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Yes – the proposals in the report will affect the whole city and involve financial implications in excess of £1m

Executive Summary

The Ofsted Inspection of Coventry's Children's Services published in March 2014 judged the three areas of 'Looked After Children', 'Leaving Care' and 'Adoption Performance' as requiring improvement. The Improvement Notice issued to Coventry City Council on 30th June 2014 included the requirement to address the areas of improvement identified by the inspection of services for children undertaken by Ofsted, including services for children looked after.

In response to the need to improve Children’s Services in Coventry, The Children’s Services Strategy 2016 – 2018 was developed to set out a Vision for Children’s Services and a detailed transformation programme that supports the improvement of Children’s Services and places children at the heart of everything we do.

The improvement of these services sits within the context of a significant savings pressure for Children’s Services with a requirement to achieve in excess of £4 million in 2017/18, rising to in excess of £11 million from 2018/19.

The Children’s Services Transformation Programme converts the vision for the service into action that will ensure sustainable service improvement in Coventry. The programme comprises of eight discrete projects, largely falling under the 2 broad themes of workforce redesign and looked after children placements.

Children’s Internal Residential Care Redesign is one of the eight projects and sets out to improve the quality of children's homes provided by the Council, whilst realising revenue benefits. It is planned that the redesign of the service will reduce spend on external residential provision by creating additional internal capacity by utilising the existing resource tied up in the current
provision. The proposal is to provide homes with additional capacity, higher levels of occupancy and improved quality of care that represent better value for money.

A stakeholder consultation process on the proposal took place between 1 December 2016 and 13 January 2017. This consultation was approved by the Cabinet Member for Children and Young People at his meeting on 16th November 2016.

This report sets out the primary business drivers for the reconfiguration of both Gravel Hill and The Grange children’s homes in Coventry into 4 smaller group homes which will present a more coherent, modern and suitable model of provision for the future care of Coventry’s children and young people who require a residential base for their time in care.

It is proposed that both current homes are de-commissioned and that The Grange is sold with a re-investment of the capital proceeds in the purchase of three new properties which will be registered with Ofsted as children’s homes providing 12 residential placements in total. In addition, it is proposed that Gravel Hill is subjected to a short phase of refurbishment and re-modelling so as to be re-opened as a new 4 bed home giving a total in-house provision of 16 beds.

Furthermore, it is proposed that the re-location of Coventry’s children’s homes presents the opportunity to adopt a new model of residential care which is modern, progressive and fit for the future.

Though this proposal has been formulated primarily to improve practice and outcomes for children living in residential care, it is nevertheless anticipated that financial benefits will accrue. These are currently estimated to be up to £879k per annum derived from having a greater in-house capacity and a corresponding reduction in the number of external placements needing to be purchased.

**Recommendations:**

The Cabinet is recommended to:-

(1) Agree the newly configured model for children’s residential care outlined in this report

(2) Agree to the sale of The Grange children’s home and the re-investment of the capital proceeds into the purchase of three new homes which will be registered with Ofsted as four bed children’s homes

(3) Agree to the re-modelling and refurbishment of Gravel Hill as one of the new homes as a more cost-effective option for the council.

(4) Agree to the purchase of the three new homes using corporate capital resources pending capital receipt from disposal of The Grange.

**List of Appendices included:**
Appendix A – Equality Consultation Analysis

**Background papers:**
None
Has it been or will it be considered by Scrutiny?
No. Although this report has not been considered by Scrutiny, the proposals were presented to Scrutiny Board 2 who gave its support to the plans as outlined.

Has it been or will it be considered by any other Council Committee, Advisory Panel or other body?
Corporate Parenting Board will consider this report at its February meeting

Will this report go to Council?
No
1. Context (or background)

1.1 Coventry currently operates two in-house children’s homes for children and young people assessed as having emotional and behavioural difficulties. These homes are Gravel Hill and The Grange, together registered for children of either gender aged between 10 and 18 years. Gravel Hill is used as a short-term assessment centre and offers a 12-week programme and The Grange offers medium to long term placements for those assessed as needing residential care as opposed to a family based placement. This report sets out a credible and forward thinking option for future service delivery of residential care provision for children in Coventry.

2. Options considered and recommended proposal

2.1 Option 1 – retain the current 2 homes with their existing Statements of Purpose and operating procedures representing a “no change option”. This was considered and was rejected for reasons which are outlined in the main body of the report. In brief the homes use an outmoded and dated model of residential care practice, considered to be overly institutional by modern standards and in addition do not currently offer good value for money in comparison to residential care provided either by other local authorities or voluntary or private sector providers. Occupancy levels have been relatively low, staff resource levels relatively high and these factors have conspired to provide a weekly placement cost which is not sustainable.

2.2 Option 2 – dispense with internal residential provision altogether and simply commission placements according to identified need via a combination of block contracts, framework agreement provision and spot purchase from the market. Whilst this is a position which has been adopted by a number of local authorities it is not considered to represent the best way forward in Coventry for the following reasons:

- A greater degree of control of placement supply is retained by having internal provision
- Retaining in-house provision allows for greater flexibility in overall service delivery and the use of controllable resources
- The proposed model increases overall capacity and reduces the need for more expensive external placements
- Retention of capital assets which may well appreciate in value over time
- Increases local provision and better ensures continuity of education and healthcare
- Avoids last minute emergency placement searches and being at the mercy of the market and the potential for excessive charging

2.3 Option 3 – preferred and recommended option – de-commission the existing resource and dispose of one site at The Grange, re-investing the capital proceeds to enable the purchase of 3 modern homes in established residential areas in and around Coventry and at the same time adopt a fresh and newer model of residential care practice which is more in line with standards for contemporary residential care. In addition, re-model and re-furbish the home at Gravel Hill in order to provide a 4th home of equal standard. This will avoid or minimise the negative aspects of institutionalisation and put Coventry at the forefront of service development in this service area and at the same time enhance the prospects of better outcomes for children.
2.4 Modern residential care is a complex business based on simple principles – the core task is to provide good quality care in a group setting so as to replicate as much as possible what would happen in a thriving, happy and healthy family.

2.5 This report therefore rejects the dated practice and procedures which are still to be found in the current Coventry homes – the large institutional kitchens, the plethora of office space for staff, the manual recording and retention of information and the existence of domestic staff for cleaning the premises and cooks providing food. Waking night staff to supervise children when they are sleeping will only be used in exceptional circumstances and when the need arises.

2.6 Instead, what is proposed is the establishment of small homes, with a maximum of four residents and which operate in a way which much more closely resembles ordinary family life, where shared activity is paramount, where the creation of close nurturing relationships is emphasised and where the trappings of institutional life are eliminated, or at least minimised. These will be homes where adults and children interact continuously, where menus are planned and food is cooked together, where individual and group activities are negotiated and undertaken, where pride and ownership of the property is a joint venture and where there is shared responsibility for upkeep, maintenance and neighbourliness. In short, they are less children’s homes and more homes for children.

2.7 Rationale for Change

2.7.1 The current provision offers a maximum occupancy of 10 beds (4 registered at Gravel Hill and 6 the effective operating maximum at The Grange).

2.7.2 The proposed new model comprising of 4 X 6 bedroom homes would offer up to 16 placements if suitable properties are available in the area, with two of the bedrooms in each home set aside as staff sleep-in rooms.

2.7.3 There are revenue benefits as a result of this proposal as detailed in Financial Implications section. In addition to savings benefits the proposed new model would achieve the following:

- enable more flexibility to meet the needs of our children living in residential care
- enable the retention of an in-house provision which gives a greater degree of control
- increased capacity and the potential to avoid up to 6 external and distant residential placements
- increased local provision to ensure continuity of education and health care and
- the purchase of properties that are fit for purpose and meet service requirements.

2.8 Occupancy levels and placement costs

2.8.1 Both homes have found it difficult to achieve overall occupancy levels in line with their terms of registration, which are 8 young people at The Grange and 4 young people at Gravel Hill. A maximum occupancy level of 8 young people should be viewed as excessive by modern standards.

2.8.2 An analysis of occupancy levels conducted early in 2016 showed that average occupancy for the 2 homes were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Occupancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Grange</td>
<td>58% occupancy (77% if max occupancy is taken as six)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravel Hill</td>
<td>83% occupancy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.8.3 Residential care caters for a wide range of need – the in-house provision in Coventry is designed and operated to meet the needs of those assessed as having a level of emotional and behavioural disorder (EBD).

2.8.4 Nationally there are 5,220 children in 1,760 children's homes (excludes secure accommodation, residential special schools and short breaks provision). These homes are operated by local authorities (370), private sector organisation (11,293) and voluntary organisations (97).

*(Children’s Homes Data Pack, DfE 2014)*

2.8.5 A comparison of weekly cost shows that:

- Other LA homes - £2,964 per week
- Coventry homes - £5,405 per week

### 2.9 The current resource:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gravel Hill</th>
<th>The Grange</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Budget (direct cost)</td>
<td>£985k</td>
<td>£966k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Budget (centralised costs and overheads)</td>
<td>£137K</td>
<td>£134K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff allocation</td>
<td>25 staff (+relief staff)</td>
<td>26 staff (+relief staff)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Costs</td>
<td>£888,451</td>
<td>£909,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Structure</td>
<td>Registered Manager</td>
<td>Registered Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deputy Manager</td>
<td>Deputy Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Team Leaders x 3</td>
<td>Team Leaders x 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Res Childrens Workers(RCW) x 12</td>
<td>Res Childrens Workers(RCW) x 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Night Care Worker x 1.8 fte (3 posts)</td>
<td>Night Care Worker x 1.8 fte (3 posts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Domestics x 1.4 fte (2 posts)</td>
<td>Domestics x 1.4 fte (2 posts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cooks x 1.4 fte (2 posts)</td>
<td>Cooks x 1.4 fte (2 posts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Admin Team Leader x 1fte</td>
<td>Admin Team Leader x 1fte</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.10 Proposed staff structure x 4 homes

- Registered Manager
- Deputy Manager
- RCW x 8 of various grades (using career grade structure and progression)
- Admin 0.5fte

2.11 Summary of changes in structure

1. The new model deletes the role of Team Leader as this post is no longer required
2. The new model deletes the role of Night Care Worker and replaces this role with 2 sleep-in posts in each home but retains the ability to use waking night staff when/if deemed appropriate
3. The new model deletes Domestic cleaning posts
4. The new model deletes Cooks posts
5. The new model includes a 0.5 Administrative post attached to each home (this could be filled by 2 FTE employees covering two homes each)

2.12 Indicative Costs of new homes

2.12.1 Cost is per home, based on 4 beds at 85% occupancy. All costs and budgets exclude centralised charges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Minimum (£)</th>
<th>Maximum (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff costs</td>
<td>417,756</td>
<td>525,891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Running costs</td>
<td>50,984</td>
<td>50,984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total operating cost</td>
<td>468,740</td>
<td>576,876</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.12.2 The total running costs for four x four bed homes would be between £1.875m and £2.308m. The current available budget for the existing residential homes is £1.950m (excludes indirect costs)

2.12.3 The proposed model would provide an additional six beds compared with the existing units. This would enable placement for up to six additional children who would otherwise have been placed in an external residential placement, resulting in cost avoidance of up to £879,000 per annum, based on 87% occupancy, based on the average national cost of residential care.
Maximum Financial Benefit | Minimum Financial Benefit
--- | ---
Places | 16 | 16
Assumed operating capacity | 87% | 85%
Extra places over and above current operating capacity | 4 | 3.5
Cost (direct) | £1.875M | £2.308M
Cost (centralised charge & overhead) | £0.271M | £0.271M
Net difference compared to existing budget | £(0.075m) | £0.358m
Cost avoidance (reduced need for external residential) | £(0.804m) | £(0.786m)
Net financial benefit | £(0.879m) | £(0.428m)
Weekly Unit Cost (Full Cost) | £2964 | £3,647
Distance from DfE 2014 Benchmark | £0 | £683

### 2.13 Capital cost considerations

#### 2.13.1
It is envisaged that the City Council will dispose of The Grange and re-invest the proceeds into the purchase or acquisition of 3 new homes. These homes will be smaller and situated in suitable residential areas so as to create a sense of normalisation for our young people. The plans further allow for Gravel Hill to be retained as one of the new homes and it is envisaged that a programme of minor works and refurbishment will be undertaken to bring it into line with the standards and quality of the new homes. This is a more cost-effective solution as Gravel Hill is valued at £185k with an anticipated maximum spend of £30k to bring it up to the required standard. It would not be possible to purchase a property of sufficient quality or size for £215k.

#### 2.13.2
An initial search for suitable property in and around the Coventry area has indicated that, whilst there is not a wealth of options, there is a sufficient supply of homes located in residential areas to be able to bring this re-provisioning plan to fruition. Market prices suggest a range of between £350k and £450k per property, suggesting a total capital spend of £1.2m (taking an average likely cost). It is believed that this amount could be met via the sale/disposal of the existing site at The Grange, and possibly leave an amount for any required refurbishment needed to make the properties fit for purpose and compliant with Ofsted and other regulations.

#### 2.13.3
The intention is to seek residential dwellings that require minimal refurbishment and alteration works. The property running costs of the Grange and Gravel Hill in 2015/16 were £62,000 and £20,000 respectively. Of this, approximately 50% was spent on repairs and maintenance in part due to high planned maintenance specifications but also high levels of day to day reactive repairs. At this stage it is not expected that property savings will be made and existing budgets will be needed to meet the running costs of the four new homes. Indeed, in the overlap between service models there may be a short term increase in property running costs as the replacement provision needs to be acquired and run before the existing can be disposed.
2.13.4 Property Services have been fully involved in valuations of the existing sites, the analysis required in deciding to retain Gravel Hill, the schedule of required modifications to Gravel Hill and the undertaking of relevant property searches for new properties.

2.14 Summary of Benefits

- Retaining in-house provision gives a greater degree of control
- More flexibility to meet current needs
- Increases capacity and avoids 6 external residential placements
- Council has capital assets which will appreciate in value
- Properties that are fit for purpose and meet service requirements
- Anticipated savings/cost avoidance of up to £879k per annum
- Increases local provision to ensure continuity of education and healthcare

2.15 Revenue Cost avoidance and savings

2.15.1 Current provision has been able to offer a maximum capacity of 10 beds, with 4 being the registered maximum at Gravel Hill and 6 being the effective operating maximum at The Grange (though formally registered for 8).

2.15.2 It is proposed that the new homes will offer a maximum capacity of 16 beds comprising of 4x4 bed homes (16 in total).

2.15.3 By providing 16 beds within the newly configured internal service, an additional 6 beds will be created over and above existing provision. This will avoid the need to purchase these beds from the external market and, at an average national cost per bed of £2,964 per week this would bring a cost avoidance/savings figure of up to £879,000 per annum, based on an assumed 87% occupancy – and would enable us to benchmark our unit cost well with DfE LA homes and private sector

2.15.4 In addition to the revenue savings and cost avoidance cited above there are other more operational reasons for retaining some provision of internal residential care.

- Retaining a degree of direct control over the making of placements
- Avoids being at the total mercy of market and commercial forces
- Avoids the notorious difficulty of having to find emergency provision from the private sector at short notice, often at very high cost
- Spreads the risk profile of Coventry more evenly amongst internal provision, block contracted provision and external spot purchase

2.16 Conclusions and Next Steps

2.16.1 The current in-house residential service operated at The Grange and at Gravel Hill is no longer fit for purpose. It has buildings which are not suitable for modern residential care provision, has excessive staffing and budget allocation and has in recent times provided low occupancy at hugely inflated cost per placement.

2.16.2 Coventry City Council should seize the opportunity now to reconfigure this service into a modern, contemporary and progressive residential operation which provides top quality care for those in need of a local residential resource.
2.16.3 Work has taken place with colleagues in Property Services in relation to the following:

- Market Valuation of current assets
- All necessary steps being taken in relation to the disposal of The Grange
- Necessary compliance issues in relation to planning, and Ofsted registration.
- Property search within the area with required locality assessment
- Property condition analysis of Gravel Hill and a costed schedule of re-modelling

2.17 Links with commissioning of external residential care

2.17.1 This project is being undertaken in close liaison with the project to re-commission a residential service following the expiry of the 10 year contract with Hexagon Care. It is planned to provide a total of 60 residential beds – 16 beds within internal provision as outlined in this report, 24 beds commissioned locally from a range of providers in and near to Coventry and a continued arrangement to spot purchase 20 beds from the market in response to a range of diverse and specialist need presented by children and young people. A total of 60 beds represents an overall decrease in usage but would bring Coventry into line with national averages of having 10% of looked after children in residential settings.

3. Results of consultation undertaken

3.1 The consultation undertaken was public. In order to ensure that stakeholders were able to share their views with the Council the consultation was undertaken in a variety of ways; an online survey and access to a generic email address to make individual comments, Trade Union and staff briefings, staff workshops, a partner agency workshop, consultation with the Children and Young People’s Transformation Reference Group and individual consultation meetings with children currently resident in the city council children’s homes.

3.2 Responses were overall positive in terms of smaller homes more akin to a family environment and it was recognised that this model could save money on external placements.

3.3 The online survey received a very small number of respondents (11) and these showed support for the new model although there were mixed views on the removal of waking night staff, depending on the needs of the child.

3.4 Staff expressed some concerns regarding increased pressure on management due to a reduction in administration and Team Leader posts and there was a perception that there may be increased pressure on staff through new shift patterns and increased travel to work.

3.5 Staff responded that they felt the Gravel Hill children’s home already offered a family type setting and did not feel it necessary to sell the property.

3.6 Partners responded that the new model would offer more choice and enable better matching. Partners raised concern regarding availability of suitable properties and neighbourhoods and one partner shared concerns regarding links with other services, e.g. health, SEN, youth service.

3.7 A small number of partners expressed concern with regard to the proposed change in staffing model at night with regard to a perception that this may increase risks to children.
3.8 The Children and Young People’s Transformation Reference Group gave feedback on the proposals during a meeting and agreed with the proposal for small homes with up to 4 children only. Feedback was also positive in terms of the homes having a less institutionalised feel and more homely touches for example “not like offices”. The children and young people also commented that it was important for more children and young people to be able to stay in Coventry.

3.9 Children currently residing in our existing children’s homes were consulted and when asked what future homes should be like the children gave mixed views on the size of the houses but felt the homes should be out of town with good transport links and that the homes should be mixed gender.

3.10 One response was received from Trade Union colleagues which focussed on the staffing implications for the proposed model and issues and questions have been responded to in conjunction with Human Resources colleagues.

4. Timetable for implementing this decision

4.1 This report is seeking a decision to proceed with the proposed new model. If agreed, it is envisaged that the implementation phase will take place between March 2017 and August 2017 with the aim of having the newly configured service fully operational by September 2017. Exact implementation timetable will be dependent on the local property supply and availability of suitable accommodation.

5. Comments from the Director of Finance and Corporate Services

5.1 Financial implications

5.1.1 Cost benefits would be realised due to placing more children in internal provision without incurring additional costs, so therefore needing less external provision. This is estimated to be a reduction in cost of £879K+ and the internal residential project has an annual revenue savings target of £750K. The financial savings hinge on the ability to achieve a high level of occupancy on an ongoing basis (in excess of 85%). This is considered to be achievable based on the provision being less institutionalised and the aim for this provision to be a long-term provision for children with residential care needs.

5.1.2 In addition to revenue there will also be capital implications. The implementation of the project depends on the disposal and sale of The Grange, and the remodelling of Gravel Hill. Any proceeds from the sale of the asset would then be used to purchase the new provision and remodel Gravel Hill, however there is potentially a timing issue and bridging finance will be required to ensure continuity of provision. The expectation is that the cost of purchasing and remodelling new/existing properties will not exceed proceeds from sale of the current asset. Estimated valuation of the site at The Grange is in the region of £1.3m.

5.2 Legal implications

5.2.1 The Children Act 1989 (Section 22(4)) requires the Council to consult with young people and seek their views on decisions affecting them. The proposal will also require formal consultation with staff and their trade unions. These exercises have been completed and results are contained in Appendix 1 to this report.
5.2.2 The Children Act 1989 (Section 22G) requires local authorities to provide sufficient accommodation within the authority area which meets the needs of children that the local authority are looking after. The proposals contained in this report are made in support of this duty.

5.2.3 Public authority decision makers are under a non-delegable ongoing duty to have due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not. (Public Sector Equality duty).

5.2.4 The consultation and resulting equality assessment is intended to enable the decision makers to consider the impact and public response to the proposal and any alternative proposals raised. The product of the consultation must be conscientiously taken into account when the ultimate decision is made.

5.2.5 Section 3 of the Local Government Act 1999 and the statutory guidance issued under it imposes duty on a local authority to make arrangements to secure continuous improvement in the way on which its functions are exercised, having regard to a combination of economy, efficiency and effectiveness.

5.2.6 Regulation 49 Children’s Homes (England) Regulations 2015 requires the responsible individual and/or the registered person to give notice in writing to Her Majesty’s Chief Inspector of Ofsted as soon as it is practicable to do so if a registered provider proposes to cease to carry on or manage the home. All required notifications to Ofsted will be made in relation to closure of old homes and registration of the new homes.

6. Other Implications

6.1 How will this contribute to the Council’s priorities?

6.1.1 This proposed service development would make proactive contributions in a number of areas for Council priority. At a direct level, the newly configured arrangements will have immediate and sustainable impact to outcomes for children in care. The new model will provide improved quality of accommodation than currently exists, which will be located in established residential areas with good access to transport and easy availability of community resources and activities. This will enable our children to be in a better position to make positive contributions to both their own lives and the wider neighbourhood in which they live.

6.1.2 We aspire to look after our children in care within or close to Coventry. This allows for the maintenance of family contact and continuity of both education and healthcare. It also allows for a seamless transition towards independence for those children aged over 16 who will most likely be looking to assume adulthood and settle within the city. They will be close to any work experience, training and/or employment opportunities that may become available and will have ready access to their Social Worker or Personal Adviser situated within localities.

6.2 How is risk being managed?

6.2.1 A Transformation Programme Delivery Board meets on a monthly basis with representation from all Children’s Services Teams. An Internal Residential Care Redesign Project Team meets regularly to progress actions and manage identified risks. A project risk register has been established for the project. The Project Team Manager reports to the Transformation Board at each monthly meeting sharing a Highlight Report which give updates on progress, identified risks and mitigation. Risks will continue to be
identified through the implementation phase of the project, mitigations sought and impact managed through this process.

6.3 **What is the impact on the organisation?**

6.3.1 **Staffing Impacts**

6.3.1.1 The proposals outlined will impact on staff. There will be some staffing reductions and changes to working practice and hours. The proposed model would remove the Waking Nights arrangements (unless exceptional circumstances require this to be in place) and introduce Sleep-in positions. There would no longer be a requirement for the Team Leader, Cook and Domestic posts. Staff and Trade Unions have been fully consulted on the specific content of the proposals. Any changes will be managed in accordance with the City Council’s agreement on management of change which aims to manage staffing reductions through management of vacancies, reviews of temporary contracts and avoidance of compulsory redundancies through redeployment or Early Retirement Voluntary Redundancy opportunities where possible.

6.3.2 **Property Implications**

6.3.2.1 The property implications of this proposal are as follows. The existing children’s home at The Grange will be declared surplus and disposed of at an estimated disposal value of £1.3m to fund the acquisition of three six-bedroomed detached houses in the Coventry area. It is assumed that the properties to be acquired will be in good order with little requirement to spend on them, other than to ensure fire, Health and safety and Children’s Homes Regulations compliance. In addition the property at Gravel Hill will be made subject to a short period of re-modelling and modernisation so as to bring it into line with the other homes. Estimated costs for this are £30k and a schedule of works has been prepared and these will be funded from the 2017-18 Property Repairs Capital Programme.

6.3.2.2 A desk top survey of available properties in Coventry has indicated that there are some buildings on the market in the City, but availability for purchase will obviously be market dependent at the point when the decision to acquire is made.

6.3.2.3 The three replacement properties are assumed to incur the same property running costs of the current two properties (£82,000 per annum). There will be some overlap of running costs as it will be necessary to acquire the replacement properties before the disposal of the existing ones. If there are additional property running costs these will impact on the savings achieved, though this is believed to be unlikely.

6.3.2.4 Further work has been done with planning colleagues to ensure what if any planning permissions are required for the premises to be acquired and disposed.

6.3.2.5 The Council invested £330,000 in 2010/11 converting Gravel Hill into its current configuration. For this reason, and given the relatively low valuation of the site it is recommended that the property be retained and used as one of the four new homes.

6.4 **Equalities Impact Assessment**

6.4.1 An ECA (Equalities Consultation Assessment) is attached in Appendix A.

6.4.2 These proposals potentially impact the children and young people currently living at The Grange. However, those who are placed at Gravel Hill live there for an assessment
period of 12 weeks only and therefore would not be directly impacted by the implementation of the proposals.

6.4.3 Due to the residential care provided by the homes the proposal will disproportionately affect 13 to 15 year olds who are looked after by the local authority. However the new model aims to improve the environment and care offered to these young people.

6.4.4 Coventry will retain its dedicated resource for looked after children with a disability at Broad Park House and will continue to spot purchase services for this client group in the usual way. Gravel Hill can offer a bed for a child with a disability if required and this facility will remain.

6.4.5 There have been a number of unaccompanied asylum seeking children resident in the children's homes and the needs of these children will be assessed and met through the proposed new model.

6.5 Implications for (or impact on) the environment

None

6.6 Implications for partner organisations?

Any impact on partner agencies as a result of these proposals will be minimal and is expected to be positive. The increase in capacity arising from the proposals will ensure more young people in care placed locally and therefore have improved access to wraparound support services such as Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS). Community Safety will be enhanced through a careful property search and locality assessments. Partner agencies have been specifically consulted on these proposals.
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<td></td>
<td>10/02/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lara Knight</td>
<td>Governance Services Co-ordinator</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>13/02/2017</td>
<td>13/02/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicola David</td>
<td>Lead Accountant, Business Partner</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>08/02/2017</td>
<td>13/02/2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Names of approvers for submission: (officers and members)

Finance: Rachael Sugars
Finance Manager
Place
08/02/2017
08/02/2017

Legal: Julie Newman
Legal Services Manager (People)
Place
08/02/2017
08/02/2017

Director: John Gregg
Director, Children’s Services
People
13/02/2017
15/02/2017

Members:
Councillor Ruane, Cabinet Member for Children and Young People

This report is published on the council's website: www.coventry.gov.uk/meetings