

## Overview of Responses and Recommendations

| Budget Proposals 16/17: Chestnut Walk Care Home                  |  | Tandra Forster - Head of Adult Social Care  | 19 January 2016<br>Version 2 (Exec)                               |
|--|--|---|---|
| <b>Proposal:</b>   | Closure of Chestnut Walk Care Home   |   |   |
| <b>Total budget 15/16:</b>                                       | £354,000   | <b>Recommended officer saving 16/17:</b>  | £94,000 (26%)   |
| <b>Initial proposed saving 16/17:</b>                            | £94,000 (26%)  | <b>Final recommendation to Executive 16/17:</b>   | To proceed with this savings proposal, without any modifications. |
| <b>Nos of responses:</b>   | 13 in total, including two from Parish Councils (Tilehurst and Pangbourne), and six responses from users and carers.   |   |   |
| <b>Key issues raised:</b>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Negative impact the cuts in funding would have on very vulnerable elderly people and their families and concerned about alternatives to the closure of the home in terms of placements provided by the external market and the locality and quality of such placements.</li> <li>Loss of specialised staff</li> <li>Shortage of Care Home Placements in West Berkshire</li> </ul> |   |   |
| <b>Equality issues:</b>  | No specific issue was highlighted for one particular group identified under the protected characteristics, but it was felt that closure would impact significantly on current residents and their families and limit choice in the future.   |   |   |
| <b>Suggestions for reducing the impact on service users:</b>     | <b>Suggestion</b>  | <b>Council response</b>   |   |
|  | No suggestions made.   | We recognise the impact that implementation of this proposal will have on existing residents and will seek to minimise this by working closely with them and their families to manage the closure.  |   |
| <b>Alternative options for applying the saving in this area:</b> | <b>Suggestion</b>  | <b>Council response</b>   |   |
|  | Divest other Services  | As part of developing the range of proposals the Council has reviewed all its activities to ensure the focus of its work is on key statutory services. This proposal will allow us to continue to support people who need residential care. |   |
|  | Use capital receipts to fund the home  | Capital receipts are one off monies and the financial rules do not allow capital funding to be used to fund revenue costs.  |   |

**NB:** This overview and recommendation paper should be read in conjunction with the Summary of Responses and Verbatim Responses received in relation to this proposal, circulated electronically to all members alongside the agenda pack and published online on our [Consultation Portal](#).

## Overview of Responses and Recommendations

| Budget Proposals 16/17: Chestnut Walk Care Home         |  | Tandra Forster - Head of Adult Social Care  | 19 January 2016<br>Version 2 (Exec) |
|---|--|---|-------------------------------------|
|   | Building more local care homes, extending existing provision   | <p>We continue to look at options to improve the viability and sustainability of our own homes. Chestnut Walk is situated on a compact site and therefore it is not possible to increase its scale for the current purpose.</p> <p>We are interested in developing a larger home but this is not a short term solution due to the availability of land and capital investment that would be required.</p> <p>The idea around extending and use of Alice Bye Court and Redwood House is a interesting concept, but due to restrictions on the sites and land it would not be possible to achieve this.</p> |                                     |
|   | Staffing   | <p>We are working to ensure we retain staff and will hold vacancies within services that have a similar role, to enable these staff to be retained within the council and services.</p>   |                                     |
| <b>Suggestions for how others may help contribute:</b>  | <p>The Care Quality Team are actively engaged in ensuring these external services and monitored to ensure compliance and good quality care. These Services are also regulated by the Care Quality Commission</p> |   |                                     |
| <b>Officer conclusion as a result of the responses:</b> | <p>The exercise has not highlighted any impacts that are not already anticipated.</p>  |   |                                     |
| <b>Officer recommendation as a result of responses:</b> | <p>Feedback has not uncovered any further issues which would prevent the council from proceeding with this proposal. It's therefore recommended to implement this proposal with no changes.</p>                  |   |                                     |

**NB:** This overview and recommendation paper should be read in conjunction with the Summary of Responses and Verbatim Responses received in relation to this proposal, circulated electronically to all members alongside the agenda pack and published online on our [Consultation Portal](#).