



## **RHONDDA CYNON TAF COUNCIL OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

Minutes of the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on Monday, 22 July 2019 at 5.00 pm at the Council Chamber, The Pavilions, Cambrian Park, Clydach Vale, Tonypany, CF40 2XX.

### **County Borough Councillors - Overview and Scrutiny Committee Members in attendance:-**

Councillor M Adams (Chair)

Councillor J Bonetto	Councillor P Jarman
Councillor J Harries	Councillor J Brencher
Councillor D Macey	Councillor L Walker
Councillor G Caple	Councillor M Griffiths
Councillor S Morgans	Councillor W Jones

### **Co-Opted Members in attendance:-**

Mr C Jones, Representing GMB  
Mr J Fish, Voting Elected Parent / Governor Representative

### **Officers in attendance:-**

Mr C Hanagan, Service Director of Democratic Services & Communication  
Mr G Isingrini, Group Director Community & Children's Services  
Mr N Elliott, Director of Adult Services

### **County Borough Councillors in attendance:-**

Councillor R Bevan, Councillor G Stacey, Councillor R Yeo, Councillor M Powell and  
Councillor E Griffiths

#### **1 Declaration of Interest**

In accordance with the Council's Code of Conduct, there were no declarations made pertaining to the agenda.

#### **2 Welcome & Procedures**

The Chair Welcomed Members and the public to the Special Meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. The Chair introduce the Officer to both Members and the public and explained the procedure rules to all present.

The Chair advised the Committee that as part of today's proceedings three members of the public, namely Mrs A Tritschler, Dr L Arthur and Ms H Cooke would be invited to address the Committee in relation to the modernisation of residential care and day care for older people.

#### **3 Pre Scrutiny - Modernisation of Residential Care & Day Care for Older**

## People

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and advised Members that as part of today's proceedings three members of the public who had requested the opportunity to address the committee, namely Dr L Arthur, Mrs A Tritschler and Mrs H Locke would be invited to speak.

The Service Director Democratic Services & Communications explained the purpose of the report in respect of the modernisation of residential care and day care for older people. He continued to explain the reasoning behind the report being presented to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee this evening, which was to allow Members to undertake pre- scrutiny on the report summarising the results of the 12-week public, resident and staff consultation process. He explained that Members comments would form part of the reported feedback the Cabinet will receive, when it considers this matter. The Service Director of Democratic Services & Communications highlighted to Members that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee will continue to receive regular progress updates in relation to the matter and where required provide feedback to the Cabinet to ensure that Scrutiny continues to contribute to the proposals.

The Service Director Democratic Services & Communications recapped on the Overview and Scrutiny Committee involvement to date, highlighting that Scrutiny had previously scrutinised the Council's Extra Care Strategy (September 2017) and the preferred options presented by Officers for potential consultation (December 2018)

The Service Director Democratic Services & Communications highlighted that the undertaking of pre scrutiny by the Overview & Scrutiny Committee at this key juncture in the decision making process strengthens accountability and assists Cabinet in taking any future decisions on these matters.

The Service Director Democratic Services & Communications then invited the Group Director of Community and Children's Services in conjunction with Director of Adult Services to present the report to Members and Public.

The Group Director Community and Children's Service explained the reasoning behind the need to modernise and continually improve Adult Social Care Services with Rhondda Cynon Taf. It was explained that the population within Rhondda Cynon Taf is increasing and living longer, with more people expected to be affected by dementia and limiting long-term illness. As a result, the Council must continue to deliver care services as effectively as possible to maximise the benefits and manage cost pressures. We continue to believe that people wish to remain in their own homes wherever possible and investment in the Extra care development programme and further modernisation of Support at Home and other adult support services all aim to better meet the changing needs and expectations of our community. We will also continue to seek to deliver the most suitable response to an individual's needs in the context of what matters to them whilst ensuring we maximise independence and it is for this reason that we would want to see a clear focus on supporting complex cases and the provision

of respite.

Officers explained that the demand for residential care placements has fallen and the main contributing factor for this is that people are choosing to live in their own homes for as long as possible. The Director of Adult Services explained that as of 28<sup>th</sup> May 2019, there were 140 overall vacancies within residential and nursing care homes; this includes 105 in residential care in RCT.

The Group Director Community and Children's Services also referred to the recent Care Inspectorate Wales letter "there is a recognition of the need to update the local authority's own in house adult accommodation provision, in line with peoples changing needs and expectations. The pace of this change needs to be maintained and accelerated, in order to ensure that the services provided are in line with both presenting and anticipated needs. The planned further expansion of Extra Care facilities, based on the successful new build in Talbot Green and the new build on the previous residential care facility, is an illustration of the local authority's practical response to this identified need."

The Director of Adult Services explained that Rhondda Cynon Taf commissioned Practice Solutions Ltd to undertake an independent review into residential care homes and day services for older people. It was explained that the review involved an initial stage of research, followed by field work, which involved visiting care homes and day care services managed by the Council. Members were informed that the data and findings were reported to Cabinet on 21<sup>st</sup> November 2018 and Cabinet agreed a number of recommendations regarding the future service delivery model for the Council's Care Homes and Services.

As Members would recall the Overview and Scrutiny Committee supported the direction of travel and the decision to consult on the future service delivery model for the Council's Residential Care Homes and Day Care Services. The Group Director Community and Children's Services and Director of Adult Services informed Members of the key issues highlighted within the report for both residential and day care services, which included the quality of care and support provided, the location of the homes the financial implications for individuals moving into private care homes amongst others.

Members were informed that the consultation took place over the period from 14<sup>th</sup> January 2019 to 8<sup>th</sup> April 2019. The aim of the consultation was to gather as many views as possible from interested stakeholders to inform the Council in its decision making as to the future structure of residential and day care services for the older people within Rhondda Cynon Taf.

Officers explained that along with the consultation events, questionnaires were used to obtain people's views. Members were informed that in total 372 responses were received in relation to the review of the residential services. It was highlighted that 47.3 % of respondents agreed with the Council's preference to retain a level of provision of residential care homes, which are focused on providing complex care and respite. 34.9% disagreed with the Council's preferred option.

The Officers added that in terms of the Council's preferred option to phase the decommissioning of the Council's day services as part of a planned programme of transformation in line with the proposed new service model – 53 % of respondents disagreed with the preferred option. 48.3% of people who responded agreed with the option to do nothing.

Members were presented with the detailed consultation reports, along with a summary of the main themes that emerged in the consultation; including responses from officers.

In his conclusion, the Group Director Community and Children's Services along with the Director of Adult Services summarised the options:

Residential Care Homes:

- Option 1 : To continue existing arrangements – do nothing
- Option 2: Phased decommissioning of all the Council's care homes as part of planned programme of transformation in line with the implementation of the Council's extra care development programme and Cwm Taf care Market position.
- Option 3: (Cabinet's preferred Option for consultation): Council retains a level of provision of Residential Care Homes which are focussed on providing complex care and respite

Day Care:

- Option 1: Continue existing arrangements – Do Nothing
- Option 2: Phased decommissioning of the Council's day services as part of a planned programme of transformation in line with the proposed new service model – Preferred Option.

The Chair thanked the Officers for their detailed report and their overview and explained to the Overview & Scrutiny Committee that they would now hear from the three public speakers.

The three public speakers, Dr L Arthur, Mrs A Tritschler and Mrs H Locke were afforded the opportunity to address the Committee as follows:

Dr L Arthur who is a member of the campaign group Save Care Homes and Centres (SCHAC) informed the Committee that he wanted to highlight that the group are supportive of the modernisation agenda and policies that give people choice and support but felt strongly that the change was driven by austerity and saving requirements. Dr Arthur also informed the Committee that the group was calling for an all- Wales summit on residential care and for the Council to put a moratorium on any cuts until that had taken place. He also questions the definition of complex care and felt that the demand for residential care would increase in the future, rather than fall as the Council figures suggest.

Mrs A Tritschler Chair of the Rhondda Cynon Taf Older Person's Advisory Group (OPAG) thanked the committee for allowing her to address them on a very contentious matter. She explained that OPAG oversees the 50+ Forums in Rhondda Cynon Taf, which help support people to live independently and remain active. She stated that the group strongly opposed the closure of residential care homes without suitable alternatives and that members are suspicious of private care homes and have a lack of confidence in what they provide. Mrs Tritschler explained that a number of the group had visited Ty Heulog Extra Care provision. Transport was seen as another concern and finally the provision within the Rhondda Fach area where there seems to be no alternative.

Finally Ms H Locke who is speaking on behalf of the residents of Parc Newydd Residential Care home in Talbot Green. She informed Members of the first class service residents receive for the local authority run care homes and stated that she also had visited the Ty Heulog Extra Care provision; however felt that even though the provision is well designed it would not be suitable for higher needs.

The Chair thanked the public for their contribution and allowed the Group Director Community and Children's Service to pick up on the points raised.

He explained that the purpose of the consultation exercise was to get the view of the public on how the Authority can continue to improve and modernise our residential and day care services, and stressed that this was not a response to austerity.

The Group Director Community and Children's Services also explained that even though there are vacancies in the private sector the Local Authority still feel there is a need for some in house care provision- people have a choice and we are looking to provide better choices in the future.

In response to the question regarding the extra care provision, the officers explained that this provision is used extensively, is cost effective and allows the resident to live as independently as possible in modern surroundings with 24-hour care and support to meet any changing needs. In relation to the financial concerns, Officers explained the rules on savings levels, income, benefits etc. and how it compares to care homes.

The Group Director Community and Children's Services invited Mr Sherlock from Practice Solutions to provide the Committee with more information on the concept of extra care provision and the way it has been developed and utilised elsewhere. The Chair thanked the Officers for the response and opened up the meeting to Members. A Member asked Mr Sherlock a question relating to what experience he had had with social care. In response, he explained that he had over 46 years' experience within the social care environment and gave background on the work of Practice Solutions.

A Member stated that everyone has different experiences in terms of care and whilst people want to stay at home and live independently, this does not always work and expressed concerns about couples being split up and this often results in both not living much longer. The Group Director Community and Children's Services explained that extra care could be a solution to this as it allows couples to live independently with support if and when it is needed. A number of double rooms will be available in each facility.

In relation to the changes, a Member asked what effect it would have on delayed transfers of care (bed blocking) and will this approach end up costing residents more. Officers explained that there should be no adverse impact and it would provide more option and choice.

The Chair commented on dementia care and felt strongly that as an Authority we need to look at people's dignity and their needs. In respect of accessibility, the Chair wanted clarity on the reference to a five mile radius within the report. He raised concerns that geographically the care provision with the Rhondda Fach area could cause concern as it could mean that resident would be placed outside of the area e.g. Cwmbach which is not practical for residents or family members.

Officers explained that the 5 mile radius was a tool used to help us consider

what is available locally. People want to remain in their own homes wherever possible and the Extra development programme and further modernisation of Support at Home and other adult support services all aim to better meet changing needs and expectations of our community including those living with dementia. We will also continue to seek to deliver the most suitable response to an individual's needs in the context of what matters to them whilst ensuring we maximise independence and it is for this reason that we would want to see a clear focus on supporting complex cases and the provision of respite.

Complex Care is an overarching term that is used to represent a multitude of factors that contribute to an individual's overall care needs. These include emotional, physiological, social, personal, sensory, communication, environmental and health needs. Individuals and their individual circumstances need to be considered in the assessment process in which consideration of the varying levels of each of the above factors is made - a decision can then be made on an individual's level and category of care. The assessments which take place are undertaken by suitably qualified and skilled care managers, registered home managers and health professionals.

A Member highlighted the important value of the local authority continuing to play a leading role in the delivery of residential care, acknowledged that people's expectations, and needs change. The Member continued by saying that she is in favour of the extra care provision, however key questions need to be asked on data. Her final point regarding day care services and the provision of tackling loneliness and the challenges of dementia highlight the need to find a model to improve services to the older people within RCT.

Officers explained that dementia care is a key priority and that need would continue to be the determining factor for accessing services. In respect of day care services officers referred to the development of Community Hubs and how specialist day care services would focus on the more complex cases. In addition to the dementia provision in our planned Extra care developments the Cabinet's preferred option would allow the Council to focus our residential care on those complex cases (including levels of dementia) that would not be adequately supported at home, or in other ways e.g. in extra care etc. The new Registration standards also provide us with more flexibility that would again support us in enhancing the range of options and levels of support that need to be met in Residential settings.

The Chair asked officer if they were basing their report on current levels of demand or future trends.

The Director of Adult Services explained it was the current level of demand and applying statistical analysis for the future. Within the O&S report we have summarised the work that has been undertaken to gain a better understanding of the forecast demand for extra care housing and care home provision in Rhondda Cynon Taf and compared this to the existing provision. To do this, the "More Choice, Greater Voice" forecast model has been used as the baseline model for predicting demand.

We have provided an evidence base within the O&S report and the strategic intention to move away from institutional care and for care home services to focus on supporting people with more complex needs and severe levels of dementia is based upon the Regional and local analysis and documentation that has been presented to Cabinet previously including the independent report from Practise Solutions.

Whilst there are occasional difficulties finding places for people in local care homes, there are no significant shortfalls in provision overall and this suggests there is an excess in the current level of provision for residential beds; whilst nursing bed levels are more widely occupied.

The planned development of extra care homes will also provide more choice to people that require increasing levels of personal care. Such choice will be expected to reduce the demand for residential care. It is not, however, expected to have such an impact on the demand for nursing care provision. Given the lack of extra care homes in Rhondda Cynon Taf, it has been assumed that 35% of people placed into a residential care home might have been suitable for extra care. The availability of extra care may also prompt people to choose this type of accommodation before a crisis situation stimulates a need for a care home placement. This effect would suggest the demand for residential care will fall as the availability of extra care increases.

Finally, the timelines for our extensive and ambitious modernisation programme will allow us to adjust our approach as required.

Another Member highlighted the importance of investing in the service and thanked officers for undertaking such an extensive consultation. A Member asked whether the care will be externalised in extra care homes. The Member expressed concern that she felt that we do not know if premises will be public sector retained and went on to say that people in extra care do not get the same protection as people in residential care. The Member continued to comment that it was their view that the Council had not sufficiently invested in residential homes and asked why this has not been done before reaching what the member described as a 'crisis point'.

Officers explained that whilst commissioning care externally is often the case in extra care developments Cabinet had determined that in its larger extra care developments the care would be provided by the Council. The Council in-house care homes are dated buildings, and whilst the quality of the care by staff is good, the facilities no longer meet modern standards. The homes were built over 30 years ago and were not designed to meet the current expectations of accommodation and were built for a different generation of older people than is now the case. Modern purpose-built care homes are designed to be dementia-friendly and have a bigger space standard to support mobility / hoisting needs. They also have en-suite facilities, so people are more able to toilet themselves. This is clearly a very important part of maintaining someone's sense of dignity and independence. Having said that the Council's homes do meet current regulatory requirements and the O&S report presents information on what would be required to bring them up to modern standards together with details on the implications. As stated previously there are no concerns regarding the current quality of care.

Putting further comment and questions to officer the Member questioned the data put before them and commented that the data was flawed as admission restriction had been put in place with regards to entries in to care homes. The final point, which the Member wanted addressing was regarding the financial implications of Extra care.

Officers explained that the demographic profile is trying to balance the understanding of changing demand and expectations for the future with a clear focus on improving the range of options available to maximise independence. The Group Director Community and Children's Services explained that data had been presented showing the position prior to any restrictions and again explained the rationale for the restrictions. With regards to the comment relating to people having to sell their homes to pay for the care, Officers explained the different financial arrangements that are applicable in Extra Care.

A Member commented that having looked at the information from the public speakers and if the building requires renovating do they still have the same requirements as new build or can we get around this.

The Officer explained that the Council Homes do still meet regulatory standards but emphasised the importance of providing the best possible facilities for our people taking into account changing expectations. Any new build would need to meet the new standards.

A number of Members queried the need to consider a geographical balance within the respective valleys of Rhondda Cynon Taf, specifically referencing the Rhondda Fach area and the potential concerns relating to transport. In response to the Members view officers explained that the five-mile radius analysis was a tool to provide information on what is available in the respective areas of Rhondda Cynon Taf.

Members asked how any change would be managed for current residents going forward.

Each individual case would be assigned a social worker, each individual would have a choice. As explained in the O&S report in the event of any agreed change resident and their family will be supported by a Social Care Practitioner who will assess individual needs and discuss preferences and help to choose an appropriate alternative service. This will take into account specific issues such as long standing friendships. Where appropriate other care professionals including health GPs will be involved, as will staff from the home, who as far as possible will support each resident's transition into an alternative service.

A Member wanted clarity on the day care provision as he felt it was a lifeline for some members of the community and if the provision were to be taken away, it would have a detrimental effect on their future needs.

Officers explained that there would be no change to the provision unless there is a new provision available. For people who currently use the older people's day centres, there is a commitment that each person, with an assessed need, will continue to have the same level of service as they currently receive under any new service model. This is important to stress as some people have interpreted the proposal around decommissioning as a service loss rather than a service change.

A Co-Opted Member of the Committee wanted clarification on a few points. He asked for assurances that the Authority did not put a stop on placing people in care homes before the report.



The Group Director Community and Children's Service explained that even while the restriction had been applied a number of people had been placed in the care homes when it was the appropriate option.

The Chair of the Health and Wellbeing Committee thanked Members for the opportunity to speak and explained that the Health and Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee recognises that the status – quo is not sustainable and that people are living longer with expectations changing. He explained that the Health & Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee had looked into the availability of private sector provision, locally and there are gaps. He asked Officers if they believe the private sector is sustainable financially. Officers explained that there is always a risk however there are services that the Council does not provide e.g. nursing care. Officers confirmed that there is a very good working relationship with the private sector and felt that this was stronger than it has been in previous years.

The Chair of the Finance & Performance Committee thanked the committee for the opportunity to contribute. The member commented that in his view the changes being considered were overdue particularly when considered against the progress made in other European countries to modernise the delivery of services available to older people to meet changing demands and expectations.

The Committee also took on board the view of the trade union representatives.

The Chair thanked Members, public and officer for their contribution to the meeting. In summing up the Chair stated he believed from the deliberations of the committee that there was clearly great value placed upon local authority delivery and that this is something clearly the committee shared, while also recognising that things need to change, to support people who are living longer, to have a choice to do so independently.

The Chair acknowledged that in his view the Group Director & Council was also committed to local authority delivery. The Chair asked a further question, seeking the view of the Director that should the circumstance arise in which Cabinet progress the preferred model consulted upon, would the Council be doing the right thing and why? The Chair believed this comment to be important for the record.

In response to the question, the Group Director Community and Children's Services re-affirmed his committed to the change and improvement agenda that has been set out in numerous reports and emphasised that the status quo was not a viable option for all the reasons highlighted in the report.

After robust discussion and deliberation the Overview and Scrutiny Committee **RESOLVED** to:

- Acknowledge the consultation result and information provided in the report and agree that any recommendations will be put to Cabinet for consideration when determining the future service delivery model proposals for the Council's Residential Care Homes and Day Care Services in September 2019
- Agree the preferred option for in-house Residential Care (Council retains a level of provision of Residential Care Homes which are focussed on providing complex care and respite) in light of the feedback received during the consultation process; the assumption made in terms of ongoing demand and supply; the analysis of local availability and

geographical requirements i.e. 5 mile radius.

- Agree the preferred option for Council day Care (planned programme of transformation and modernisation) in light of the feedback received during the consultation process and information provided in this report

NOTE: County Borough Councillors P. Jarman and D Macey wished to have recorded the fact that she proposed and voted for in favour of the following lost motion:-

“That Cabinet retains the present level of residential care provision”

#### **4 Review of the Council's Electoral arrangements by the Local Democracy & Boundary Commission for Wales**

The Chair informed Members that before the Director of Legal Services presented the report in respect of the 'Review of the Council's Electoral Arrangements by the Local Democracy and Boundary Commission for Wales', he had received written submissions from individual Members that being County Borough Councillors G. Thomas, R. Turner, M Griffiths and T Leyshon which would be taken into consideration as part of reporting to full Council.

The Director of Legal Services outlined the background of the report and it was explained that the Commission has now developed its Draft Proposals in relation to its review and these are contained in the Draft Proposal Report, which Members would have had the opportunity to consider before the meeting.

The Director of Legal Services continued to explain that the Commission has now commenced a 12-week period of statutory consultation on the Draft Proposals Report, which runs from 26<sup>th</sup> June 2019 to 17<sup>th</sup> September 2019 and invites representations, which are based on evidence and facts relevant to the specific proposal in consideration.

Members were asked to consider the summary of the draft proposal for each Electoral Ward and put their representations forward as part of the consultation feedback – either at the meeting or in advance of the Council meeting which would consider the Draft Proposals Report.

The Chair opened up the meeting to Members for their view and comments.

In respect of the Wards within the Rhondda Fach Area Members strongly agreed that the level of representation should remain as it currently stands. Members felt by lowering the numbers from six Members to four Members would be to the detriment of the residents who live in the area particularly as there was no Community Council and the size of the proposed Electoral Ward areas. Members felt that the number of schools within the proposed areas would also suffer, as some schools could end up with no Councillor representation on their governing bodies.

A Member requested clarification relating to the maps of the Church Village area. The Member observed that properties within the Dyffryn Y Coed area are

not depicted on the map contained with the Draft Proposals Report and sought clarification as to whether the number of the dwellings and electors within that area had been taken into consideration when preparing the report. Officers confirmed that this would be checked but it was understood they had been even thought the OS map which was being used which did not show the development.

A Member raised the proposals relating to combining the existing Treforest and Graig Wards and whilst acknowledging certain parts of Treforest could transfer to the Graig Ward they should remain separate wards.

In respect of the proposed arrangements for the Mountain Ash Electoral Ward, a Member raised concerns about under representation and felt that it was a number crunching exercise and residents within the communities need to retain the existing arrangements.

In respect of the Treorchy proposal, a Member commented that Treorchy is a thriving area and the 'capital of Rhondda' and to reduce the ward to a two Member ward shows lack of knowledge.

In relation to Aberaman North and South a Member queried whether consideration has been given to the LDP when considering the proposal. The Member felt that the LDP forecast figures for 2023 electorate should have been taken into account, they continued by asking if the Boundary Commission could clarify what level of consideration they have given to this aspect when reflecting on their recommendations as this would increase the numbers within the Ward.

After further discussion Member's **RESOLVED:**

- To acknowledge the Commissions Draft Proposals Report in respect of the Council's future Electoral Arrangements, as outlined in their draft proposal
- That Members comments , observations and recommendations in respect of the Draft proposals will be taken into consideration before being presented to Full Council at its meeting in September 2019

## **5 URGENT BUSINESS**

**This meeting closed at Time Not  
Specified**

**CLLR M. ADAMS  
CHAIR.**

