

CABINET – 30 March 2022
PUBLIC QUESTIONS

1. Questioner's name: Adrian Oldman	Respondent's name: Cllr Philip Robinson
<p>Agenda Item 10: Bus Back Better - Gloucestershire's Enhanced Partnership</p> <p>GCC's Bus Service Improvement Plan (BSIP), which sets out its future vision for bus services across the County, has been submitted to the Department for Transport in the hope that it will receive a slice of the £1.4bn Bus Back Better funding. Early recipients of this funding have already been announced in the Government's Levelling up the United Kingdom White Paper.</p> <p>When does GCC expect to hear back on the outcome of its funding bid for this pot?</p>	<p>A funding announcement by the Department for Transport is expected imminently.</p>
2. Questioner's name: Adrian Oldman	Respondent's name: Cllr Philip Robinson
<p>Agenda Item 10: Bus Back Better - Gloucestershire's Enhanced Partnership</p> <p>At the Council's budget setting meeting, Cllr Hawthorne said he was expecting the County to receive between £30-40m - is this still likely to be the case?</p>	<p>We will not know what level of funding will be available until the Department for Transport confirms this. However, since we submitted our BSIP bid the government has explained that councils will receive a considerably lesser sum for BSIPs than the initial headline total of £3bn.</p>
3. Questioner's name: Adrian Oldman	Respondent's name: Cllr Philip Robinson
<p>Agenda Item 10: Bus Back Better - Gloucestershire's Enhanced Partnership</p>	<p>Our funding ask exceeded £30m to enable bus services to recover from the impact of Covid and to increase bus use by 10% above</p>

<p>How much money does GCC need to deliver on its BSIP?</p>	<p>pre-Covid levels by 2025 to support Gloucestershire's sustainable growth objectives.</p> <p>This is in addition to the £10m per annum funding that the council already invests in public transport and concessionary fares and £2.6m additional capital investment in bus infrastructure in the Medium-Term Financial Strategy agreed by Council in February.</p>
<p>4. Questioner's name: Adrian Oldman</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Philip Robinson</p>
<p>Agenda Item 10: Bus Back Better - Gloucestershire's Enhanced Partnership</p> <p>What plans does the Council have to finance the BSIP if it fails to receive any DfT funding?</p>	<p>It is unlikely that we will receive no DfT funding and whatever the outcome we will continue to explore opportunities to attract investment into public transport to support our levelling up and sustainable growth ambitions.</p> <p>In our base budget we will continue to invest over £10m per annum in public transport and concessionary fares. We are also making £2.6m new capital investment in bus infrastructure, in the Medium-Term Financial Strategy agreed by Council in February.</p>
<p>5. Questioner's name: Adrian Oldman</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Philip Robinson</p>
<p>Agenda Item 10: Bus Back Better - Gloucestershire's Enhanced Partnership</p> <p>The BSIP states: "We firmly believe that a high functioning bus service can deliver sustainable transport choices for all residents, ensuring equity of access to education, employment and training,</p>	<p>Gloucestershire is not alone in seeing disruption caused to bus services due to the impact of Covid on staffing and bus passenger levels. To support local communities the council continues to fully fund the subsidised bus service network at the same level as before the pandemic to support bus service continuity. We are</p>

and ... a de-facto choice for all transport requirements in the county". Given the daily cancellation of huge numbers of Stagecoach buses that were put on to a reduced service in January 2022 in order to 'improve reliability' what urgent steps are being taken to bring our bus service back to even pre-pandemic levels?

also providing all bus operators with concessionary fare reimbursement far above what is required. This is in addition to the on-going DfT funding Bus Recovery Grant.

With specific regards to Stagecoach, we understand a range of factors led to recent cancellations of trips due to driver shortages. Whilst these issues are not completely resolved there has been a marked improvement in recent weeks and we are in regular contact with Stagecoach's senior management to monitor and support their efforts.

This page is intentionally left blank

MEMBER QUESTIONS

CABINET MEETING – 30 March 2022

<p>Question 1: Cllr Jeremy Hilton</p> <p>Agenda Item 7: Market Shaping and Review of the Estates & Commissioning Strategies</p> <p>Bohanam House is a care home providing 40 beds in which the county council owns the freehold.</p> <p>What assessment has been done to identify the cost of refitting it to modernise the care provision to bring it up to modern day standards?</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Carole Allaway Martin</p> <p>The works to modernise, and refit specifically Bohanam House have not been carried out, however previous feasibility studies and analysis of previous older style properties have estimated the cost of at least £784,000.</p> <p>However, this would still not result in a home fit for purpose to support people with dementia by current standards.</p> <p>Such works would also mean the loss of bedrooms, in order to create larger rooms needed to accommodate equipment and personal belongings. The reduction in the number of beds also impacts on the financial viability of the home.</p>
<p>Question 2: Cllr Jeremy Hilton</p> <p>Agenda Item 7: Market Shaping and Review of the Estates & Commissioning Strategies</p> <p>Can you please provide details of the occupancy of Bohanam House over the last five years?</p> <p>Details on a quarterly basis would be fine.</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Carole Allaway Martin</p> <p>Occupancy for homes under the Gloucestershire Care Providers contract were formerly managed using district occupancy levels rather than by individual care home. We are therefore providing the quarterly percentage of beds occupied by GCC/ Health funded individuals for the last 2 years</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• April 2020- (61% Occupied)• July 2020- (51% Occupied)• November 2020- (48% Occupied)• March 2021- (46% Occupied)• July 2021 –(38% Occupied)• November 2021 (41% Occupied)• February 2022 (36% Occupied)

MEMBER QUESTIONS

CABINET MEETING – 30 March 2022

Question 3: Cllr Jeremy Hilton	Respondent: Cllr Carole Allaway Martin
<p>Agenda Item 7: Market Shaping and Review of the Estates & Commissioning Strategies</p> <p>Could you please list all other elderly persons care homes in the city of Gloucester?</p> <p>Giving following details</p> <p>Name of care home, number of beds, occupancy rate, owner/operator and whether the care home meets modern day standards of provision.</p> <p>Also indicate the latest Care Quality Commission assessment, whether they are outstanding, good, requires improvement or inadequate.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Avalon Residential Home- ARTI Care Homes (Gloucester) Limited (20 Beds) (90% Occupancy) CQC-Good 2. Bramble House- Forestglade Limited (27 Beds) (93% Occupancy) CQC- Good 3. Brunswick House Nursing Home -Buckland Care Limited (44 Beds) (86% Occupancy) CQC-Requires Improvement 4. Cavendish Care Home- Cavendish Care Home Limited (24 Beds) (83% Occupancy) CQC- Requires Improvement 5. Chapel House Care Centre - Coate Water Care Company (Church View Nursing Home) Limited 41 (Beds) (88% Occupancy) CQC-Good 6. Charnwood House Nursing Home- Wotton Rise Nursing Home Limited 35 (83%) CQC-Good 7. Chestnut Residential Care Home - Nazdak Limited (5 Beds) (0% Occupancy) CQC-Good 8. Guild House Residential Home-The Gloucester Charities Trust (34 Beds) (79% Occupancy) CQC- Good 9. Horton House Residential Care Home-Highcleeve Limited (24 Beds) (96% Occupancy) CQC- Good 10. Keychange Charity Sceats Care Home- Keychange Charity (24 Beds) (63% Occupancy) CQC-Good 11. Magdalen House Nursing Home -The Gloucester Charities Trust (28 Beds) (82% Occupancy) CQC- Good 12. OSJCT Chestnut Court- The Orders of St. John Care Trust (80 Beds) (78% Occupancy) CQC- Good 13. OSJCT Millbrook Lodge- The Orders of St. John Care Trust (80 Beds) (81% Occupancy) CQC-Good 14. Park View Gloucester- Parkview Gloucester Ltd (102 Beds) (73% Occupancy) CQC- Good

MEMBER QUESTIONS

CABINET MEETING – 30 March 2022

Page 7

	<p>15. Parton House- C.T.C.H. Limited (36 Beds) (78% Occupancy) CQC- Good</p> <p>16. Pine Tree Court Care Home- Woodland Healthcare Limited (34 Beds) (44% Occupancy) CQC-Good</p> <p>17. Redlands Acre- C.T.C.H. Limited (35 Beds) (86% Occupancy) CQC- Good</p> <p>18. Saintbridge House Nursing and Residential Home- Painswick Road Care Home Ltd (36 Beds) (86% Occupancy) CQC- Good</p> <p>19. St Paul's Residential Home- Mrs Mobina Sayani (32 Beds) (100% Occupancy) CQC- Good</p> <p>20. The Dean Neurological Centre- Ramsay Health Care UK Operations Limited (60 Beds) (75% Occupancy) CQC- Good</p> <p>21. The Knoll- Alder Meadow Limited (27) (56% Occupancy) CQC- Good</p> <p>22. The Lawns -The Lawns Limited (30 Beds) (70% Occupancy) CQC- Good</p> <p>23. Westbourne Care Home- Westbourne Care Limited (35 Beds) (77% Occupancy) CQC- Good</p> <p>24. Woodstock Nursing Home- Coate Water Care Company (Church View Nursing Home) Limited (28 Beds) (96% Occupancy) CQC- Good</p> <p>25. Wotton Rise Nursing Home Limited- Wotton Rise Nursing Home Limited (27 Beds) (100% Occupancy) CQC- Good</p>
<p>Question 4: Cllr Jeremy Hilton</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Carole Allaway Martin</p>
<p>Agenda Item 7: Market Shaping and Review of the Estates & Commissioning Strategies</p> <p>The report says that in Gloucester there are 23 individuals waiting for a service. Please explain the reasons for this delay? The report says there is an occupancy rate of 72%, which would indicate a vacancy rate of 28%.</p>	<p>At the time of writing the Cabinet report there were 23 individuals waiting for domiciliary care. Agencies have had difficulty with staff sickness and absence due to Covid-19 isolation or infection. Both care homes and domiciliary care providers have reported absence due to covid and norovirus. The Integrated Brokerage team work 7 days a week to arrange packages of care for our residents.</p>

MEMBER QUESTIONS

CABINET MEETING – 30 March 2022

	The occupancy of care homes changes daily but at the time of collating the statistics for the report, the vacancy was 28%. However, the type of vacancies also impacts on financial viability as part of the consultation we aim to identify the types of vacancies within care homes.
Question 5: Cllr Jeremy Hilton	Respondent: Cllr Carole Allaway Martin
<p>Agenda Item 7: Market Shaping and Review of the Estates & Commissioning Strategies</p> <p>Currently how many residents of Bohanam House are being funded privately and how many being funded by the county council?</p>	<p>As of the 24.03.22</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 16 GCC or NHS funded • 6 Self-funded
Question 6: Cllr Jeremy Hilton	Respondent: Cllr Carole Allaway Martin
<p>Agenda Item 7: Market Shaping and Review of the Estates & Commissioning Strategies</p> <p>Could you please provide me with the basic terms and conditions and the rates of pay of staff being employed under the Gloucestershire Care Partnership employed at Bohanam House?</p>	<p>Gloucestershire Care Partnership and OSJCT are the employers of these staff, and they have responded with the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Basic hourly rate of pay for a Carer – £9.73 - Basic terms and conditions include: - 28 days pro rata holiday inclusive of bank holidays - 8 days pro rata company sick pay - Pension - Life Assurance
Question 7: Cllr Jeremy Hilton	Respondent: Cllr Carole Allaway Martin
<p>Agenda Item 7: Market Shaping and Review of the Estates & Commissioning Strategies</p> <p>Could you provide me with details of staff retention and turnover of front line care workers employed at Bohanam House?</p>	<p>Gloucestershire Care Partnership and OSJCT are the employers of these staff, and they have responded with the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Leavers under 12 months – 57% - Total turnover (leavers under 12 months and all other leavers) – 29%

MEMBER QUESTIONS

CABINET MEETING – 30 March 2022

	- Annualised as of February 2022.
Question 8: Cllr Colin Hay	Respondent: Cllr Lynden Stowe
<p>Agenda Item 5: Financial Monitoring Report 2021/22 In February, with report papers released in advance of the County Council Budget meeting, the Financial Monitoring Report forecast a year end overspend of £964k. Just one month later, after the Budget meeting, the FMR predicts an end position underspend of £640k.</p> <p>Can the Cabinet Member please explain how, in little over a month, officers have found a further £1.604 million?</p>	<p>The most significant movement since the previous outturn forecast has been in relation to Adult Social Care. The position has been particularly fluid in 2021/22 as a consequence of the pandemic, impacting directly upon recruitment and retention of staff in particular and subsequently the implementation of service developments.</p> <p>This reflects that the underspends are one-off in nature, directly related to current circumstances.</p> <p>These issues have impacted all staff groups within Adult Social Care. There is a natural tendency for budget managers to be cautious with their outturn forecasts, which in this instance has led to the shift in the forecast at the year end.</p> <p>It is worth noting that the change in outturn forecast needs to be seen in the wider context of the scale of the whole budget. In this context the movement represents a shift of approximately 0.33%.</p>
Question 9: Cllr Colin Hay	Respondent: Cllr Lynden Stowe
<p>Agenda Item 13: Schedule of Proposed Disposals</p> <p>At last month's Full Council the Conservative group refused our proposal for an acre for acre strategy – instead, choosing to continue selling off our county's rural estate.</p> <p>Can the Cabinet Member please confirm how much farmland is currently on the disposals list?</p>	<p>Farmland currently on the disposals list totals 517 acres.</p>

MEMBER QUESTIONS

CABINET MEETING – 30 March 2022

<p>Question 10: Cllr Colin Hay</p> <p>Agenda Item 13: Schedule of Proposed Disposals</p> <p>Can the Cabinet Member please confirm the total rent this land currently / could potentially provide to the Council from farm tenants?</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Lynden Stowe</p> <p>The total income associated with this land is £107,904. The land included in this forms part of the current capital receipts target of £47m in years 2021/2025.</p>
<p>Question 11: Cllr Linda Cohen</p> <p>Agenda Item 6: Southfield House Semi-independent Accommodation and Support Services for Young People</p> <p>We really welcome this important initiative to help those leaving care transition to independent living.</p> <p>Can the Cabinet Member confirm whether, if residents are working, there will the expectation be that they will be paying rent at Southfield House?</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Stephen Davies</p> <p>We need to remember that GGC cannot be a landlord, therefore no rent can be paid directly, but there will be some options within the contract for rent/housing benefit to be paid directly to the provider, these monies are then deducted from the contract price each quarter.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing benefit - any person within the whole Southfield project (main and old buildings) if they are in receipt or apply for housing benefit - this will be paid to the provider and deducted from the contract price. • Rent charge for both the main and old house - where young people are in employment or apprenticeships a rent contribution will apply - again paid directly to the provider and deducted from the contract price. The rent contribution will be proportionate to the young person's earning and other financial commitments.
<p>Question 12: Cllr Linda Cohen</p> <p>Agenda Item 6: Southfield House Semi-independent Accommodation and Support Services for Young People</p> <p>Will there be an expectation that residents contribute to the maintenance and cleanliness of the property so that they learn to be self-sufficient?</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Stephen Davies</p> <p>All young people have responsibility for their own accommodation/ flat - to keep it clean and safe, staff do support some young people with how to manage this, as for some young people it's about learning these skills. - for example, at Trevone house, some young people have agreed development plans for keeping their flats clean, this can include daily prompts and agreed room visits, so the young person does not get overwhelmed by the tasks.</p>

MEMBER QUESTIONS

CABINET MEETING – 30 March 2022

	Communal areas are everyone’s responsibility - if young people do cooking activities together, this includes cleaning up afterwards.
Question 13: Cllr Linda Cohen	Respondent: Cllr Stephen Davies
<p>Agenda Item 6: Southfield House Semi-independent Accommodation and Support Services for Young People</p> <p>What will be the expected / maximum length of tenancy for residents of Southfield?</p>	<p>Young people can live in Southfields main building from 16years - 25years and within the old building from 18-25years. This allows them the security of knowing they have to plan, develop and secure new accommodation as they transition into adulthood. Some young people will not require this length of time - it’s a needs led process, while others, particularly those stepping down from tier 4 accommodation will need this extended timeframe.</p> <p>The experience from Trevone house, has shown us that young people choose to move on when they are ready and feel confident to do so.</p>
Question 14: Cllr Roger Whyborn	Respondent: Cllr Philip Robinson
<p>Agenda Item 10: Bus Back Better – Gloucestershire’s Enhanced Partnership</p> <p>TIMELINES FOR MEMBER ENGAGEMENT</p> <p>When will members have sight of what goes into the Enhanced Partnership agreement, particularly the appendices, and will members get an opportunity to input to it, ideally through Environment Scrutiny committee?</p>	<p>A draft partnership is currently being prepared, and will be shared with all stakeholders, including members, in April 2022.</p> <p>There are no plans to present to the Environment Scrutiny Committee as yet however if requested by the Committee this would be done.</p>
Question 15: Cllr Roger Whyborn	Respondent: Cllr Philip Robinson
<p>Agenda Item 10: Bus Back Better – Gloucestershire’s Enhanced Partnership</p> <p>EXPECTATIONS FROM THE BSIP & EP</p>	<p>As with all public transport networks there are issues that can be addressed to improve services. However, that does not imply that the existing service is ‘poor’. Issues have been exacerbated by the unprecedented impact of the pandemic on passenger numbers and the ability of operators to deliver bus services.</p>

MEMBER QUESTIONS

CABINET MEETING – 30 March 2022

<p>The aim to increase bus usage across the county is laudable, and a potentially large contributor to decarbonisation. Would the cabinet member agree that generally speaking, and recognising that bus operators have worked hard on these issues, there is poor reliability, connectivity, frequency, speed, and route design of services across the network, with other impediments such as high fares, playing a further part in supressing passenger numbers?</p>	<p>The work to date on the BSIP/EP alongside GCC's existing commitments to the investment and development of high-quality services shows that recovery from the effects of the pandemic is a high priority.</p>
<p>Question 16: Cllr Roger Whyborn</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Philip Robinson</p>
<p>Agenda Item 10: Bus Back Better – Gloucestershire's Enhanced Partnership</p> <p>EXPECTATIONS FROM THE BSIP & EP</p> <p>In particular, that with pre-pandemic bus usages for commuting at 6% in Cheltenham, 8% Gloucester, 5% in Tewkesbury, a very fundamental holistic review of services is required, and one which looks at very different approaches for rural areas especially in Cotswold, and Forest, and Stroud.</p> <p>Would you further agree that such a review should include, but not be limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All of the aims within 1.5 of your report to cabinet, especially real time information? • Measures and Facilities to improve bus reliability, including bus priority schemes? • Explore where more direct services are possible? • Recognising that direct services are not always possible, improve bus-to-bus links especially where they are currently poor, including but not limited to Cheltenham town centre, and using 	<p>There has been a strong recovery in bus passenger numbers in recent months, at the height of the pandemic we were seeing numbers at less than 20% of their usual level, this has recovered to approximately 70%. However, there will undoubtedly be a lasting impact of the pandemic on the way buses are used.</p> <p>The BSIP outlines a series of aims to continue this recovery and to improve the quality of public transport throughout the county. The items and themes listed in the question are very much part of this approach.</p>

MEMBER QUESTIONS

CABINET MEETING – 30 March 2022

<p>simple transport hubs where they add value in the main interchange places across the County?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Also factor in strengthened bus to rail links with more routes and more frequent bus services, including but not limited to those at Kemble, Cheltenham Spa, Ashchurch, Moreton-in-Marsh, Lydney, and within Stroud district? • More buses in the morning and evening, particularly with young people’s journeys in mind? • A comprehensive and frequent set of routes extending to next main towns out-of-county? • Review fares which are problematic for specific groups, such as 16 - 22 y/o and families. 	
<p>Question 17: Cllr Roger Whyborn</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Philip Robinson</p>
<p>Agenda Item 10: Bus Back Better – Gloucestershire’s Enhanced Partnership</p> <p>INTEGRATION WITH RAIL AND ACTIVE TRAVEL A few people already commute by rail – e.g. from Cheltenham to Gloucester – having already used a bus in order to reach the train station. To what extent, if at all, will the EP extend to integration with rail travel, including through ticketing for both commuting and leisure, and also extend to active travel modes? The Arle Court Transport Hub will no doubt be a wonderful prestige project, but what other interchanges are envisaged where people can transfer from walking and cycling to bus, and indeed rail services, and/or charge electric vehicles?</p>	<p>An Interchange Study is currently being commissioned and will consider the various issues raised, this is a key component of the plans to improve better access to public transport services for all residents. This study will inform on a variety of interchanges required throughout the county with facilities to encourage multi-modal travel.</p> <p>The 'Plus-Bus' scheme currently exists and provides some integration between rail and bus tickets. This is something that can be built upon to achieve the aims of further ticketing integration.</p>
<p>Question 18: Cllr Roger Whyborn</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Philip Robinson</p>
<p>Agenda Item 10: Bus Back Better – Gloucestershire’s Enhanced Partnership</p>	<p>Current indications are that a franchised network would require a huge amount of funding to implement, far more funding than even the most</p>

MEMBER QUESTIONS

CABINET MEETING – 30 March 2022

<p>FRANCHISING OF BUS SERVICES</p> <p>Does the will exist to embrace a franchising approach to bus services – obviously this needs a change of approach by central government, and the lobbying thereof – possibly as an end destination point for the Enhanced Partnership. In any event will the cabinet commit to a ‘no-holds-barred’ review of public transport services across Gloucestershire which is both comprehensive and holistic, with the entire bus network on the table?</p>	<p>optimistic expectations of what could be made available to GCC via the BSIP.</p> <p>Given the nature of public transport in Gloucestershire, the Enhanced Partnership is a far more suitable path to investment and improvement.</p> <p>We will continue to work very closely with all operators in the county to maximise the availability of bus services, to develop them where appropriate and to ensure they are fit for purpose.</p>
<p>Question 19: Cllr Paul Hodgkinson</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Philip Robinson</p>
<p>Agenda Item 11: Social Value – sustaining the recovery and levelling up</p> <p>Does the Council employ the principles of social value in its disposals – and if not, why?</p>	<p>Yes, the Council’s policies are developed to be applicable in all appropriate circumstances. Social Value is considered alongside and in conjunction with value for money and the best outcomes for Gloucestershire residents. Investment decisions, whether in terms of procurement and contracts, disposal, purchase and maintenance of assets or financial investments, are all set within the context of Council policies and its constitution, including the Social Value policy, which provides flexibility to consider the context of decisions, as reflected by the response to the situation in Ukraine.</p>
<p>Question 20: Cllr Paul Hodgkinson</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Philip Robinson</p>
<p>Agenda Item 11: Social Value – sustaining the recovery and levelling up</p> <p>Does the Council employ the principles of social value in its investments – and if not, why?</p>	<p>Yes, the Council’s policies are developed to be applicable in all appropriate circumstances. Social Value is considered alongside and in conjunction with value for money and the best outcomes for Gloucestershire residents. Investment decisions, whether in terms of procurement and contracts, disposal, purchase and maintenance of assets or financial investments, are all set within the context of Council policies and its constitution, including the Social Value policy, which</p>

MEMBER QUESTIONS

CABINET MEETING – 30 March 2022

	provides flexibility to consider the context of decisions, as reflected by the response to the situation in Ukraine.
Question 21: Cllr Lisa Spivey	Respondent: Cllr Carole Allaway Martin
<p>Agenda Item 7: Market Shaping and Review of the Estates & Commissioning Strategies</p> <p>All too often our residents see consultation as a tick box exercise, with decisions already set in stone. Can the Cabinet Member confirm how this council will prove to our residents that it has truly taken consultation feedback into account?</p>	<p>We have engaged an independent consultancy called Evolving Communities to undertake the discussion on potential de-commissioning, re-development and proposed new builds. Though the focus is currently, (rightly), on the potential de-commissioning of the older homes the consultation will focus on the wider market shaping conversation. Consultation is necessary for us to make the correct decisions on the shape of health and care provision both now and in the future. We aim to be transparent in all aspects of the discussions now underway and will feedback to the individuals concerned at key points within the consultation process.</p>
Question 22: Cllr Lisa Spivey	Respondent: Cllr Carole Allaway Martin
<p>Agenda Item 7: Market Shaping and Review of the Estates & Commissioning Strategies</p> <p>What questions will be put to residents during this consultation? Will there be an opportunity for residents to state that they do not want the care home to close?</p>	<p>Residents and relatives during the consultation sessions with GCC will be asked to tell us how they feel a potential closure would impact them. This will also involve being given the opportunity to tell us if they do not want the care home to close, and the reasons for this.</p> <p>Meetings which will be led by Evolving Communities will give residents and relatives the opportunity to discuss their concerns about any potential closure and in particular, the likely impact it may have on their health and wellbeing. Issues that will be addressed will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Health • Transport – e.g., ability of relatives and friends to visit • Relationships with friends (e.g., those that they have made within the home) • Social events – do residents attend church or other groups either within or external to the home.

MEMBER QUESTIONS

CABINET MEETING – 30 March 2022

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilities – is there anything about the current set-up that they would miss or anything that a new home would need (e.g., gardens) • Family – would a move take them further away from family or are their couples within the same home.
<p>Question 23: Cllr John Bloxsom</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Carole Allaway Martin</p>
<p>Agenda Item 7: Market Shaping and Review of the Estates & Commissioning Strategies</p> <p>The recent CQC reports state that there are patients who are in local hospitals due to delays in their discharge to home to community care. How would the proposed closure of County owned care homes help to improve this situation?</p>	<p>The CQC carried out an inspection of local NHS services and how they worked together to support the flow of patients through the acute hospital. It did not inspect GCC or the independent adult social care market.</p> <p>For some time now GCC's aim has been to promote independence and support people to stay in their own homes for as long as possible. Overtime we have seen less reliance on care home beds and instead the need for services in the community to enable independence.</p> <p>The patients referred to in the CQC report do not need a care home bed. Therefore, the proposed closure of care home beds will not impact on this particular issue.</p>
<p>Question 24: Cllr John Bloxsom</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Carole Allaway Martin</p>
<p>Agenda Item 7: Market Shaping and Review of the Estates & Commissioning Strategies</p> <p>There is reported to be a lack of sufficient domiciliary care capacity in Gloucestershire, with care homes being used for those who are assessed as needing a package of care in their own home. How will the recommendations in this report improve that situation?</p>	<p>There is a separate but linked piece of market development work being undertaken with home (domiciliary) care providers. This work is aiming to review the way we commission this service and how our providers deliver care within people's own homes.</p>
<p>Question 25: Cllr John Bloxsom</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Carole Allaway Martin</p>
<p>Agenda Item 7: Market Shaping and Review of the Estates & Commissioning Strategies</p>	<p>We have used the capacity within the care home sector to support people on their journey home we have purchased several beds with both the</p>

MEMBER QUESTIONS

CABINET MEETING – 30 March 2022

<p>The CQC has found that there are delays in discharging older patients from hospitals whilst this report states there are vacancies in care homes. How can this capacity be used to enable people to leave hospital as part of a pathway to independent living with the support they require?</p>	<p>GCP contract and the wider market to this effect. However, our aim, and the aims wishes of our residents, is to return home, we are therefore reluctant to purchase care homes beds that do not have therapy and adult social support or an ethos or working to return people home.</p>
<p>Question 26: Cllr John Bloxsom</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Carole Allaway Martin</p>
<p>Agenda Item 7: Market Shaping and Review of the Estates & Commissioning Strategies</p> <p>How will the needs of residents be addressed, where they live in homes identified as being ones that could close, and are likely to be impacted by transfer trauma associated with health complications, leading to decline and even premature death?</p>	<p>Part of the consultation exercise is to determine the needs and wishes of the residents, families, friends, and staff to ensure the best outcome for all concerned.</p> <p>We will be balancing the individual needs against the needs of the wider community and the future needs of health and social care provision for Gloucestershire.</p>
<p>Question 27: Cllr John Bloxsom</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Carole Allaway Martin</p>
<p>Agenda Item 7: Market Shaping and Review of the Estates & Commissioning Strategies</p> <p>There are purpose built, and comparatively modern buildings, amongst the homes that are identified for potential closure. How would best use be made of these to repurpose them to meet the future housing and support needs of the rising population of older people?</p>	<p>As well as proposing to consult on de-commissioning homes we are also suggesting that we invest in new homes and in the redevelopment of some sites for housing with care and flexible care facilities for those living with complex and multiple care needs, including advanced dementia neurological conditions, and acquired brain injury.</p>
<p>Question 28: Cllr John Bloxsom</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Carole Allaway Martin</p>
<p>Agenda Item 7: Market Shaping and Review of the Estates & Commissioning Strategies</p> <p>How will the diminished care home sector that remains, if these proposals are agreed, be supported to provide services that meet the needs of people with complex or multiple care needs?</p>	<p>The proposals outlined in the paper supports the consultation on the de-commissioning of some older homes but also proposes re-development of one site and the development of other sites in areas of the county where we know there is a potential future need.</p>

MEMBER QUESTIONS

CABINET MEETING – 30 March 2022

As part of our on-going statutory duty to manage the care market we will continue to meet regularly with representatives from across the care sector in Gloucestershire to understand how we can best support them.

ADDITIONAL PUBLIC QUESTIONS

CABINET MEETING – 30 March 2022

Question 1: Adele Radford	Respondent: Cllr Carole Allaway Martin
Agenda item 7 Can the Council explain why lack of occupancy is being used as the reason to propose care home closure, when care homes have not been permitted to accept new residents due to the ongoing Covid 19 restrictions?	The report discusses occupancy across the entire care home market. It is recognised that the Covid 19 pandemic has stopped some homes being able to admit new residents. However, the feedback from the engagement programme also identified that those who would traditionally choose residential care, (as a preferred option), are either choosing to receive care in their own home or are electing to move to housing with care, (extra care housing and retirement villages).
Question 2: Adele Radford	Respondent: Cllr Carole Allaway Martin
Agenda item 7 Can the Council explain why, if lack of occupancy of care homes is leading to this proposal for closure, that at least one of the three care homes offered as alternative accommodation has no vacancies?	The Forest of Dean has the lowest vacancy levels in the county. This is outlined in the report along with proposals to address this in the longer term. The proposed closure of Westbury Court is to aid overall sustainability across the market in Gloucestershire. The plans to build in other areas of the Forest support the longer-term need for localised care. The long-term future of Westbury is limited by the site it occupies in relation to the river and the national trust garden. The building has limited appeal to self-funders who expect facilities similar to those they now expect at home. Westbury Court also draws residents from Gloucester City and Newent rather than the wider Forest of Dean district. In seeking to develop and redevelop properties in the Forest area Gloucestershire County Council is planning for the long term health and care needs outlined in our demographic profiles.

ADDITIONAL PUBLIC QUESTIONS

CABINET MEETING – 30 March 2022

Question 3: Adele Radford	Respondent: Cllr Carole Allaway Martin
Agenda item 7 Can the Council explain why, at the resident and families meeting last Tuesday, 22 nd March we were handed a letter which had no written information on the proposed timeline which was only given verbally?	The meeting on Tuesday 22 nd March was intended to advise on the publication of the Cabinet report, subject to approval on 30 th March. The aim was to prepare individuals for the content of the report and the proposal to consult on the closure of the four homes. The timeline will be distributed once Cabinet have approved the approach.
Question 4: Adele Radford	Respondent: Cllr Carole Allaway Martin
Agenda item 7 Can the Council further explain why the importance of the Cabinet meeting on Wednesday, 30 th March was not included in this letter?	The second paragraph of the letter outlines the role of the Cabinet in this process stating: “On Wednesday 30 th March, the county council’s Cabinet will be asked to consider plans to close Westbury Court care home and three others across the county, which is a Gloucestershire County Council building contracted to the Gloucestershire Care Partnership with OSJCT as the care provider”. While that means that the Cabinet meeting is an important part of the process, there will be other opportunities over the coming months for residents and their families to make their views known. The future of the homes will be subject to a further Cabinet decision once the consultation process is concluded.

ADDITIONAL PUBLIC QUESTIONS

CABINET MEETING – 30 March 2022

<p>Question 5: Adele Radford</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Carole Allaway Martin</p>
<p>Agenda item 7</p> <p>Can the Council explain why no further information has been received since the meeting on Tuesday, 22nd March?</p>	<p>The decision to consult on the proposal will be taken on 30th March 2022. Until the decision is made at Cabinet, Gloucestershire County Council officers can take no further action. The meeting on Tuesday 22nd March was intended to advise on the publication of the Cabinet report. The aim was to prepare individuals for the content of the report and the proposal to consult on the closure of the four homes concerned.</p>
<p>Question 6: Adele Radford</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Carole Allaway Martin</p>
<p>Agenda item 7</p> <p>Can the Council explain how those who are disadvantaged by way of lack of internet access for whatever reason who have family at the care home are able to communicate in writing with the Council and receive replies from the Council given the timeframe between the publishing of the paper on Tuesday, 22nd March at 3.30pm and the Cabinet meeting on Wednesday, 30th March?</p>	<p>The publication was timed in order for GCC officers and OSJCT staff to advise on the publication of the report. As the report is proposing a consultation this is not the only opportunity to comment on the proposals or the potential impact of the proposals on the residents, staff, families and friends and the wider communities of Gloucestershire.</p>
<p>Question 7: Adele Radford</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Carole Allaway Martin</p>
<p>Agenda item 7</p> <p>Can the Council explain how they will be compensating self funding residents forced to pay higher care home costs if they are moved from Westbury Court to a more expensive provider?</p>	<p>Should the consultation result in any closures all residents of the four homes will be supported to find alternatives. Any increase in costs as a result of any closure will be discussed and negotiated on a case by case basis.</p>

ADDITIONAL PUBLIC QUESTIONS

CABINET MEETING – 30 March 2022

<p>Question 8: Adele Radford</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Carole Allaway Martin</p>
<p>Agenda item 7</p> <p>Can the Council explain how residents family and friends will be compensated for having to travel greater distances to visit residents currently at Westbury Court?</p>	<p>Should the consultation result in closure of the home the aim is to place residents as close to the current home as possible, (should this be the preferred option). Residents, families, friends and representatives will be fully engaged in the choice of any alternative homes.</p>
<p>Question 9: Adele Radford</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Carole Allaway Martin</p>
<p>Agenda item 7</p> <p>Can the Council further assure families that if residents are moved to alternative provision that there will be more than adequate public transport to the doorstep of the alternative care provision, given that many of those who visit residents may themselves have mobility issues?</p>	<p>Should the consultation result in closure of the home the aim is to place residents as close to the current home as possible. Residents, families, friends and representatives will be fully engaged in the choice of any alternative homes.</p>
<p>Question 10: Adele Radford</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Carole Allaway Martin</p>
<p>Agenda item 7</p> <p>Can the Council explain why, given that lack of occupancy and therefore finance is the reason for the proposed care home closure, and that the population as a whole are being asked to contribute more personally to Adult Social Care via Council Tax precept and increased National Insurance contributions, a party is planned for in excess of 400 Adult Social Care staff on 15th July, 2022 at a budget for catering</p>	<p>The report does focus on occupancy but not from a finance angle. Low occupancy is linked to the sustainability of the wider market.</p> <p>I am unable to comment on the plans for a party for Adult Social Care staff as this is not something that GCC has planned. There is normally an award ceremony, The Care Awards held by Gloucestershire Care Providers Forum to celebrate Independent Care providers. This event is run by GCPA and is funded by sponsors who support the promotion of excellence in care.</p>

ADDITIONAL PUBLIC QUESTIONS

CABINET MEETING – 30 March 2022

<p>of £10 to £15 per head together with a bar and a marquee?</p>	
<p>Question 11: Jane Cutter</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Carole Allaway Martin</p>
<p>Agenda item 7</p> <p><u>Equality Impact Assessment</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surveys and 1:1 session have not been offered. In the case of residents who are not able to comprehend this would have been done to LPA (or equivalent family/friends?). Furthermore, service users – is this current or for possible future users – surveys of local communities would most likely find that if a person has to go into a care home their choice would be local and good quality – Westbury fits this. • Equality Impact Assessment – lack of data, not much work been put into finding how it impacts both service users, workforce and those with relative/friends in the Home. Sidestepping the issue? There are many areas where data is to be gathered at a later time, has this been done? Also suggests a lack of preparation done before this proposal has been made. Do the council actually know who this will affect? • Sex - ‘Not known, however most people working as carers in the H&SC sector are female.’ (<i>Equality Impact Assessment</i>, February 2022, p. 3). Again highlights the lack of research that has been conducted before this proposal has been put forward. What is this implying? Only females are carers – in the twenty-first century? Ignoring the hard work of many male carers. • Planned Actions – No negatives. Why? How? Biased reporting. 	<p>The Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) accompanying the 30th March Cabinet report is based on the broader feedback obtained in the engagement exercise. In taking the recommendation forward it was recognised that the final outcome which will be presented to the June 2022 Cabinet would need to be informed by a more focused consultation process. The Consultation process will therefore inform a three level EIA focusing on the impact on the protected characteristics of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Current residents of the care homes under consideration 2. The family, friends, and representatives of the residents in the care homes under consideration 3. The staff working in the care homes currently under consideration 4. The wider impact on the local community surrounding the care homes currently under consideration & 5. The immediate and longer-term impact on the wider population of Gloucestershire. <p>We have engaged an independent consultancy to undertake this work and they will ensure they capture information relating to the various protected characteristic of the individuals concerned. All communication will be supported by translation and communication aids as necessary and engagement will be offered through a variety of means from one to one sessions through to on line surveys.</p>

ADDITIONAL PUBLIC QUESTIONS

CABINET MEETING – 30 March 2022

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The consultation period and the time to get answers from ‘the cabinet’ do not add up. Consultation period by end of April? But time for questions need to be done by 30 March 2022. Implies a desire for proposal not to be challenged. 	
<p>Question 12: Jane Cutter</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Carole Allaway Martin</p>
<p>Agenda item 7</p> <p><u>Market engagement review & analysis of the Gloucestershire care market</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ‘Individuals wishing to remain in their own homes for as long as possible, with an increased drive for independence has grown’ (<i>Market engagement review & analysis of the Gloucestershire care market</i>, p. 6). While this is true it does not consider the many variables concerning the viability of care at home. The obvious problem is one the council have discovered themselves, the lack of quality domiciliary care, particularly seen in rural areas, where those who need the care are spaced out and the time/distance between clients means not many can be seen. For example, some would not get breakfast until 11am and then put back to bed at 6pm. Especially with staffing crisis (<i>Invisible crisis in home care unfolding as social care sector loses up to 50,000 staff in lead up to winter months</i>, Nuffield Trust, December 2021). Furthermore, there becomes a point when care at home is impractical and becomes detrimental to the client. Three visits a day can be challenging to organise by the care provider due to the issues listed above. Then the individual needs of an elderly person becomes complex – they may require a hoist and that needs two carers to be able to operate safely. The tipping point begins to shift towards them being in a home. Also, the mental/social 	<p>Gloucestershire County Council recognise that there is a viable role for care homes in a vibrant Health and Social Care market which is why the paper also proposes the development of a new home in the Forest of Dean.</p> <p>We recognise that the vacancy level in the Forest is the lowest in the county; Westbury Court attracts residents from with Gloucester City.</p> <p>There is an increase in Gloucestershire citizens choosing to opt for purchasing or renting Housing with Care, (extra care, retirement villages, etc.), rather than opting for a traditional residential setting. We have been informed that this is based on the fact that residential care can take into account the value of property whereas housing with care allows a level of equity release and early planned decision making. The engagement and consultation process will explore this in greater detail.</p> <p>As outlined in the paper Gloucestershire County Council is also undertaking focused work with the domiciliary care sector to change the way in which we purchase and deliver care in people’s homes. This work will also support the development of the Enhanced Independence Offer, (outlined in the paper) and the</p>

ADDITIONAL PUBLIC QUESTIONS

CABINET MEETING – 30 March 2022

<p>side – easier to meet/talk to people in a home. Rural isolation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ‘We are frequently utilising care home beds for individuals who have been assessed as needing a package of care in their own home’ (<i>Market engagement review & analysis of the Gloucestershire care market</i>, p. 8). – So, you (the council) need care home beds? Even if people want to stay in their own homes, they cannot due to the lack of domiciliary care providers – See appendix 1 of <i>Market engagement review & analysis of the Gloucestershire care market</i>, with the distinct lack of domiciliary providers in FOD. • Regarding vacancies, Covid-19 took out entire care homes there is going to be some empty beds. But considering the aging population these will soon be filled, especially concerning the many issues that domiciliary care is facing. 	<p>Home First ethos adopted for the hospital discharge service</p>
<p>Question 13: Jane Cutter</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Carole Allaway Martin</p>
<p>Agenda item 7</p> <p><u>Market Shaping and Review of the Estates & Commissioning Strategies</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reasons for Recommendation (d) – how does this work in rural areas – not a strong enough foundation for domiciliary care in place. <i>Market engagement review & analysis of the Gloucestershire care market</i> states it can take up to five months for adequate care provisions to be made (p. 6). By the removal of care homes, it will lead to more ‘bed-blockers’ in hospitals. In accordance with Care Act (2014) (2a-i) GCC plans do not promote the well-being of an 	<p>It is our aim that people in hospital are supported to return home. This aim also meets the wishes and intentions of our residents. The current high numbers of people waiting to leave hospital is due to the fact that many are waiting for a Discharge to Assess bed, (placements for individuals leaving hospital who require an Adult Social Care assessment of need in order to decide the support they may require in the future. These beds also offer therapy input to assist individuals to return to a level of independence following a hospital stay).</p> <p>Placements in care homes are hampered by the need to close the home and isolate individuals’ resident there during viral outbreaks. We are unable to place individuals in homes with an</p>

ADDITIONAL PUBLIC QUESTIONS

CABINET MEETING – 30 March 2022

individual.

- A breakdown of costs for closure – estimated at 200-300k is this a good use of council funds? (*Market Shaping and Review of the Estates & Commissioning Strategies*, p. 3).
- 28 – why has Westbury been chosen? Removing an option for local people to stay in their communities. The document states that finding appropriate place in local community is already challenging yet you are choosing to remove a choice.
- 32 – confirms the lack of care homes in the area. Again, raising the question of why Westbury is being put forward as a place to close. Furthermore, it does not make any sense to close a Home when there has been no provision put into place to build a ‘modern’ one. Will the new sites be environmentally friendly – not built on green fields. Incidentally, how long has the new hospital in Cinderford been talked about?
- 33 – Again why the closure of a local care home? Westbury serves the rural community. You have successfully identified the problem, yet your solution is to close a rural care home? Especially considering Westbury is able to care for dementia patients, something that is lacking in the Forest of Dean.
- Of note – no vacancy rates for the Forest of Dean. Strongly implies that more care beds are required.
- 47(d) – ‘the Westbury Court site attracts people from the west of Gloucester City’ – evidence? A number are from the immediate vicinity. ‘A feasibility study on a site in Coleford and researching other options for developing new care provision in the Forest of Dean

outbreak nor are we able to place an individual with an active infection into a care setting.

Increasing the capacity which supports individuals to return home increases the options to move people through the system and increases the individual’s potential to return to and then maintain independence.

We are aiming to build in areas of the Forest of Dean where the population profile indicates we will require residential provision. The paper and the consultation process is focused on the Health & Social Care provision for the county in the short, medium and longer term. The consultation process will inform the final decision. The residents, family, friends and staff of in the homes have the opportunity to demonstrate the homes importance to the area as will the wider population of the Forest of Dean and other localities in Gloucestershire.

Westbury Court has limited development potential because of its location between the river and the National Trust gardens, the potential to increase the building size to add modern facilities. The building has limited appeal to self-funders who expect facilities similar to those they now expect at home. Westbury Court also draws residents from Gloucester City and Newent rather than the wider Forest of Dean district. In seeking to develop and redevelop properties in the Forest of Dean area Gloucestershire County Council is planning for the long-term health and care needs outlined in our demographic profiles.

ADDITIONAL PUBLIC QUESTIONS

CABINET MEETING – 30 March 2022

<p>district.’ – So, the Forest of Dean lacks care home beds. Your answer is to shut one whilst making promises that a new home will be built. By the time that may happen the people in Westbury will most likely be dead, having been removed from their local area due to the shortage of beds after the council chose to exacerbate the problem. Furthermore, is Coleford viable? Approximately 13 miles (25 minutes) away. Will it be as easily accessible for visitors (on a bus route) or what about those who can easily walk (better for the environment). A Coleford site would benefit the other side of the Forest, not those who belong in Westbury-on-Severn and surrounding areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 60 – some recognition that the threat of closure create uncertainty for those effected. This is of massive importance for Westbury Care Home as many other Care Homes in the surrounding area are at full capacity e.g. The Coombs. So where are the residents to go? To state the obvious, the supposed homes with vacancies in Gloucester and Cheltenham would not be appropriate due to them being inaccessible for people to visit. • Overall, there is a lack of evidence in the report that supports the closure of Westbury, especially compared to the other three homes. Why is this? Is this the continual marginalisation of the people of the Forest of Dean? 	
<p>Question 14: Janet Marrott</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Carole Allaway Martin</p>
<p>Agenda item 7</p> <p>Why were relatives and staff of the care homes mentioned in the report</p>	<p>The meeting on Tuesday 22nd March was intended to advise on the publication of the Cabinet report. The aim was to prepare</p>

ADDITIONAL PUBLIC QUESTIONS

CABINET MEETING – 30 March 2022

<p>(Agenda Item 7) only given very short notice of the meetings called to explain the content of the report and not notified of what the meeting was about. Also, why were the staff of Westbury Care Home not informed that a meeting would be taking place and were not informed themselves until 30 minutes prior to the other meeting of the situation.</p>	<p>individuals for the content of the report and the proposal to consult on the closure of the four homes. The timeline will be distributed once Cabinet have approved the approach.</p> <p>The meeting aimed to avoid the publication of the Cabinet paper being the first knowledge that residents, families and staff had of the intention to consult on potential closures.</p>
<p>Question 15: Janet Marrott</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Carole Allaway Martin</p>
<p>Agenda item 7</p> <p>The report refers to consultation with the relatives and residents. All that has been offered at present is another meeting on 5th April to report on the Cabinet decision prior to evaluation</p> <p>When Mitcheldean people were promised consultation over the impending of Townsend House there was no consultation only one public meeting in the church at which consultation was promised. Consultation by email or online surveys is not consultation. Covid can no longer be used as an excuse for failing to hold face to face meetings.</p>	<p>Until the Cabinet take the decision to consult on the proposals in the paper, we are unable to undertake any further work. The meetings proposed for early April will update the Cabinet's decision and will then outline the direction for the consultation or not as necessary.</p>
<p>Question 16: Janet Marrott</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Carole Allaway Martin</p>
<p>Agenda item 7</p> <p>No solution was offered as to where residents would be removed to or when it would be likely to happen. Given that Brenda Yearwood claimed it is hoped to have a new purpose-built care home on land owned by GCC in Coleford (presumably at The Coombs) by 2025 what will happen in the meantime. Rodley House is just as much in need of updating regarding residents' toilet facilities as is Westbury Court.</p>	<p>The site mentioned for a new care home is an undeveloped site. The officers mentioned that there is land in Coleford that is being considered for development. The land is currently owned by GCC and is near to the new community hospital We are also looking at other options within the district and will consult on each of these as the plans arise.</p>

ADDITIONAL PUBLIC QUESTIONS

CABINET MEETING – 30 March 2022

<p>Question 17: Janet Marrott</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Carole Allaway Martin</p>
<p>Agenda item 7</p> <p>Is there any truth in the suggestion that Planning Permission has been given for the building of a private care home in Lydney in an area towards the docks and that is where current residents of OSJCT local homes may be rehoused or is this an off-the-cuff response to a question.</p>	<p>There has been an application made to the district council to develop a care home in Lydney it is doubtful that this site would be developed in time to be a credible option for any potential closure at this stage.</p>
<p>Question 18: Paul Radford</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Carole Allaway Martin</p>
<p>Agenda item 7</p> <p>Why were we only given 48 working hours' notice of the meeting and with no indication of the meetings purpose?</p>	<p>The meeting was to advise on the publication of the Cabinet report as we did not want residents, families, friends and staff to learn of the consultation as part of publication of Cabinet papers.</p>
<p>Question 19: Paul Radford</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Carole Allaway Martin</p>
<p>Agenda item 7</p> <p>Why were we not informed at the meeting of the full reasons for the proposed closure?</p>	<p>The Cabinet report is not proposing closures rather it seeks approval from Cabinet on the potential closure of four homes in order to aid the sustainability of the wider care market. Any decision on closure will be based on the feedback to the consultation and will be taken by the Cabinet at a meeting later in the year.</p>
<p>Question 20: Paul Radford</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Carole Allaway Martin</p>
<p>Agenda item 7</p> <p>The Order Of St Johns Care Trust (OSJCT) had already had card printed with alternative care homes within the OSJCT group and the Westbury Court Care Home</p>	<p>OSJCT explained this at the meeting outlining that this was for information only but that, having undertaken previous consultations, they recognised that families liked to be aware of the alternatives/options.</p>

ADDITIONAL PUBLIC QUESTIONS

CABINET MEETING – 30 March 2022

<p>General manager named as a contact. This was premeditated.</p>	
<p>Question 21: Paul Radford</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Carole Allaway Martin</p>
<p>Agenda item 7</p> <p>We were informed that one of the reasons for the proposed closure was the lack of need and lack of full occupancy within the care sector, however one of the suggest care homes on the list is already full, leaving only three to choose from.</p>	<p>The Forest of Dean has the lowest vacancy levels in the county. This is outlined in the report along with proposals to address this in the longer term. The proposed closure of Westbury Court is to aid overall sustainability across the market and the plans to build in other areas of the Forest support the longer-term need for localised care. The long-term future of Westbury is limited by the site it occupies in relation to the river and the national trust garden. The building has limited appeal to self-funders who expect facilities similar to those they now expect at home. Westbury Court also draws residents from Gloucester City and Newent rather than the wider Forest of Dean district. In seeking to develop and redevelop properties in the Forest area Gloucestershire County Council is planning for the long term health and care needs outlined in our demographic profiles.</p>
<p>Question 22: Paul Radford</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Carole Allaway Martin</p>
<p>Agenda item 7</p> <p>Can you explain why lack of occupancy is being sited when care homes have not been allowed to accept new residents during covid19?</p>	<p>The report discusses occupancy across the entire care home market. We recognise that the Covid 19 pandemic has stopped some homes being able to admit new residents. However the feedback from the engagement programme also identified that those who would traditionally choose residential care as a preferred option are either choosing to receive care in their own</p>

ADDITIONAL PUBLIC QUESTIONS

CABINET MEETING – 30 March 2022

	home or are electing to move to housing with care, (extra care housing and retirement villages)
Question 23: Paul Radford	Respondent: Cllr Carole Allaway Martin
<p>Agenda item 7</p> <p>The pricing structure of the alternative care homes is not in line with Westbury Court (more expensive) will this be addressed?</p>	Should the consultation result in any closures all residents of the four homes will be supported to find alternatives. Any increase in costs as a result of any closure will be discussed and negotiated on a case by case basis.
Question 24: Paul Radford	Respondent: Cllr Carole Allaway Martin
<p>Agenda item 7</p> <p>If a resident needs nursing care what options are there?</p>	All OSJCT homes within the county offer nursing provision.
Question 25: Paul Radford	Respondent: Cllr Carole Allaway Martin
<p>Agenda item 7</p> <p>No follow up communications have been given to the questions asked at the meeting of Tuesday the 22nd of March however this is marked as agenda item No. 7. This is premature</p>	The decision to consult on the proposal will be taken on 30 th March 2022. Until the decision is made at Cabinet, Gloucestershire County Council officers can take no further action. The meeting on Tuesday 22 nd March was intended to advise on the publication of the Cabinet report. The aim was to prepare individuals for the content of the report and the proposal to consult on the closure of the four homes concerned.

ADDITIONAL PUBLIC QUESTIONS

CABINET MEETING – 30 March 2022

Question 26: Paul Radford	Respondent: Cllr Carole Allaway Martin
Agenda item 7 No solution was given to try and maintain friendship groups for the residents or staff	Should any of the homes close we will commit to try and move staff and residents in their relative friendship groups.