

scrumptious ('skrʌmpjəs) *adj.* *Inf.* very pleasing; delicious — 'scrumptiously *adv.*

scrumpy ('skrʌmpɪ) *n.* a rough dry cider, brewed esp. in the West Country of England.

scrunch ('skrʌntʃ) *vb.* **1.** to crumple or crunch or to be crumpled or crunched. — *n.* **2.** the act or sound of scrunching.

scruple ('skrʌ:pəl) *n.* **1.** a doubt or hesitation as to what is morally right in a certain situation. **2.** *Arch.* a very small amount. **3.** a unit of weight equal to 20 grains (1.296 grams). — *vb.* **4.** (*obs.* when *tr.*) to have doubts (about), esp. from a moral compunction.

scrupulous ('skrʌ:pjʊləs) *adj.* **1.** characterized by careful observation of what is morally right. **2.** very careful or precise. — 'scrupulously *adv.* — 'scrupulousness *n.*

scrutinise or **-nize** ('skrʌ:tɪnaɪz) *vb.* (*tr.*) to examine carefully or in minute detail. — 'scruti**niser** or **-nizer** *n.*

scrutiny ('skrʌ:tɪni) *n.* **1.** close or minute examination. **2.** a searching look. **3.** official examination of votes [from Latin *scrūtiniū* and *scrūtārī* to search even to the rags, from *scrūta*, rags, trash.]

scuba ('skju:bə) *n.* an apparatus used in scindiving, consisting of a cylinder or cylinders containing compressed air attached to a breathing apparatus.

scud (skʌd) *vb.* **scudding, scudded.** (*intr.*) **1.** (esp. of clouds) to move along swiftly and smoothly. **2.** *Naut.* to run before a gale. — *n.* **3.** the act of scudding. **4. a.** a formation of low ragged clouds driven by a strong wind beneath rain-bearing clouds. **b.** a sudden shower or gust of wind.

scuff (skʌf) *vb.* **1.** to drag (the feet) while walking. **2.** to scratch (a surface) or (of a surface) to become scratched. **3.** (*tr.*) *U.S.* to poke at (something) with the foot. — *n.* **4.** the act or sound of scuffing. **5.** a rubbed place caused by scuffing. **6.** a backless slipper.

scuffle ('skʌfl) *vb.* (*intr.*) **1.** to fight in a disorderly manner. **2.** to move by shuffling. — *n.* **3.** a disorderly struggle; the sound made by scuffling.

scull (skʌl) *n.* **1.** a single oar moved from the stern of a boat to propel it. **2.** one of a pair of single-handed oars, both of which are pulled by the same person in a racing shell propelled by a single oar. **3.** a single oar. **4.** an act, instance, period, or distance. **5.** to propel (a boat) with a scull. — 'sculler *n.*

scullery (skʌləri) *n., pl. -leries.* *Chiefly Brit.* a small room or part of a kitchen where kitchen utensils are kept.

scoundrel ('skaʊndrəl) *n.* **1.** a mean or despicable person. **2.** a person employed to work in a kitchen. **3.** a variant of **sculpture**. **2.** (*in* the sense of **sculpture**).

sculpt ('skʌlp) *vb.* **1.** to make (a work of art) by carving or modelling. **2.** to make (a work of art) by carving or modelling. **3.** to make (a work of art) by carving or modelling.

sculptress ('skʌltres) *n.* a person who sculpts.

sculpture ('skʌltʃə) *n.* **1.** the art of making a work of art by carving or modelling. **2.** a work of art made by carving or modelling. **3.** a work of art made by carving or modelling. **4.** a work of art made by carving or modelling.

by natural processes. — *vb.* (*mainly tr.*) **4.** (*also intr.*) to carve, cast, or fashion (stone, bronze etc) three-dimensionally. **5.** to portray (a person, etc.) by means of sculpture. **6.** to form in the manner of sculpture. **7.** to decorate with sculpture. — 'sculptural *adj.*

scumble ('skʌmbəl) *vb.* **1.** (in painting and drawing) to soften or blend (an outline or colour) with an upper coat of opaque colour, applied very thinly. **2.** to produce an effect of broken colour on doors, panelling, etc. by exposing coats of paint below the top coat. — *n.* **3.** the upper layer of colour applied in this way.

scunner ('skʌnə) *Dialect, chiefly Scot.* — *vb.* **1.** (*intr.*) to feel aversion. **2.** (*tr.*) to produce a feeling of aversion in. — *n.* **3.** a strong aversion (often in **take a scunner**). **4.** an object of dislike.

scupper¹ ('skʌpə) *n.* *Naut.* a drain or spout allowing water on the deck of a vessel to flow overboard.

scupper² ('skʌpə) *vb.* (*tr.*) *Brit. sl.* to overwhelm, ruin, or disable.

scurry ('skʌrɪ) *vb.* **-rying, -ried.** **1.** to move about hurriedly. **2.** (*intr.*) to whirl about. *n., pl. -ries.* **3.** the act or sound of scurrying. **4.** a brisk light whirling movement, as of snow.

scut (skʌt) *n.* a small animal such as the deer or rabbit.

scuttle¹ ('skʌtl) *vb.* **1.** to move quickly. **2.** *Dialect chiefly Brit.* to move quickly. **3.** to move quickly. **4.** to move quickly.

Day Care for Older People

Scrutiny Review

Final Report

April 2006

CONTENTS

Contents	1
Foreword	2
Executive Summary and Recommendations	3
Part I – Background to this Review	5
The Review Process	5
Methodology	5
Background to the Intensive Day Care Programme	6
Rationale	6
Project Progress	6
Part II – Findings	8
Introduction	8
People with Mild to Moderate Needs	8
The Committee’s Views	9
Sheen Lane Day Centre’s Transition to an IDCC	11
The Committee’s Views	12
Transportation	13
The Committee’s Views	14
Assessments and Referrals	14
The Committee’s Views	15
Role of Richmond and Twickenham Primary Care Trust	15
Facilities	16
The Need for a New Four Year Strategy	16
Part III – Conclusion	18
Table of Recommendations	19
Appendices	20
App. A – Social Day Care Centre Facilities in LBRUT	20
App. B – Council-run Intensive Day Care Centres	21
App. C – Timeline for the Intensive Day Care Programme	22
App. D – Capacity at Sheen Lane Day Centre	23
App. E – Cost of Running In-House Day Centres	24
App. F – Grants for Voluntary Day Centres	25

FOREWORD



It gives me great pleasure to introduce this report, which represents the findings and recommendations of what has proved a very valuable scrutiny review. As with the rest of the country, the Borough has an ageing population that can be expected to place increasing pressure on Older People's Day Care Services in coming years. It is vital that the Council take appropriate steps now to prepare for this and meet the needs of older people. The change programme to Day Care Services is currently at the half-way stage. The changes have led to understandable anxiety amongst many service users about the future. Our Committee therefore decided to undertake this review to evaluate the progress made in reconfiguring the Borough's Day Centres, to identify areas of concern, provide a forum for all partners to make their views known and make any recommendations that we felt were needed.

This review has been too short to do full justice to this topic and the report raises a number of issues that need further investigation. However, within these constraints the review has succeeded in bringing together a number of partners and has undertaken some important work. This has only been possible thanks to the excellent support we have enjoyed from Social Services, RTPCT and the voluntary sector.

On behalf of my colleagues, I would like to thank Anne Bogod from the Consortium and Anne Stratton from the PCT for giving up their time to address the Committee. I would also like to thank all those organisations and individuals who have submitted comments or who attended our meeting on 8 March 2006. Their involvement with the review has been one of its greatest strengths and their comments have proved invaluable in the formation of this report.

Councillor Sue Jones

Chairman of the Social Care and Housing Overview and Scrutiny Committee

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. As a result of its work and the evidence the Committee has gathered and heard, it has a series of recommendations covering people with mild to moderate needs; Sheen Lane Day Centre's transition to an intensive day care centre; facilities at the Day Care Centres; issues regarding transportation, assessments and referrals; the role of the Richmond and Twickenham Primary Care Trust; and the need for a strategy looking beyond the current change programme.

People With Mild To Moderate Needs

2. The Committee feels that the evidence it has seen suggests that there is a gap in services for people with mild to moderate needs, especially for those in the early stages of dementia. It believes there is a lack of information on the scale of the problem and requests that Social Services assess how many people currently attending Social Day Care, and how many people in the wider community, fall into this group. **(Recommendations 1-2)**
3. The Committee also believes that there is a gap between what care Social Services expects the Social Day Care Centres to provide and what care the Social Day Care Centres feel able to offer those who are not eligible to attend Intensive Day Care Centres (IDCCs). It suggests that agreement is reached with the voluntary sector on care level provision at Social Day Centres. Statutory organisations should also investigate providing training for Social Day Care Centre staff. **(Recommendation 3)**

Sheen Lane Day Centre's Transition To An IDCC

4. The Committee is concerned that turning Sheen Lane Day Centre into an IDCC could break up the strong social links at the centre and welcomes Social Services' efforts to keep activities running at the Sheen Lane site. It is also concerned about the effect that charges for accommodation and administration may have on accessibility to these services. **(Recommendation 4)**
5. The Committee welcomes the work that has occurred in partnership with FISH (a voluntary care scheme that operates in Barnes, Mortlake and East Sheen) and Library Services at Sheen Lane Day Centre. However the Committee would urge that this is extended to include other partners e.g. RTPCT, Richmond Adult Community College and the Consortium. **(Recommendation 5)**
6. The Committee is also concerned that some clients may find that they have no alternative venue when Sheen Lane stops accepting non-eligible clients. The Committee welcomes Social Services' reassurance that timescales will not take priority over ensuring that non-eligible service users have alternative day care arrangements in place, and has made this a formal recommendation. **(Recommendation 6)**

Transportation

7. The Committee is particularly concerned that charges are levied on clients who are unable to use public transport by reason of their disability. This appears discriminatory, as older people who are able to use public transport can travel

free with their Freedom Pass. The Committee therefore calls for transportation charges for older people who cannot use public transport to be removed.

(Recommendation 7)

Assessments and Referrals

8. The Committee recommends that clients who have been moved from an IDCC should be given a priority assessment if their Social Day Centre feels they need to return. It feels that it is unreasonable for these clients to have a long wait for an assessment before they receive the care they need. **(Recommendation 8)**
9. Given the number of assessments that clients are now required to undertake, the Committee feels it is crucial that the Single Assessment Programme starts running as soon as possible. **(Recommendation 9)**
10. Finally, the Committee would like a rigorous quality assurance system to be in place for Care Management. It recommends that a number of Borough-wide performance indicators for Care Management be developed so that Scrutiny and Social Services can better evaluate its performance. **(Recommendation 10)**

Role of Richmond and Twickenham Primary Care Trust

11. The Committee believes there is a case for RTPCT to provide greater financial support to the IDCC programme, within the context of current government policy to shift resources from acute to preventative care. This is supported by the expectation that IDCCs will relieve pressure on acute NHS services. **(Recommendation 11)**

Facilities

12. Decorative work and gardening needs to be undertaken at the Day Centres which Committee members visited. The Committee suggests that greater use of people sentenced to community service orders could be an affordable solution, subject to the necessary safeguards being in place. **(Recommendation 12)**

The Need for a New Four-Year Strategy

13. The Committee recommends that a new four-year strategy outlining a vision for Older People's Day Care, covering the period 2008/9 to 2011/12, is produced to adequately plan for service provision in the future. It should focus on how the problems outlined in this report can be addressed. **(Recommendation 13)**

PART I – BACKGROUND TO THIS REVIEW

THE REVIEW PROCESS

14. The Social Care and Housing Overview and Scrutiny Committee first considered the main proposals of the Day Care Review for Older People on 20 October 2003, and approved the strategy as set out in the report brought to that meeting.¹ The Committee later requested six monthly progress reports at its meeting on 9 March 2004 to ensure that it continued to be consulted on the project.
15. When setting its priorities for 2005/6, the Committee felt it was timely for scrutiny to conduct a review of the progress to date. It wanted to consider what lessons could be learned from those centres that have already switched to Intensive Day Care Centres (IDCCs), and how these could be applied to centres that have still to make the transition.
16. At its meeting on 23 June 2005, the Committee formally decided to make the review of Day Care Service provision one of its priority topics for the 2005/06 Municipal year. The Committee recognised that the current transition to IDCCs and Social Day Care Centres from a more generic day care service, was a cause of anxiety for a number of users as it amounted to a significant departure from the services that they had previously received.
17. The Committee agreed the following terms of reference for the review:
 - To review progress on the implementation of the Day Care Review for Older People.
 - To review how the partnership arrangements for the provision of Day Services for Older People are working.

METHODOLOGY

18. It was clear that there would not be enough time to look at this topic in the same depth as a Scrutiny Task Group. However, Members wished to involve users as much as possible and wanted to visit Day Centres themselves so that they could speak to users, centre managers and staff. They visited Ham Day Care Centre, Twickenham IDCC and Tangle Hall IDCC and attended a user consultation meeting at Sheen Lane Day Centre. Posters were put up at Day Centres and GPs' surgeries to encourage users and carers to write in. Submissions were also requested from specific stakeholders and received from Elleray Hall, Age Concern, Richmond Good Neighbours and Kathy Sheldon from the Richmond and Twickenham Patient and Public Involvement Forum (PPIF). Desk based research was also undertaken.
19. All the submissions and findings to date were considered at the Committee's meeting on 8 March 2006. Anne Bogod of the Richmond Community Support Service Consortium (Consortium) and Anne Stratton from Richmond and Twickenham Primary Care Trust (RTPCT) gave presentations. George Bielstein

¹ Meeting of the Social Care and Housing Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 20 October 2003:
http://www.richmond.gov.uk/council_committees_list.htm?mgl=ieListDocuments.asp&CId=169&Mid=984&Ver=4&#A15311

BACKGROUND TO THE INTENSIVE DAY CARE PROGRAMME

Rationale

20. The programme is a four year project, begun in 2003, to move from five Council-run generic Day Care Centres, to four Council-run IDCCs alongside social day care provided by the voluntary sector. Social Services' rationale for this project was:

- That the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames (LBRuT) was unusual in not directing its funding to those with the highest need so that they could remain in their homes as long as possible.
- That the cost of providing care to people at Sheen Lane and Twickenham Day Care Centres, which had high numbers of 'social users', was broadly the same as costs for the voluntary sector.
- That there was a shortage of community based service to support people with higher levels of need.
- That 'preventative services' in the Borough were important but could be provided better by the voluntary sector.

21. The purpose of IDCCs was to provide "centre based services that will support highly dependent people."² The vision for the voluntary Social Centres was that they would turn the "voluntary sector day care centres and neighbourhood care resources into services that best respond to the wider social needs of Older People in their own localities."³

22. Care Management is the service area within Social Services responsible for deciding which users are eligible for IDCCs. Users are only eligible for an IDCC place if Care Management assesses them as having care requirements that meet the eligibility criteria. All attendees of day centres who are willing to receive a care assessment are given one. Those users who are assessed as needing the more intensive services are directed to the most appropriate IDCC, which is usually their current centre. All other users are directed to Social Day Care Centres. Once an IDCC is operational, admission to it continues to be through an assessment from Care Management.

Project Progress

23. Twickenham and Tangle Hall Day Care Centres have already changed into IDCCs. Sheen Lane Day Centre is scheduled to make the transition from June 2006 and Ham Day Care Centre from September 2006. Both Tangle Hall and Ham focus on the needs of people with dementias, whereas Twickenham and Sheen Lane (the latter after its transition to an IDCC) focus on the needs of physically disabled older people.

² Report of Director of Social Services and Housing, "Older Person's Day Care", Social Care and Housing Overview and Scrutiny Committee, 9 March 2004, page 1.

³ *Ibid.*

24. The Social Day Care Centres are run by the voluntary sector. As part of the move towards voluntary run social day care, LBRuT entered into a Service Level Agreement (SLA) with Age Concern to provide a new social centre at what was previously the Council-run Barnes Green Day Centre. A Service Level Agreement was also entered into with Richmond and Kingston Accessible Transport (RAKAT), to provide flexible transport for users to Barnes Green Social Centre, Linden Hall and medical appointments. Another Service Level Agreement was entered into with the Consortium, which represents a number of voluntary organisations. Its role includes supporting Day Care users who were not eligible for IDCC treatment to access other services and centres.
25. Tangle Hall IDCC was not significantly affected by the change to an IDCC, because it already specialised in clients with dementias. Ham Day Care Centre does not expect to be significantly affected when it changes to an IDCC for the same reason. However, there were 21 'social users' at Twickenham who were assessed as being ineligible for intensive care and were (with the exception of a couple of users, who only used the hairdresser at the centre) transferred to either Linden Hall or Elleray Hall. One user has already returned to Twickenham following the transition and another user is expected to return shortly.
26. Sheen Lane is currently in the process of consulting with its users about the change to an IDCC. The Sheen Lane Transition Group has been set up and a consultation meeting with users was held on 14 February 2006. There are currently 94 people who are not eligible for intensive day care. Of these, 19 are undergoing assessments, which have not all been completed.

PART II – FINDINGS

INTRODUCTION

27. It is the nature of a Scrutiny review to focus on concerns and problems. However, the Committee wishes to stress just how much positive feedback it received from the stakeholders involved in this review.
28. Both Age Concern and the Consortium commented on the excellent cooperation they had received from Social Services. The Consortium further reported that, although the views given to them should be treated with caution, the users that had been moved from Twickenham did “in the main... appreciate that the alternatives being offered to them were more suited to their needs and capabilities.”
29. RTPCT feel that the Intensive Day Care Centres benefit users by providing them with integrated services. Members who visited the Council-run Day Centres were very impressed by the professionalism of their staff and the high level of services offered to clients. The Committee also recognises that the Intensive Day Care Centres offer an excellent service to the clients that attend them.
30. The Committee is only too aware that Social Services are working to a very tight budget and that this places limits on the level of services that can be provided. It also shares the goal of supporting people to remain in their own homes. This benefits clients and also has the potential to make future financial savings for Social Services’ budgets. Supporting people in residential or nursing care accounted for 45% of the Older People’s budget in 2004/5 and that budget will be under increasing pressure as the Borough’s population ages.
31. The Committee is therefore broadly in favour of the Intensive Day Care programme. However, this is with the strong proviso that the concerns it has outlined in this report are addressed.

PEOPLE WITH MILD TO MODERATE NEEDS

32. At several points during the review, a number of partners expressed the concern that there was a gap in the services offered to people who did not meet the eligibility criteria for Intensive Day Care services but who were still in need of care and support.
33. Such concerns were raised on Members’ visit to Ham Day Centre. Members were told that Ham Day Centre wanted greater provision for mild dementia sufferers and that Ham’s services were not suitable for people in the early stages of dementia. This is because such people do not need the high level of care offered at the centre and can become depressed after spending time around people in the later stages of their own illness. It was the view of care staff at the centre that mixing clients in the earlier stages of dementia with clients in its later stages could lead to deterioration in their conditions.
34. A specific case was cited on Members’ visit to Twickenham IDCC. There was a client at the Centre who was suffering from mild to moderate dementia. Members were told that Twickenham did not meet his needs, as the building was not alarmed and his behaviour could be quite disruptive for other clients. They heard that he had visited Ham Day Care Centre (which specialises in dementias) on

one of his better days and had found the experience of being with people in the later stages of dementia depressing.

35. The gap was also an issue raised by the voluntary sector. Age Concern stated in its submission that IDCC provision does not meet the needs of people with mild to moderate needs. It gave the recently bereaved or people with mild dementia as examples of clients who are not being adequately catered for at present. It was worried that without appropriate care these people could develop depression.
36. Both Age Concern and Richmond Good Neighbours were concerned that providing day care for people with moderate needs would become the responsibility of the voluntary sector. They stated that apart from Barnes Green Social Centre, which is separately commissioned by the Council, the voluntary sector day centres have neither staff with the requisite training nor the necessary level of resources to provide the service such users would need.
37. These concerns were shared by the Consortium, which was worried that the care levels agreed between the Council and Age Concern for Barnes Green Day Centre would be rolled out to other centres in the Borough. It stated that this could not be an option without wide ranging discussions with the other social centre providers and much higher levels of funding, in line with that received by Barnes Green Social Centre under its SLA. It presented the Avenue Club at Kew as an example of how much this level of care could cost. The Avenue Club needed to spend an estimated £14,000 a year to provide twenty disabled people with care on one day a week.
38. Some voluntary sector organisations do offer more specialist care outside of a day centre setting. Homelink said that it currently has a role in providing care for people with mild to moderate needs as it offers respite care, one day a week, to 110 clients with long-term illnesses, disabilities or mental health problems. Integrated Neurological Services (INS)⁴ is another body that felt it could potentially offer increased services to people with long-term neurological conditions who are unable to access current Day Services. However, it said that any expansion would be subject to more space and more funding. INS stated that most of its clients from LBRuT did not access other Day Care services.
39. Social Services agreed that there was a gap in this area and that extra funding might be needed. They indicated that they might be able to look at providing funding to Social Day Centres to support individual clients, depending on the costs involved. They also said that if any money was obtained through a POPPS (Partnerships for Older People Project) bid, some of this could be made available to clients with mild to moderate needs. However, LBRuT is mostly unsuccessful at winning such bids because other more deprived areas usually receive this funding. Social Services also pointed out that there have been discussions about holding days at Ham Day Centre for people in the early stages of dementia.

The Committee's Views

40. The Committee feels that the concerns expressed above clearly point to a gap in services for people with mild to moderate needs, especially for those in the early stages of dementia. The Committee is worried that dementia sufferers might not have their conditions recognised early enough in the Social Day Centres. Staff and volunteers at these centres do not necessarily have the expertise or training to spot these conditions. For the same reason, the Committee feels there is a

⁴ INS' purpose is to provide ongoing rehabilitation and emotional and practical support to people with neurological conditions and to their family carers.

risk that users at Social Day Centres might not receive the level of care they require, which could lead to a worsening of their conditions. This in turn would put extra pressure on IDCC places.

41. The Committee feels that this danger is real and steps must be put in place to avoid it. Therefore, whilst it accepts the general principle of shifting resources from purely social users to those with what are essentially intermediate needs (i.e. users attending what LBRuT is calling Intensive Day Care, but not requiring residential care), it feels that appropriate care must be in place for those with mild to moderate needs, irrespective of who provides it.
42. Currently, there appears to be a gap between what care Social Services expects the Social Day Care Centres to provide and what care the Social Day Care Centres feel able to offer for those who are not eligible to attend IDCCs. It should also be remembered that the care levels expected of Barnes Green Day Centre under their SLA with Social Services are higher than the other voluntary sector day centres feel able to offer.
43. The Committee believes that statutory organisations still have responsibilities for this group and that there is a need for a more coherent policy. It suggests that agreement is reached with the voluntary sector on care level provision at Social Day Centres. Within this, the Committee feels that statutory organisations should investigate providing training for Social Day Care Centre staff.
44. The ongoing Mental Health Review, due to report in June 2006, should help inform such an agreement. The Committee is also aware that this whole area is a topic of national debate.
45. There appears to be a lack of information on the scale of the problem. The Committee feels that Social Services should assess how many people currently attending Social Day Care fall into this group. It also feels that there needs to be an assessment of how many people there are in the wider community who could fall into this group, but do not currently access Day Services. It further recommends that a needs analysis for this group be undertaken. A clear grasp of the scale of this problem will help with the future planning and provision of services.
46. The Mental Health Review should provide the information outlined above in regard to dementia sufferers. However, the Committee wishes to keep this issue under review and would like information reported back separately if it is not included in that review.

Recommendation 1: That Social Services provide information on how many people currently attending Social Day Care Centres fall into the mild to moderate needs group.

Recommendation 2: That Social Services investigate the number of people in the wider community whose needs would place them in the mild to moderate needs group.

Recommendation 3: That agreement is reached between Social Services and the Voluntary Sector Social Day Centre providers regarding care level provision.

SHEEN LANE DAY CENTRE'S TRANSITION TO AN IDCC

47. Sheen Lane Day Centre is currently preparing to become an IDCC. Users understandably feel anxious about the changes, especially those who are going to be moved from the centre. Many users are worried that the changes will break up the community that has built up at the centre over a long period of time. Users are concerned that the classes they have attended will cease, that people will be moved away from their friends and that people will no longer be able to access popular services such as hairdressing.
48. A representative of Sheen Lane User Group felt that referring to people as 'social users' was a misnomer, because the main aim of all the activities at Sheen Lane was therapeutic and they were only available to the elderly. The inclusiveness of the activities was one of Sheen Lane Centre's biggest strengths and he urged that the activities continue on the site, even if not at the centre itself. He thought that if venues and administration could be provided, these activities could be self-financing.
49. The Consortium stated that it is expecting more difficulty in moving people from Sheen Lane Day Centre than it had experienced with Twickenham, mainly as there were three times as many people to move. In addition, there are a number of other complicating factors. The first is that transport links are more difficult, especially by public transport. The second is that there are strong social links within the centre and that there are many people who will want to stay together, across care level requirements. The third is that people at the centre identify strongly with Sheen and not other parts of the Borough.
50. The Assistant Director (Adult Social Services) attended a user consultation meeting at Sheen Lane on 14 February 2006. He said at that meeting that the Council would look into providing other rooms for groups to use inside the Sheen Lane complex. He also promised to continue to consult people about the changes and provide facilities for groups who did not need intensive day care to attend Barnes Green Social Centre, with transport provided for those with transport difficulties. He also offered to support people to access other hairdressing services. Social Services have stated that timescales for transition to an IDCC would not take precedence over providing non-eligible users of Sheen Lane with alternative day care arrangements.
51. At the Committee meeting, Social Services stated that they were looking into providing services at Sheen Lane for the more active elderly. However, they stated that Social Services had a responsibility to cater for people with higher needs and there were not the resources to fund open access to Day Care for those over 65. They felt that Social Services should not fund arts and leisure facilities. Social Services later informed the Committee that Library Services have agreed to allow groups access to the library and that the communal area and small hall on the site are also being utilised. They stated that work to keep activities running on the site was also being undertaken in partnership with FISH.
52. The Committee heard that Sheen Lane is in a perfect location for a Social Day Centre as it has good transport links and community facilities such as shops and GPs nearby. It is also within easy walking distance of Mortlake and so serves that community too. Users believed that the inclusiveness generated by mixing users with different levels of care was one of the centre's greatest strengths. They felt that separating people by care level could have a detrimental effect on health. Users were also disappointed that Social Services had not given more consideration to the suggestion that an IDCC be set up at Barnes Hospital and that Sheen Lane be left as it is currently.

53. Social Services stated that they were happy to look at any proposal for an alternative venue but that it would need to be financially viable. They said that there was not enough money to invest in new infrastructure at Barnes Hospital.
54. There was an issue raised about the capacity at Sheen Lane Centre. There will be a capacity of 30 users per day, however it is expected that there will be 84 eligible users. Obviously, these users do not attend every day, but the centre will still need to operate over capacity. Social Services said that the centre would operate over the capacity of 30 per day to accommodate those eligible users already attending, but that waiting lists for the centre would be worked out on the basis of 30 per day.
55. Social Services also stated that a significant amount of work had been undertaken at Sheen Lane Day Centre with people suffering from Functional Mental Illness (FMI). There are currently 19 users at Sheen Lane who suffer from an FMI but who are not included amongst the 84 users mentioned above. There is a separate service run at Sheen Lane for people suffering from an FMI, which receives joint funding from LBRuT and RTPCT. These users will not impact on the 84 users with physical needs mentioned above. The Mental Health Review, (see paragraph 44) will doubtless address the needs of the FMI user group. However, as the same transport provision is offered to both users groups, the FMI users will put more pressure on transport services (see Appendix D).

The Committee's Views

56. The Committee is concerned that turning Sheen Lane Day Centre into an IDCC could break up the strong social links at the centre, which are particularly valuable due to the centre's links to the wider community. It welcomes Social Services' efforts to keep activities running at the Sheen Lane site, even if not necessarily at the Day Centre. However, the Committee is concerned that passing any charges for accommodation and administration on to users could have a negative effect on accessibility to these services.
57. The Committee feels that greater partnership working around the Sheen Lane Day Centre site, such as has occurred under the "Ham Working Together" programme, would be a good way of providing high quality services. The Committee welcomes the work that has occurred with FISH and Library Services at Sheen Lane Day Centre. However the Committee would urge that this is extended to include other partners. Without wishing to provide an exhaustive list of potential partners, examples would be RTPCT, Richmond Adult Community College, the Consortium and Library and Information Services. A joined-up approach to providing such services could help preserve the much-valued activities at Sheen Lane Day Centre.
58. The Committee is concerned that significant numbers of clients involved in Sheen Lane's transition to an IDCC may find that they have no alternative venue when Sheen Lane stops accepting non-eligible clients. The Committee welcomes Social Services' reassurance that timescales will not take priority over ensuring that non-eligible service users have alternative day care arrangements in place. However, the Committee would still like this to be a formal recommendation so that it will be reported back in the progress updates.

Recommendation 4: *That everything possible continues to be done to preserve activities for non-eligible users of Sheen Lane Day Centre on the same site.*

Recommendation 5: *That the joint approach currently undertaken at Sheen Lane be extended to include all relevant partners to continue to support activities at Sheen Lane for non-eligible service users.*

Recommendation 6: *That timescales for transition to an IDCC do not take priority over providing non-eligible users of Sheen Lane with alternative day care arrangements.*

TRANSPORTATION

59. There were concerns raised about transport services to the social day centres but these did not seem to apply to the statutory centres. Twickenham, Tangle Hall and Ham, which are Council-run, were all pleased with the transport arrangements to their centres. Generally, they felt that they had improved and become more flexible.
60. In their submissions to the Committee, Age Concern and Richmond Good Neighbours pointed out that because of the changes, many people now have to travel further to access day care and will continue to have to do so.
61. There are only three social centres, and two IDCCs, one for dementia and one for physical disability, on each side of the river (Tangle Hall IDCC operates a Borough wide service at weekends). This means that many users will face a longer journey to access day care than was previously the case. Therefore, to maintain accessibility, it is crucial that high quality, flexible and affordable transport services are in place.
62. Age Concern stated that with the reduction in LBRuT transport provision, it is essential that a sustainable and cost effective transport solution be reached across the borough that does not rely on volunteer drivers.
63. Elleray Hall raised specific concerns about transport. Firstly, it was worried about rumours that Elleray Hall would only have one bus instead of the two buses it currently has and stated that this could not meet its needs. The Social Services report mentions that preliminary investigations are underway to look at extending RAKAT provision to Elleray Hall.⁵ At the Committee meeting, Social Services said that no decision had been taken and that there would be a discussion with Elleray Hall about transport issues.
64. Another concern raised by Elleray Hall was that members would have to pay £1.20 a day for the transport service. It felt this was discriminatory as those members without mobility problems could arrive at the centre free on public transport by using their Freedom Pass. It stated that £1.20 per day was a significant amount for people to find from their pensions and could mean that there were people who could not afford the transport, especially as users already had to make a contribution for their lunch and membership fees.
65. The Committee heard that there would be transport problems for people going to Barnes Green Social Centre from East Sheen, as the public transport links were not as good as in other parts of the Borough. It also heard that there was a need for an improvement in affordable transport links.
66. Social Services have acknowledged the transport difficulties. However, they stated that transport was a national problem and that, although discussions were

⁵ Report of Director of Social Services and Housing, "Older Person's Day Care", Social Care and Housing Overview and Scrutiny Committee, March 2006, page 2.

continuing, this could only be resolved in the longer term. Social Services pointed to the Transport Solutions Model, which aims to maximise current transport resources through a partnership approach between statutory and non-statutory providers of day care and day support, as a means through which improvements were being sought. They also stated that charges for Day Centre transport could be compared with like-for-like services for people who cannot access public transport such as dial-a-ride, which make charges and like day centre transport, provide a door-to-door and often an escorted service for users.

The Committee's Views

67. The Committee is concerned about the distance that many clients now have to travel to access Day Care Services, which is stressful for them and also has an unfavourable environmental impact. However, it accepts that this is an unavoidable effect of the Intensive Day Care Programme. The Committee feels that given the longer distances clients now have to travel, it is essential that transport is a high priority.
68. The Committee is concerned that charges are levied on clients who are unable to use public transport by reason of their disability. This appears discriminatory, as older people who are able to use public transport can travel free with their Freedom Pass. The Committee therefore calls for transportation charges for older people who cannot use public transport to be removed.

Recommendation 7: That accessible transport services are provided free of charge to Older People who cannot use public transport.

ASSESSMENTS AND REFERRALS

69. There have been a number of issues raised about the process for assessments and referrals of clients. Age Concern is worried about both the timescales and quality of Care Management Assessments. It said that there had been delays to the process caused by resource issues.
70. Age Concern cited the case of a woman who had had to wait two months for an assessment to return back to Twickenham. Elleray Hall also mentioned this individual's situation. Elleray Hall, Age Concern and the Consortium all believe that there should be a fast-track system for people who have moved from an IDCC to return and then have a reassessment.
71. Following the meeting, another individual case was drawn to the attention of the Committee. This was of a user who attended Ham Day Centre during the week, but was referred by them to attend Tangle Hall at weekends. This required an assessment from Care Management, but it took four months for the assessment for Tangle Hall to be carried out. The Committee would like reassurances that this is an isolated case.
72. Some stakeholders and representatives said how beneficial it would be to have a Single Care Assessment process for all health and social care needs rather than numerous assessments that were stressful for users and carers. This project is on-going but concerns were expressed that progress on achieving it had been slow.

The Committee's Views

73. The Committee feels that a fast-track system of referrals for former users of IDCCs should be set up. This would allow users to receive a priority care assessment to return to their previous centre if the Social Day Centre that they attend consider this necessary. The Committee feels that these clients have already had to wait for and undergo a large number of assessments and that it is unreasonable for them to have a long wait for an assessment before they receive the care they need.
74. The Committee also wants to see a speedy implementation of the Single Assessment Programme. Given the number of assessments that clients are now required to undertake, the Committee feels it is crucial that this programme starts running as soon as possible.
75. Finally, the Committee would like there to be a rigorous quality assurance system in place for Care Management. The cases outlined above would indicate that there have been unreasonable delays in some cases for assessments to take place. The Committee would like to see a number of Borough-wide performance indicators for Care Management developed so that Scrutiny and Social Services can better evaluate performance.

Recommendation 8: *That a fast-track referral system is set up, which gives former users of day centres that have changed to IDCCs a priority care assessment, if they are referred by their Social Centre.*

Recommendation 9: *That a speedy implementation of the Single Assessment Programme is undertaken.*

Recommendation 10: *That a number of Borough-wide performance indicators for Care Management are developed.*

ROLE OF RICHMOND AND TWICKENHAM PRIMARY CARE TRUST

76. Within the context of funding for the changes to Day Centres, the Committee heard that RTPCT had originally been asked for a contribution of £268,000 over four years for the provision of Occupational Therapy and Physiotherapy at the IDCCs. RTPCT has made it clear that its position from the start has always been that Day Centre clients would already be accessing these services and, as such, there would only be a refocusing of where services were provided and not any new funding.
77. The PCT provides Occupational Therapists and Physiotherapists and the Keep Well Nurse. It also provides £20,000 a year for transport to Social Day Centres and some funding for Ellera Hall, FISH, EMAG and Age Concern, though this is less than is provided by Social Services (see Appendix F).
78. It was the view of RTPCT that although Social Services and Health provision is moving ever-closer together, day service provision is primarily Social Services' responsibility.

79. The Committee fully recognises the pressures on RTPCT budgets. However, it is current government policy to shift resources from acute to preventative care. It can be expected that IDCCs will relieve pressure on acute NHS services. The Committee therefore feels that there is a case for RTPCT to provide greater financial support to the IDCC programme, within the context of the shift towards preventative care.

Recommendation 11: That RTPCT should provide greater financial support to the IDCC programme, within the context of the shift towards preventative care.

FACILITIES

80. The Committee has concerns about the facilities at Council-run Day Centres. It heard that Twickenham Day Centre had purchased a significant amount of the equipment from money left in a legacy, rather than from its budget. Whilst this was an innovative use of extra funding, it cannot be expected that such funds will be available at Sheen Lane Day Centre when it undergoes its transition.
81. Social Services accept that Twickenham IDCC is not the best venue for people with disabilities, given its narrow doors and corridors. The Committee recognises that financial constraints mean that this cannot be resolved in the short term but feel that it should be noted in this report.
82. Many Members also noted on their visits to Day Centres that there was some decorative work and gardening that needs to be done to make them more attractive. The Committee again recognises financial constraints, but feels that greater use of people sentenced to community service orders could be a solution, subject to the necessary safeguards being in place. The Consortium has suggested that inmates from Latchmere prison⁶ could be used to undertake this work.

Recommendation 12: That greater use is made of people doing community service orders for decorative work and gardening at Day Care Centres.

THE NEED FOR A NEW FOUR YEAR STRATEGY

83. The Committee has identified a number of issues in this report that it feels need a long-term response. This need becomes apparent when it is considered that there is an ageing population in the Borough and that Day Care Service resources will come under increasing pressure. It is therefore important that any plan to remedy these problems looks to the future and makes allowance for changing demographics.
84. The Committee believes that a new four-year strategy outlining a vision for Older People's Day Care, covering the period 2008/9 to 2011/12, is required to take this process forward and that it should focus on how the problems outlined in this

⁶ This is a resettlement prison in Ham.

report can be addressed. This plan should also involve all relevant partners and focus on joint working between them. The Committee acknowledges that a wider Older People's strategy is going to be produced and believes that the four-year strategy suggested above could be included within that. The Committee also believes that the four-year strategy should link into the findings of the Mental Health Review.

Recommendation 13: That a new four-year strategy for Older People's Day Care, covering the period 2008/9-2011/12, be produced, which focuses on the problems outlined in this report.

PART III – CONCLUSION

85. The changes to Older People's Day Centres are important as services for this age group are going to come under increasing pressure as the baby-boomer generation retires. The Committee broadly welcomes the Intensive Day Care Programme, as it allows clients who might otherwise have to be in residential care to remain in their own homes. This is good for clients and also has the potential to save Social Services money.
86. However, the Committee has identified a number of concerns in this report about the service that clients are currently receiving and made a number of recommendations which it feels would help to give all clients the level of care they deserve and require.

TABLE OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Rec. No.	Recommendation	For action by:
1.	<i>That Social Services provide information on how many people currently attending Social Day Care Centres fall into the mild to moderate needs group.</i>	LBRuT
2.	<i>That Social Services investigate the number of people in the wider community whose needs would place them in the mild to moderate needs group.</i>	LBRuT
3.	<i>That agreement is reached between Social Services and the Voluntary Sector Social Day Centre providers regarding care level provision.</i>	LBRuT
4.	<i>That everything possible continues to be done to preserve activities for non-eligible users of Sheen Lane Day Centre on the same site.</i>	LBRuT
5.	<i>That the joint approach currently undertaken at Sheen Lane be extended to include all relevant partners to continue to support activities at Sheen Lane for non-eligible service users.</i>	LBRuT
6.	<i>That timescales for transition to an IDCC do not take priority over providing non-eligible users of Sheen Lane with alternative day care arrangements.</i>	LBRuT
7.	<i>That accessible transport services are provided free of charge to Older People who cannot use public transport.</i>	LBRuT
8.	<i>That a fast-track referral system is set up, which gives former users of day centres that have changed to IDCCs a priority care assessment, if they are referred by their Social Centre.</i>	LBRuT
9.	<i>That a speedy implementation of the Single Assessment Programme is undertaken.</i>	LBRuT/RTPCT
10.	<i>That a number of Borough-wide performance indicators for Care Management are developed.</i>	LBRuT
11.	<i>That RTPCT should provide greater financial support to the IDCC programme, within the context of the shift towards preventative care.</i>	RTPCT
12.	<i>That greater use is made of people doing community service orders for decorative work and gardening at Day Care Centres.</i>	LBRuT
13.	<i>That a new four-year strategy for Older People's Day Care, covering the period 2008/9-2011/12, be produced, which focuses on the problems outlined in this report.</i>	LBRuT

APPENDICES

APP. A – SOCIAL DAY CARE CENTRE FACILITIES IN LBRUT

Centre Name	Managed By	Location	Opening Hours	Users
Barnes Green Social Centre	Age Concern	Barnes	9am-5pm Monday - Friday	Social Centre for the over 50s.
The Avenue Club	Kew Community Trust	Kew	9am-3pm Monday-Friday	Social Club primarily for older people.
Linden Hall Social Club	Linden Hall Day Centre Association	Hampton	9.30am-4pm Monday - Friday	Social Club for the over 60s.
Meadows Hall	Age Concern	Richmond	9-5pm Monday - Friday	Activities for retired people.
Elleray Hall	Teddington Old People's Welfare Association	Teddington	9.30am-4pm Monday-Friday	Social Club for the over 60s.
Whitton Day Centre	Age Concern	Whitton	9.30am-4pm Tuesday, Wednesday and Friday.	Social Centre
Minority Ethnic Elders Group at Whitton Day Centre.	EMAG	Whitton	10am – 1pm Monday, Wednesday and Thursday.	Social Centre for ethnic elders.

APP. B – COUNCIL-RUN INTENSIVE DAY CARE CENTRES

Centre Name	Location	Opening Hours	Users	Capacity
Ham Day Centre	Ham	9am-5pm Monday - Friday	Clients referred with dementias	20 clients per day
Sheen Lane Day Centre	East Sheen	9am-5pm Monday - Friday	Clients referred with physical disabilities	30 clients per day
Tangley Hall Intensive Day Care Centre	Hampton	9am-5pm 365 days a year	Clients referred with dementias	15 clients per day
Twickenham Intensive Day Care Centre	Twickenham	9am-5pm Monday - Friday	Clients referred with physical disabilities	30 clients per day

APP. C – TIMELINE FOR THE INTENSIVE DAY CARE PROGRAMME

EVENT	DATE
IDCC proposals brought before Social Care and Housing Overview and Scrutiny Committee	20 October 2003
Barnes Green Day Centre transferred to Age Concern to become Barnes Green Social Centre	1 August 2004
Service Level Agreement entered into with RAKAT	January 2005
Richmond Community Support Service Consortium appointed	May 2005, started work on July 2005
Twickenham Day Centre becomes an IDCC	July 2005
Tangley Hall Day Centre becomes an IDCC	September 2005
Sheen Lane Day Centre will transfer to an IDCC	June 2006
Ham Day Centre will transfer to an IDCC	September 2006

APP. D – CAPACITY AT SHEEN LANE DAY CENTRE

Current Provision, (December 2005)

Average Weekly Attendance figures, excluding people with an FMI

Set against the proposed IDCC daily capacity of 30 people

Day	Eligible	+/-
Monday	30	0
Tuesday	31	+1
Wednesday	40	+10
Thursday	38	+8
Friday	39	+9

Average Weekly Transport Use, including people with an FMI

Set against the proposed daily transport capacity of 30 people

Day	Number	+/-
Monday	43	+13
Tuesday	44	+14
Wednesday	48	+18
Thursday	45	+15
Friday	46	+16

Appendix E

Cost of running Inhouse Day Centres (£)

	Running Costs	Service Recharges*	Capital Recharges*	Receipts/Fees+	Grants	Total
Tangley Hall	369,300	43,800	14,400	-7,600		419,900
Ham	285,900	58,600	111,600	-10,600		445,500
Twickenham	320,200	49,300	22,200	-9,700		382,000
Sheen Lane	313,900	95,900	28,500	-11,600	-36,600	390,100

SLA Budgets

Barnes Green (Age Concern) £89,712 + £5,000 (Transport)

RAKAT 46,000

Community Support Service £58,865 (2005/06), £57,192 (2006/07);

*Recharges are an internal accounting procedure used to recoup expenditure between departments.

+Money received by Day Centres from users for the services offered.

Appendix F

GRANTS FOR VOLUNTARY DAY CENTRES

ORGANISATION	SOURCES OF ALLOCATED FUNDS				
	LBRUT	PCT	LSC	TOTAL	
Teddington Old People Welfare Association (Elleray Hall DC)	35,000	10,000	0	45,000	
FiSH - Mortlake, Barnes & East Sheen DC's					This relates to a contribution towards running activities in day centres, rather than running the day centre itself)
	10,378	2,000	0	12,378	
Kew Community Trust (for the Avenue Club)	35,818	0	1,075	36,893	
Linden Hall Day Centre EMAG Whitton DC	28,050	0	0	28,050	
	23,412	16,679	0	40,091	This figure covers all of EMAG's activities and is not solely for Day Centre work.
Age Concern for Meadow's Hall					Whitton Day Centre is primarily run by EMAG, with Age Concern sharing a couple of days.
	45,000	12,311	15,206	72,517	Approximately £45K plus 2% of Age Concern's grant goes towards running Meadows Hall and 50% of the PCT money. The LSC grant is to provide learning activities at the day centre.
TOTALS	<u>177,658</u>	<u>40,990</u>	<u>16,281</u>	<u>234,929</u>	

Note : It is not possible to precisely identify the amounts allocated to the running of day centres as the grant awards area contribution to a number of services provided by voluntary organisations.

L.B. Richmond upon Thames

LBRUT

Primary Care Trust

PCT

London South Learning Skills Council

LSC