



Review of Adult Day Care Services in Bracknell Forest (Johnstone Court Day Centre & Downside Resource Centre)

**Report by the Working Group of the Health,
Social Care and Housing Scrutiny Panel**

**Councillor Anne Shillcock – Lead Member
Councillor John Harrison
Councillor Tony Packham**

20th January 2004

The working group would like to express their thanks for their co-operation and time to:-

Councillor Gareth Barnard, Executive Portfolio Holder, Social Services & Housing
Councillor Jacqui Ryder, Voluntary Sector Champion
Councillor Cliff Thompson, Pensioners' Champion
Mr Simon Pearce, Head of Adult Services

And for support and advice:-

Andrea Carr, Senior Democratic Services Officer
Jan Haunton, Project Development Officer

Johnstone Court Closure

Summary:

The Health, Social Care and Housing Scrutiny Panel at its November meeting set up a working group to look into the decision to close Johnstone Court Day Centre for the Elderly following the Adult Services Day Opportunities Review.

The working group reviewed the documentation, visited existing facilities and interviewed witnesses. The working group concluded that the decision to re-organise adult day care services and to base both services for the elderly and people with physical disabilities at one centre could be successful. They concluded, however, that this would only be the case if the assurances given by the Head of Adult Services and the Executive Portfolio Holder for Health, Social Services and Housing with regard to funding were honoured.

Concerns were identified around the decision making and consultation process and these form the basis of the recommendations at the end of the report.

Table of Contents

Part 1 - Introduction	4
Part 2 – Working Group.....	4
Membership of the working group	4
The Brief	4
Background	5
Part 3 – Existing Facilities	6
Visit to Johnstone Court.....	6
Visit to Downside Resource Centre	6
Part 4 - Reviewing the evidence to address the issues outlined in The Brief	7
The process leading to the decision to close Johnstone Court.....	7
The Consultation Process.....	7
Considering the needs of the older residents in the Borough	8
Implementation of plan to close Johnstone Court and transfer the existing users to other facilities.....	8
Part 5 – Evidence of Champions.....	9
Witness session with the Champion for the Voluntary Sector, Cllr.Jacqui Ryder	9
Witness Session the Pensioners Champion, Cllr. Cliff Thompson.....	9
Part 6 – Working Group Conclusions	10
Part 7 - Recommendations	12
Recommendation 1	12
Recommendation 2	12
Recommendation 3	12
Recommendation 4	13
Recommendation 5	13

Part 1 - Introduction

On October the 21st 2003, a report was presented to the Executive Committee on the Adult Services Day Opportunities Review. The recommendation was that Johnstone Court should be closed and that day services should be centralised at the Downside Resource Centre. This recommendation was passed by the Executive, with the decision planned to take effect from April 2004 and the Downside facility will from that date be used by both older people and adults with a physical disability.

At a meeting of the Health, Social Care and Housing Scrutiny Panel held on November the 4th, 2003 this decision was discussed briefly and concerns were raised by a number of members. It was agreed that a working group of three members should be established to consider the reasons leading to the decision, the concerns identified, and to identify possible resulting future actions needed.

Part 2 – Working Group

Membership of the working group

The membership was agreed as follows:

Councillor Anne Shillcock - Lead Member
Councillor John Harrison
Councillor Tony Packham

The Brief

At the first meeting of the working group it was agreed that the following issues should be addressed:

- To look at the process which lead to this decision and comment accordingly
- To look at the consultation which took place and to assess whether all relevant parties were involved
- To consider whether the needs of the older residents in the Borough who do not currently access Johnstone Court were also taken into account and if so to what extent?
- To consider the implementation of the planned transfer from Johnstone Court to other facilities

In order to carry out this piece of work it was agreed that members should:

1. Obtain and study the Final Report and Recommendations on the Review and the attached Appendices
2. Obtain information on the consultation process – i.e. look at the results of the questionnaires, discussion groups and the Stakeholder Day
3. Visit both Johnstone Court and the Downside Resource Centre
4. Interview the following witnesses:

Mr Simon Pearce – Head of Adult Services
Councillor Gareth Barnard – Executive Portfolio Holder for Health, Social Services and Housing
Councillor Jacqui Ryder – Voluntary Sector Champion
Councillor Cliff Thompson – Pensioners Champion

Background

The Review of Adult Services was a consequence of the SSI/Audit Commission Report in 2000 which identified a number of concerns. The Report concluded that the Social Services Department were not meeting the needs of the elderly residents in the community; that the department information on those needs was under developed and that the provision needed to be modernised.

As a result of the comments made in the SSI Report, the Social Services Department decided to carry out a review of its adult day care facilities and the service that is provided. The review process was carried out from mid 2002 to mid 2003 and was conducted by an Independent Consultant. The review was completed in September 2003 with the production of a Final Report recommending the closure of Johnstone Court, and a series of appendices attached.

Within the review programme there were a number of consultation processes which included questionnaires, discussion groups for users and carers and a Stakeholders Day for users, carers and other agencies.

Information provided by the 2001 census indicated that the number of elderly people over the age of 75 living in the Borough was in excess of 5,000. One of the stated aims of the review was to enable greater access to support from within this group.

There are currently three day care facilities provided by the Borough:–

- Johnstone Court Day Centre for the elderly
- Downside Resource Centre for adults with disabilities
- BROC (Bracknell Resource & Opportunity Centre) – The Centre for adults with learning disabilities - this centre is not part of the working groups' brief

There are also other facilities provided for the elderly of the Borough and these include, Voluntary Sector Day Centres and activities set up in local community associations.

Part 3 – Existing Facilities

Visit to Johnstone Court

The three members of the working group visited Johnstone Court on December 10th and were met by a member of staff who showed us around the premises and outlined for us the activities that took place during the week. The building has been in use for many years and is of a very traditional design. Johnstone Court consists of one large open plan area separated into three sections, two social areas and a dining area that affronts the kitchen. Offset from the main area are two curtained alcoves which are used as games rooms. These are stocked with a variety of board games, a pool table and a dart board. The building is light and airy and is in good decorative order. There is a large well equipped kitchen which provides fresh cooked meals for clients each day. The kitchen was until recently used by Meals on Wheels who deliver to clients locally.

There are several smaller rooms where provision is made for clients' personal care and a hairdresser attends the Centre regularly.

The Centre was run by Berkshire County Council until BFBC became a Unitary Authority in 1998. During a general discussion the group were informed that until a year or two before 1998 the Centre had been used in a multi purpose way. The Centre had two types of clients – clients who were considered to be vulnerable or whose carers needed respite as is the case now and it also operated as a drop-in for pensioners. This was apparently very successful and the Centre was well used. Then the criteria was changed and the drop-in facility ceased. It is since that time that numbers have dropped.

Currently the Centre is under-used with approximately 25 clients a day. There is capacity for at least 40 clients a day.

The staff describe the Centre as a very happy place and reported that the clients enjoyed attending, although they admitted that the range of activities was very restricted.

The building is also used by several outside groups, including a Saturday children's club for children with disabilities and The Alzheimer's Group.

Visit to Downside Resource Centre

The visit to Downside also took place on December 10th 2003 and the working group were met by staff and shown around the building. Downside is also an old building and of fairly traditional design. It is on two floors but is served with a lift and ramps for ease of access. The building is in a poor state of repair and is in urgent need of re-decoration and some immediate repairs are needed to the roof which has caused ongoing problems for some time.

The size of the building has allowed Downside to develop a range of activities and the provision is good. Dedicated rooms are available for woodwork, art and pottery, photography and cooking. All purpose rooms are available for socialising, meals,

exercise events and entertainments. There are excellent computer facilities. The Centre has established good links with Bracknell College and some clients go to the college and others have courses arranged for them at the Centre, with college tutors coming to them. The Centre has capacity for up to 40 users a day and currently approximately 36 clients attend on most days.

Personal care facilities at the centre are of a more than acceptable standard.

One problem the centre does have is considerable amounts of vandalism. This is due in part to the fact that they have no secure boundaries – the surrounding area is open plan and fronts onto communal land. A secure fence around the building would help to address this issue and would also allow clients to develop additional interests such as gardening.

Part 4 - Reviewing the evidence to address the issues outlined in the Brief

The process leading to the decision to close Johnstone Court:

The decision to undertake a review of adult services followed criticism by the SSI/Audit Commission Report in 2000. The report indicated concern that Social Services were not meeting the needs of the whole community of elderly residents and that the services needing developing and modernising.

The review that took place over the last year, however, only covered the existing facilities provided by the Borough – i.e. the three Day Centres and did not include any exploration of what other facilities were available. Some, of course, are known about. However, the range and amount of activity taking place at other centres such as Community Associations was not explored.

The review ended with a Final Report on the Day Centres – Johnstone Court and Downside together with analysis of the questionnaires of both centres. Unfortunately the Stakeholder Day Agenda and the feedback from the day are not available. However, a list of attendees was provided.

The Consultation Process

The consultation process, carried out by the independent consultant was based on a questionnaire. Opportunities were provided for users and carers to complete the questionnaire individually; or together with a staff member for support. Small group discussions were also set up based on the questionnaire. All users and carers at Johnstone Court and the Downside Resource Centre were offered this opportunity. The results of these questionnaires were collated and attached to the final report as appendices.

A Stakeholders Day was also held and invitations to this event were sent to users, carers, staff and some outside agencies. There is some evidence that the number of outside agencies invited was restricted and that bodies who might have been

expected to have a contribution to make were not invited. Two specific bodies have indicated their concern at not being invited. The Pensioners Association have complained that they were not invited to the day nor were they consulted in any other way.

The results of the questionnaire were in the main very positive about both centres. With respect to Johnstone Court the criticisms were not about the building, but about a wish for more variety of activities, the opportunity to attend more frequently and for longer periods of time. A major criticism was around transport.

Considering the needs of the older residents in the Borough

In the report to the Executive it was noted that there are more than 5,000 residents over the age of 75 of whom some 1,400 are over the age of 85. It also reported that one of the aims of the review of Day Services was to enable greater access to support for a wider range of this group. However no work was done within the review to assess what the needs of this wider group might be. The review focussed entirely on the current users and carers.

Implementation of plan to close Johnstone Court and transfer the existing users to other facilities.

The time scale for the transfer is December 03 to the 1st April 04 and does provide for individual and sensitive work to be done with all the current users of Johnstone Court. A Social Worker with specialised skills in the area of assessment of need has been appointed. Her role is to assess the needs and provide a care plan for each of the clients. Transport will continue to be available.

Clients will also be taken on visits to other facilities and will be encouraged to make choices that will meet their needs. The range of options includes existing facilities, together with proposals to use general community facilities such as community centres, pubs, garden centres and the like. Work will need to be done to explore the feasibility of using such facilities in terms of physical access and management goodwill.

Visits have already taken place to a number of facilities including Downside, Sandhurst Day Centre and a housing association – the Montgomery of Alamein Court.

Anecdotal information received by the working group to both Downside and Johnstone Court suggests that clients are beginning to feel more relaxed and that they enjoyed their visits and are beginning to feel more positive about the future.

As a result of the information collated for the report, 9 Options were developed.

A summary report was presented to the Executive on October 21st 2003. Attached to the summary was the document 'My Voice, My Choice' - concerning BROCC and the final report on Downside and Johnstone Court. What was not included were the range of Options – so the Executive saw only the one option which was the

recommendation included in the report. The analysis of the questionnaires was also not included.

The decision to close Johnstone Court was taken by the Executive without an opportunity to discuss other possibilities.

Part 5 – Evidence of Champions

Witness session with the Champion for the Voluntary Sector, Cllr. Jacqui Ryder

Councillor Mrs Ryder, the Voluntary Sector Champion in response to the questions posed to her informed the sub group that she had not been consulted in her role as Champion. She would not necessarily have expected to be asked about Johnstone Court but did express surprise that she had not been consulted on the review in general owing to her wider involvement in voluntary services.

Councillor Ryder was aware that the Review was taking place. She had visited the day centres that had been arranged for members of the Select Committee. She was surprised that she had not been invited in her role as Voluntary Sector Champion to the Stakeholders Day.

Councillor Ryder did agree with the general thrust of the Review's philosophy which is that there needs to be a variety of opportunities for older residents. Many older residents were very active and happy to make their own arrangements. She also commented that there was an increasing number of over 80 year olds, many of whom were very frail. It was this group that required services from the Borough.

Councillor Ryder felt that her previous experience as the Chairperson of Age Concern did give her considerable knowledge, which might have been of value. She was also aware that other senior citizens had been consulted, but some had not.

Councillor Ryder's view for the future was that active senior citizens required independence and were not likely to seek help from the Borough. They are likely to get involved in a range of activities, such as the University of the Third Age.

Transport was an issue and this had been identified in the Review and this is currently being reviewed by the Borough.

Witness Session the Pensioners Champion, Cllr. Cliff Thompson

In response to questions Councillor Thompson replied that he had not been specifically consulted as Champion but had been aware of the Review and had attended related meetings as a local Ward Councillor. He had also visited Johnstone Court.

Councillor Thompson felt the role of Champion lacked clarity and that officers lost sight of whom it may be beneficial to consult. He was aware that other groups were concerned that they had not been consulted and mentioned in particular the Senior Citizens Forum.

Councillor Thompson felt that over time the use of Johnstone Court had declined in part because the general view was that the service might not continue. He felt that capacity could have increased but no clear desire to revive numbers was apparent. He also wondered whether there was some confusion about who the centre was intended to support – i.e. the whole Borough or the local area. Transport and the changing criteria for eligibility impinged on this.

Councillor Thompson, like Councillor Ryder, felt that many older residents wished to pursue their own lives without Borough support. Transport and income, however, did affect individuals ability to socialise. He did, however, feel in general that older residents were content. He was particularly complimentary about the service provided by the 'Look In', which he visits weekly to meet residents.

Councillor Thompson felt positive about using Downside for older residents because of the wider range of facilities available. He also agreed that some users of Johnstone Court might enjoy having their needs met in other venues such as the British Legion or bowling clubs.

Part 6 – Working Group Conclusions

The conclusions of the Working Group are based on the written documentation we received (see appendix) and the Witness interviews. An outline of the interviews with the two Champions is given above. The interviews with the Executive Portfolio Holder and the Head of Adult Services were very comprehensive and were intended to confirm and expand on the information contained in the written documentation. It seemed appropriate therefore to incorporate their responses within this section.

The Executive Portfolio Holder and the Head of Adult Services were both very robust in their support of the decision to re-organise the day services in the way proposed and felt that their view was supported by discussion informal and formal that they had had over the 2 years since the SSI Inspection, and the progress that the Department had made in those two years. The intention is to provide a wider range of activities in a variety of venues to enable older residents, both current and future users to remain part of the wider community. It is also intended to use the money freed up by the closure of Johnstone Court to effect these changes. Councillor Barnard pointed out that this was in line with other new provisions in the pipeline such as the planned additional facility at Ladybank.

The criticism within the SSI Report did not only identify a need to modernise existing facilities but commented on the fact that the Department's information of the needs of the large older population were underdeveloped. In the Summary Report to the Executive it was stated that one of the aims of the review was to enable greater access to support a wider range within this group. However, with the exception of the Stakeholder Day the written evidence – i.e. the Final Report and Recommendations focussed entirely of the current users and carers. The

consultation process equally - i.e. the Questionnaires also focussed on existing users and carers.

The Working Group noted that the Analysis of the Questionnaires showed that most users and carers were very satisfied with the services. Where there was criticism it was about wanting to attend Johnstone Court more often, on the days they did attend they wanted to arrive earlier and go home later and they did want a wider range of activities to be on offer. A major criticism was the difficulties experienced with transport. Both Councillor Barnard and Mr Pearce agreed that this was an issue that will need to be addressed. Mr Pearce reported that they are looking at a range of possibilities to resolve this issue, which might include providing users with some form of travel fund to enable them to make their own arrangements.

The Report to the Executive did not include all the available information. They did have the final report and recommendation on the review of Downside and Johnstone Court but they did not have the Analysis of the Questionnaires nor did they have the information on the range of possible Options. The Agenda for the Stakeholder Day and the feedback on the day were not provided for them and unfortunately the Working Group have not been able to access that information. The Working Group queried the inappropriateness of the Executive making decisions without having the full information available to them. Mr Pearce commented that within the new structure Officers were being urged to condense reports. Councillor Barnard expressed the view that over the previous 2 year period he had made many visits to other authorities, attended many conferences and had discussions with a wide range of professionals. This had helped him to build up considerable knowledge which he was able to share with the Executive. The Executive were also aware that background information was available.

In response to concerns raised by the Working Group about not involving the range of people/groups who might be able to contribute, Mr Pearce admitted that with hindsight some individuals had unfortunately not been invited. He regretted that the Voluntary Sector Champion had not been invited and that a representative of the Pensioners Association had not received an invitation.

The Working Group had informative discussions with the two Champions and were disappointed that neither were formally involved in the review process. This appears to reflect the Council's unclear view of what their role should be. The Working Group recognised that both Champions have over many years built up a body of knowledge which should be used by the Council.

The Working Group is of the view that given the time scale of the review, which extended over a period of a year to 18 months, the timetable should have enabled the Report on the Review of Downside and Johnstone Court to come to the Health, Social Care and Housing Scrutiny Panel for them to discuss and comment on, before going to the Executive Committee. Councillor Barnard felt there were good reasons for not doing so at the time but accepted that in future, this should happen.

One of the reasons for the changes in the structure of Local Councils expressed by the Government was to enable Councillors to have some time freed up to encourage them to become more involved in their local communities. The members of the Scrutiny Panel are doing that and between them have considerable knowledge of their communities and one way of using this is to ensure that the Committee has an opportunity to comment in advance of decisions being made.

The Working Group consider that the process of decision making should be absolutely transparent if residents are to be assured of the fairness of decisions that are taken. This requires comprehensive consultation, using all the expertise available.

Part 7 - Recommendations

Recommendation 1

The evidence presented to the working group, both written and in discussions with the witnesses, enabled us to draw the conclusion that the decision to reconfigure the adult day services leading to the closure of Johnstone Court and using the Downside Resource Centre as the main base could be successful. However, this judgement was based on assurances with regard to funding that the working group expect to be honoured.

The working group support the decision to close Johnstone Court provided the assurances given by the Head of Adult Services and the Executive Portfolio Holder are implemented, which were:

- a) **That the sum of £40,000.00 allocated for the transition process is used for this purpose**
- b) **Any financial savings resulting from the closure of Johnstone Court should be used to ensure greater access to support for an increased number of elderly residents**
- c) **Of critical importance is the need to up-grade the Downside Resource Centre including roof repairs, decorative order and security fencing**

Recommendation 2

The working group was concerned that the decision taken by the Executive was made by them without all the relevant written documentation. It is our view that to encourage transparency in the decision making process, decisions should be made based on all the facts.

When the Executive are expected to make a decision which will affect residents of the Borough, Officers should provide all the supporting written documentation. The Executive should not rely on summaries as a basis for making a decision.

Recommendation 3

The criticism by the SSI/Audit Commission in 2000 was that day care services needed to be modernised. However, they also criticized the fact that the Social Services and Housing Department did not have a good understanding of the needs of the older residents in the Borough (population in excess of 5,000 age 75 and over) and their services generally were under developed. It is the working groups view that

the Review of Adult Day Opportunities should have included some investigation into what those needs might be. The working group were informed that there had been some work done in this area but there was no written information on this and the report to the Executive focussed on Johnstone Court and Downside. The working group were aware that a Stakeholder Day was held with some related agencies. However, not all appropriate individuals/groups were invited. The agenda and feedback on this day were not available for the working group to study and so we are not able to comment on the value of this day.

The consultation process should have included a much broader base than just the current users and carers to enable the Social Services and Housing Department to begin to assess likely future need as well as the immediate need and this work now needs to be done.

Recommendation 4

The Borough Council decided several years ago to introduce a system of "Champions". Their roles have not been clearly defined and perhaps this is something that the Council needs to consider. However, the expectation was that they would provide a link with specific groups and over time develop expertise which the Council could use. The Pensioners Champion and the Voluntary Sector Champion were not consulted in their official capacity and it is the view of the working group that this was a "missed opportunity". Their links to the community and background knowledge should have been used.

The role of the "Champions" should be clarified. Officers should be encouraged to make use of the knowledge and expertise of the "Champions" in future reviews.

Recommendation 5

One of the main reasons for the re-structuring of the Council into an Executive/Scrutiny role was given as "to enable non-executive members of the Council to develop closer relationships with their local ward." A way of doing this would be to include ward councillors in the consultation process. This could be organised through the relevant Scrutiny Panel.

Given the timescale of the review process which was between a year and eighteen months, the timetable should have enabled the Report of the Review to go before the Health, Social Care and Housing Scrutiny Panel for their comments before the decision was taken at the Executive Committee in October 2003.

Future reviews should include in their timetable:

- a) **At the planning stage a referral to the appropriate Scrutiny Panel asking if and how, they might like to contribute**
- b) **Any report should be referred to the appropriate Scrutiny Panel for comments before going to the Executive for decision making.**

List of attachments/appendices

1. The questions which formed the basis of the discussions with the Witnesses Interviewees:

- Questions to the Executive Portfolio Holder
- Questions to the Champions
- Questions to the Head of Adult Services

(There are full Minutes of the above interviews which are available to Members of the Health, Social Care & Housing Scrutiny Panel)

2. List of the Stakeholders Day attendees
3. Re-provision of Day Care Action Plan

The following reports were considered by the working group: (All of this information is available to Members via Simon Pearce's department).

1. The Summary Report to the Executive Committee dated 21st October 2003
2. The final report and recommendations on the review of Downside Resource Centre and Johnstone Court Centre
3. The Johnstone Court Options Appendix
4. Analysis of Questionnaires on Johnstone Court and Downside
5. SSI/Audit Commission Report dated February 2001

Questions to Councillor Gareth Barnard – 5th January 2004

The SSI/Audit Commission report of 2000 concluded that Social Services were not meeting the needs of the whole community and that the department information on what those needs were was under developed and that the existing provision needed to be modernised:

Given that the report was referring to the potential needs of all elderly residents in the borough (75+ age group in excess of 5,000) why did the review not include some attempt to assess future need of the elderly not currently accessing borough provision?

Johnstone Court – The analysis of the questionnaire completed by Carers and Users of Johnstone Court was very positive, the negative points centred around a need for more variety of activities and opportunities to attend more sessions and for longer periods of time. Difficulties were also associated with transport

Why was the decision made to close Johnstone Court rather than to expand and use it in a multi-purpose way i.e. luncheon clubs drop in coffee mornings?

The numbers of 85+ residents is rising steadily. Is it not likely that a facility such as Johnstone Court might be needed in the future? Have we the evidence to say that this is not the case?

Executive decision making

How comfortable do you feel about the Executive making decisions which directly affect residents without all the necessary information that was available?

Funding of extra facilities

If as a result of the closure of Johnstone Court the numbers of elderly using voluntary provision and community association centres increases how will this be funded and manned?

**Questions to Cllr. Jacqui Ryder – Voluntary Sector Champion
Cllr. Cliff Thompson – Pensions Champion
on Thursday 18th December 2003**

- In your role as Champion were you consulted during the review of adult services, with regard to the reorganisation of services at Johnstone Court/Downside?
- In your professional capacity as Champion were you asked to assist in the process of consultation in any way whatsoever?
- Do you consider that being involved in consultations such as this should be part of your role and, in what way?
- Based on your experience could you have provided information on how to begin the process of identifying the needs of the 5,000 people over 75 years of age who are not currently accessing Council facilities?

Questions to Simon Pearce on 20th November 2003

1. Please could you give us a brief outline of the reasons for the review including whether there was a financial component?
2. When the recommendation went to the Portfolio Holder did that include the full report and alternative options and was this also available to the full Executive?
3. The consultation process – did this include possible future users of Johnstone Court and Voluntary Bodies that provide other day facilities/activities?
4. Did we make use of the services of our Voluntary Body Champion and Pensioners' Champion – did they play any part in the consultation process – were they asked to express an opinion based on the knowledge they have gained over time?
5. Was an attempt to establish whether the 100 users of Johnstone Court would be able to be absorbed into the other provisions and what is the financial cost to the Voluntary Bodies likely to be?
6. Transport it is acknowledged is a difficult problem – have any plans been made to resolve the issues?

June King
Supportive Housing Officer

Glynne Novelle
Leisure

Sue Telfer
Voluntary Action Group

Carol Dann
Chair- MS / BUG

Pricilla D'Cruz
Manager Woodmancote

Mary Thomson
Manager Worlds End
Age Concern

Cissy Allwright
Vice Chairperson
Alzheimers support group

Alun Powell
Transport Co-ordinator

Lynsay Fortune
WRVS
Linda Macvay
Sheltered Housing

Kay Hinkley
PCT

Dr Gareth Barnard
Executive Member for
Social Services, Health & Housing

Cliff Thomson
Pensioners Champion

Isobel Mattick

John Coward
Life Styles

Representatives from Downside

David Parker

Care Activity Organiser
Downside Resource Centre

Herbie Hickman

Care Activity Organiser
Downside Resource Centre

Lyn Rusk

Volunteer
Downside Resource Centre

~~Denis Lewis~~

Chairperson - Committee
Downside Resource Centre

Gary Merrill

Vice Chairperson - Committee
Downside Resource Centre

Lynda Little

Treasurer - Committee
Downside Resource Centre

Colin Neale

Treasurer - Committee
Downside Resource Centre

Tracy Musto

Secretary - Committee
Downside Resource Centre

Glenda Mulloy

Committee - member
Downside Resource Centre

Maggie Gillson

Committee - member

~~Adrian Edwards~~

~~Committee member
Downside Resource Centre~~

Alan Curtis

Committee member
Downside Resource Centre

~~David Hart~~

Committee member
Downside Resource Centre X

Andrew Cook
Downside Resource Centre

~~Stephanie O'Connell~~ X not able to come
Downside Resource Centre

~~John Free~~
Downside Resource Centre X

Downside Resource Centre M. C. G.

Teresa Sutherland X
Downside Resource Centre ✓

Allen Mennett ✓

8/9.

PROJECT BRIEF
RE-PROVISION DAY CARE

BACKGROUND

Following a review of Day opportunities a decision has been made to close Johnstone Court Day Centre. Day opportunities in the future will be co-ordinated from Downside Resource Centre. There is an expectation that Bracknell Forest Borough Council will move away from traditional building based services, and facilitate increased use of community services.

AGREED PLAN OF ACTION

- All clients attending Johnstone Court to receive an individual assessment of need. Following assessment alternative provision to be identified taking into consideration the possibility of moving with any close friends made at Johnstone Court.
- Menu of choice from the following:-
 - Downside Resource Centre
 - Heathlands Day Centre
 - Age Concern Day Centre
 - Sandhurst Day Centre
 - Community Centres
 - Luncheon Clubs
 - Pubs
 - Garden Centres
 - Any other identified community resource
- Assessments to begin December 2003 following and initial introduction visit on 1st December 2003
- Clients to be assessed at home N.O.K to be invited to be present.
- Assessments and re-provision to be completed by 31st March 2004.
- Any care managers planning reviews of clients will continue to do so and liase with Jane Ryder.