

Care Home Modernisation Programme  
Alternative Options

	Option	Pros	Cons
1	Continue running the existing 7 homes, and revisit our strategy in light of the 're-wiring public services' programme	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opportunity to take stock and ensure that we do not rush into a Plan B that is not fully thought through/costed or understood and 'owned' by key stakeholders. Will need to learn all lessons from current procurement exercise.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Criticism likely for failure to deliver and lack of clarity about a Plan B.</li> <li>The overspend on running the existing care homes in 2013/14 was £654k.</li> </ul>
2	New procurement – different offer/deal. Would need to do more 'soft market testing' to gauge the market's interest/preferences, e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CYC to relinquish its requirement to retain ownership of the land/asset</li> <li>Take over running of the 7 EPHs with a view to re-providing in 2/3 new care homes</li> <li>CYC to gift sites?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Builds on work to date and retains hope off delivering the original vision, albeit with significant delay</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Affordability will still be <u>the</u> key issue</li> <li>Market confidence/interest may be affected by failure of current procurement</li> </ul>
3	Shift focus to Extra Care Housing as an alternative to Residential Care. Look to purchase all high threshold residential care from the private sector and invest heavily in Sheltered with Extra Care (SHEC) schemes – e.g. at Haxby, Windsor, Glen Lodge. Complete new builds? Will need to factor in overnight care.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transformational</li> <li>Partnership with CANs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Another huge project that will require significant resources and a long lead-in time</li> <li>Significant challenges around re-location of existing residents/tenants to facilitate moves</li> </ul>
4	Re-visit alternative delivery models: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local Authority Trading Company (LATC)</li> <li>Mutual/Social Enterprise</li> <li>Place 7 EPHs in an Arms Length Management Organisation (ALMO)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Politically attractive to current Administration</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Question marks remain about whether we have the capacity/skill-set required to run with such models and make them happen</li> <li>Still need to tackle the fact our homes are not fit for purpose</li> </ul>

	Option	Pros	Cons
5	Gradual closure of the 7 EPHs with new placements commissioned from the private sector	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We buy only what is needed and can be afforded to allow further budget reductions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Falls short of original vision on several fronts</li> <li>• Very difficult transition period as homes are gradually run-down</li> </ul>
6	Develop a Care Village only at Lowfield – with care home, extra care housing, and far less (if any?) independent housing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Retains elements of the original vision and other options</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Feels like a compromise/half-way house</li> </ul>