

Cabinet

12th September 2012



**Report on a Review of County Durham
Care & Support Day Services and
recommendations on a redesign of these
services**

Report of Corporate Management Team

Rachael Shimmin, Director of Children and Adults Services

Councillor Morris Nicholls, Portfolio Holder, Adult Care

Purpose of the Report

- 1 To present findings following the review of County Durham Care & Support (CDCS) in house day services;
- 2 To report the outcome of a consultation on a proposed re-design and reconfiguration;
- 3 To make recommendations in light of the need to: make services more inclusive; ensure value for money; and meet the requirements of the Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP).

Background

- 4 Day services in County Durham provide care and support to a wide range of service users. The total 2012/13 budget for day services across all service user groups in County Durham is £17.04m. This provides day services for 3,787 people, based on the numbers of people receiving a day service over the course of the 2011/12 financial year. Based on the most recently available Institute of Public Finance figures, Durham spends £52 per head of population on day care compared to a national average spend of £34 per head.
- 5 The total budget for in house day services is £7.6m. The total budget for independent sector day services is £9.44m, including Direct Payment provisions. The average unit costs for learning disabilities day services are 45% higher than comparable costs in the independent sector. The average unit costs for older persons / physical disabilities day services are 127% higher than comparable costs in the independent sector.
- 6 The Council needs to ensure that services are commissioned which:
 - Are delivered in appropriate venues which are fit for purpose and able to meet the needs of users.
 - Ensure value for money and improve choice and control over services, in line with the Personalisation agenda.

- Meet the changing needs and expectations both of existing service users and younger people coming into adult services.
- 7 Changes in demand and occupancy and the need to secure value for money, while meeting MTFP requirements, have prompted a review of CDCS day services. The review has focused on a number of factors including occupancy, value for money, the suitability of buildings and carer and service user views.
 - 8 CDCS day services are currently delivered in two ways, in large purpose built day centre buildings (10 services), and in a range of smaller services such as factory units, shops or community venues (18 services). Large day centres deliver services to both older people / those with physical disabilities and to people with a learning disability:

Large Day Centres - OP/PD

Peterlee Day Centre

Stanley Day Centre

Spennymoor Day Centre

Empower 2 (Chester-le-Street)

Abbey Day Centre (Pity Me)

Bede Day Centre (Barnard Castle)

Large Day Centres - LD

Shinwell Centre (Peterlee)

Oaks Centre (Newton Aycliffe)

Durham Centre (Aykley Heads)

Aucklandgate Centre (B Auckland)

Appendix 2 describes the current services in more detail.

Medium Term Financial Plan

- 9 The Council is forecasting the need to deliver £159.2m of cash savings for the five year period 2011/12 to 2015/16, and savings of approximately £180m when including forecasts for 2016/17. The Adult Social Care element of those savings determined to date totals £46.2m.
- 10 The MTFP requires the Council to, where possible, make savings against back office costs rather than front line services, and through securing services that represent good value for money.
- 11 If the changes to CDCS day services recommended in this report are agreed and subsequently implemented it will enable ASC to make savings by reducing capacity which is not needed, and to avoid significant future costs maintaining and upgrading unsuitable buildings. Importantly those assessed as needing day services will continue to receive them, in the main alongside the same peer group and staff teams as now. The main changes proposed here are to venues, with current care plans remaining the same and arrangements for transport etc. being adjusted to take venue changes into account. This will allow the service to make revenue savings of over £446,000 p.a. and to avoid significant capital expenditure.

Review Findings

Demand for Day Services

- 12 This review has identified that demand for day services is falling across all service user groups. Between 1st April 2010 and 1st June 2012 the number of

service users in receipt of a day service overall (independent sector and CDCS) has fallen by 25%. In CDCS, large day centres in particular have seen significant reductions in occupancy and are operating with large amounts of spare capacity. For an average week in quarter 4 2011/12, occupancy was running at below 50% in 5 of the 10 large day centres. There are a number of interacting factors which have contributed to the reduction of demand for day care. They include: the more consistent application of eligibility criteria including eligibility for transport; charging; personalisation; and the changing expectations of service users, in particular younger people and their families. Risk assessments are in place for service users who choose to discontinue or reduce their attendance at day services. Care Management staff monitor such cases in order to take remedial action if service users become more vulnerable.

- 13 The high levels of spare capacity in the service have allowed for some service efficiencies to be made, including reductions in staff numbers. These efficiencies have contributed to the MTFP target for In House Provider Review but further efficiencies are not possible without rationalising services and buildings.

Unit Cost Comparison

- 14 Unit costs for CDCS day services, both OP/PD and LD, are high in comparison to independent sector provision:

- CDCS OP / PD - £77.02 full day (Independent Sector £33.86)
- CDCS LD – £69.00 full day (Independent Sector £47.41)

The high unit costs are partly a result of under use of the services

DCC Buildings

- 15 In most cases, large day centres were built several decades ago and are expensive services to run, in terms of both utility costs and ongoing repairs and maintenance. In addition, such centres are often also situated away from community activity, for example in industrial or business park locations. They were established in a time before direct payments, and the development of the independent sector, when most people received council run building based services.
- 16 Some investment has taken place in the buildings over recent years and consequently some premises are considered generally fit for purpose for the future, such as Empower 2 and Aucklandgate, for example. Investment has been limited to essential maintenance in the remaining buildings, and a number are in a poor state of repair. This is particularly apparent in LD services.
- 17 A full condition assessment survey (future repairs and maintenance liabilities and accessibility of buildings) of the current building stock has been undertaken by CIPFA Property, commissioned through DCC Assets team, for the large LD and PDSI buildings. The defects and repairs identified have been prioritised, using a 'traffic light' system, and costed using industry standard rates. More detail is set out in Appendix 3.
- 18 The cost to bring premises up to an acceptable standard is **£4.69m** over the next 10 years, with priority works over the next 4 years of **£2.76m**. Even with this level of investment, these facilities would not be fit for future need as they are large, old fashioned institutions that do not support a modern, person centred approach

to care. Further analysis for each building is shown in Appendix 5 (property scorecards).

Proposals for the future

- 19 To meet the problems of: decreasing population demand; the cost of bringing buildings up to an acceptable standard; and the need to be more community inclusive and improve value for money; CDC&S has developed plans to reduce the number of its delivery sites.
- 20 Detailed proposals for the current stock of large LD and OP/PDSI buildings are set out below. In Peterlee and Durham this work will involve the integration of existing DCC sites. In Spennymoor, Stanley and Newton Aycliffe, community based accommodation / venue opportunities have been identified in local leisure centres, which would allow services to move from unsuitable buildings within 12 months. Service users and staff will move to the new locations.
- 21 A total of 455 service users would be affected by the changes proposed (235 older people / people with physical disabilities and 220 people with a learning disability).
- 22 Detailed proposals for each site are as follows:
 - Shinwell Centre closes and service transfers to Peterlee Day Centre
 - Stanley Day Centre closes and service transfers to Louisa Centre
 - Durham Centre closes and service transfers to Abbey Day Centre
 - Spennymoor Day Centre closes and service transfers to Spennymoor Leisure Centre
 - Oaks Centre closes and service transfers to Newton Aycliffe Leisure Centre.

Properties surplus to the Council's requirements would be placed on the open market for sale.

Staff Savings

- 23 As well as significant building cost avoidance being achieved through this approach, further savings will be realised by considering the business case for voluntary ER/VR expressions of interest. This proposed redesign of CDC&S Day Services within the identified venues will be linked to the 2013/14 MTFP in respect of Management & Support Services / Service Rationalisation. Earlier work related to ER/VR has identified staff members who are interested in this opportunity. No compulsory redundancies will be required.

Integration of Services

- 24 Service user client groups (i.e. OP / PDSI and LD) will mix in service delivery locations where, in the past, they have mainly received their service in separate buildings. CDC&S staff would manage this harmonisation carefully with a staged approach to the transition being put in place, giving service users time to adapt to the changes. Some work has been done in services over recent years to integrate service users from differing client groups, with joint activities and limited sharing of venues being introduced. CDC&S staff are experienced in this type of

work and would use their knowledge to ensure a sensitive transition for all service users.

- 25 Capacity information for the sites to be harmonised shows that the revised service delivery locations have the capacity to meet the needs of the increased number of service users who will be attending.

Projected Savings

- 26 ASC will save a total of £446k per annum by consolidating day service buildings. These figures are based on working estimates from CDCS management from individuals who have indicated an informal interest in ER/VR and net savings in building costs once rents of new premises are taken into account.
- 27 Completion date for the redesign of day services would be autumn 2013 (dependent upon completion of building alterations). Savings to be taken in financial year 2013 -14 subject to completion dates for individual sites. See Appendix 4 for details of savings for each centre.

Consultation

- 28 Clearly these changes will have an impact on people who use the services and raise concerns for some of these people and their families. The proposals to amalgamate and relocate some services have been the subject of a consultation exercise. The consultation was carried out from 17th May 2012 to 29th June 2012 (For technical reasons it was extended for a week for a small group of service users at the Oaks Centre). The consultation was targeted at service users and carers at affected day services; both those who might move and those currently using services which would change as a result of integration.

Methodology

- 29 The main method of collecting views was via questionnaires. A protocol endorsed by the Learning Disabilities Partnership Board was followed which recommended that service users with a learning disability were contacted via their carers. OP/PD service users were contacted directly. A total of 455 questionnaires were sent out to service users. In addition, staff at affected day centres were informed that they were able to take part in the consultation and could give their views via a questionnaire, or through email response depending on their preference. Two questionnaires were received from informal staff groups, one from Spennymoor Day Centre and one from Peterlee Day Centre, although individual staff involved in completing the questionnaires did not identify themselves. Issues raised in these questionnaires were similar to those identified by service users and carers, which are set out below. One individual member of staff from Spennymoor Day Centre also replied to the consultation via email and, again, raised issues consistent with those raised by service users and carers.
- 30 Questionnaires were accompanied by information explaining the proposals (see Appendix 7). A total of 233 questionnaires were completed and returned, just over 51% (99 responses came from service users and 124 from carers).
- 31 Dedicated advocacy support was offered, through Durham Citizens Advice Bureau, to those taking part in the consultation.
- 32 Consultation drop-in sessions were arranged at each of the affected day services allowing service users and carers to discuss the proposals and receive

assistance with completing questionnaires. Further sessions were arranged on request at a number of centres, and ASC staff attended carer meetings and coffee mornings to discuss proposals, where requested.

Key Messages from Consultation

33 The following is a summary of responses received during the consultation. The questionnaire used in the consultation is attached at Appendix 7. A full consultation report is available in the Members library.

Facilities / Activities

34 The most common concern related to activities and facilities. 35 separate statements concerning facilities and activities were contained within the total number of returned questionnaires. The majority of concerns were raised in respect of those services which are proposed to move to Leisure Centre facilities. Examples include:

- concerns that activities will be reduced or restricted by having less space or fewer staff.
- a need to ensure that more specialised facilities such as Snoezalam rooms are available.
- the need for quiet or private areas for service users to spend time away from main day centre activities.
- Loss of a specialised gym (Spennymoor only) and training kitchens.

Service User Needs

35 A total of 26 separate comments related to difficulty with changes to routine while 25 separate comments addressed the need for smooth transition arrangements to be put in place. Many of these views were expressed by carers rather than by service users themselves with the majority coming from carers of people with a learning disability.

36 Some service users and carers made reference to being anxious about the potential changes and expressed a desire to see day services remain as they are. There is a significant level of trust in the current services and positive comments have been made about the buildings, staff knowledge and skills and the friendships individuals have made.

Alternative Proposals

37 63 respondents made suggestions on alternative ways in which the Council might make day services more effective whilst providing good quality services. Comments ranged from investing in existing buildings and services rather than making the changes proposed, bringing other service users and groups into existing centres to increase their use and reversing the effect that charging for day services has had since its introduction.

Meals

38 A total of 25 separate comments were made in the questionnaires regarding the proposals to make alternative arrangements for the provision of meals, where services are proposed to move to leisure centres. Where services are

integrating within existing day services, arrangements for the delivery of meals will remain the same.

- 39 The existing services at Stanley , Spennymoor and Newton Aycliffe provide cooked hot meals on the premises for which service users pay £2.75 per meal. A significant number of service users and carers were anxious that they would not be able to access a hot meal if the proposed changes are made. Some individuals have commented that this provision is the only opportunity the service user has to receive a hot meal. Some responses expressed concern that the cost of hot meals in the leisure centres – where available – would be more expensive.

Safety, Security and Suitability of Venues

- 40 A total of 10 separate comments were recorded regarding car parking / transport arrangements, while 9 comments addressed concerns regarding the safety of service users. In addition, 4 questionnaires referred to concern about protecting privacy and dignity in public buildings. Each of these comments was made in respect of proposals to use Leisure Centre venues for the delivery of day services.

Positive Comments

- 41 There were 13 positive comments made about the proposed changes, with some service users and carers welcoming the new opportunities they expect to be offered if the proposed changes are made, and / or wishing to be more active in their local communities. Some comments were also made expressing understanding of the Council's financial position and the need to review the way in which services are delivered.

Managing Change

- 42 This section describes steps which would be taken to address the concerns identified through the consultation, should the decision be taken to go ahead with the proposed changes.

Facilities / Activities

- 43 CDCS would ensure that activities such as art, IT and craft work are maintained and service users would be given equal opportunities to participate in the activities which they enjoy currently. Proposed new service delivery venues have been assessed to ensure they have appropriate space to host the facilities and activities currently being accessed. Staff teams would amalgamate in revised venues, meaning enough staff would still be available.
- 44 The integration of services would give service users an opportunity to access activities which are currently not available at their day service, either through accessing a new day centre with different facilities or taking advantage of the wider opportunities available in leisure centres where such moves are proposed. Some day services are already located within leisure centres and service users are able to access facilities such as indoor sports and dance rooms.
- 45 Specialist activities, such as Snoezalam rooms would transfer from existing service delivery venues. Plans for relocated services have taken these needs into account including the provision of specialist gym equipment in one centre and activity kitchens.

46 CDCS are conscious of the need to maintain quieter or more private areas in day services and have taken this into account when planning moves. Potential quiet areas have been identified in the redesigned services and Leisure Centre managers have also expressed a willingness to offer further facilities in the wider leisure centres where required. Future developments will take into account the needs of different service user groups, with individuals and groups being able to access a range of environments within the service which suit their both their needs and the activities on offer.

Service User Needs

47 CDCS staff have extensive previous experience both of moving service delivery venues and integrating service users into new facilities / services. Staff would adopt a sensitive approach to such moves and manage changes effectively.

48 Careful transition arrangements would be put in place, with service users given time to adjust to the proposed move. A transitional phase would be built into timescale plans, with service users, particularly those with a learning disability, being introduced to new venues slowly. Support would be available from care management staff and advocacy services, in addition to that offered by CDCS staff.

49 Staff teams currently in place in existing day services would be retained and staff, with the exception of those who express an interest in ER / VR opportunities, would transfer to the new services and remain available to provide care and support to the service users whom they work with currently.

50 Service users would transfer to new, integrated services, with no changes being made to existing care plans. Current service user friendships would therefore be maintained as service users would be able to continue attending day services with their current peer group.

Meals

51 In many independent sector, and smaller CDCS, day services, meals are not offered as a matter of course to service users.

52 Alternative proposals for service users attending services based in leisure centres have been explored. A wider range of options would be available in the new venues offering service users greater independence and choice. Service users will be able to choose from:

- bringing a packed lunch; including using microwaves to heat food brought in by service users and using the centres activity kitchens to assist in basic meal preparation
- accessing local food / café facilities close to the centres
- Accessing café's situated in leisure centres
- Ordering a hot meal which will be brought into the centre

53 Staff will assist service users in accessing alternative meal arrangements. Where people have special dietary needs, they will be met. They will also continue to assist people with eating where required, including cutting up food and ensuring that service users remain safe. The spaces available in the leisure centres will include staffed eating areas.

Safety, Security and Suitability of Venues

- 54 Some carers expressed anxiety about the safety of those for whom they care and some service users themselves commented on the need to be safe and have privacy if the proposed redesign goes ahead.
- 55 Though several of the proposed new services are located in leisure centres, day services will continue to have their own, private space which is separate to the areas accessed by the general public. Facilities such as changing places and assisted toilets will be carefully designed to maintain dignity and staff will continue to offer a high standard of care and support.
- 56 Previous examples of learning disability day services which have integrated into leisure centres, i.e. Silver Street in Spennymoor and the Shannon Group at the Louisa Centre, have proved very successful and CDCS staff would use their experience of establishing such services to successfully redesign the services described in this report. Risk assessments and appropriate controls would be put in place for all activity which may present a risk to service users accessing integrated services.
- 57 ASC staff are working with colleagues in Sport and Leisure and Direct Services and will make necessary adjustments to transport drop-off and parking arrangements to ensure that service users are able to access their day service venue safely and easily. For example, arrangements would be made for alternative entrances to leisure centres to be brought into use, improvements to ramps and new hand rails will be put in place.

Equality Act 2010

- 58 DCC is committed to its responsibilities under the Equality Act and recognises it has the following duties:
- Eliminating unlawful discrimination & harassment;
 - Advancing equality of opportunity;
 - Promoting good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.
- 59 An Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) has been undertaken to identify any potential negative consequences from proposed changes to day services, and to mitigate against these. The full EIA is at Appendix 6 of this report and it sets out the specific steps that have and may be undertaken to ensure the Council complies with the above duties should the recommendations in this report be agreed. The mitigating actions are summarised in the paragraph below.
- 60 The EIA has identified the main impacts that would arise from the redesign of CDC&S day services, and also the mitigating factors that could be put in place to reduce any negative impact. Examples are set out below and they indicate that there are potential impacts which would need to be managed in any transitional arrangements:

- There are more female than male service users identifying an effect from the proposals and the population is predominantly older;
- Some service users may be more likely to become anxious due to their disability, particularly those with a learning disability, and will need time and careful transition planning to adjust to change;
- More community based facilities could lead to service users being able to more easily access community facilities, therefore having a positive impact on their health and wellbeing;
- Staff whom have protected characteristics may be impacted by the proposals.

61 If the decision is taken to close day service buildings, any users of those services would continue to have their assessed needs met. This would mean transferring to a different venue. There would be sufficient places available to meet the needs of people. Durham County Council would make any transition as smooth as possible and ensure that integrated services were fully aware of care and health needs, personal preferences and any other important factors. Where required service users would be introduced gradually to a new service to help them with the change process. Service users will also be offered the opportunity to choose a different type of service, by using Direct Payments for example.

Conclusion

- 62 The consultation on the redesign of CDCS day services has identified that a significant minority of service users believe that the changes proposed would have a negative impact on them (23.1% thought the impact would be major and a further 14.9% thought it would be minor) . Their concerns focus largely on the suitability of the alternative premises; changes to meals arrangements; and the difficulty of changing services for vulnerable people and affecting their established routine.
- 63 Adult Social Care staff have extensive experience and expertise in supporting vulnerable service users through change, and every effort would be made to minimise the effect on service users, for example by maintaining existing care plans, retaining service user groups and staff teams, making proposed moves over short distances and adjusting transport arrangements and carefully designing proposed integrated services to deliver increased choice in activities and facilities to users.
- 64 Savings of £446k could be made on staffing and property costs by redesigning CDCS day services, and moving some service delivery venues. In addition, a total of £2.497m future revenue cost (repairs, maintenance and accessibility) could be avoided by rationalising building stock. Unless the service is permitted to rationalise its services and buildings, it is likely to continue to offer poor value for money.

Recommendations

- 65 Cabinet is asked to agree to:
- The implementation of the redesign of CDCS day services.
 - Note that further work will be carried out to monitor the changing picture on demand, attendance, staffing requirements and building stock. As the market

changes, further reviews of the viability of in house day services will be undertaken and, as required, detailed proposals will be developed to ensure that CDC&S day services are fit for purpose, represent value for money and are able to fulfil their strategic objectives.

Contact: Nick Whitton, Head of Commissioning

Tel: 0191 383 4188

Appendix 1: Implications

Finance – Implementation of the proposed changes will contribute to the MTFP in 2013/14.

Staffing – Consideration will be given to ER/VR applications within CDC&S if these proposals are approved.

Risk – A move of service involves a variety of risks. Any moves will be subject to detailed risk assessments.

Equality and Diversity / Public Sector Equality Duty – EQIA has been completed with regard to the proposals in this report.

Accommodation - There will be accommodation issues as staff and service users will be moving to new sites. The asset management team have been fully involved in the development of these proposals.

Crime and Disorder – N/A

Human Rights - This has been taken into account as part of the EQIA.

Consultation - Targeted consultation has been undertaken on the proposals.

Procurement – N/A.

Disability Issues - Included in the EQIA

Legal Implications – ER / VR issues will be considered with HR / legal services. Legal services advised on various aspects of the development of the consultation.

Appendix 2 – Overview of Current Service Provision

LD Services		
Location	Large Buildings	Smaller Units
Durham & Chester-le-street	Durham Centre Empower 2	Bullion Hall Pelton Fell Community Centre
Derwentside		Louisa Centre (Hill View & Valley View) The Local Company Ebony Woodwork Gap Gardeners Annfield Plain Resource Centre
Easington	Shinwell	Woodhouse Park Gardens Bracken Hill Woodwork Unit
Sedgefield	Oaks	Silver Street PACE Shop FADD
Wear Valley & Dales	Auckland Gate	Wear Valley Centre Harmire Proudfoot Drive

OP/PD Services		
Durham & Chester-le-Street	Abbey Day Centre	
Derwentside	Stanley Day Centre	Percy Gardens
Easington	Peterlee Day Centre	
Sedgefield	Spennymoor Day Centre	
Wear Valley & Dales	Bede Day Centre	Stanhope Resource Centre Evenwood Outreach

Appendix 3 – Building Survey Findings

Defects and repairs identified in buildings surveys are given a priority grade (1 – 4) based on the following criteria:

Priority Grade	Description
Priority 1	Urgent work that will prevent immediate closure of premises and/or address an immediate high risk to the health and safety of occupants and/or remedy a serious breach of legislation.
Priority 2	Essential work required within two years that will prevent serious deterioration of the fabric or services and/or address a medium risk to the health and safety of occupants and/or remedy a less serious breach of legislation.
Priority 3	Desirable work required within three to five years that will prevent deterioration of the fabric or services and/or address a low risk to the health and safety of occupants and/or remedy a less serious breach of legislation.
Priority 4	Long-term work required outside the five year planning period that will prevent deterioration of the fabric or services.

Condition costs recorded in surveys are based on the 'like for like' replacement or renewal of existing building elements, and as such do not include any enhancements unless required to comply with current building standards and / or regulations.

Surveys cover a period of 10 years (2011 – 2020 inclusive) and costs also exclude any life-cycle replacement beyond 2020. Costs are based on the Schedule of Rates from the national price book guidelines and the BCIS (Building Cost Information Service) and also exclude costs such as professional fees, asbestos removal, upgraded standards (e.g. insulation requirements), environmental impacts etc. To account for these exclusions, it is customary to add 30% uplift to costs in surveys.

The table below provides an overview of the current status of the large LD and OP/PDSI buildings, based on traffic light indicators, as well as the costs highlighted by the surveys for each premises. Traffic light indicator criteria are as follows:

Green - Retain Property and Carry-out Continued Maintenance

Amber - Retain Property and Undertake Major Improvements or Explore Options for Better Utilisation

Red - Consider Closure and Possible Disposal if Surplus to Service Requirements

(if a property generates four or more red traffic lights following score-card analysis, then it should automatically be considered for closure/disposal)

Asset Score Card Analysis

Property	Fit for Purpose	Utilisation	Building Quality Condition	Building Quality Access	Running Cost	Environment Impact	Repairs & Maintenance Backlog	Access Backlog	Total – Repairs / Maintenance Accessibility	Priority Works* – Next 4 yrs
Bede Day centre	Red	Red	Red	Orange	Red	Red	£54,748	£12,515	£67,263	£41,728
Empower 2	Orange	Green	Red	Green	Red	Red	£128,064	£27,050	£155,114	£68,120
Auckland Gate centre	Orange	Green	Red	Green	Red	Red	£170,567	£27,000	£197,567	£106,095
Peterlee Day centre	Red	Red	Red	Green	Red	Red	£319,122	£9,515	£328,637	£192,830
Stanley Day centre	Red	Red	Red	Green	Red	Orange	£377,731	£11,630	£389,361	£219,838
Oaks centre	Red	Red	Red	Green	Red	Red	£382,250	£41,410	£423,660	£236,195
Abbey Day centre	Red	Red	Red	Green	Red	Red	£387,851	£26,370	£414,221	£224,378
Spennymoor Day centre	Red	Red	Red	Green	Red	Red	£500,726	£20,915	£521,641	£310,884
Durham centre	Red	Orange	Red	Green	Red	Red	£513,258	£27,240	£540,498	£341,738
Shinwell centre	Red	Orange	Red	Green	Red	Red	£596,851	£24,755	£621,606	£395,496
Total Repairs & Maintenance and Accessibility Need (£)									£3,659,568	£2,137,302
With 30% uplift applied to Repairs & Maintenance costs to account for asbestos removal, professional fees etc									£4,688,918	£2,759,860

* Priority grades 1, 2 and two thirds of Priority 3 costs.

Appendix 4 – Potential Savings by Day Service

Shinwell Centre	Saving	Stanley Day Centre	Saving	Durham Centre	Saving	Spennymoor Day Centre	Saving	Oaks Centre	Saving
Premises	£48k	Premises	£0	Premises	£38k	Premises	£0	Premises	£0k
Staff	£102k	Staff	£139k	Staff	£32k	Staff	£48k	Staff	£39k
Total	£150k	Total	£139k	Total	£70k	Total	£48k	Total	£39k
Cost Avoidance – Revenue & Maintenance	£622k	Cost Avoidance – Revenue & Maintenance	£389k	Cost Avoidance – Revenue & Maintenance	£540k	Cost Avoidance – Revenue & Maintenance	£522k	Cost Avoidance – Revenue & Maintenance	£424k

Totals – All Centres

All Centres	GRAND TOTAL
Premises	£86k
Staff	£360k
Total	£446k
Cost Avoidance – Revenue & Maintenance	£2.497m