

**RHONDDA CYNON TAF COUNTY BOROUGH COUNCIL**

**CABINET**

**21<sup>ST</sup> NOVEMBER 2018**

**SUPPORT @HOME MAESTRISANT SERVICE**

**REPORT OF THE GROUP DIRECTOR, COMMUNITY & CHILDREN'S SERVICES IN DISCUSSION WITH THE RELEVANT PORTFOLIO HOLDER, COUNCILLOR G HOPKINS**

**Author:** Neil Elliott, Service Director Adult Services Tel. 01443 444603

**1. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT**

- 1.1 The purpose of the report is to update Cabinet on the outcome of the consultation to change the dedicated internal Support @Home Service at Maestrisant in Talbot Green to another domiciliary care provider.

**2. RECOMMENDATIONS**

It is recommended that the Cabinet:

- 2.1 Considers the responses to the consultation undertaken in respect of the potential change to the dedicated internal Support @Home Service at Maestrisant in Talbot Green to another domiciliary care provider.
- 2.2 Subject to 2.1 above, agrees to maintain the dedicated internal Support @Home Service at the Maestrisant Housing Scheme in Talbot Green and not change to another domiciliary care provider.
- 2.3 Subject to 2.2 above, agrees to provide, where appropriate and following assessment of need, other residents living at Maestrisant with care and support from the dedicated internal Support @Home Service rather than use other domiciliary care providers.

**3. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 3.1 Following the consultation and engagement with the people receiving care and support at Maestrisant, their advocates, families and social workers and the individual review of each person it is evident there is likely to be significant detriment to these people should a change of domiciliary care provider be pursued.
- 3.2 While it was initially identified that costs could be reduced by a change of domiciliary care provider, the engagement with the people receiving care and support has identified the significant benefit they receive both physically and mentally from the knowledge, experience and

continuation of care provided by the Support @Home Maestrisant Service.

- 3.3 On review, it was also identified that other residents at Maestrisant could be included, where appropriate and following assessment of need, in the dedicated Support @Home Service, and thereby allowing the current Service to maximise the value for money and potentially better quality services to the residents of Maestrisant by being on site.

#### **4. BACKGROUND**

- 4.1 Services are regularly reviewed to ensure they meet people's needs and are value for money. As part of this work, Adult Services highlighted the need to review the provision of domiciliary care and support to four people resident at the Maestrisant housing complex by the internal Support @Home Service. Whilst it was identified the Service was meeting these people's needs it was potentially more costly than a similar service provided by another domiciliary care provider.
- 4.2 Maestrisant is a 31 bed housing scheme located in Talbot Green, owned by Habinteg Housing Association. Habinteg employ a Scheme Manager who is on duty between 9am and 5pm and an on-call system operates outside these hours. Each tenant has a tenancy agreement and pays rent.
- 4.3 Four people who live at Maestrisant receive 24/7 care and support provided by a dedicated team of internal Support @Home care staff who are based at Maestrisant and this operates like an independent supported accommodation home within the large scheme. All four people have a significant disability and have lived at Maestrisant and received care and support from the dedicated internal Support @Home Services for many years.
- 4.4 In addition, there are other tenants at Maestrisant with an assessed care and support need that Adult Social Care has commissioned care from alternative independent domiciliary care providers.

#### **5. CONSULTATION**

- 5.1 A four week consultation was undertaken with each person receiving care and support from the internal Support @Home Maestrisant Service. Adult Services commissioned independent advocacy from Age Connects Morgannwg to support each person through the consultation process.
- 5.2 Individual briefing sessions were arranged with each person, their families, carers and, where appropriate, social workers to outline the proposal. In addition, staff received a briefing session but were not formally consulted at that stage. The Joint Trade Unions and a

representative from the Council's Human Resources department were in attendance.

- 5.3 At the end of the four week consultation period Age Connects prepared a report to feedback the resident's views. The report was ratified by the people in receipt of care and presented to Adult Services by the Age Connect advocate. A summary of the views of each person (changed where required to protect their identity) is provided below:

CR1 struggled to understand the proposal, after numerous meetings to gather CR1 views; I (advocate) still wasn't convinced CR1 fully understood what was being explained to CR1.

CR1's reactions/views remained consistent, explaining CR1 would like to keep the same carers/staff and worried about change and worried about losing friends/family and concerned if CR1 would be able to form new relationships with new carers if the proposal goes ahead.

CR2 struggled to understand the proposal, after numerous meetings CR2 still appeared to have little insight into what is being proposed. CR2's reactions and views were inconsistent, sometimes CR2 wanted new domiciliary staff, other times CR2 became quite distressed by the proposal, and therefore it was difficult to obtain CR2's views and wishes.

CR2's main concerns in regard to the proposal were communicating with new carers, particularly them understanding CR2.

A specialist provider maybe able to offer additional support to CR2 if the proposal goes ahead. CR2 has been consistent in requesting to live with other people with similar conditions to CR2.

CR3 demonstrated understanding. CR3's reactions and views remained the same.

CR3 would like to keep the current domiciliary staff, CR3 is distressed and angered at the proposal. CR3's main concerns were CR3 losing control of CR3's life, CR3 worried about change, CR3 will miss current carers and the relationship CR3 has with them and CR3 concerned about forming new relationships with new carers if the proposal goes ahead.

CR4 appeared to understand what was being proposed. CR4's reactions and views remained the same, CR4 doesn't want to change domiciliary care providers.

CR4's main concerns are: new care staff may not be able to meet CR4's complex needs and has concerns about the communication barriers CR4 will have with new carers and thus raised concerns about not being so actively involved in CR4's care and life.

CR4 is also concerned about losing CR4's independence and losing the relationships CR4 has with current care providers.

In conclusion the advocate said:

- 3 out of the 4 residents do not want to change the domiciliary care providers, 1 resident was inconsistent in their views. 3 out of the 4 residents are happy with their life as it is and do not want change. All residents were distressed and emotional by the proposed changes. All residents were concerned about losing relationships and forming new ones, all residents raised concerns about new care providers supporting them in a way they are accustomed to. All residents feared change. All residents raised concerns about the barriers they will face with new care providers if the proposal goes ahead.
- All displayed strong emotional ties to current carers, words such as family and friends were used to describe them. It was often stated current carers go above and beyond what is the care-plans. All were afraid of change, all raised concerns about there being barriers they may face with new care providers, barriers such as the communication and understanding of them and their needs.

## **6. EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS**

6.1 Cabinet Members will be fully aware and mindful of the general equality duty introduced by the Equality Act 2010 and the specific public sector equality duties applicable to the Council as a local authority in Wales.

6.2 Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 (Public Sector Single Equality Duty) requires public authorities to demonstrate in decision making that they have paid 'due regard' to the need to:

- eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation;
- advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it;
- foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.

The relevant protected characteristics are age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion and belief, sex and sexual orientation.

6.3 The Council must have due regard to the impact of any of the proposals on those with a protected characteristic. The Council has a specific duty to publish information to demonstrate how it has paid due regard to the aims above as part of its decision making. Undertaking an Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) screening exercise (and if necessary

full EIA) would be evidence that the Council has considered its legal obligations in this regard.

- 6.4 An EIA screening has been completed in accordance with the Council's Policy and Guidance. Some potential negative impact had been identified affecting one or more of the target equality groups. A full EIA has been completed. It shows that although there were some areas of concerns in relation to communication challenges it is possible to take steps to mitigate any adverse impact through the use of an advocacy service.
- 6.5 In addition, all the people receiving care and support from the Support @Home Maestrisant Service received a review of their Care and Support plan in line with the Social Services and Wellbeing (Wales) Act 2014.

## **7. FINANCIAL IMPLICATION(S)**

- 7.1 The outcome of the consultation and the subsequent proposals set out in this report have the primary focus of maintaining the delivery of consistent good quality care for the people receiving care and support from Support @Home Maestrisant Service. Whilst the potential for reduced costs by a change of domiciliary care provider is a secondary consideration, the proposals for change should provide the current Service opportunity to maximise the value for money through more cost effective solutions. Notwithstanding this, any costs incurred in respect to provision of care and support for existing or new people with an assessed need will need to be met from existing Adult Social Care budgets.

## **8. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS AND LEGISLATION CONSIDERED**

- 8.1 Any provision of services would need to be considered in accordance with the Social Services and Wellbeing (Wales) Act 2014 (the "Act"). Local Authorities have a general duty under the Act to promote wellbeing. This duty applies when considering decisions in respect of an individual but also when considering broader strategic issues that do not relate to an individual. In doing so, the overall purpose is to produce a sustainable and diverse range of care and support services to deliver better, innovative and cost-effective services and support and promote the wellbeing of every person, and carer, with the need of care and support.
- 8.2 In addition, the Act and accompanying Part 4 Code of Practice sets out that where an Authority has carried out an assessment which has revealed that the person has needs for care and support then the local authority must decide if those needs meet the eligibility criteria, and if they do, it must meet those needs.

8.3 The recommendations set out in Section 2 of this report, in order that the highest standards of care and support can be maintained, is consistent with the Council's duty under the Act.

8.4 There is also a requirement to consult and engage with people receiving care and support services as part of any planned change to the services they received and details of this are contained in Section 5 above.

## **9. LINKS TO THE CORPORATE AND NATIONAL PRIORITIES AND THE WELLBEING OF FUTURE GENERATIONS ACT**

9.1 This report supports two of the [Council's corporate priorities](#), namely:

- People - promoting independence and positive lives for everyone
- Living within our means - where services are delivered efficiently to achieve value for money for the taxpayer

## **10. CONCLUSIONS**

10.1 Following the consultation and engagement with the people receiving care and support at Maestrisant, their advocates, families and social workers and the individual review of each person it is evident there is likely to be significant detriment to these people should a change of domiciliary care provider be pursued. While it was initially identified that costs could be reduced by a change of domiciliary care provider, the engagement with the people receiving care and support has identified the significant benefit they receive both physically and mentally from the knowledge, experience and continuation of care provided by the Support @Home Maestrisant Service. It is not felt that this would be maintained or improved by changing the current provision

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972**

**AS AMENDED BY**

**THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION) ACT 1985**

**RHONDDA CYNON TAF COUNTY BOROUGH COUNCIL**

**CABINET**

**21<sup>st</sup> NOVEMBER 2018**

**REPORT OF THE GROUP DIRECTOR, COMMUNITY & CHILDREN'S  
SERVICES IN DISCUSSION WITH THE RELEVANT PORTFOLIO HOLDER,  
COUNCILLOR G HOPKINS**

**SUPPORT @HOME MAESTRISANT SERVICE**

**Background Papers**

Social Services and Wellbeing (Wales) Act 2014.

**Officer to contact: Neil Elliott, Service Director for Adults. Tel. No.  
01443 444603**