

# WORCESTERSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

## RECORD OF MEMBER DELEGATED DECISION

### **FUTURE DELIVERY LOCATION FOR WORCESTERSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL'S RESIDENTIAL REPLACEMENT CARE PROVISION FOR ADULTS WITH LEARNING DISABILITIES.**

<b>Key Decision</b>	Yes. Impacts on the future location of Worcestershire County Council's replacement care provision and has been subject to formal consultation.
<b>Date of Decision</b>	2 August 2025
<b>Decision Maker</b>	Cllr Sue Eacock
<b>Brief Description of Decision</b>	<p>(a) To note the outcome of the public consultation as summarised in paragraphs 8-15;</p> <p>(b) To approve the relocation of residential replacement care services from Worth Crescent and Pershore to Greenhill Lodge in Worcester;</p> <p>(c) To approve a consultation on the relocation of day services provision at Worcester Resource Centre into Greenhill Lodge ahead of a final decision, and;</p> <p>(d) To recommend to Council the use of £619,390, subject to a final decision on relocation of Worcester Resource Centre, of the existing Capital Investment in Community Capacity/ Specialised</p>
<b>Reason(s) for Decision</b>	<p>To consolidate provision into one location which will prevent the need for higher cost capital renovation works, release properties as surplus and generate a revenue savings. There is a further decision pending, subject to formal consultation, on consolidating a County Council operated day service provision for adults with learning disabilities, which if agreed will generate further revenue savings and potential capital receipt.</p>
<b>Alternative Options Considered and Rejected</b>	<p>1. Stay in the current locations (Worth Crescent and Pershore). This has been rejected as the costs are higher and no potential for capital receipts.</p>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Consolidate Worth Crescent into Pershore and renovate Pershore to increase available beds. This has been rejected as the costs are higher and a lower potential for capital receipts.</li> <li>3. Externalise the provision. This has been rejected as there are limited specialist providers with experience of delivering this type of provision and there is no reliable approximation of the fees required to deliver this type of provision without a clear understanding of the running costs of the location and core staffing model alongside any TUPE implications.</li> </ol>
<b>Any Conflict of Interest declared by a consulted Cabinet Member/ any dispensation granted</b>	
<b>Signature of Decision Maker</b>	Cllr Sue Eacock CMR Adult Social Care
<b>Date of Implementation of Decision</b>	8 August 2025