people are living longer, it needs to be improved rather than scraped, there should be more nursing homes not less. It is a well-known fact that this is the most popular home in Ilkeston – where everyone wants to be in. we are worried, she is 94 years old, they don't like change, she has been in the home for 4 years. The biggest upset is Beryl was in the Army she did her utmost for Queen and Country. I feel like we are letting her down and it's quite upsetting. She has done her best for us – I feel like we are letting her down.
- My mum doesn't drive (she is 79 years old) – she visits her mum in the home every day, how would she get to any of the other homes listed in the cabinet paper – it would be at least two buses.
- Not just about the stress it causes – it's about the overall outcomes on mental and physical health if you move them
- Not knowing the repercussions of losing the beds does not provide meaningful consultation
- Not looking at the bigger picture – I might need somewhere local in the future live Hazelwood – where would I go if it was closed?
- On-going community use of the land for Adult Social Care and ensure that whatever the land is used for if the decision is made to close Hazelwood that the land is used for the benefit of the community
- Only a few care homes in the area in a community like Cotmanhay you need somewhere near by – need to be able to walk to it to visit your loved ones
- People tend to be quite happy in there which says a lot about the home and staff. They do quite a bit of activities for them. They hold summer/Christmas fayres that the public can attend.
- Putting loved ones in a home is extremely stressful once they are settled the last thing you want is the thought of them having to move
- Really good integration of all ages coming into the home to reflect the local community

- Relatives visiting would find it difficult in some areas – Hazelwood is easily accessible on the bus if you don't drive
- Residents NOK) The top and bottom of it is we don't want it to close. I don't know what will happen to her if it closes. She is 98 years old, she is settled, it's going to be very upsetting for her. I am quite worried about it for her. She is settled in the environment and anything different/changes she is frightened. I just hope they will listen to us and keep it open.
- Should have done the repairs in the more timely way – it's a lack of planning for the future with our assets and not looking at the bigger picture
- Some of the residents have already moved once and when you are in your late 80' and 90's you don't want the upheaval and stress of moving
- Such a shame if it closed
- That's not going to go down very well with the old folks it is – that's going to cause a lot of upset I bet.
- The atmosphere at Hazelwood is great – the staff make it feel really homely and they have a really good 'banter' with the residents
- The availability of respite care in the area is not good
- The cabinet paper states the costs going forward but not what has been spent, I understand money has already been spent so it would be silly to stop now.
- The Cabinet paper wording has been weighted in a particular way and not been put in a favourable way
- The cost of travel to the hospital is double the fair
- The council have the money to keep it open and should spend it on local people. Why not build new ones before shutting existing ones?
- The home could engage better with the local community
- The home does need repairing
- The home is only small – but this is in its favour as this makes it more homely
- The impact of the family when they are put into residential home is very emotional and stressful – to have a decision like this hanging over you is very upsetting
- The last administration should have started the work they had put the money on one side for – the work would have been underway or completed by now and this just would not be an issue
- The locality of Hazelwood and the ability for me to visit Mum is essential to ensure I can visit regularly
- The outcomes for residents are there – when they are moved from a stable environment it takes them a long time to adjust

- The worst thing you can do is moving the elderly – causing stress mental and physical. It could also cause problems to the family visiting.
- There is a need for more beds rather than less
- There is too much money spent on administration and not enough spent where it is needed.
- They are all settled in the home
- They shouldn't close it, it's the only council home in Ilkeston. I know a few people in the home and they don't want it closing. They have been there for years and they don't want to be moved, it will upset them to move.
- To move would be a big upheaval
- Very pleasant location and local amenity
- Visited lots of residential homes and Hazelwood is the best I have been in
- We are losing so many community facilities – which is making a big negativity in the area
- We feel it has already been decided
- We need local authority run homes available in our local community for local people to stay in the area in which they are familiar
- We need them all – don't close it
- We really need the further information before a democratic decision is made
- We want assurance about what will happen in the future – we want to know the actual risk of if the home were to close – the wording of the cabinet paper was not helpful or realistic
- When Hillcrest closed – some of the residents died – I think this will happen again if we close Hazelwood
- Where are the residents going to go?
- Why don't we make the comments that have been captured available on-line?
- Will the building be replaced with high density housing (flats)? It's in a quite area we don't get the trouble that comes with it, in my opinion it is a natural green area.
- Worried about lack of visitors if it closed and moved elsewhere
- Would question the timescale for the proposed work – and would like to see a plan of how this would breakdown
- You don't want to be moved from pillar to post – particularly at that age
- You need local care homes for local people so they can stay in their local community

Comments and feedback from meetings at Hazelwood

- Clarity if this is just the roof?
- The patients are really looked after in Hazelwood
- It would be hugely disruptive for the residents to move
- It is proven that the impact tends to be worse on moving the elderly
- Hard to put relation in a home in the first place, then you struggle to get them settled – to move them to another home could kill them
- It is strange as we now also have noxious fumes in the kitchen – is this all down to funding? There are five other care home which have closed in the area – all of which followed significant consultation – this consultation is just a tick boxing exercise
- If you have to do the work surely it could be done a bit by bit and keep the residents together – relationships and friendships that they have built in her really matter
- Hazelwood is the last Derbyshire County Council run home in Ilkeston – Cotmanhay is the most deprived area in Derbyshire – an area of older people who need affordable older peoples residential services – yet the Tories want to close this.
- We think that DCC want to run Hazelwood into the ground and then sell the land as it is a very valuable piece of estate land – we don't think DCC care less about the residents
- Who did the valuations/estimates as these appear to be an over inflated quote
- Would it be cheaper for the industry to quote and work on the timescale as the ones in the Cabinet paper don't seem realistic
- I thought that the Council had to have 3 quotes to get things done – it should be more like £1.7m if quotes were obtained
- When you were closing the other care homes like Hillcrest – you said that you would put a dementia unit here – that now seems to have been squashed – were has the money gone from that land sell off?
- Have all the issues considered by the cabinet such as other available residential beds that are available in the area – because beds just aren't available in the Cotmanhay area
- Have they considered that costs against the cost of a new build?
- Can you clarify what you class as the local area for beds – as the people from Cotmanhay and Ilkeston don't mix and never have with the people of Long Eaton
- I understand that there are already 10 people on the waiting list for Florence Shipley
- This is the only place in our local area for people in Cotmanhay
- Transport is an issue for the relatives as we don't all drive
- Is the £1.7million available to spend now?

- Surely you can get project managers or architects to plan the proposed project one section at a time to keep disruption to a minimum for the residents
- We think to spend £2.1 million on this home as it is the last one available for old people in the area would be a good use of public money
- Get 3 quotes and that would get the cost down
- The costings in the Cabinet paper work out at £56,000 a room – you can build a lot for this kind of money
- Figures are ridiculous- you need a specification and then get more competitive quotes and timeframes to do the work with as little disruption to the residents as possible
- The residents need to stay with their friends
- What will happen if this place is knocked down – have you really no plans for the land?
- The residents would be prepared to put up with the disruption
- The staff at Hazelwood are brilliant
- If you move the residents it will finish them off
- Will the report that goes to Cabinet consider the future provision in Cotmanhay for older people?
- Has other sites been considered in the local area of Cotmanhay/Ilkeston?
- The travel time to other area's if the residents do move is not so easy for relatives to visit
- We have put our relatives in here because we wanted them in here
- Closure of Hillcrest was done and the space was taken at Hazelwood – this means that we have really reduced the amount of choice available to people in the Cotmanhay area if they need residential care
- If it is closed what about redundancy for staff and has this been taken into account for the costings?
- DCC usually relocate their staff rather than 'make' them redundant but they tend to send them about 12 miles away to get out of paying redundancy because the staff then just leave
- Night staff are now on days because of another paper – this has already caused changes in the home for the residents to endure such as they no longer have a dedicated entertainments staff person. Instead all the staff try to do this role and it is not a natural role for some of them and they also have to double up with care whilst trying to keep the residents occupied
- The atmosphere in Hazelwood is the tops and other amenities in the home are not being used to their full potential and these have slipped over the last year
- If Hazelwood were to close it would be a huge loss to relatives and friends in here and people who are in and out for respite care. there is something special about Hazelwood
- There should be some sort of regular checks carried out for all DCC homes such as are the lawns mowed/is there stuff hanging around to go to

the tip – all these sort of things should be regular checks for homes to ensure that they keep their standards high

- Everything is down to in-house and the estimate for the proposed work should be done on a magnitude basis and then break down the estimate for the work on this costing bases
- Get other quotes and they may be lower to show that this is not just a tick box exercise and that is not going to close the home without doing your homework proper
- Going through the list of care homes in the area – if the home closes what will happen to the residents if it does. There are just not residential homes in Cotmanhay?
- I do not want to be in a situation again like I was two years ago when the home my loved one was in was closed. I had to look at different homes and going around lots of different places, and this is the best one that I found in this area. Just looking for a home for your loved one is very stressful for everyone concerned
- This proposal is just pushing people into the private sector. Residential homes in the private sector cost so much more – so what happens if the resident or their relatives are just not able to find the top up fees? The choice of Council run homes is reducing all the time
- It is glaringly obvious that we are living in a time when there is more elderly and will need more facilities like this one – not less. The proposed scheme should be costed correctly and then it would save the disruption to the residents and the stress this is causing and save them having to move
- In 2010 £85,000 was stated for making the gold wing into bedrooms so what have you been doing since then – this is seven years ago?
- Seven years later if you had done something then it we wouldn't be sat here now and it would already have been sorted
- Very convenient to put all the costings together in one report so it looks such a big thing
- Why can't the refurbishment be professionally managed to improve the way it is managed and reduce the disruption to residents
- Just do it a section at a time to keep it open and cause as little disruption to the residents as possible
- This is our money – so we want three quotes before a decision is made – you can't make a decision on the figures that have been put in that report – they are just not realistic
- It was reported by Maggie Throup that we had reserves – money over £2m is a drop in the ocean when you take the reserves into account. This is tax payers money we are talking about and we want Hazelwood to stay open and have the work done but the work does need to show value for money
- It is value for money for the people of Cotmanhay to have this facility kept open for them to have as an option in their old age if they require care

- We all pay council fees – who would pay those fees if they were in private care as private care home charge more and the care is not as good as it is in Derbyshire County Council care home and particularly here at Hazelwood
- When I went through this type of thing two years ago there simply were not any places at other homes available
- What do you class as the local area
- If the council are willing to pay into a private home – why not have the money put into Hazelwood
- We owned a pharmacy and I dealt with 13 homes and this is superb. The disruption of moving and the impact that it could have on the patients is not taken into consideration
- Friendship groups need to be taken onto consideration
- Wendy the unit manager and her team do a superb job here – it makes it feel like one big family
- This is the best one of the lot and I have looked at a lot of homes
- Do the work in twelve months look again at the timeframe and costs and just get it done
- In 2015 you produced a 175 page report on the consultation to close 4 homes and keep 17 Derbyshire County Council residential homes open – what has happened to this pledge?
- It looks to me that you have already got all this planned as we received the letter and the leaflet at the same time as the report was made public – it looks like this is a done deal
- We just simply do not want this home closed it provide such a great home for the old people of Cotmanhay
- The scrutiny report on ONS was given at the same Cabinet meeting as the proposal to close Hazelwood. In the 2015 report it stated that £4.2 million was the cost for the 22 residential homes that were open at that time. The costings for refurbishing Hazelwood would take up half of that funding – that just does not add up?
- It would appear that Derbyshire County Council are under investing in their estate and have preferred the massive new builds to ensuring that the residential homes buildings are kept to a good standard
- I would like to see an informal show of hands to keep the home open (this did not take place)
- There appears to be a lack of regular inspection of building and properties by DCC –which makes us suspicious that this had already been planned
- It would be a tragedy if Hazelwood were to shut
- If we are unhappy with the decision the elected members take is there any way we can challenge this decision
- There should be an going inspection of the buildings
- What about the boilers – surely you can just cap the pipes under the floors and re-channel new ones?

- What about the long term future of elderly people in the area? Where are the people going to go in five to ten years' time? It's not much foresight on behalf of the Council with an ageing population to even think about closing the only residential care home it has in this area
- It is premature to make the ONS decision for policies and procedures for housing elderly in the future
- why can't it be part of a properly funded scheme to ensure that money is spend on keeping facilities up to date
- the simple fact is that you are underfunded by central government for the work that you need to do on homes such as these
- Could the work be done in half the time and half the money – I think it could
- Do residents object to the proposed upheaval?
- You are putting people's lives in limbo – this is really cruel at their age
- It takes such a long time to settle into somewhere new – these residents are now settled here and like it – it this considered?
- In your leaflet you state 'you are committed to providing the best possible care and accommodation for older people across the county' but you are not providing care especially in the Ilkeston area
- Cotmanhay always seems to be left behind
- Will the Cabinet members see the notes taken today?
- I am mindful that hospitals are built by specialist companies – could the Council not contract with one of these, or could this building be leased by one of these and it be kept open
- We need more choice of care home not less
- Is there any proposal to make all of the bedrooms at Hazelwood on-suite or is it just the gold wing which would be classed as a 'new build' with appropriate regulations being considered
- Permanent residents are not coming into the home now – why is this
- There are not enough DCC run homes in Erewash
- Can you reserve private beds if the proposal to close Hazelwood goes ahead?
- We need to account for others who are now looking to come into residential care – what choice will they have in future
- Can we just say that Wendy does a wonderful job on such a tight budget
- Sarah – the entertainments member of staff did such a fantastic job and now they all have to do a little bit of the entertainment role now the changes to the staffing shifts have embedded. Entertainment for the elderly is a vocation and passion and not everyone naturally holds this
- The staff really motivated my relative and looked after the residents – Wendy has a fantastic team
- Some to the residents have come from Hillcrest and now could possibly have to move again and I think some of them might die as a result. I would blame myself if this happened

- Familiarity of staff makes a difference and with dementia this is important in care
- I only live five minutes away and visit Mum on a regular basis, I wouldn't be able to do this so easily if she had to move to another care home in Erewash
- I hope that this isn't part of privatising care in Derbyshire
- Relatives would like to record that the first meeting notes did not truly capture the passion of all involved to keep Hazelwood open and requested that this be recorded
- A discussion took place on the pipes and it was clarified that they were so badly corroded that they needed to be dug up and then re-aligned
- A really heated discussion took place with all the relatives regarding the estimates and overwhelmingly the relatives wished for further estimates to be calculated for the repairs
- What is an estimate? I want to know what it is actually going to cost for a proper decision to be based on 'actual' figures (this was echoed by the majority in the consultation meeting)
- If you are going to shut the home – just do it – but do not use estimates as an excuse
- They are in-house estimates so bound to be bias
- They didn't do a good job in the first place when this building was built
- One relatives asked the meeting if they had ever noticed that Hazelwood was cold. She used this as reasoning that if there was a problem with the heating – and if there was - surely visitors would have also noticed this
- It's like they have inflated the estimate for the repair work
- I've had a structural report on my own home and it was not accurate – if I had gone ahead without a second opinion I would have been carrying out work that was not required – and I think it is the same scenario
- Derbyshire County Council need to get three proper quotes to base a proper decision on the work – the estimate is just not good enough
- We think that you are using the cost of work as an excuse to shut Hazelwood
- This is a fabulous home and it is worth the investment
- Hazelwood is the jewel in the crown for DCC and you should keep it open
- Moving these residents out will kill them
- It would be a life limiting move to move them out – we will lose our loved ones if you do this
- We don't want them to have the stress of this and don't want them to have to move – they are happy and settled here
- Out of the £4.2 million budget why was Hazelwood the third in line for repairs and why has this home not been done first
- There are 10 vacant rooms - why not do the gold wing refurbishment first?
- For the sake of £400,000 ignore gold wing and keep it as storage and just do a good job of repairing the rest of the home

- When speaking to a local builder about the roof – he stated did you ever see any existing house that has a complete replacement roof
- Cotmanhay Hill will have the same structure as Hazelwood – and none of these have ever had to have a complete replacement roof
- In the June 2015 Cabinet report - £4.2million was quoted to fund the residential homes refurbishment within DCC. With the report was a comprehensive analysis. The 2017 Cabinet report now just reiterates this – what was the original estimates for the repairs which were first identified in 2015? In the 2015 report the structural engineer said that he would not change his recommendations
- Was the Lee's residential home work done in-house?
- As part of the consultation exercise can you give an estimate of how much it will cost
- Do you appreciate that there will be less care facilities in this area – the Cabinet paper does not cover the lack of care in this area and the problem that this will cause for the elderly now and for future provision for the people of Erewash
- Moving residents around the building is less disruptive than moving them around the county
- Why don't you ask the relatives 'if they mind being moved' you will soon find out that they all want to stay here and would rather put up with the disruption whilst the work is taking place than having to move
- We think this is a done deal and the consultation is just a tick box exercise
- I am involved in soft market testing – has this work really been properly costed?
- In the letter we received informing us of the consultation it already pledges to look after residents – doesn't that make it a done deal?
- Concerned about the upset and disruption if they stay here – what about the stress if you move them to other areas?
- Is not any alternative accommodation in this area- Hazelwood needs to stay open for the elderly people of this area
- The choice of alternative residential homes in the area are non-existent
- It is not OK to move the residents to different areas and out of the borders of Cotmanhay and Ilkeston – this is their homes and where they lived and are familiar with
- If they were homeless people who were being re-homed they would have to stay in the area in which they were familiar and had lived – this is just not fair on the residents to even think about moving them to different places
- There is nowhere else in this area for them to go to – you will just kill them if you try
- You must already have decided where you are moving them to
- Can you define what is 'the local area' for them to move to if the proposal goes ahead – there is no-where in Cotmanhay - where you would move them to

- There are no other local homes in our area
- I was involved following the 2015 report when homes in this area were closed following a so-called consultation. When I tried to find an appropriate home for my loved one I was given the name of 'Hillcrest' but when we contacted them they told us it's no good coming here we are going to close
- If you can find places to move the residents to – you would be lucky there are no places left in our local area
- I want to see hard evidence that beds exist and the Elected Members are made aware of the struggle that relatives go through when they are looking for a good home for their loved ones. If our relatives do survive a move – will you be doing this all again in 2 years' time in the next home that they move on to?
- There are 12 people on the waiting list for homes in the area – if you close Hazelwood it is going to cause such a backlog of available beds – it's just not feasible to even think about shutting Hazelwood – the beds are needed now for the residents of Cotmanhay
- Suspending a waiting list does not create beds – if you have to try and find homes for all these 25 residents you are going to struggle
- If private care is used will DCC give re-assurances that they will bridge the gap in costs
- Meeting the cost is not a certainty
- The number of beds in this area are already to capacity – this is another reason for keeping Hazelwood open and making more available beds in the area. Looking for a room for a relative is very difficult and no other homes that I have looked at come up to the standard of Hazelwood.
- The difference this home made to our loved one is fabulous – it's such a great feeling when you know that your loved one is somewhere that they like and you can see them blossoming – the care and attention given by staff here is amazing
- It is such a great feeling when you think that you have found a home that is as good as Hazelwood and you know that your loved one will be settled
- Hazelwood is such a fantastic place – we found it via respite care and so pleased we did – do not shut this home
- We are living in a society where people are getting older so closing a home at this time is not feasible – it just does not make strategic sense
- 80 new homes have just been proposed on a local site – why is Derbyshire County Council not linking in with them to make sure that any new homes have the elderly considered at the planning stage
- In the 2017 report – is this the Director of Adult Cares recommendation to the Elected Members to close Hazelwood?
- Why are there no councillors here today or Directors?
- You've got the money and a brilliant home here – just get the work done at a reasonable price

- £30m investment in care homes is mentioned in the Conservatives manifesto – so why not invest in Hazelwood?
- How do we know that the Conservatives at DCC are not planning to return to their previous plan in 2012 and close all existing run DCC homes?
- In the kitchen estimate of £150,000 – how detailed is this estimate – this amount seems very large for a kitchen that is to provide food for 25 residents – is it having granite worktops or something? NB Rob Moore agreed to provide Wendy with the costing to share with anyone who wishes to see this
- Everyone present at this meeting would like to see alternative estimates being drawn up – and only then should a decision be made – you can't make a decision on the estimates that have been put in this cabinet paper – they just don't stack up
- Nobody has mentioned how good the quality of care in this home is – the staff are great – they keep the residents motivated and looking forward to the next day – this is really important
- The quality of care at Hazelwood is excellent and this should be taken into account
- Discussion took place on en-suite bedrooms and width of corridors at Hazelwood and the Quality Care Commission (CQC) regulations for any new builds
- The residents are not telling you that Hazelwood is not fit for purpose – it is there home and they love it here
- What about the £1.7m – could you not include the amount that you lay aside for the annual maintenance for Hazelwood and include this in the calculation?
- In the national press this week it has been stated that 9 in 10 area will run out of care homes in the next few years. Why not board off the Gold wing and just use the existing home
- I was shocked to see the contents of the structural engineers report – surely there should be an on-going inspections of the property to ensure that they are ok – if this has been overlooked/missed surely there is a degree of negligence here on the part of the Council?
- Digging up floors is just really not necessary – just put modern heating around the sides
- £2million to keep this place open is peanuts in the bigger picture – just keep it open
- We think this is a tick box exercise
- In Hazelwood you get the finest care – and care should be the number one priority for the council.
- It's like sitting on a bomb waiting for the decision of whether the home is to be closed and not to know the outcome over the Christmas period is just cruel
- Ilkeston is the fourth largest town in the area – there are no other homes in this area

- Where are the other old people in the area going to go? Where is the sense in this proposed closure when we have a home's shortage?
- Where has the money gone from Southlands residential home closure – there was a pledge that Southlands was for the local community – has this money gone back in the pot?
- I think that DCC don't want to own properties and staff with all the responsibly of providing pension benefits etc. – I think that they want to use private properties and we all know that the private sector are all about just the money and not the standard of care provided
- If people are going into the private sector DCC will not or can't pay the additional amount – sometimes its £200 - £300 difference – what reassurance do we have from DCC that it will pay 'reasonable' top up fees
- A further discussion took place on what is reasonable for DCC to pay in top up fees and how this is not publicly announced to the private sector to try and avoid the private sector fee's being increased due to increased demand
- A discussion took place on negotiation of fees in the private sector and the commitment by DCC to pay 'reasonable' top up fees
- Other options should have been considered and use the reserves to do a proper job on this home
- Bramble Lodge costs £620 per week – where does the extra cost to cover this come from is our loved ones have to move to somewhere like this?
- As public services are dissolved it will rely on the tax payer to cover all the costs of the increasing private sector – and as demand increases the private sector are bound to inflate their charges
- The feeling here tonight is overwhelming that to spend the money on Hazelwood is a good use of public money
- In the future what choice will there be of residential care in this area? Where can we put older people in the local area – there just will not be any choice for future generations
- If you close Hazelwood you are just restricting the choice for future generations when they reach old age
- It is short sighted to rely just on the private sector – we need a mix of public sector and private sector to ensure the continuation of good quality affordable care in the future
- Can the Council close down residential homes and then just leave them empty for years?
- These residents could be dead in two years – spend the money on this home and their care
- The 2015 home report did not put Hazelwood as a priority to close – why have you done such a u turn in two years – is it the change of leadership to Conservative that have suddenly made this a priority
- These people have paid their taxes all their lives and will have paid enough over the years to cover the cost of the work that is required – just get it done and look after these residents – don't make them move it will kill them

- Do we get a reduction in our council tax as the public services that we used to enjoy all decline?
- What will happen to the money allocated for this if Hazelwood does close?
- Request was made to see the estimates for the work done on The Ley's residential home and Rowthorne and provide them to Wendy as a comparison of charges already paid - Rob Moore to provide these
- You just need to get factual quotes for the work
- You need to get several prices and get the work estimated for elements of the work
- If the condition of the roof etc was known and was listed when the report of 2015 was compiled why is the work and costing such a surprise now? You had no plans to close Hazelwood back in 2015 – why do it now based on the same information that was available back in 2015?
- As a taxpayer I say spend the money to keep Hazelwood open
- I have a 100 year old house and there is no way that my roof would need this sort of repair – so why would you need to do this sort of work to a building that was built in the 1970's?
- When the structural engineer revisited the report after the 2015 Cabinet paper – did the engineer actually go up into the loft space
- Can we get better estimates before a decision is made?
- Why are they spending money 'wily nilly' on the home – like curtains and new boilers if they are proposing to close the home – it just doesn't add up and make sense
- By 6pm tonight we will have over 1,100 signatures and this is just one of the petitions that is active at the moment – the petition to keep Hazelwood open has now gone nationwide
- Discussion took place on petitions and their guidelines – this is the webpage guidance for this
https://www.derbyshire.gov.uk/council/have_your_say/Petitions/guidelines/default.asp
- My Mum's son lives in Australia – and it gave him such peace of mind to know that Mum was settled in Hazelwood and that the care and support provided here is fabulous
- I hope that you are seeing our passion to keep Hazelwood open and how strong we feel that it should be kept open – please make sure that the Elected Members realise just how strongly we feel about this
- Discussion about the use of photographs of residents on previous closures publicity back in 2015 – this will be brought to senior managers attention to look into and respond to the affected residents and their families
- What will this home do to ensure that our relatives are re-located locally and in their friendship groups if the decision is taken to close?
- Why aren't the people who are accountable not here?
- What happens to staff and how do they have their say on the proposal to close their place of work – they do such a fantastic job and should be thought about carefully

- Discussion on bed blocking took place and the timings of this
- The longer you leave it the more it will cost to have the work done – costs always go up
- Have the Council considered the cost of redundancy in their costings for the proposed closure
- The inflexibility of shifts and the recent changes to these that the Council has introduced can be adding to the care costs – some staff have left because of these changes and to recruit new staff is always difficult
- The staff here work hard for our parents and then they are not allowed into meeting like this and voice their opinions – it's as though the Council don't value them – they are such a valuable asset to you
- Sarah (one of the staff) does such a brilliant job at motivating the residents and giving them activities to look forward to
- What is the additional cost which made DCC change its mind from the 2015 report to now to not go ahead with the planned repairs?
- £1.7 million is a perfectly good use of public money
- How much was this building supposed to cost to get it right – the figure quoted in the 2015 report and the figure in the 2017 report does not seem to have changed? (Rob Moore pledged to look into this and make figures available to view at Hazelwood via Wendy Rhodes – Unit Manager)
- My mother in law had a fall and was taken to hospital from Hazelwood. The stress this change in environment caused here was traumatic. She was hysterical the whole time she was in hospital it caused her fear and all the time all she was asking was to come back 'home' to Hazelwood. She was pulling her cannula out and getting out of bed and became very agitated. It took her six months from coming to Hazelwood to become settled here – she is now such a different person – this is her home. She will just not cope with moving somewhere else – you will kill her if you try.
- We have paid taxes all our lives so we can come to a place like this where you feel safe and the quality of care is excellent – over the time of the people who are currently resident in her they will have paid the £1.2 million in their taxes – do the right thing and spend it on them to allow them to stay here at Hazelwood
- You can see with my relative that just moving seats at this meeting tonight has confused and distressed her – what would you do to her if you made her move to a new home?