

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

Question 5: Adele Radford	Respondent: Cllr Carole Allaway Martin
Agenda item 7 Can the Council explain why no further information has been received since the meeting on Tuesday, 22 nd March?	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.
Question 6: Adele Radford	Respondent: Cllr Carole Allaway Martin
Agenda item 7 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, 22 nd March at 3.30pm and the Cabinet meeting on Wednesday, 30 th March?	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.
Question 7: Adele Radford	Respondent: Cllr Carole Allaway Martin
Agenda item 7 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?	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.

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

<p>individual.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A breakdown of costs for closure – estimated at 200-300k is this a good use of council funds? (<i>Market Shaping and Review of the Estates & Commissioning Strategies</i>, 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	<p>outbreak nor are we able to place an individual with an active infection into a care setting.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
--	--

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?	
Question 14: Janet Marrott	Respondent: Cllr Carole Allaway Martin
Agenda item 7 Why were relatives and staff of the care homes mentioned in the report	The meeting on Tuesday 22 nd March was intended to advise on the publication of the Cabinet report. The aim was to prepare

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

Question 17: Janet Marrott	Respondent: Cllr Carole Allaway Martin
Agenda item 7 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.	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.
Question 18: Paul Radford	Respondent: Cllr Carole Allaway Martin
Agenda item 7 Why were we only given 48 working hours' notice of the meeting and with no indication of the meetings purpose?	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.
Question 19: Paul Radford	Respondent: Cllr Carole Allaway Martin
Agenda item 7 Why were we not informed at the meeting of the full reasons for the proposed closure?	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.
Question 20: Paul Radford	Respondent: Cllr Carole Allaway Martin
Agenda item 7 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	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.

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.