

CABINET	Paper no 13
Meeting date: 8 June 2010	
From: Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Corporate Director – Adult and Local Services	

FLOODING AND CUMBRIA CARE RESIDENTIAL HOMES

PART A – RECOMMENDATION OF CABINET MEMBER

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1** *The purpose of this report is to inform Cabinet of the risk associated with flooding and Cumbria Care residential homes and make proposals for minimising the risks that residents, staff and the Council face in relation to this.*
- 1.2** *This paper sets out the options available regarding each home at risk and makes a subsequent recommendation relating to each.*
- 1.3** *This paper seeks agreement from Cabinet to proceed as set out in order to deal with the issues facing each care home. It should be noted that any decision about each home is the responsibility of Cumbria County Council and not that of other organisations such as the Environment Agency. The Environment Agency provides data that the Council needs to take account of.*

2.0 STRATEGIC PLANNING AND EQUALITY IMPLICATIONS

- 2.1** *The Commissioning Strategy for Older People and Their Carers 2009-2020 sets out the Council's vision of the services required in the future to achieve the best possible outcomes for older people and their carers. The aim is to respond to the growth in the older population by a shift in service provision from residential care to supporting people to stay at home or in extra care housing. This is material in considering the implications of re-occupying Ravensfield.*
- 2.2** *The modernisation of Cumbria Care is essential to deliver the key outcome of the Council Plan to improve the health and wellbeing of adults and is at the heart of delivering the white paper "Our health, our care, our say – a new direction for community services".*
- 2.3** *The proposals will be subject to consultation and equality impact assessment where required*

3.0 RECOMMENDATION

3.1 Cabinet is asked to agree:

- 3.1.1 *The Abbey, Staveley – Continue to operate as at present and monitor risks associated with flooding and take appropriate action. This course of action does not increase the level of risk currently faced by residents, staff and therefore the County Council.***
- 3.1.2 *Edenside, Appleby – Continue to operate as at present and monitor risks associated with flooding and take appropriate action. This course of action does not increase the level of risk faced by residents, staff and therefore the County Council.***
- 3.1.3 *Ravensfield, Keswick – In light of the continued flood risks, to undertake a formal consultation on the proposal to not re-occupy the home and close the home on a permanent basis - (Option 3). This course of action does not increase the level of risk faced by residents, staff and therefore the County Council as a result of flooding whereas re-occupation would increase the risk. Feedback from older people in previous consultations on the future of Cumbria Care has indicated that people would prefer to live in their own homes with support or in services such as extra care housing. The decreasing demand for residential care, an increase in people choosing to utilise home care provision to remain living independently at home, an increase in adequate alternative residential care provision and the current home not meeting modern day standard all support this option.***
- 3.2 *Cabinet is recommended to invite Scrutiny Committee to oversee the development of detailed consultation arrangements.***
- 3.3 *Cabinet will be requested to consider the results of the formal consultation on Ravensfield, when they are available, for a decision on whether the home should be re-occupied or permanently closed.***

James Airey

Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care

PART B - Advice of Corporate Director – Adult and Local Services

4.0 BACKGROUND

- 4.1** The consequences of flooding are much greater for a care home than for a domestic dwelling. This is because the needs of people living there are much more complex and the impact of any loss of utilities, access to parts of the building, disruption to normal routine and provision of care is therefore more severe.

4.2 The consequences of urgent evacuation are also significant and present a risk to service users, staff and to emergency services supporting any evacuation. The decision to evacuate is based upon recommendation from the relevant emergency services. Prior to an evacuation every individual is assessed for any risks to health as the process for moving frail and elderly residents during an emergency evacuation can be stressful for many people and may have a detrimental effect on their health. It also has an impact on local health and social care services that need to absorb a large number of displaced and highly vulnerable people. Planning for evacuation needs to be taken some hours in advance of the actual evacuation to ensure that risk assessments, health assessments, alternative accommodation and appropriate transport is available. It is not possible, therefore, to adopt a “wait and see” approach and evacuate at the point at which water is surrounding the building.

4.3 In essence, a flood event poses a dilemma to the Council. If residents remain in the building during a flood, they are, depending on the extent of flooding and the design of the building, placed at risk. The act of evacuation, however, also places them at risk. In considering the issues, the Council must be mindful of its duty of care to residents, staff and other organisations. It must take account of all reasonably foreseeable risks and take action to minimise both the likelihood of adverse events arising and the consequences of such events.

4.4 Environment Agency model of risk

The Environment Agency utilise a risk model to guide property owners and insurance companies based on the annual statistical chance of flooding in a given area and local flood risk management investment plans. This model uses three levels of risk:

Low – the chance of flooding in any year is 0.5% (1 in 200) or less

Moderate – the chance of flooding in any year is 1.3% (1 in 75) or less but greater than 0.5% (1 in 200)

Significant – the chance of flooding in any year is greater than 1.3% (1 in 75)

4.5 Cumbria Care homes liable to flooding

There are three Cumbria Care homes considered to be in flood risk areas; these are The Abbey in Staveley, Edenside in Appleby and Ravensfield in Keswick. None were designed to be flood resistant. Using the Environment Agency risk model, the homes are categorised as follows:-

- 4.6 Edenside – The risk category identified for Edenside is borderline between significant with the chance of flooding in any year being greater than 1.3 per cent or 1 in 75 and moderate; the chance of flooding in any year is 1.3 per cent (1 in 75) or less but greater than 0.5 per cent (1 in 200). Appleby has experienced several cases of extreme flooding over recent years. Although the location of Edenside (25 beds) means that the home is surrounded by water when there is flooding in Appleby, the home itself has never flooded nor has there been any recommendation to evacuate. The location of the home and road access mean that evacuation could be difficult to carry out. While residents have never been evacuated they have been moved upstairs as a precaution. The rain in November 2009 did not affect the Appleby area to the same extent as other parts of the County. Flood defence work has already been carried out by the Environment Agency in Appleby.
- 4.7 The Abbey - The Environment Agency flood map online RASP system when applied to The Abbey location identifies a moderate risk of flooding - the chance of flooding in any year is 1.3 per cent (1 in 75) or less but greater than 0.5 per cent (1 in 200). The Abbey (30 beds) has experienced several incidents of flooding over the last three years. This flooding was restricted to the cellar and in all instances required the water to be pumped out. The pumping arrangements have been upgraded following the last flooding in 2009. Residents have never been evacuated or considered to be at any kind of risk. There are no plans for any flood defence work by the Environment Agency in the local area.
- 4.8 Ravensfield – The risk category is currently 1 in 50 (significant) – The Environment Agency are examining the scope to upgrade the Keswick flood defence in 2011 although funding has not yet been agreed. If this work does go ahead the works would seek to provide a minimum of 1 in 75 protection which would take Ravensfield into the moderate risk category. The location of Ravensfield and the proposed flood defence works would mean that the likely gain is an increase in the amount of time available to evacuate rather than elimination of flooding. Whilst this will have a positive impact if implemented, it does not reduce the fact that the risk category will remain at significant until such works are completed.
- 4.9 Ravensfield residential care home in Keswick was evacuated on 19 November 2009 due to the threat of flooding. Although the home narrowly avoided being flooded, the outside walls were submerged to varying depths and it lost electrical supply for two days. Repair work has included removing flood water from the lift shaft which had ceased to be operational as a result of water ingress. Further work was required to remove water from various ducts in the building. Residents were evacuated as a decision needs to be taken before the waters rise to a certain level so ambulances can be used to support safe evacuation rather than boats and helicopters. Ravensfield has been evacuated twice in the last five years due to the risk of flooding
- 4.10 The home has thirty beds including six beds for people with dementia. The layout of the home is such that upward evacuation, which is a contingency plan in place at Edenside, is not possible. This is because, unlike Edenside, Ravensfield has no lounges upstairs, only small bedrooms and bathrooms. The residents with bedrooms on the ground floor could not therefore be accommodated upstairs. Based on recent experience, it seems foreseeable that a further evacuation will be required at some point if the building is re-occupied.

4.11 The Current Position: Flood Defence Work

- 4.11.1 The Environment Agency has advised that the current flood defences opposite Ravensfield against the river offer 1 in 50 years protection. The other flood defences in Keswick are on Crosthwaite Road and only offer 1 in 10 years protection. This is all classed as being a significant risk using the Environment Agency model.
- 4.11.2 The Environment Agency is currently undertaking reinstatement works to the High Hill wall following a post flood structural survey. This work is due to be completed by June 2010. This work will reinstate the wall to its pre November 2009 level of flood protection and so will not reduce the risk of flooding or further evacuations of residents below the levels that have prompted previous evacuations.
- 4.11.3 The Environment Agency has proposals to carry out further flood defence work in Keswick which are, as yet, unfunded. Subject to securing funding the Environment Agency's advice is that work would commence in the Summer of 2011 at the earliest. The specific location of Ravensfield means that this work would not avoid future flooding to Ravensfield but would provide more time to evacuate residents. If this work goes ahead, then the Environment Agency will aim to ensure a minimum of 1 in 75 protection which would place the area of Ravensfield into the moderate risk category.
- 4.11.4 The Environment Agency has advised that property owners should take their own flood defence measures. A survey conducted for the Council suggests a number of mitigation measures that could be put in place to reduce the impact of future flooding. This work includes:
- Flood doors/gates obtained for fitting to all the external doors of the property
 - The foul and surface water drainage system to be surveyed so that non-return valves can be fitted to the individual drainage runs where backing up of water/sewage in the pipe work may enter the property
 - Covers should be provided to all vents passing through external walls to prevent water entering the property
- 4.11.5 The total cost of this flood mitigation work is around £20 - 30K.
- 4.11.6 Ravensfield lost its electric power supply during the floods due to a submerged substation. Work to reconfigure the electrical supply in the home to accept a plug in generator could be delivered to meet emergency requirements. However to provide an industrial generator fit for the task would best be achieved through a contract with a generator supplier which provide the facility on demand rather than as a permanent fixture. While this could be done contractually, supply would be on the basis of a flood warning and it is therefore conceivable that generator supply in an emerging flood situation might not materialise. The anticipated cost of this work and an annual supply agreement is around £3-4k.
- 4.11.7 This work will be of some assistance but does not address the fundamental issue that the site is prone to flooding. Whilst it is possible to limit water ingress, access to the site is lost, thus making changes to staff and the provision of emergency medical care extremely difficult. As has been previously noted, any decision about evacuation needs to be undertaken at an early stage, well before road access to the building is lost.

4.12 Ravensfield Residents:

4.12.1 The twenty two residents who were living at Ravensfield were evacuated on 19 November 2009 to other Cumbria Care homes in Penrith or West Cumbria. Since then the situation has changed through a combination of reasons outlined in the table below. The table also draws out the outcome of an informal preference exercise asking residents / family members what they would wish to do while the way forward for Ravensfield was being considered.

Current situation / expressed preference	Number of residents
Already opted to remain in temporary locations permanently or have transferred to alternative permanent locations	5
Wish to return to Ravensfield – no other preference	5
Move to an alternative home or stay in current home but would wish to consider returning to Ravensfield if / when it re opens	3
Seeking a permanent transfer elsewhere	1
No preference expressed	4
Resident has died	4

4.12.2 Alternative provision by the independent sector is available in Keswick, Cockermouth and Penrith. **4.13 Ravensfield Staff:**

4.13.1 There are currently 29 Cumbria Care employees at Ravensfield. This consists of 1 manager (temporary appointment), 20 support workers, 4 supervisors and 4 ancillaries.

4.13.2 Redeployment opportunities have been made available to all staff whilst the home has not been re-occupied. Subject to consultation, if a decision to close Ravensfield being made permanent offers of redeployment could be made with little to no recourse to redundancy.

4.13.3 The majority of employees at Ravensfield travel to work from outside the local Keswick area and have not been adversely affected by the closure.

4.13.4 It has become increasingly difficult to recruit care staff in the Keswick area. There were several staff vacancies at the time of the closure, including a vacancy for the home manager.

4.14 Local Service Provision and Need:

4.14.1 Older people across Cumbria have told us that what they want is to be given the level and type of support that allows them to retain their independence and remain in their own homes and services are being developed to respond to this. A night-time high level domiciliary care service has been set up in Keswick which is helping people to remain living at home. In the period since Ravensfield was evacuated, it has been possible to continue to meet the long term needs of local people through a combination of care in people's own homes and use of other residential provision in the area.

4.14.2 The service provision in the area is outlined below:

Type of Service	Care and Support Provision	Provider	No of Beds/Units
Ravensfield	Residential Care Home	Cumbria Care	30
The Millfield Care Home, Penrith Road	Residential Care Home	Independent Provider	28
Nether Place, Chestnut Hill	Nursing Home	Independent Provider	32
Home Care	Home care	Cumbria Care, Applegarth Eden Country Care	Spot purchased as required
Generic Domiciliary Care – Night Service	Home care with basic nursing tasks	Applegarth	45.15 hours per week
Lakehead Court, The Headlands	Sheltered Housing	Anchor Retirement (Housing Association)	33
Derwent Close	Housing for over 55s (in development)	Derwent & Solway Housing Association	26
Potential Extra Care Housing Scheme (in early stages of development)	Extra Care Housing	Derwent & Solway Housing Association	40

- 4.14.3 A local housing association has prioritised the development of a 40 bed extra care scheme in Keswick and a bid for capital funding from the Homes and Communities Agency is being submitted later in the summer. Extra care housing offers more independence, a range of on site activities, higher space standards and a modern environment for residents. With the provision of on site 24/7 care teams and the use of assistive technology, it is possible for extra care housing to offer a real alternative to residential care. The development of this scheme will provide more choice to local people long term and contribute to the local housing need.
- 4.14.4 The view of adult social care commissioners is that the need for residential care in Keswick is likely to be met by the existing independent care homes in Keswick and the Cumbria Care home in Penrith. Residential care for people with dementia is available within Cumbria Care's Greengarth residential care home at Penrith or Richmond Park in Workington. There is currently several vacancies within one of the care homes in Keswick and an independent sector provider has recently opened a new build 60 bed nursing home in Cockermouth. Capacity will be sufficient in the area if Ravensfield remains closed and, indeed, it could be considered that there was excess capacity given the under-occupancy of Ravensfield (8 vacancies at the time of evacuation) and the continued ability to meet people's needs since November 2009.
- 4.14.5 The Council's commissioning plans for older people, based on feedback from older people themselves, see a reduction in residential care due to the growth of homecare services and alternative accommodation based services, such as extra care which enable people to live at home for as long as possible. There was a reduction in demand for residential care at Ravensfield over the last six months prior to evacuation to an occupancy rate of 83.3% in early November. The occupancy rate at the time of evacuation was 73.3% (22 residents out of a capacity of 30).
- 4.14.6 Cabinet and full Council have previously acknowledged that changes in legislation and the frailty of older people now entering care has resulted in the Cumbria Care buildings used for residential care no longer being fit for purpose. The buildings are not conducive to providing high quality care given small room sizes, a lack of ensuite bathroom facilities and the growing dependency of older people. The small rooms creates problems for wheelchair users, people who use walking frames and in the use of hoisting equipment. As generational expectations increase occupancy at Ravensfield is likely to reduce further as people opt for modern facilities with the dignity offered by ensuite facilities and good sized accommodation.

4.15 Options for the Future of Each Home

- 4.15.1 This section considers choices that the Council has with regard to the future of the three residential care homes that are at risk of flooding.
- 4.15.2 The Abbey, Staveley – Based on an assessment of the moderate risk of flooding and the fact that current contingency arrangements avoid the need to evacuate residents, the recommended option is for this home to remain open and for the future risk of flooding to be monitored.
The pros and cons of this option are:

Pros	Cons
Low risk of evacuation of residents and the disruption caused by a planned closure is avoided.	There remains a risk of flooding in the cellar
No flood prevention investment costs to the Council as the cellar pump has been upgraded.	There is a low risk of needing to evacuate residents.
Cumbria Care continues to provide a service in Staveley.	Staffing and other cost issues remain.
There is no disruption caused by closing a home.	Does not contribute to any future modernisation plans.

Risks: Moderate risk of flooding and low risk of subsequent evacuation.

Cost: Nil.

Timescale: N/A

- 4.15.3 Edenside, Appleby – Based on an assessment of the moderate risk of flooding and the low likelihood of evacuation of residents, the option recommended for this home is to remain open and for the future risk of flooding to be monitored.

The pros and cons of this option are:

Pros	Cons
Low risk of evacuation of residents and residents can be moved upstairs as a precaution. The disruption caused by a planned closure is avoided.	There remains a risk of flooding in the local area and due to the location of the home it can be surrounded by water.
No flood prevention investment costs to the Council.	The isolation of the home in instances of severe flooding makes access to the home difficult potentially causing difficulties in services accessing the home.
Cumbria Care continues to provide a service in Appleby.	The location of the home in instances of flooding means any future evacuation would be difficult due to road access.
There is no disruption caused by closing a home.	Staffing and other cost issues remain.
The Environment Agency has already carried out flood defence work in Appleby.	Does not contribute to any future modernisation plans.

Risks: Moderate risk of flooding and low risk of subsequent evacuation.

Cost: Nil.

Timescale: NA.

- 4.15.4 This section considers choices that the Council has with regard to the future of Ravensfield residential care home given an assessment of the significant risk of flooding and the lack of contingency other than evacuation. The options include:

4.15.5 Option 1: Reopen Ravenfield without investment

The pros and cons of this option are:

Pros	Cons
Those residents who wish to return are able to return to a familiar environment if they are able	Residents and staff placed at risk in the event of future flooding and a decision to not evacuate.
No flood prevention investment costs to the Council	Residents, staff and emergency services personnel placed at risk in the event of future flooding and a decision to evacuate.
Cumbria Care continues to provide a residential service in Keswick until the building is deemed not to be able to meet residents needs due to dated design.	Does not contribute to any future modernisation plans
	Failure in Council's duty of care.
	All residents will need to be moved from current homes back to Keswick which involves further health risk.

Risks: High. Reopening the home without any flood proofing will put residents at risk of future evacuation. The home is on a flood plain and future risk will remain. The building layout precludes any practicable contingency other than evacuation.

Cost: Nil. However, this option will miss the opportunity to redirect revenue costs to other providers and utilise capacity in other Cumbria Care homes.

Timescale: The home can be re-occupied quickly

4.15.6 Option 2: Cumbria County Council to invest in minimal flood defence work to further protect building and re-occupy

The pros and cons of this option are:

Pros	Cons
Ravenfield can reopen	Residents and staff still potentially placed at risk in the event of a flood and a decision to remain.
	Residents, staff and emergency services personnel still placed at risk in the event of a flood and evacuation being required.
Residents can return to Keswick if they wish and are able	Cost to the Council of approx £20 - 30,000
	Does not contribute to any future modernisation plans
Cumbria Care continues to provide a residential service in	With current vacancies in other Cumbria Care homes and other

Keswick until the building is deemed not to be able to meet residents needs due to dated design.	provision in Keswick, there would be excess capacity.
	Council would not have fully discharged duty of care
	All residents will need to be moved from current homes back to Keswick which involves further health risk.

Risks: Medium. Investment may enable residents to remain at Ravensfield in the event of any future flooding but it is likely that a decision to evacuate would still be required as the building is designed with bedrooms on the upper floor (no living space unlike other Cumbria Care homes). Scope to evacuate to the upper floor in the event of water entering the building is therefore nil.

Cost: £20,000.

Timescale: Approximately three months.

4.15.7 Option 3: Consult on the potential closure of Ravensfield

The pros and cons of this option are:

Pros	Cons
No ongoing risk to residents, staff and emergency services personnel from future evacuations	Public concerns
No ongoing risk to residents and residents from flooding	Residents unable to return to Ravensfield if they still wish to
Investment in flood defence work not required	Inconvenience to family members of existing residents who live in Keswick
Removes uncertainty and allows residents to remain in their new home or transfer to other homes closer to family	No Cumbria Care residential provision in Keswick
Resolves need for future closure as the service becomes increasingly unable to meet the needs of future residents	
Some residents could access alternative independent sector provision in the area	
Council fully discharges duty of care in relation to flood risks	

Risk: Small. The Council's duty to protect vulnerable people and to minimise their exposure to foreseeable risk is fully discharged.

Cost: The average weekly cost per bed for a resident in Ravensfield (based on 95% occupancy) is £436 which is comparable to the average weekly cost per bed in the Independent Sector of £432. Assuming that the same number of residents will be supported in the

future there is therefore, no material efficiency that is derived from closing Ravensfield.

The costs associated with securing and maintenance of the site are estimated to be £5-10k per month. In addition, no costs for flood proofing the site would be required.

Timescale: Approximately six months.

5.0 OPTIONS

- 5.1 That Cabinet approves the recommendations.
- 5.2 That Cabinet suggests specific revisions to the recommendations.
- 5.3 That Cabinet rejects the recommendations.

6.0 RESOURCE AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATION

- 6.1 In the event that following consultation Cabinet decide to close Ravensfield there will be no material savings (dependent on the long term occupation rates of Ravensfield) because the cost differential of placing residents in the Independent Sector compared with Ravensfield is minimal based on 95% occupancy levels. This is based on the assumption that the same planned number of residents will continue to receive residential care in this locality. Additional costs associated with flood proofing will be avoided
- 6.2 Vacancies have been reduced by utilising capacity in other Cumbria Care homes which is a more efficient use of resources.
- 6.3 No redundancy costs anticipated at this time because the staff have been re-deployed onto other duties.
- 6.4 There would be some costs associated with securing the site which is estimated at £5-10k per month. There will be a capital receipt.

7.0 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 7.1 Proposals to close existing care homes should involve consultation with those affected by it. Correct consultation processes should be followed as failure to do so will expose the County Council to a high risk of legal challenge.
- 7.2 The principles of the "Coughlan" legal case apply when closing care homes. This case states that where residents have a legitimate expectation that care will be provided from a particular home, the authority must be clear that other factors outweigh this legitimate expectation in any decision to close that particular home. The consultation process should allow any such legitimate expectation to be identified.

The Council should ensure that its consultation meets the following criteria:

- To be proper, consultation must be undertaken at a time when proposals are at a formative stage
- Must include sufficient reasons for particular proposals to allow those consulted to give intelligent consideration and intelligent response
- Adequate time must be given for this purpose
- The product of consultation must be conscientiously taken into account when ultimate decisions are taken.

7.3 Consultation at a formative stage would normally occur as the Council takes an early view of options and seeks to obtain input to those deliberations from those individuals and communities affected. In this case the home has been vacated due to the flood related evacuation but the consultation remains at a formative stage because reopening is an option but those being consulted will need to be given information which identifies the significance of the flood risk in that consultation and future decisions taken.

7.4 The car park at the front of the building is currently leased. The building and site the building is situated on are owned by Cumbria County Council. There are no restrictions in the title documents that would prevent the Council selling this land.

7.5 If a person dies at Ravensfield, the Council may face prosecution under the Corporate Manslaughter and Corporate Homicide Act 2007 if it can be proved that all of the following apply:

7.5.1 The way in which the Council's activities are managed or organised caused the person's death

7.5.2 The person's death was the result of a gross breach of a duty of care owed to that person

7.5.3 The way in which senior management managed or organised the Council's activities is a substantial element of the breach

7.6 The Act sets out certain factors that a jury **must** take into account when deciding whether an organisation is guilty of an offence, namely:

- Whether the organisation was in breach of health and safety legislation.
- How serious the management failure was.
- How much of a risk there was of death occurring.

It also sets out a non-exhaustive list of factors that a jury must take into account, including any health and safety guidance relating to the breach and whether there was any attitudes, policies, systems or accepted practices in the organisation that were likely to have encouraged a management failure.

7.7 If convicted of the offence, the Council could face an unlimited fine, a remedial order requiring it to remedy the management failure that caused the death, and/or an order requiring it to publicise the conviction.

Under health and safety legislation, the Council is responsible for ensuring the health and safety of its employees and those that are affected by their activities so far as reasonably practicable and must assess and review the work-related risks faced by its employees and by others affected by the company's activities. This risk assessment must be "sufficient and suitable". The Council must also make and give effect to appropriate arrangements for the effective planning, organisation, control, monitoring and review of the preventive and protective measures.

7.8 In the light of the above, the Council will need to consider these risks as part of its decision making on closure.

8.0 CONCLUSION

8.1 Flooding presents a significant risk to residents of care homes. There are three Cumbria Care homes where this risk applies. In the case of two of them, the balance of probability and consequence means that whilst closure would further reduce risk to the residents and therefore the Council, this course of action is not indicated by the current level of risk. In the case of the third, the continued risk of flooding, even in the event of future flood defences being implemented, coupled with the consequences, places residents at continued risk. The inherent design and location of the building means that there are limitations on the minimisation and mitigation that can be achieved.

Cabinet is requested to consider the proposal to consult on the proposed closure of Ravenfield residential care home in Keswick due to the risk to residents and staff of future flooding and the availability of alternative provision as utilised since November 2009.

Richard Parry
Corporate Director – Adult and Local Services

25 May 2010

Formatted: No underline

APPENDICES

Appendix 1 – maps

Appendix 2- independent risk assessment

Executive Decision	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes*	<input type="checkbox"/>
Key Decision	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
If a Key Decision, is the proposal published in the current Forward Plan?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is the decision exempt from call-in on grounds of urgency?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> No*
If exempt from call-in, has the agreement of the Chair of the relevant Overview and Scrutiny Committee been sought or obtained?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A*
Has this matter been considered by Overview and Scrutiny? If so, give details below.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> No*
Has an environmental or sustainability impact assessment been undertaken?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> No*
Has an equality impact assessment been undertaken?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> No*

N.B. *If an executive decision is made, then a decision cannot be implemented until the expiry of the eighth working day after the date of the meeting – unless the decision is urgent and exempt from call-in and the Head of Member Services and Scrutiny has obtained the necessary approvals.*

PREVIOUS RELEVANT COUNCIL OR EXECUTIVE DECISIONS
[including Local Committees]

No previous decisions

CONSIDERATION BY OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY

Not considered by Overview and Scrutiny

BACKGROUND PAPERS

No background papers

RESPONSIBLE CABINET MEMBER

Councillor James Airey, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care

REPORT AUTHOR

Contact: Richard Parry, 01228 227110, richard.parry@cumbriacc.gov.uk.