

CABINET – 22 June 2022
PUBLIC QUESTIONS

<p>1. Questioner's name: Helen Hews</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Carole Allaway-Martin</p>
<p>Agenda Item 5: Consultation update on the proposed decommissioning and closure of four homes within the Gloucestershire Care Partnership</p> <p>Point 20, where did the figure of 14 residents come from as we currently have more than that in the home?</p>	<p>The information was based on the resident's tracker submitted by Bohanam House and circulated at planning and risk mitigation meetings. The figure of 14 reflects the number of residents who are GCC funded, and the 3 self-funders were identified separately on the submission.</p>
<p>2. Questioner's name: Helen Hews</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Carole Allaway-Martin</p>
<p>Agenda Item 5: Consultation update on the proposed decommissioning and closure of four homes within the Gloucestershire Care Partnership</p> <p>Point 22, we are not a dementia registered home but do cater for residents who live well with their dementia so why is the fact we do not have complex dementia residents being used in this report when we are not registered to do so? -will this now be an expectation for ALL homes in the county to provide complex dementia care as this seems unfair to judge us on this if it is not mandated for all?</p>	<p>We are seeing an increase in the complex needs in the residents who require care homes.</p> <p>We are also seeing a deterioration in the health of residents with dementia while living in residential settings. This may change their care requirements and we may need to source an alternative placement.</p> <p>We do require care homes to be able to be flexible in the care they are able to provide, as complex needs develop and increase. This forms part of our market and contract management duties to work with our Care Sector.</p>
<p>3. Questioner's name: Helen Hews</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Carole Allaway-Martin</p>
<p>Agenda Item 5: Consultation update on the proposed decommissioning and closure of four homes within the Gloucestershire Care Partnership</p>	<p>This point forms part of the rationale and longer-term planning for the care home market, and is not necessarily a reflection of the current residents you have living at Bohanam,</p>

<p>Point 160, who claimed we nursed residents in bed because we cannot get equipment in to rooms and corridors are too small to facilitate this? this is inaccurate as all residents that are clinically able to do so do come out of there rooms and attend the lounge/dining rooms. We only nurse residents in bed when there is a clinical need to do so.</p>	<p>We recognise the increased and complex needs that individual are living with daily, and particularly now when entering nursing or residential care. This increases the need for specialist care and equipment to be able to support them, this often requires spacious bedrooms, and bathing facilities and corridors to safely manoeuvre equipment to keep both residents and staff safe.</p> <p>There is then also the demand for adequate storage to be able to safely store any specialist equipment, and adhere to safety precautions, and infection prevention & control measures.</p>
<p>4. Questioner's name: Helen Hews</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Carole Allaway-Martin</p>
<p>Agenda Item 5: Consultation update on the proposed decommissioning and closure of four homes within the Gloucestershire Care Partnership</p> <p>Point 161, no one can recall saying we have only had one outbreak of covid in the home, staff are well aware we have had more than one outbreak, staff have previously stated we did not have any covid in the home during the first wave. But we did have one resident die with covid on the death certificate as passed within the 28 days during second year.</p> <p>We have had out breaks and family members were caught up in the testing scandal which is why we eventually had a significant prolonged outbreak within the home.</p>	<p>The comments and feedback at the consultation meetings were all recorded by our note taker. In context we took this comment to mean one outbreak.</p>

<p>5. Questioner's name: Samantha Davies</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Carole Allaway-Martin</p>
<p>Agenda Item 5: Consultation update on the proposed decommissioning and closure of four homes within the Gloucestershire Care Partnership</p> <p>What is the overall rationale for the specific homes being put forward for closure? It cannot be that they are not providing the right or up to date facilities because many of those remaining open are exactly the same. It cannot be merely occupancy as just 2 years ago this home was full and we were turning people away.</p> <p>We understand from GCC that they have used the capacity tracker to review levels of occupancy across the county in clusters (both in GCC & private sector) however that is not the only reason being looked at. They say they have looked back over 5 years however the tracker has only been available for approx. 2.5 years – this doesn't seem to add up?</p> <p>We are told we have been compared with other homes (again in GCC & private sector) using specific and comparable information yet despite asking time and time again for what this is, we are yet to be enlightened. We cannot see that the report covers or answers this fully – perhaps you can detail this for us and show how the homes proposed for closure compare to those that are not being closed. We fully understand that you cannot name names etc but there should be some figures to show how these 4 homes have been singled out.</p> <p>We look forward to your response or indeed showing us where in the paper this is explained in full please?</p>	<p>We are only able to directly influence and manage the care homes that we own, and OSJ run on our behalf.</p> <p>The capacity tracker was introduced in 2020, prior to this our contract management and market management team have worked with our care sector providers over a sustained period to obtain occupancy data and to map market trends in other ways.</p> <p>Westbury Court did reach 96% occupancy in December 2019 however prior to this Westbury Court was averaging at a 72% occupancy rate, we saw the occupancy increase following the decommissioning of another home in the Forest of Dean under the GCP contract and was sustained for a period however this is again declining.</p> <p>While occupancy forms part of the rationale, we also took into consideration the facilities within the home and the projected needs of the population of the Forest of Dean, along with the sorts of care we expect they will be requiring in the future, which is why it has been identified and we seek approval to build a new facility within the Forest of Dean to meet this demand.</p> <p>For homes to be financially viable and sustainable they require a mix of self-funded, and local authority funded placements, and Westbury has attracted less self-funders than other homes considered.</p>

<p>6. Questioner's name: Adrian Mckie</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Carole Allaway-Martin</p>
<p>Agenda Item 5: Consultation update on the proposed decommissioning and closure of four homes within the Gloucestershire Care Partnership</p> <p>Conversion: I read that the older style homes do not warrant full conversion to up to date standards as it would be too costly and they would not generate sufficient income to make them economically viable over the longer term.</p> <p>And yet the report mentions that many of the privately run homes in Cheltenham are housed in Georgian and Victorian buildings. If the necessary conversions have not taken place already, surely they face the same dilemma?</p> <p>If this is the case, then is there is a possibility that some privately owned homes will not be able to effectively compete in a market demanding up to date facilities and be subject to closure themselves?</p>	<p>While we are not able to directly influence the independent businesses within the sector, the Contract and Market Management Teams work closely with all providers and stakeholders to provide support to manage and shape the market to meet the rising demands of the population of Gloucestershire. They advise and work with providers to enhance and develop their facilities as much as possible to ensure we have enough of the right types of care provision in the right places in the county.</p>
<p>7. Questioner's name: Adrian Mckie</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Carole Allaway-Martin</p>
<p>Agenda Item 5: Consultation update on the proposed decommissioning and closure of four homes within the Gloucestershire Care Partnership</p> <p>Occupancy: I have noted the low levels of occupancy within the older style OSJCT homes and the level of free beds elsewhere in the immediate area. However these figures do not show , possibly due to commercial sensitivity, the detailed occupancy figures of other private and newer OSJCT homes.</p>	<p>As evidenced in our Cabinet Report, the continued decline in numbers of individuals entering residential or nursing care, coupled with more residents wishing to remain living at home for longer, has reduced the number of care home beds we require. Therefore, we currently have a surplus of care beds across Gloucestershire, in particularly in our urban areas.</p> <p>A key theme from our Market Engagement Survey in November was that due to the impact of the pandemic, increased costs, and</p>

<p>If we accept the premise that nursing home occupancy figures have fallen steadily, then is this reflected in other homes? Are there other private homes that have very low occupancy levels and, if not part of a large organisation, subject to possible closure themselves?</p> <p>(They may also have debts/borrowings that may be difficult to service. Without looking at detailed balance sheets and profit and loss accounts, it is difficult to make an informed opinion).</p> <p>Is it possible to carry any form of due diligence on all the other homes to ensure they are able to continue to offer a service on a going concern basis? If not, is it too premature to close four homes without knowing the continuing viability of the other homes?</p>	<p>workforce challenges provider in our local market were becoming potentially unviable. We anticipate the proposed decommissioning of the four homes will have an impact and support in the sustainability of the wider care market. The County Council's contract and market management teams will continue to support on an ongoing basis to carry out due diligence and highlight risks.</p> <p>While we acknowledge that some providers could potentially close due to viability, we will continue to work to explore and increase other options of care for individuals such as extra care, housing with care, and enhanced community care to meet individuals needs and wishes. Our review of demographic data predicts that we will still have an oversupply of care home beds across of Gloucestershire.</p> <p>We also recognise and predict there will be an increase in demand for care and specialist dementia care in 2025-2030, and particularly in certain areas therefore we will continue to plan and seek approval to build new facilities in these locations to meet rising demands.</p>
<p>8. Questioner's name: Adrian Mckie</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Carole Allaway-Martin</p>
<p>Agenda Item 5: Consultation update on the proposed decommissioning and closure of four homes within the Gloucestershire Care Partnership</p> <p>Longer term planning: the report identifies the significant issues facing the care industry as a whole including the shortage of experienced care and nursing staff, the impact of covid on its residents/ clientele and the associated costs of future infection control measures, with reduced or no additional government funding.</p> <p>Covid has placed enormous financial pressures on local authority</p>	<p>Our Proud to Care team are working directly with care providers. They help them recruit staff, focussing on people who don't normally consider careers in care and that providers don't see in their normal recruitment rounds. Proud to Care also has an extensive training offer. They help providers develop new specialisms that support people with more acute and complex needs at home.</p> <p>We have regular forums with care providers of all kinds (including those who work with self-funders) particularly in parts of the County where we know that capacity is a challenge for care at home, or specialist provision</p>

<p>funding, while Brexit has undoubtedly led to a significant reduction in existing and future staff numbers. The report also states the attrition of staff to other sectors such as hospitality and retail.</p> <p>But these are hopefully comparatively short term issues and should be seen in the context of longer term planning over the next 20 or 30 years. Economic cycles suggest that difficult times of recession or stagnation are followed by periods of growth.</p> <p>While the report concentrates on the current situation and is a logical accountant's response to an overcapacity in a post covid world, we must look over the longer term.</p> <p>Any planning must take into account the population demographic spike anticipated over the next 20 years, as the baby boom generation reaches its 80s.</p> <p>So, what is the Council's longer term view of how care will be managed?</p>	<p>Commissioning have also invested in new information technologies, such as interactive maps of supply and demand which help us to plan, operate and monitor care sector more effectivity.</p> <p>As mentioned in previous responses we are continuously working to manage and shape the care home market in now, and to plan and forecast for the future with the development of new facilities in certain areas of the county, as well as working to enhance and develop other options for care including the use the technology to support.</p>
<p>9. Questioner's name: Paul Noke</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr David Gray</p>
<p>Agenda Item 7: Scheme development funding for M5 Junction 9 and A46 (Ashchurch) Strategic Transport Scheme in 2022/23</p> <p>In a previous GCC Cabinet Report dated 24th March 2021, the amount required to develop the M5 Junction 9/A46 (Ashchurch) Transport Scheme OBC was estimated at c£8m. In the latest report this has increased to £14.108m (+76%). What are the reasons for such a significant cost overrun?</p>	<p>An estimated sum of approximately £14.108 million (in total) is now required for the development of the M5 Junction 9 and A46 (Ashchurch) Transport Scheme Outline Business Case (OBC). Since the March 2021 Cabinet report, National Highways (NH) have agreed to take on the delivery of the scheme, subject to an approved OBC. This therefore means that GCC has to ensure the OBC is now developed in line with NH's Project Control Framework which is much more in-depth and requires significant additional works (and therefore expenditure) – hence the increase in the cost of the OBC.</p>

<p>10. Questioner's name: Paul Noke</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr David Gray</p>
<p>Agenda Item 7: Scheme development funding for M5 Junction 9 and A46 (Ashchurch) Strategic Transport Scheme in 2022/23</p> <p>How much of the total £14.1m will have been funded by annual GCC Council Tax revenue?</p>	<p>Of the £8million required in 2021, £5.5million was from County Council sources. Of the £6million required in 2022, £4.5million will be from County Council sources. As mentioned in the answer to Q9, upon approval, GCC is expecting to reclaim in the region of 40-50% of the OBC costs from the DfT.</p>
<p>11. Questioner's name: Janet Marrott</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Carole Allaway-Martin</p>
<p>Agenda Item 5: Consultation update on the proposed decommissioning and closure of four homes within the Gloucestershire Care Partnership</p> <p>Given that the County Council feels the need to reduce its estate by closing older premises before building new, will the Cabinet agree to continue its arrangement of working with the Order of St John Care Trust by supporting it financially rather than moving residents from homes covered under the Gloucestershire Care Plan to premises owned by care home companies whose main aim is for the profits of shareholders.</p>	<p>GCC are committed to work in collaboration with OSJCT to transfer as many residents as possible to other homes within the trust, should individuals choose and wish to transfer to one of these homes.</p>

This page is intentionally left blank

MEMBER QUESTIONS

CABINET MEETING –22 June 2022

<p>Question 1: Cllr Jeremy Hilton</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Carole Allaway-Martin</p>
<p>Agenda Item 5: Consultation update on the proposed decommissioning and closure of four homes within the Gloucestershire Care Partnership</p> <p>On 18 May the new Cabinet Member on Public Health passed on a petition on behalf of Stonehouse residents regarding the closure of The Elms Care Home. Can the Cabinet Member please confirm the wording of this petition and how many people signed it?</p>	<p>This petition said it was based on the online petition posted by carers at The Elms the signature section was titled ‘I oppose GCC proposed changes to The Elms’ and this received 542 signatures.</p>
<p>Question 2: Cllr Jeremy Hilton</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Carole Allaway-Martin</p>
<p>Agenda Item 5: Consultation update on the proposed decommissioning and closure of four homes within the Gloucestershire Care Partnership</p> <p>The most worrying feedback from the consultation from residents and family members was that some of those cared for might not survive a move into another home. What message have you got for those families?</p>	<p>We acknowledge and understand the worries of those residents and family members and have detailed these further in our Equality Impact Assessment, along with the mitigations and extensive support we are committed to give to all residents, family, and friends.</p> <p>Sufficient time will be given to undertake careful, sensitive, and person-centred planning for the closure and relocation of residents.</p> <p>Residents and families will continue to be supported before, during and after transition to mitigate any risks to individuals’ wellbeing, and their mental and physical health.</p>
<p>Question 3: Cllr Jeremy Hilton</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Carole Allaway-Martin</p>
<p>Agenda Item 5: Consultation update on the proposed decommissioning and closure of four homes within the Gloucestershire Care Partnership</p>	<p>GCC are committed to working with The Orders of St John Care Trust (OSJCT) to transfer individuals to other settings with their</p>

MEMBER QUESTIONS

CABINET MEETING –22 June 2022

<p>It was heartening to read about the strong friendships and community feel of the care homes identified in the report. What guarantee can you make to these residents and their families that these friendship groups can be retained if made to relocate to a new home?</p>	<p>friendships groups if they wish. This also includes the staffing teams that have supported and provided care for these residents.</p> <p>We will work with OSJCT to explore every possibility of doing this in the best way, to ensure we can meet residents wishes and their care needs and maintain their existing friendship groups and community connections.</p>
<p>Question 4: Cllr Jeremy Hilton</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Carole Allaway-Martin</p>
<p>Agenda Item 5: Consultation update on the proposed decommissioning and closure of four homes within the Gloucestershire Care Partnership</p> <p>There were similar concerns raised by families that they might not be able to afford the care in other more modern facilities. Can the Cabinet Member guarantee that no resident and/or their families will be financially impacted by any decision taken?</p>	<p>Our Adult Social Care and Brokerage Team will work in collaboration with all residents and their families to identify and procure suitable alternative placements that they are happy with. We will also work hard to negotiate with our care market and to mitigate any financial impact a move may incur.</p> <p>Client contributions are the calculated on income therefore for publicly funded residents any increase in costs would sit with GCC. We have committed to also cover any additional costs for those funding their own care should this be required.</p>
<p>Question 5: Cllr Jeremy Hilton</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Carole Allaway-Martin</p>
<p>Agenda Item 5: Consultation update on the proposed decommissioning and closure of four homes within the Gloucestershire Care Partnership</p> <p>All four of the care homes identified for closure consistently had more than an 80 per cent occupancy prior to the pandemic – arguably bucking the trend in declining numbers in care. Why do</p>	<p>As evidenced in our Cabinet Report, the continued decline in individuals entering residential or nursing care and more residents wishing to remain living at home for longer has reduced the number of care home beds we require therefore we currently have a surplus of care beds across Gloucestershire, in particularly in our urban areas.</p>

MEMBER QUESTIONS

CABINET MEETING –22 June 2022

<p>you not envisage that these homes will not build back to these numbers over time?</p>	<p>While we understand and predict there will be an increase in demand for care and specialist dementia care in 2025-2030, we will continue to work to explore and increase other options of care for individuals such as extra care, housing with care, and enhanced community care to meet individuals needs and wishes and therefore predict that we will still have an oversupply of care home beds in areas of Gloucestershire.</p>
<p>Question 6: Cllr Jeremy Hilton</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Carole Allaway-Martin</p>
<p>Agenda Item 5: Consultation update on the proposed decommissioning and closure of four homes within the Gloucestershire Care Partnership</p> <p>The report says that three of the care homes Bohanam House, Orchard House and Westbury Court could not be developed to meet current requirement and standards. Please provide documentary evidence from the GCP Estates Committee and our own asset management team that these care homes could not be converted to meet modern requirements?</p>	<p>Our market engagement, and analysis has evidenced that we have an oversupply of care home beds across Gloucestershire predominantly in our urban areas, therefore the proposals to decommission these homes support in the suitability of the wider care home market and the increase in occupancy as well as a consolidation of the skilled workforce, across all homes and mainly those in the GCP estate.</p> <p>Discussions with our asset management colleagues, and during Estate Strategy meetings the potential to redevelop these facilities has been discussed at length. If we were to redevelop these facilities to include the flexible spacious accommodation and en-suite facilities we would lose several bedrooms which would make the homes unviable as the optimum number of beds would be reduced. On average a loss of one bedroom for every two en-suites required</p> <p>It was also acknowledged that to carry out these extensive redevelopments would be a significant expense, and this would still not support in market sustainability, and workforce challenges.</p>

MEMBER QUESTIONS

CABINET MEETING –22 June 2022

<p>Question 7: Cllr Jeremy Hilton</p> <p>Agenda Item 5: Consultation update on the proposed decommissioning and closure of four homes within the Gloucestershire Care Partnership</p> <p>Bohanam House is near to Gloucestershire Royal Hospital and the report says that the care home had prevented a lot of hospital admissions. Why close a care home so near to GRH that could provide beds to allow for the discharge of elderly people who are fit enough to leave an acute ward, but not yet ready to return home?</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Carole Allaway-Martin</p> <p>As mentioned in our Cabinet Report and previous reports, we do have an oversupply of Care Home beds in Gloucester and the wider districts which are utilised when required and appropriate to support hospital discharges.</p> <p>Discharge to assess pathways have also changed the way in which we assess individuals and therapy input is required to support to increase and maximise independence and this often requires specialist facilities.</p> <p>Whilst care home beds are used for short term placements to assess people for their longer-term social care needs. Relatively few will require a long-term placement in a residential or nursing home. Therefore, it is not appropriate to assume the empty beds in these homes can be used to expedite hospital discharge.</p>
<p>Question 8: Cllr Jeremy Hilton</p> <p>Agenda Item 5: Consultation update on the proposed decommissioning and closure of four homes within the Gloucestershire Care Partnership</p> <p>In a County Council press release, the Council Leader said that “When Cabinet meets, it will have to weigh up the understandable and valid concerns raised by those in the four homes with the wider trends and issues impacting on the local care market.” Yet, in the very next sentence he also said “We cannot afford to do nothing.”</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Carole Allaway-Martin</p> <p>As part of our duty under the Care Act for Market Management and following our Engagement exercise with the entire Care Market in November 2021, it was recognised that we do something to support the sector in many areas.</p> <p>During the 6-week consultation officers spent a great deal of time listening to and gathering feedback from all of the staff, residents, relatives and the wider community to understand the impact of the proposals, as well as giving opportunity to hear their thoughts and feedback on how we can work with our market to support them and meet the wishes and demands of our population in the future.</p>

MEMBER QUESTIONS

CABINET MEETING –22 June 2022

<p>Isn't it the case that you had already planned to close these care homes come what may and that the consultation was just a tick box exercise?</p>	<p>Officers also spent time responding to many questions, giving as much information regarding the rationale and reasonings for the proposals as possible.</p> <p>No decision on closure has yet been made, Cabinet will make the final decision on 22nd June 2022. The consultation was undertaken to inform and influence the decision, which in turn was informed by the market engagement exercise undertaken in November 2021</p> <p>The March Cabinet paper also sought permission to initiate a sustainability project with the home care market so that this area of the market was also more fit for purpose. This work has now started and we will report on this as the work progresses.</p>
<p>Question 9: Cllr David Willingham</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Lynden Stowe</p>
<p>Agenda Item 14: Revenue and Capital Expenditure Outturn 2021/2022</p> <p>The report notes that 17 primary schools, one special school and both alternative provision schools are running deficits. Could the Cabinet Member please provide a list of the 20 schools that are in deficit?</p>	<p>The schools currently in deficit are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bettridge School • St Catherine's Catholic Primary School • Churchdown Parton Manor Infant • Clearwell CofE Primary School • Churchdown Village Junior School • Hillesley CofE Primary School • Northleach CofE Primary School • Randwick CofE Primary School • Rodmarton School • Shurdington CofE Primary School • Soudley School • Ann Edwards CofE Primary School • Stonehouse Park Infant School

MEMBER QUESTIONS

CABINET MEETING –22 June 2022

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stratton CofE Primary School • St Mary’s CofE VA Primary School • Watermoor CofE Primary School • Blue Coat CofE Primary School • Naunton Park Primary School • Severn Valley APS • Gloucester and Forest APS
Question 10: Cllr David Willingham	Respondent: Cllr Lynden Stowe
<p>Agenda Item 14: Revenue and Capital Expenditure Outturn 2021/2022</p> <p>The special school that is in deficit appears to have a deficit of £231,436, has the school submitted a recovery plan, if so, are officers and the Cabinet Member happy with the recovery plan?</p>	<p>Members of the LA Deficit working group meet with all schools that are in deficit to support the development of a contextualised recovery plan. This is a collaborative exercise in which we agree recovery activity and timelines, so that all parties are signed up to and happy with the approach.</p>
Question 11: Cllr David Willingham	Respondent: Cllr Lynden Stowe
<p>Agenda Item 14: Revenue and Capital Expenditure Outturn 2021/2022</p> <p>The two alternative provision schools appear to have deficits of £687,742 and £46,497, have the schools submitted recovery plans, and if so are officers and the Cabinet Member happy with those recovery plans?</p>	<p>Members of the LA Deficit working group meet with all schools that are in deficit to support the development of a contextualised recovery plan. This is a collaborative exercise in which we agree recovery activity and timelines, so that all parties are signed up to and happy with the approach.</p>
Question 12: Cllr David Willingham	Respondent: Cllr Lynden Stowe
<p>Agenda Item 14: Revenue and Capital Expenditure Outturn 2021/2022</p>	<p>Members of the LA Deficit working group meet with all schools that are in deficit to support the development of a contextualised</p>

MEMBER QUESTIONS

CABINET MEETING –22 June 2022

<p>Of the 17 primary schools in deficit, the total deficit of those running a deficit of over £50k appears to be £919,543, have each of these schools submitted recovery plans, and if so are officers and the Cabinet Member happy with those recovery plans?</p>	<p>recovery plan. This is a collaborative exercise in which we agree recovery activity and timelines, so that all parties are signed up to and happy with the approach.</p>
<p>Question 13: Cllr David Willingham</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Lynden Stowe</p>
<p>Agenda Item 14: Revenue and Capital Expenditure Outturn 2021/2022</p> <p>In respect of the schools in deficit, could the Cabinet Member please advise whether the Head of Education Strategy and Development has exercised the option to add to, or replace the governing body, or taken any of the other measures listed in paragraph 59, bullet 4 of the report, and if so, for which schools?</p>	<p>Engagement from school leadership, including Governors to develop appropriate recovery plans has, in all cases, been positive and effective. As such this action has not been necessary to date.</p>
<p>Question 14: Cllr David Willingham</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Lynden Stowe</p>
<p>Agenda Item 14: Revenue and Capital Expenditure Outturn 2021/2022</p> <p>Could the Cabinet Member please confirm whether local councillors have been advised if any school in the Division they represent is in deficit, and been given the opportunity to be involved in supporting those schools with their recovery?</p>	<p>Local councillors are not routinely informed of schools in deficit and not directly involved in discussions about recovery. This is because recovery planning is predominantly focussed on operational and structural changes in school (class structures, staffing, pupil admissions etc.).</p> <p>The deficit group would, of course, reach out to councillors for support on a case-by-case basis and when appropriate.</p>
<p>Question 15: Cllr Roger Whyborn</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr David Gray</p>
<p>Agenda Item 7: Scheme development funding for M5 Junction 9 and A46 (Ashchurch) Strategic Transport Scheme in 2022/23</p>	<p>The process for allocating DfT funding to major schemes is by its nature competitive. Nevertheless, we believe that the benefits of</p>

MEMBER QUESTIONS

CABINET MEETING –22 June 2022

<p>Can the Cabinet Member say how likely it is - percentage terms - that we will win external investment for this scheme – in order to determine whether this is a good use of taxpayers’ money?</p>	<p>the scheme, in terms of safety, economy and environment, are so manifest that its completion is a highly desirable outcome whether viewed from a County, Regional or National perspective.</p> <p>Whilst GCC is the current scheme sponsor, through collaborative working with National Highways (NH), it has been agreed that, subject to an approved Outline Business Case, NH will take the scheme on for delivery.</p> <p>GCC will develop the scheme in accordance with NH’s Project Control Framework to align delivery of the project with NH’s processes and enable a smooth handover.</p> <p>GCC will therefore not require external investment for this scheme once it has been through the Outline Business Case process and (if approved) handed over to NH. GCC would continue to have input to the scheme, but NH will then be responsible for future business case development and the subsequent construction of the scheme, including the risk of overspend.</p>
<p>Question 16: Cllr Roger Whyborn</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr David Gray</p>
<p>Agenda Item 7: Scheme development funding for M5 Junction 9 and A46 (Ashchurch) Strategic Transport Scheme in 2022/23</p> <p>Can the Cabinet Member confirm that any outline plans would explicitly include exemplar active travel options in the region earmarked for highways improvements, and that any application for funding would also look to include these ?</p>	<p>The scheme aims to significantly reduce the long distance through-traffic from the A46 through Ashchurch. If approved, this, and the de-trunking of the A46 through Ashchurch, will provide GCC and the local community with the opportunity to deliver a comprehensive active travel corridor along the site of the former A road. We are currently at a very early stage of design, gathering information about existing and potential active travel options in order to inform design development.</p>

MEMBER QUESTIONS

CABINET MEETING –22 June 2022

	<p>The Government has recently launched a new executive agency, Active Travel England. Part of their remit will be to inspect highway schemes to ensure they are fully embracing the opportunity for active travel mode infrastructure to be embedded in schemes during the design phase. This will become a primary consideration in the scheme's future development.</p>
Question 17: Cllr Linda Cohen	Respondent: Cllr Philip Robinson
<p>Agenda Item 10: Community and Adult Skills Programme 2022 - 2023</p> <p>How was the delivery of adult education impacted during the pandemic, and how will these proposals help them to make up for missed opportunities?</p>	<p>Adult Education and its Subcontractors were quickly able to move to online learning during the pandemic, using platforms such as zoom and google classrooms to engage with the learners. This was well received by the large numbers of learners that we were able to engage with in this way and has allowed us to continue with a blended learning approach ensuring that all learners can continue to engage with us. This is now allowing us to reach a much wider audience ensuring that learners benefit from both face to face and virtual support in the future.</p>
Question 18: Cllr Linda Cohen	Respondent: Cllr Philip Robinson
<p>Agenda Item 10: Community and Adult Skills Programme 2022 - 2023</p> <p>Can the Cabinet Member confirm that no-one has permanently missed out on education opportunities as a result of the pandemic, because of age-limits or other factors?</p>	<p>Whilst every effort was made to reach all possible learners during the pandemic, there were some that we did not reach as well as we had pre-pandemic, due to IT capacity and clinical reasons.</p> <p>As soon as we were able, in August 2020, we opened our doors so that we could engage face-to- face with those who had been most isolated.</p>

MEMBER QUESTIONS

CABINET MEETING –22 June 2022

	<p>We worked with our subcontractors to ensure we met the needs of the most vulnerable people aged 19+ with no upper age limit within our community.</p>
<p>Question 19: Cllr John Bloxsom</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Carole Allaway-Martin</p>
<p>Agenda Item 5: Consultation update on the proposed decommissioning and closure of four homes within the Gloucestershire Care Partnership</p> <p>How will the proposed closures contribute to addressing the lack of care, in particular home care, which is responsible for delayed discharges from local hospitals?</p>	<p>There are projects being led to specifically focus on stabilising and upskilling the domiciliary care market. Adult Social Care, and Commissioning teams, are working in partnership with our key stakeholders, and the communities in Gloucestershire to explore domiciliary care provision in greater depth, to aid in strengthening the support services we can offer individuals who wish to and are able to remain in their own homes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Working with domiciliary care providers to see how we can best support them to recruit and retain an upskilled consistent workforce. • Working with the domiciliary market to identify the geographic locations that are difficult for providers to provide care, and recruit and working with them to achieve solutions to provide localised care. • Increasing the use of technology in Adult Social Care that can further support individuals, providers, and the workforce. • New approaches in care and new commercial arrangements to support providers: They might include (a) neighbourhood care, where providers operate nearer to their customers' homes. Besides reducing the time and expenses of travel, neighbourhood care helps providers better understand the

MEMBER QUESTIONS

CABINET MEETING –22 June 2022

	<p>places their customers live. They can offer not just personal care but to also help people regain independence and help people do things that improve quality of life; (b) contracts and payment terms that support providers to pay salaries and offer terms and conditions that help them compete in Gloucestershire’s labour market, the absence of which inhibit recruitment and retention of good staff; (c) better coordination and closer working relationships between home care and other health and care professionals; (d) simplification of systems and processes.</p>
<p>Question 20: Cllr John Bloxsom</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Carole Allaway-Martin</p>
<p>Agenda Item 5: Consultation update on the proposed decommissioning and closure of four homes within the Gloucestershire Care Partnership</p> <p>How many years will elapse between closure of current facilities and any new or improved alternative provision being in place?</p>	<p>If Cabinet makes a decision today to decommission, then we will be able to begin the detailed work needed on alternate specialist provision – along with the timescale for delivery.</p>
<p>Question 21: Cllr John Bloxsom</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Carole Allaway-Martin</p>
<p>Agenda Item 5: Consultation update on the proposed decommissioning and closure of four homes within the Gloucestershire Care Partnership</p> <p>Is the Cabinet Member fully aware of the distress and concerns amongst many residents, family members and staff about these proposals?</p>	<p>I have spoken with individuals who are directly involved in the consultation and with people in the wider community. I have listened with respect to the views, concerns and fears that they have shared.</p>

MEMBER QUESTIONS

CABINET MEETING –22 June 2022

<p>Question 22: Cllr John Bloxsom</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Carole Allaway-Martin</p>
<p>Agenda Item 5: Consultation update on the proposed decommissioning and closure of four homes within the Gloucestershire Care Partnership</p> <p>Is the Cabinet Member aware of the complaints that the consultation process was rushed, with lack of information and many concerns and questions not addressed?</p>	<p>All the feedback we have received from staff, residents and relatives was that they felt the consultation process was too long, and that this increased anxiety.</p> <p>Feedback that residents, relatives & staff gave to ‘Evolving Communities’ was that there were too many meetings held and they felt this repetitive.</p>
<p>Question 23: Cllr John Bloxsom</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Lynden Stowe</p>
<p>Agenda Item 14: Revenue and Capital Expenditure Outturn 2021/2022</p> <p>Given the recent failure of the County Council to secure any additional funding for the Bus Service Improvement Plan, will Cabinet review its rejection of budget amendments to further increase spending on public transport and now invest the 2021/22 revenue underspend, from which is recommends the transfer of £1.053 million to General Reserves, into support and improvement of our failing bus transport network?</p>	<p>The £1.053 million has been allocated to the general reserves for inflationary pressures but it is too early in the financial year to understand where the greatest inflationary pressures will arise, especially in the current economic circumstances, therefore decisions about if and how to use it will be made later in the year, in line with prudent financial management and control principles.</p> <p>Within the total proposed carry forwards of £5.939 million within Annex 1 (page 23) there is £0.495 million, set aside from the concessionary fares underspend, which if approved will be earmarked to help the service providers during 2022-23 as one-off support.</p>
<p>Question 24: Cllr John Bloxsom</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Philip Robinson</p>
<p>Agenda Item 11: Inclusion and SEND strategies</p>	<p>The education and inclusion strategies set out our plans to ensure that the education system provides the right support for children and young people to thrive. A key component of this is the investment in a range of new specialist provision to meet the</p>

MEMBER QUESTIONS

CABINET MEETING –22 June 2022

<p>Can the Cabinet Member give an assurance that the Education Inclusion Strategy and SEND strategies will deliver a step change in provision which will address the many concerns and complaints that families have about lack of the right type of provision to needs the needs of children, in particular those with high needs?</p>	<p>increasing need for support. There is already a new SEMH special school opening in September this year and a further school opening in Stroud in September 2023. In addition, we are planning the development and delivery of two further schools in the coming years, one of which we have already secured funding for and the other we hope to secure through the DfE Free School programme.</p>
<p>Question 25: Cllr John Bloxsom</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Dave Norman</p>
<p>Agenda Item 16: proposed re-location of Stroud Library</p> <p>How will the Cabinet Member assure future generation of library users and that the service within the town will be secure if it moves from purpose built County owned premises to a rented unit owned by a property developer?</p>	<p>Sections 10 and 11 of the cabinet report outline the steps that the County Council will take should the library service be served a hostile notice to leave the proposed new location. Expressly that: alternative suitable accommodation, based on the needs of residents, will be found to ensure the County Council meets its statutory duty under the Public Libraries and Museums Act 1964 ‘to provide a comprehensive and efficient library service for all persons’ for all those who live, work or study in the area.</p>
<p>Question 26: Cllr John Bloxsom</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Dave Norman</p>
<p>Agenda Item 16: proposed re-location of Stroud Library</p> <p>What assurances can be given that the current building, which is listed as an asset of community value and occupies an important site, will provide other services that benefit the public and not stand empty and vacant?</p>	<p>We are working with One Gloucestershire (public sector) partners to determine if they have a use for the buildings. Being listed as an asset of community value we would be required to advise community groups of our intentions and give them six months in which to develop a bid to use the property if no other service uses can be identified and we decide to dispose of the buildings. We would always look to maximise the value of an asset like this prior to disposing of it. The business case for the move of the library assumes no ongoing revenue cost for the current building.</p>
<p>Question 27: Cllr John Bloxsom</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Dave Norman</p>

MEMBER QUESTIONS

CABINET MEETING –22 June 2022

<p>Agenda Item 16: proposed re-location of Stroud Library</p> <p>When will new payment machines be installed immediately near to the new disabled parking spaces in the shopping centre car park and will they be available when the relocation is planned to occur?</p>	<p>The timing of the extension to the car park which includes the creation of new disabled spaces and step free payment machines is within the overall project timeframe determined by Dransfield Estates. It is anticipated that this phase of the works would be completed prior to the library opening.</p>
<p>Question 28: Cllr John Bloxsom</p> <p>Agenda Item 16: proposed re-location of Stroud Library</p> <p>How could safe and convenient additional on street disabled parking spaces be provided on King Street, in replacement of those currently used on Lansdown, on the same side of the proposed library, given that the frontage is entirely devoted to use as a taxi rank and bus stop?</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Dave Norman</p> <p>Gloucestershire County Council are happy to consider a proposal for additional on street blue badge parking bays, if these are required. Any changes to existing restrictions will be subject to the Traffic Regulation Order process which includes consultation with statutory bodies and the public.</p>
<p>Question 29: Cllr John Bloxsom</p> <p>Agenda Item 16: proposed re-location of Stroud Library</p> <p>Is the Cabinet Member aware of the concerns and complaints that the consultation undertaken was biased in favour of relocation, by linking service improvements only to the option of relocation and asking 'how much do you support relocation'?</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Dave Norman</p> <p>No complaints were made about this question during the consultation period and 70% of those answering agree or strongly agree with the proposal.</p>